self-reported negative feelings increased as the divisions became increasingly unfair (9); they had stronger skin conductance responses, indicating higher emotional arousal, when they rejected, as opposed to accepted, disadvantageous divisions (9, 10). In line with these findings, neuroimaging studies have demonstrated that the brain structures associated with processing negative and aversive emotions, such as the amygdala and anterior insula (aINS), are involved in disadvantageous-inequity processing (8, 11–13).

Compared with disadvantageous inequity, responses to ad-

(34). On the other hand, similar to nonsocial valuation, individuals are capable of integrating social context-related information into decision-making processes to adjust their responses to inequity (4, 35–37). These flexible adjustments take place regularly in various contexts in everyday life (38), which enable us to maintain cooperative relationships, maximize personal welfare, and adapt to dynamic social situations (39, 40). Moreover, individuals' attitudes (or subjective values) toward advantageous and disadvantageous inequity may vary differently according to contexts. For example, when distributing resources as a dictator, individuals tend to avoid advantageous inequity when interacting with cooperative others (e.g., friends or neighbors) but are more tolerant of advantageous inequity when interacting with competitive others (e.g., competitors or salesmen). In contrast, the context chang

in this condition than in the other three conditions, which would in turn result in boosted activity differences between HI and LI conditions in these regions (Fig. 4*A*). Thus, the activity of these brain regions would show significant Agent × Outcome × Inequity level three-way interactions [(Self_Pain_HI > Self_Pain_LI) − (Self_Nopain_HI > Self_Nopain_LI) − (Other_Pain_HI > Other_Pain_LI) + (Other_Nopain_HI > Other_Nopain_LI)] in the

interaction, the stronger the neural adjustment; for the disadvantageous frame, the smaller this value of interaction, the stronger the neural adjustment. The individual difference in sensitivity to guilt context [i.e., guilt proneness assessed by the Guilt and Shame Proneness scale (GASP) ( )] was related to the strength of neural adjustment in

were satisfied with the advantageous outcomes due to the context of competition. In contrast, in the current study, the setting that the coplayer may pay for the participant's mistakes created a cooperative relationship, and the participant put negative values on advantageous inequity (positive parameter

20. Xiang T, Lohrenz T, Montague PR (2013) Computational substrates of norms and their violations during social exchange. J Neurosci 33:1099–108a.
21. Miller EK, Cohen JD (2001) An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function. Annu Rev Neurosci 24:167–202.
22. Luo Y, Eickhoff SB, Hétu S, Feng C (2018) Social comparison in the brain: A coordinate-based meta-analysis of functional brain imaging studies on the downward and upward comparisons. Hum Brain Mapp 39:440–458.
23. Levy DJ, Glimcher PW (2012) The root of all value: A neural common currency for choice. Curr Opin Neurobiol 22:1027–1038.