

3-1-2013

# Cue-induced conditioned activity does not incubate but is mediated by the basolateral amygdala

Geoffrey W. Diehl

Jonathan M. Wachtel

Tracie A. Paine

*Oberlin College*, [tracie.paine@oberlin.edu](mailto:tracie.paine@oberlin.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.oberlin.edu/faculty\\_schol](https://digitalcommons.oberlin.edu/faculty_schol)

---

## Repository Citation

Diehl, Geoffrey W., Jonathan M. Wachtel, and Tracie A. Paine. 2013. "Cue-induced conditioned activity does not incubate but is mediated by the basolateral amygdala." *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior* 104: 69-79.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons at Oberlin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty & Staff Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons at Oberlin. For more information, please contact [megan.mitchell@oberlin.edu](mailto:megan.mitchell@oberlin.edu).

1  
2  
3  
4 **Cue-induced conditioned activity does not incubate but**  
5  
6 **is mediated by the basolateral amygdala**  
7  
8

9  
10 Geoffrey W. Diehl\*, Jonathan M. Wachtel\*, Tracie A. Paine  
11 Department on Neuroscience, Oberlin College, Oberlin OH 44074  
12

13 \*indicates authors contributed equally to the work  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 **Text:**

28 Words in Abstract: 282  
29 Words in Introduction: 834  
30 Words in Materials and Methods: 1147  
31 Words in Discussion: 1856  
32 Figures: 8  
33  
34  
35

36 **Corresponding Author:**

37 Tracie A. Paine  
38 119 Woodland Street  
39 Oberlin, OH 44074  
40 Phone: 440 775 8366  
41 Fax: 440 775 5397  
42 Email: [tpaine@oberlin.edu](mailto:tpaine@oberlin.edu)  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Abstract**  
5

6 Re-exposure to drug-associated cues causes significant drug craving in recovering  
7 addicts, which may precipitate relapse. In animal models of craving, drug-seeking  
8 responses for contingent delivery of drug-associated cues sensitizes or “incubates”  
9 across drug withdrawal. To date there is limited evidence supporting an incubation  
10 effect for behaviors mediated by non-contingent presentation of drug-associated cues.  
11 Here we used a model of cue-induced conditioned activity to determine if the  
12 conditioned locomotor response to a non-contingent presentation of a drug-associated  
13 cue sensitizes across drug withdrawal. In addition, because cue-induced drug-seeking  
14 responses are mediated by the rostral basolateral amygdala (rBLA), we investigated  
15 whether this structure is critical for the expression of cue-induced conditioned activity. A  
16 conditioned association between cocaine (15 mg/kg) and a compound discrete cue  
17 (flashing bicycle light + a metronome) was established over 12 conditioning sessions in  
18 male Sprague-Dawley rats. In experiment 1, cue-induced conditioned activity was  
19 assessed on 3 occasions: 3, 14 and 28 days following the final drug-cue conditioning  
20 session. Cocaine-conditioned rats demonstrated reliable cue-induced conditioned  
21 activity across all 3 test sessions, however there was no evidence of an incubation  
22 effect. To determine whether repeated testing prevented the observation of an  
23 incubation effect, rats in experiment 2 were tested either 3-days or 28-days following  
24 conditioning; again no incubation effect was observed. In experiment 3, either saline or  
25 the GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor agonist muscimol was infused prior to testing. Intra-BLA infusions  
26 of muscimol prevented the expression of cue-induced conditioned activity. These data  
27 support the role of the rBLA in mediating conditioned responses to drug-associated  
28 cues. The failure to observe an incubation effect for cue-induced conditioned activity  
29 may point to fundamental difference in the manner by which contingent and non-  
30 contingent presentations of drug-associated cues influence behavior.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Avery O’Hare and Cassie Burley for their technical assistance.

**Key Words**

Cocaine, Pavlovian Conditioning, Relapse, Incubation Effect, Basolateral Amygdala, Conditioned Activity

1  
2  
3  
4 **1. Introduction**  
5

6 Drug addiction is a chronically relapsing disorder with re-exposure to drug-associated  
7 cues being amongst the most powerful triggers for relapse. Indeed, presentation of  
8 drug-associated cues (i.e., videos involving drug-taking, images of drug-related  
9 paraphernalia, or hearing a personalized drug-related script) induces profound drug  
10 craving, or the desire to re-experience the drug effect, in abstinent cocaine addicts  
11 (Volkow et al., 2006; Childress et al., 1999) and is associated with physiological  
12 changes that reflect a “drug-like” state (Ehrman et al., 1992). It has been hypothesized  
13 that cue-induced drug craving progressively increases over the first several weeks of  
14 drug withdrawal (Gawin and Kleber, 1986), which may explain why drug-associated  
15 cues are able to induce relapse despite prolonged periods of abstinence. In rodent  
16 models of relapse, responding for a cocaine-associated cue is higher after prolonged  
17 withdrawal (e.g., one month) than it is after acute withdrawal (e.g., one day), suggesting  
18 that the ability of drug-associated cues to influence behavior may sensitize or incubate  
19 following drug discontinuation (Lu et al., 2004; Grimm et al., 2001; for review, see  
20 Pickens et al., 2011).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 In the most prevalent animal model of relapse, including that used to study the  
36 incubation effect, drug-associated cues are delivered contingently upon a lever press  
37 (Grimm et al., 2001). During training, lever-pressing results in delivery of both the drug  
38 and the drug-associated cue (e.g., a light + tone); these cues are thought to gain  
39 motivational significance by virtue of being repeatedly paired with the drug effect (See  
40 2005; Berridge, 2004). During tests of reinstatement, rats will lever press for the  
41 delivery of drug-associated cues in the absence of the drug, suggesting that drug-  
42 associated cues act as secondary reinforcers (e.g., Kantak et al., 2002; Kruzich and  
43 See, 2001; Grimm and See, 2000). In contrast, the cues that are presented to abstinent  
44 cocaine addicts (i.e., those that cause profound craving) are presented non-contingently  
45 (e.g., Childress et al., 1999). This has lead researchers to develop animal models in  
46 which drug-associated cues are also delivered non-contingently and their effects on  
47 behavior are measured. For example, in a discriminative stimulus task of reinstatement,  
48 cocaine-seeking responses are increased in the presence of a cue predictive of cocaine  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 availability (S+), but not in presence of a cue predictive of non-reward (S-), or in the  
5 absence of any cues (Yun and Fields, 2003; Ciccocioppo et al., 2001; Weiss et al.,  
6 2000). Similarly, in a cue-induced conditioned activity task, locomotor activity is  
7 increased in the presence of a discrete cue previously paired with cocaine, but is  
8 unchanged in the absence of that cue (Hotsenpiller et al., 2002; Hotsenpiller et al.,  
9 2001; Panlillio and Schindler, 1997).

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 The basolateral amygdala (BLA; consisting of the lateral, basal and accessory basal  
18 nuclei (LeDoux, 2007; Pitkänen et al., 1997)) is required for both contingent and non-  
19 contingent presentation of drug-associated cues to influence behavior. Response to  
20 contingent presentation of drug-associated cues is associated with increased neuronal  
21 activity within the BLA (as indicated by Fos protein expression) (Kufahl et al., 2009).  
22 Furthermore, excitotoxic lesions and temporary inactivation of the BLA attenuate  
23 responding for response-contingent presentations of drug-associated cues (Gabriele  
24 and See, 2010; Katak et al., 2002; Kruzich and See, 2001; Grimm and See, 2000).  
25 Likewise, non-contingent presentation of drug-associated cues increases activation of  
26 the amygdala in abstinent cocaine addicts (Bonson et al., 2002; Kilts et al., 2001;  
27 Childress et al., 1999). In rodents, re-exposure to a cocaine-associated context or a  
28 cocaine-predictive discriminative stimulus increases Fos protein expression in the BLA  
29 (Miller and Marshall, 2005; Ciccocioppo et al., 2001), while excitotoxic lesions of the  
30 BLA prevent reinstatement of drug-seeking in the presence of a cocaine-predictive cue  
31 (Yun and Fields, 2003). However, exposure to a discrete cocaine-paired cue did not  
32 increase Fos protein expression in the BLA in the cue-induced conditioned activity task  
33 (Hotsenpiller et al., 2002), indicating that the BLA may not be required for the  
34 expression of cue-induced conditioned activity.

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 One goal of the current experiment was to determine the role of the BLA in the  
52 expression of cue-induced conditioned activity. First, however we validated a model of  
53 cue-induced conditioned activity (Hotsenpiller et al., 2002; Hotsenpiller et al., 2001;  
54 Panlilio and Schindler, 1997; Polston and Glick, 2011), and used it to determine if cue-  
55 induced conditioned activity “incubated” across drug withdrawal. In the first experiment,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 cue-induced conditioned activity was measured 3 times: 3, 14 and 28 days following the  
5 final drug-cue pairing. This within-subjects design did not reveal an incubation effect,  
6 thus an additional experiment was conducted in which rats were tested either 3 days or  
7 28 days following the final drug-cue pairing. In the third experiment, the BLA was  
8 inactivated using the GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor agonist muscimol prior to testing. Consistent with  
9 previous reports (Hotsenpiller et al., 2002; Hotsenpiller et al., 2001; Panlilio and  
10 Schindler, 1997) we observed that activity was increased in the presence of a discrete  
11 drug-paired cue, but we did not observe an incubation effect; cue-induced conditioned  
12 activity was the same in early withdrawal as it was in late withdrawal. The expression of  
13 cue-induced conditioned activity was blocked by inhibition of the BLA.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **2. Materials & Methods**

### 25 **2.1 Subjects**

26 **Sixty-nine** adult male Sprague-Dawley rats bred at Oberlin College were used. Four  
27 days before starting behavioral testing (Experiments 1 and 2) or surgery (Experiment 3),  
28 rats were individually housed in polypropylene cages (48 cm x 20 cm x 26 cm) and  
29 food-restricted diet to approximately 85% of their free feeding weight. Rats used in  
30 Experiments 1 and 2 were housed in pairs; rats used in Experiment 3 were housed  
31 individually. Rats were fed (LabDiet 5001 rat chow) after daily conditioning sessions.  
32 Water was available *ad libitum* while rats were in their home cage. Rats were housed on  
33 a 14:10 hr light:dark schedule with lights off at 8 PM in a temperature controlled (22° C)  
34 colony room. All experimental procedures were conducted in accordance with the  
35 National Institutes of Health Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals  
36 (National Academy Press, 1996) and were approved by the Oberlin College IACUC.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 **2.2 Apparatus**

51 Behavioral procedures occurred in four identical locomotor activity chambers made of  
52 clear Plexiglas, each with dimensions of 43.2 cm x 43.2 cm x 30.5 cm (Med-Associates,  
53 St. Albans, VT). Each chamber contained three arrays of 16 infrared beams capable of  
54 measuring locomotor activity in three dimensions. Locomotor activity chambers were  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 connected to a PC running Activity Monitor software (version 6.00, Med-Associates) to  
5 record activity.  
6  
7  
8

### 9 10 **2.3 Drugs**

11 Cocaine hydrochloride (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) was dissolved to a dose of 15  
12 mg/kg in physiological saline (0.9% sodium chloride; Cardinal Health, McGaw Park, IL).  
13 Cocaine dose was based upon Hotsenpiller et al. (2002).  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 Muscimol (Sigma-Aldrich) was dissolved in physiological saline to a final concentration  
19 of 50 ng/μl; aliquots were stored at -20°C until use. Muscimol infusion dose was based  
20 upon Ishikawa et al. (2008).  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 26 **2.4 Surgery**

27 Prior to behavioral testing rats used in Experiment 3 (n = 24) were bilaterally implanted  
28 with guide cannulae (23-gauge, Plastics One, Roanoke VA) aimed at the basolateral  
29 amygdala (BLA). Rats were anesthetized with sodium pentobarbital (65 mg/kg, IP)  
30 (Sigma-Aldrich), the skull exposed, burr holes drilled above the BLA, and the cannulae  
31 were lowered into place (BLA coordinates relative to bregma: A/P: -2.6 mm, M/L: ± 5.0  
32 mm, D/V: -5.2 mm from dura (Paxinos and Watson, 2009)). Skull screws and dental  
33 acrylic secured the guide cannulae in place. Obturators and injector needles (30-  
34 gauge) extended 1.5 mm below the guide cannulae.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Rats were given 1 week to recover following surgery before behavioral training started.  
45 Throughout the recovery period and training, the obturators were manipulated in order  
46 to habituate rats to the handling necessary for infusions and to ensure that obturators  
47 remained secure.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 54 **2.5 Infusions**

55 Prior to baseline sessions preceding each test session, rats in Experiment 3 (see below)  
56 received bilateral infusions of either muscimol (25 ng/0.5 μl/side) or saline (vehicle; 0.5  
57 μl/side). All infusions occurred at a rate of 0.25 μl/min, and injectors were left in place  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 for an additional two minutes to allow for drug diffusion before being replaced by  
5  
6 obturators.  
7  
8

## 9 10 **2.6 Cocaine-Cue Conditioning**

11 A timeline for all behavioral training is shown in **Figure 1**. Habituation and training  
12 sessions were similar to previously described procedures (Hotsenpiller et al., 2001;  
13 Panlilio and Schindler, 1997). Procedures for the habituation and training sessions  
14 were exactly the same for Experiments 1, 2 and 3. As detailed below, procedures for  
15 the test sessions differed between the three experiments.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 2.6.1 Habituation

23  
24 Prior to training, rats underwent three 60-min habituation sessions. Immediately prior to  
25 each session rats were treated with saline (1 ml/kg, IP). Data from these sessions were  
26 used to divide rats into cocaine-conditioned and saline-conditioned groups.  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 2.6.2 Training

32  
33 Following habituation, rats underwent 12 consecutive training sessions; each training  
34 session was divided into a 30-min baseline session and a 30-min conditioning session.  
35 During the baseline session, rats were placed in the activity chamber in the absence of  
36 any cues. At the completion of the baseline session rats were removed from the  
37 chamber, injected with either saline or cocaine and then returned to the chamber for the  
38 conditioning session. Conditioning sessions were further divided into cue present (CS+)  
39 and cue absent (CS-) sessions. Prior to CS+ sessions, rats in the cocaine-conditioned  
40 group were administered cocaine (15 mg/kg, IP) and rats in the saline-conditioned  
41 group were administered saline (1 ml/kg, IP) and placed in the activity chamber in the  
42 presence of a compound audiovisual cue. The cue consisted of a flashing yellow  
43 bicycle light (Ventura LED) and an electronic metronome (Aroma Music Co., China) set  
44 to 77 bpm; these were placed directly above the center of each locomotor chamber.  
45 Prior to CS- sessions, rats in both the cocaine- and saline-conditioned groups were  
46 administered saline (1 ml/kg, IP) and then placed in the activity chamber in the absence  
47 of the discrete compound cue.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 2.6.3 Testing

7  
8 *2.6.3.1 Experiment 1: Validation of the cocaine-cue conditioning protocol*

9  
10 Rats (n=8 saline; n=8 cocaine) were tested on 3 separate occasions: 3, 14 and 28 days  
11 following the completion of conditioning. Each test occurred over 2 days: on one day  
12 the rat was tested in the presence of the cue (CS+ session) and on the other day it was  
13 tested in the absence of the cue (CS- session). Similar to training, each daily test  
14 session began with a 30-min baseline session. At the completion of the baseline  
15 session, rats were removed from the chamber, administered saline (1 ml/kg, IP) and  
16 then returned to the chamber with either the cue present (CS+ session) or the cue  
17 absent (CS- session) for the 30-min test session. The order of CS+ and CS- sessions  
18 was counterbalanced across rats.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 *2.6.3.2 Experiment 2: Determining if non-contingently presented drug-associated cues*  
29 *incubate*

30  
31 In order to determine if repeated testing impeded the observation of an incubation effect  
32 separate sets of rats were tested either 3 days (n=6 saline, n=7 cocaine) or 28 days  
33 (n=8 saline; n=8 cocaine) following the completion of conditioning. All other procedures  
34 were identical to those in Experiment 1.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 *2.6.3.3 Experiment 3: Effect of BLA inactivation on cue-induced activity*

42 Rats (n=12 saline; n=12 cocaine) were tested 3 days following the completion of  
43 conditioning; the test occurred over 4 days. Rats were first infused with either muscimol  
44 or vehicle and then placed in the activity chamber for a 30-min baseline session. At the  
45 completion of the baseline session, rats were removed from the chamber, administered  
46 saline (1 ml/kg, IP) and then placed into the chamber with either the cue present (CS+  
47 session) or the cue absent (CS- session) for the 30-min test session. Rats were tested  
48 once under each possible combination: vehicle/CS-, vehicle/CS+, muscimol/CS-,  
49 muscimol/CS+; the order of vehicle and muscimol infusions and CS- and CS+ sessions  
50 were counterbalanced across rats.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 2.7 Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed with two-way, three-way repeated or four-way repeated measures analyses of variance (ANOVAs) with Condition (cocaine or saline) or Incubation Time (3-day or 28-day) as the between subjects factors. The within subjects factors were Day (or Infusion [vehicle or muscimol]) and Session (CS+ or CS-). Significant main effects and interactions were further analyzed using an estimated marginal means procedure with a Bonferroni correction.

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Experiment 1: Validation of the cocaine-cue conditioning protocol

#### 3.1.1 Habituation

Activity of all rats decreased across the habituation sessions ( $F(2, 28) = 20.46, P < 0.01$ ; **Figure 2A**); activity was significantly higher in session 1 than it was in sessions 2 and 3 ( $P < 0.01$ ). Neither the main effect of Condition nor the Condition X Day interaction were significant (both  $F < 1.0, P > 0.05$ ).

#### 3.1.2 Training

*Baseline Sessions:* Activity differed across baseline sessions ( $F(5, 70) = 4.09, P < 0.01$ ; **Figure 2B**); activity was higher in the first baseline session than it was in the second baseline session ( $P < 0.01$ ). No other main effects or interactions were statistically significant (all  $F < 2.12, all P > 0.5$ ).

*Conditioning Sessions:* Across conditioning sessions there was a significant main effect of Condition ( $F(1, 14) = 42.74, P < 0.01$ ), a significant main effect of Session ( $F(1, 14) = 52.22, P < 0.01$ ) and a significant Condition X Session interaction ( $F(1, 14) = 48.85, P < 0.01$ ; **Figure 2C**). Post-hoc analysis of the interaction revealed that cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity during CS+ sessions than during CS- sessions ( $P < 0.01$ ) and exhibited more activity than saline-conditioned rats during CS+ sessions ( $P < 0.01$ ). No other main effects or interactions were statistically significant (all  $F < 1.25, all P > 0.05$ ).

### 3.1.3 Testing

*Baseline Sessions:* Activity levels were significantly different across the baseline sessions preceding the three test sessions ( $F(2,28) = 15.31, P < 0.01$ ; see **Figure 3A**); activity during the baseline sessions was lower in test 1 than it was in tests 2 and 3 (both  $P < 0.01$ ). No other main effects or interactions were statistically significant (all  $F < 4.17, all P > 0.05$ ).

*Test Sessions:* Across the three tests there was significant main effect of Condition ( $F(1, 14) = 4.47, P = 0.05$ ), a significant main effect of Session ( $F(1, 14) = 49.63, P < 0.01$ ) and a significant Condition X Session interaction ( $F(1,14) = 13.65, P < 0.01$ ; see **Figure 3B**). Post-hoc analysis of the interaction revealed that although both cocaine-conditioned rats and saline-conditioned rats exhibited more activity in the presence of the cue (CS+ session) than in the absence of the cue (CS- session; both  $P < 0.05$ ), cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity than saline-conditioned rats in the presence of the cue (CS+ session,  $P < 0.01$ ). Cocaine-conditioned and saline-conditioned rats exhibited equivalent activity in the absence of the cue (CS- session,  $P > 0.05$ ). These data demonstrate that the cocaine-cue conditioning protocol was effective in establishing an association between the cocaine and the audiovisual cue. No other main effects or interactions were statistically significant (all  $F < 1.83, all P > 0.05$ ).

## **3.2 Experiment 2: Determining if non-contingently presented drug-associated cues incubate**

### 3.2.1 Habituation

There was a significant effect of habituation day ( $F(2, 50) = 23.37, P < 0.01$ ; **Figure 4A**); this effect was modulated by Incubation Time (Day X Incubation Time interaction;  $F(2,50) = 6.87, P < 0.01$ ). Rats in the 3-day group exhibited more activity than rats in the 28-day group during habituation session 3 ( $P < 0.05$ ). The activity of rats in the 28-day group was lower in sessions 2 and 3 than it was in session 1 (both  $P < 0.05$ ). In contrast, the activity of rats in the 3-day group was lower in session 2 ( $P < 0.05$ ), but not

1  
2  
3  
4 in session 3, than it was in session 1. No other main effects and interactions were  
5 statistically significant (all  $F < 1.43$ ,  $P > 0.05$ ).  
6  
7  
8

### 9 3.2.2 Training

10 *Baseline Sessions:* There were a significant main effects of Day ( $F(5,125) = 6.52$ ,  $P <$   
11  $0.01$ ; **Figure 4B**) and Session ( $F(1, 25) = 5.95$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ). In addition there was a  
12 significant 2-way Day X Session interaction ( $F(5, 125) = 2.30$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ), a significant 3-  
13 way Day X Session X Incubation Time interaction ( $F(5, 125) = 3.88$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) and a  
14 significant 4-way Day X Session X Treatment X Incubation Time interaction ( $F(5, 125) =$   
15  $2.56$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ). Analysis of the 4-way interaction revealed that saline-treated rats in the  
16 3-day group exhibited more activity on CS- baseline sessions 4 and 6 than they did in  
17 the corresponding CS+ baseline sessions (both  $P < 0.05$ ). Saline-treated rats in the 28-  
18 day group exhibited more activity in CS- baseline session 5 than they did in the  
19 corresponding CS+ baseline session ( $P < 0.05$ ). Cocaine-treated rats in the 3-day  
20 group exhibited more activity in CS- baseline session 4 than they did in the  
21 corresponding CS+ baseline session ( $P < 0.05$ ). Cocaine-treated rats in the 28-day  
22 group exhibited more activity on CS- baseline sessions 1 and 5 than they did in the  
23 corresponding CS+ baseline sessions (both  $P < 0.05$ ). In addition, saline-treated rats in  
24 the 3-day group exhibited less activity than saline-treated rats in the 28-day group on  
25 CS+ baseline session 4 and 6 (both  $P < 0.05$ ). Similarly, cocaine-treated rats in the 3-  
26 day group exhibited less activity than cocaine-treated rats in the 28-day group on CS+  
27 baseline session 6 ( $P < 0.05$ ). No other main effects and interactions were statistically  
28 significant (all  $F < 3.08$ , all  $P > 0.05$ ).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 *Conditioning Sessions:* During conditioning sessions there was a significant effect of  
49 Session ( $F(1, 25) = 117.83$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ; **Figure 4C**), a significant effect of Treatment ( $F(1,$   
50  $25) = 91.26$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ), a significant Session X Treatment interaction ( $F(1, 25) = 109.00$ ,  
51  $P < 0.01$ ), and a significant Day X Treatment interaction ( $F(5, 125) = 2.29$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ).  
52 Analysis of the Day X Treatment interaction revealed that cocaine-treated rats exhibited  
53 more activity than saline-treated rats across all days (collapsed across CS+ and CS-  
54 sessions; all  $P < 0.01$ ). In addition, cocaine-treated rats exhibited more activity on days  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 2, 3 and 5 than they did on day 1 (all  $P < 0.05$ ). Analysis of the Session X Treatment  
5 interaction revealed that cocaine-treated rats exhibited more activity than saline-treated  
6 rats on all CS+ sessions (all  $P < 0.01$ ) and cocaine-treated rats exhibited more activity  
7 on CS+ session than on CS- sessions (all  $P < 0.05$ ). No other main effects and  
8 interactions were statistically significant (all  $F < 2.15$ , all  $P > 0.05$ ).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

### 14 3.2.3 Testing

15 *Baseline Sessions:* Rats in the 28-day group exhibited more activity during the 30-min  
16 baseline session than rats in the 3-day group ( $F(1, 25) = 13.28$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ; see **Figure**  
17 **5A**). No other main effects and interactions were significant (all  $F < 1.02$ , all  $P > 0.05$ ).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 *Test Sessions:* There was a trend for a main effect of Session ( $F(1, 25) = 4.06$ ,  $P <$   
25  $0.10$ ) and a Session X Treatment interaction ( $F(1, 25) = 3.03$ ,  $P < 0.10$ ). Because we  
26 hypothesized *a priori* that cocaine-treated rats would exhibit more activity in the  
27 presence of the cue (CS+ session) than in its absence (CS- session); post-hoc analyses  
28 were conducted on the Session X Treatment interaction. Consistent with our  
29 hypothesis, cocaine-treated rats exhibited more activity in the presence of the cue than  
30 in its absence ( $P < 0.05$ ). In addition cocaine-treated rats exhibited more activity than  
31 saline-treated rats in the presence, but not the absence, of the cue ( $P < 0.05$ ). No other  
32 main effects and interactions were statistically significant (all  $F < 2.72$ , all  $P > 0.05$ ).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

## 43 **3.3 Experiment 3: Effect of BLA inactivation on cue-induced activity**

### 44 3.3.1 Histological Analysis

45 **Figure 6** depicts cannulae placements of the rats used in the statistical analyses. Of  
46 the 24 rats tested, 5 were excluded from analyses (not shown). Three cocaine-  
47 conditioned rats, and one saline-conditioned rat were excluded based on inaccurate  
48 cannulae placements, while a third saline-conditioned rat was excluded as an outlier  
49 based on multiple sessions of activity greater than 2.5 standard deviations above the  
50 group mean. A total of nine cocaine-conditioned rats and ten saline-conditioned rats  
51 were included in statistical analyses. Although a few cannulae placements were slightly  
52 ventral of the target, these were included in they statistical analyses because the area  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 of drug diffusion would likely include the BLA (Martin, 1991). Moreover, when rats with  
5 ventral placements were excluded from the statistical analysis the same pattern of  
6 effects was observed, although a number of these comparisons only resulted in a trend  
7 towards significance (i.e.,  $P < 0.10$ ) rather than statistical **significance**.  
8  
9

### 10 3.3.2 Habituation

11 Activity of all rats decreased across the habituation sessions ( $F(2, 34) = 17.01, P <$   
12  $0.01$ ; **Figure 7A**); activity was significantly higher on session 1 than it was on session 3  
13 ( $P < 0.01$ ). Neither the main effect of Condition nor the Condition X Day interaction  
14 were significant (both  $F < 1.0, P > 0.05$ ).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

### 24 3.3.3 Training

25 **Baseline Sessions:** There was a significant Condition X Session X Day interaction for  
26 the activity during the 30-min baseline sessions that preceded the conditioning sessions  
27 ( $F(5, 85) = 3.53, P < 0.05$ ; see **Figure 7B**). During sessions 1 and 4 cocaine-  
28 conditioned rats exhibited more activity prior to CS- sessions than they did prior to CS+  
29 sessions (both  $P \leq 0.05$ ). During session 2 saline-conditioned rats exhibited more  
30 activity prior to CS+ session than they did prior to CS- sessions ( $P < 0.05$ ). In addition,  
31 cocaine-treated rats exhibited more activity than saline-treated rats during baseline CS+  
32 sessions 5 and 6 and baseline CS- sessions 2 and 5 (all  $P < 0.05$ ). No other main  
33 effects or interactions were statistically significant (all  $F < 3.89, all P > 0.05$ ).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 **Conditioning Sessions:** Across the conditioning sessions there was a significant main  
45 effect of Condition ( $F(1, 17) = 15.83, P < 0.01$ ), a significant main effect of Session ( $F(1,$   
46  $17) = 18.41, P < 0.01$ ), and a significant Condition X Session interaction ( $F(1, 17) =$   
47  $16.51, P < 0.01$ ; see **Figure 7C**). Cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity than  
48 saline-conditioned rats during both CS+ ( $P < 0.01$ ) and CS- ( $P < 0.05$ ) sessions.  
49 Cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity during CS+ sessions than CS-  
50 sessions ( $P < 0.01$ ). Activity of saline-conditioned rats did not differ across CS+ and  
51 CS- sessions ( $P > 0.05$ ). No other main effects or interactions were statistically  
52 significant (all  $F < 1.00, all P > 0.05$ ).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

### 3.3.4 Testing

*Baseline Sessions:* In the baseline session preceding the test session, cocaine-conditioned rats were more active than saline-conditioned rats ( $F(1,17) = 14.15, P < 0.01$ ; **Figure 8A**). In addition, muscimol infusions significantly decreased activity relative to vehicle infusions ( $F(1, 17) = 10.30, P < 0.01$ ). No other main effects or interactions were statistically significant (all  $F < 2.86, all P > 0.05$ ).

*Test Sessions:* In the test session, there were significant main effects of Condition ( $F(1,17) = 19.18, P < 0.01$ ), Session ( $F(1,17) = 4.95, P < 0.01$ ), and Infusion ( $F(1,17) = 14.75, P < 0.01$ ). In addition, there were significant Session X Condition ( $F(1,17) = 9.48, P < 0.01$ ), Infusion X Condition ( $F(1,17) = 4.38, P = 0.05$ ) and Condition X Session X Infusion interactions ( $F(1,17) = 6.08, P < 0.05$ ; **Figure 8B**). Post-hoc analyses on the Condition X Session X Infusion interaction revealed that the conditioning protocol was successful in establishing a cocaine-cue association: following a vehicle infusion, cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited greater activity in the presence of the cue (CS+ session) than in its absence (CS- session) ( $P < 0.01$ ). Inactivation of the BLA blocked the expression of cocaine-cue conditioning: following a muscimol infusion, cocaine-conditioned rats did not exhibit more activity in the presence of the cue (CS+ session) than in its absence (CS- session) ( $P > 0.05$ ). Moreover, the activity of cocaine-conditioned rats in the presence of the cue (CS+ session) was significantly lower following a muscimol infusion than it was following a vehicle infusion ( $P < 0.01$ ). The activity of saline-conditioned rats was not affected by exposure to the cue or by infusions (all  $P > 0.05$ ), and was significantly lower than cocaine-conditioned rats, irrespective of cue or infusion (all  $P < 0.05$ ). The Session X Infusion interaction was not statistically significant ( $F < 3.1, P > 0.05$ ).

## **4. Discussion**

Consistent with previous reports, we observed that re-exposure to a discrete compound cue (flashing bicycle light + metronome), previously paired with cocaine administration, induced robust conditioned activity (Hotsenpiller et al., 2002; Hotsenpiller et al., 2001;



1  
2  
3  
4 Panlilio and Schindler, 1997). Moreover, the conditioned locomotor response lasted for  
5 at least 28 days following the last drug-cue pairing and endured despite repeated  
6 testing. However, the magnitude of the conditioned locomotor response did not  
7 increase across withdrawal suggesting that, unlike cue-induced reinstatement of drug-  
8 seeking (reviewed in Pickens et al., 2011; Li et al., 2008; Lu et al., 2004; Grimm et al.,  
9 2001), cue-induced conditioned activity does not incubate across drug withdrawal.  
10 Finally, the expression of cue-induced conditioned activity requires the BLA; inactivation  
11 of the BLA with the GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor agonist muscimol prevented cue-induced  
12 conditioned activity.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

#### 22 **4.1 Cue-induced Conditioned Activity**

23  
24 In experiments 1, 2 and 3, cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity in the  
25 presence of the discrete compound cue (flashing bicycle light + metronome) than in the  
26 absence of the cue. Furthermore, cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity than  
27 saline-conditioned rats in the presence of the cue. Combined these data suggest that  
28 the cue gained the incentive motivational significance of cocaine through repeated  
29 pairings. In Experiment 1 however, saline-conditioned rats also exhibited more activity  
30 in the presence of the cue than in its absence suggesting that the cue itself may  
31 increase activity regardless of prior conditioning. Because saline-conditioned rats did  
32 not exhibit increased activity in the presence of the cue during training in Experiment 1  
33 or during either training or testing in Experiment 2 and 3, we suggest that this effect may  
34 be a false positive. Furthermore, the magnitude of the cue effect was smaller in saline-  
35 conditioned rats than it was in cocaine-conditioned rats. Thus, even if the cue itself  
36 inconsistently increases locomotor activity, such an increase in activity is not sufficient  
37 to account for the cue-induced activity observed in cocaine-conditioned rats.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Drug-associated contexts have also been found to gain incentive-motivational  
52 properties of the drugs themselves (reviewed in Crombag et al., 2008). In the current  
53 experiment great care was taken to minimize conditioning to the context (i.e., the  
54 locomotor activity chambers). First, rats were habituated to the chambers over three  
55 60-min sessions. Second, each training and testing session began with a 30-min  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 baseline session in which rats were exposed to the environment in the absence of both  
5 the cue and the drug. Third, rats were trained using explicit CS-sessions; in these  
6 sessions saline administration was paired with the context in the absence of the cue.  
7  
8 Previous research and preliminary results from our lab indicated that these measures  
9 are necessary in order to minimize conditioning to the context and to maximize  
10 conditioning to the discrete compound cue (Wachtel and Paine, 2011; Panlilio and  
11 Schindler, 1997). Despite these efforts, there was evidence for contextual conditioning  
12 in cocaine-conditioned rats, particularly in Experiment 3. Both during training and  
13 during testing the cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity than the saline-  
14 conditioned rats during baseline sessions and CS- sessions. Importantly however, this  
15 contextual conditioning did not interfere with the ability of the discrete cue to elicit  
16 conditioned activity. That is, cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity in the  
17 presence of the cue than in its absence.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

#### 29 30 **4.2 The incubation effect**

31 Drug-seeking responses that result in presentation of a drug-associated cue increase  
32 across drug withdrawal, a phenomenon termed the “incubation of drug craving”  
33 (Pickens et al., 2011). For example, cocaine-seeking responses are greater in late  
34 withdrawal (e.g., 1 month) than in early withdrawal (e.g., 1 day), peaking approximately  
35 1 month after discontinuation of cocaine self-administration (reviewed in Pickens et al.,  
36 2011; Grimm et al., 2001; Lu et al., 2004). **Moreover, incubation of craving has been**  
37 **observed following self-administration of other drug rewards (e.g., heroin, alcohol**  
38 **and nicotine; reviewed in Pickens et al., 2011) and non-drug rewards (e.g.,**  
39 **sucrose; Grimm et al., 2011).** More recently, context-dependent increases in reward-  
40 seeking have also been observed using the place-conditioning paradigm (Li et al.,  
41 2008). In that experiment, the magnitude of the place preference for a heroin-paired  
42 environment was higher in late withdrawal (e.g., 14 days) than it was in early withdrawal  
43 (e.g., 1 day) (Li et al., 2008). Based upon these reports, we aimed to determine if non-  
44 contingent presentation of a drug-associated cue would also sensitize or incubate  
45 across drug withdrawal.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Surprisingly, we did not observe that cue-induced conditioned activity incubated across  
5 drug withdrawal—the magnitude of the cue effect was equivalent when tested in either  
6 early or late withdrawal. The failure to observe an incubation effect occurred regardless  
7 of whether a within subjects or a between subjects design was used. That said, in both  
8 Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 activity during the baseline sessions increased as time  
9 from training increased. This increase in activity *may* have occluded our ability to  
10 observe the incubation effect. However, because the activity during the CS- test  
11 sessions was equivalent during the early and late tests, we do not believe that this is the  
12 case. Further, the increase in baseline activity was observed in all rats regardless of  
13 condition. Thus, we hypothesize that the increased activity during the baseline sessions  
14 resulted from dishabituation to the activity chambers—as the time from training  
15 increased the rats’ memory for the chambers may have diminished.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 **The failure to observe an incubation effect following non-contingent**  
29 **presentations of drug-associated cues suggests that there maybe something**  
30 **fundamentally different about cues that gain motivational significance through**  
31 **passive administration of drugs compared to cues that gain their motivational**  
32 **significance via self-administration of drugs. Although one report finds that**  
33 **heroin-induced conditioned place preference incubates across drug withdrawal**  
34 **(Li et al., 2008), there are other reports that suggest that both cocaine-induced**  
35 **(Mueller and Stewart, 2000; Brabant et al., 2005) and heroin-induced (Mueller and**  
36 **Stewart, 2002; Lu et al., 2000) conditioned place preference fail to incubate across**  
37 **drug withdrawal. Moreover, there is no clear evidence that responding in the**  
38 **presence of a drug-predictive cue (S+) incubates across drug withdrawal**  
39 **(Ciccopcioppo et al., 2001). In that experiment however, the number of cocaine-**  
40 **seeking responses in the presence of the S+ was greater during protracted**  
41 **withdrawal than it was during early withdrawal, but this comparison was not**  
42 **analyzed statistically (Ciccopcioppo et al., 2001). Moreover, Weiss et al. (2001)**  
43 **demonstrated that the ability of cocaine-predictive cues to reinstate drug-seeking**  
44 **remained stable for up to a month following drug-discontinuation despite**  
45 **repeated testing. These data, combined with the observations of the current**  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **experiment, suggest that non-contingent presentation of drug-associated cues do**  
5 **not result in behavioral effects that incubate across drug withdrawal (but see Li et**  
6 **al., 2008). Rather, the incubation of ‘craving’ may be relatively restricted to**  
7 **contingent presentations of drug-associated cues.**  
8  
9

### 10 11 12 13 **4.3 Role of the BLA in Cue-Induced Conditioned Activity**

14  
15 Intra-BLA infusions of the GABA<sub>A</sub> receptor agonist muscimol blocked the expression of  
16 cue-induced conditioned activity. That is, activity in the presence of the cue was  
17 significantly lower following an intra-BLA muscimol infusion than it was following a  
18 vehicle infusion. Furthermore activity following muscimol infusions was not different in  
19 the presence as compare to the absence of the cue. In all rats, intra-BLA muscimol  
20 infusions caused a small but significant decrease in activity during the baseline session  
21 (i.e., the first 30-min post-infusion). Similar motor impairments following BLA  
22 inactivation have been previously observed (Cain et al., 2009; Ishikawa et al., 2008). A  
23 generalized motor impairment however, is unlikely to account for the inability of the  
24 conditioned cue to increase locomotor activity following intra-BLA muscimol infusions.  
25 During the test session, intra-BLA muscimol infusions did not affect activity of cocaine-  
26 conditioned rats in the absence of the cue (i.e., comparison of CS- conditions). In  
27 addition, muscimol infusions did not affect the activity of saline-conditioned rats during  
28 the test session. Thus, although intra-BLA muscimol infusions can decrease locomotor  
29 activity, it is unlikely that a general suppression of activity underlies the inability of the  
30 cocaine-associated cue to increase locomotor activity. Rather, inactivation of the BLA  
31 likely results in a selective decrease in the ability of the conditioned cue to alter  
32 behavior.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 The data from the current experiment are consistent with previous reports implicating  
51 the BLA in the expression of learned associative responses. Because cannulae  
52 placements in the current experiment were restricted to the rostral BLA, the current data  
53 support the notion that the rostral BLA is important for the expression of drug-cue  
54 associations. Previously, it has been observed that the rostral, but not the caudal, BLA  
55 is critical for contingent presentations of drug-associated cues to reinstate drug seeking  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 behavior (Kantak et al., 2002; Mashhoon et al., 2009; Mashhoon et al., 2010). That  
5 said, the effects of caudal BLA inactivation on cue-induced conditioned activity were not  
6 tested in the current experiment. Thus it remains to be determined if a parallel  
7 functional division in the BLA is observed for cue-induced conditioned activity.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 The BLA may modulate the locomotor response to the conditioned cue via its  
14 interactions with the nucleus accumbens (NAc). The BLA sends glutamatergic afferents  
15 to the NAc (LeDoux, 2007; Pitkänen et al., 1997); a connection that is necessary for  
16 cue-controlled cocaine seeking under a second order schedule of reinforcement  
17 (Ambroggi et al., 2008; Di Ciano and Everitt, 2004). In a paradigm similar to the one  
18 used in the current experiment, re-exposure to a drug-associated cue caused an  
19 increase in intra-NAc glutamate release and systemic blockade of glutamate AMPA  
20 receptors prevented the expression of cue-induced conditioned activity (Hotsenpiller et  
21 al., 2001). It is possible that the observed rise in NAc glutamate resulted from  
22 increased activity of glutamatergic neurons originating in the BLA. Moreover, it is  
23 possible that systemic blockade of glutamate transmission prevented cue-induced  
24 conditioned activity by inhibiting neural activity within the BLA, rather than by blocking  
25 glutamate receptors in the NAc per se. Future research will determine if cue-induced  
26 conditioned activity is mediated by a direct connection from the BLA to the NAc.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Alternatively, it is possible that the BLA maybe interacting with the prelimbic (PrL)  
42 prefrontal cortex to modulate the locomotor response to the conditioned cues. The PrL  
43 receives a direct connection from the BLA (Hoover and Vertes, 2007). Indeed,  
44 asymmetric inactivation of the BLA and PrL decrease reinstatement of drug-seeking  
45 behavior under a second order schedule of reinforcement (Mashhoon et al., 2010).  
46 Furthermore, inactivation of the PrL (dorsal prefrontal cortex) is sufficient to attenuate  
47 cue-induced reinstatement of drug-seeking (McLaughlin and See, 2003). Finally,  
48 response contingent presentation of cocaine-associated cues is associated with  
49 increased Fos expression in the prefrontal cortex (Kufahl et al., 2009). Thus, it is  
50 possible that the PrL plays a similar role in cue-induced conditioned activity as it does in  
51 cue-induced reinstatement of drug-seeking behavior.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

#### 4.4 Summary and Conclusions

Cue-induced craving is purported to be a major contributing factor to relapse (Pickens et al., 2011; Volkow et al., 2006). In the clinic non-contingent presentations of drug-associated cues results in profound drug craving (Volkow et al., 2006; Childress et al., 1999) and physiological responses resembling a drug-like state (Ehrman et al., 1992). Here we demonstrate that non-contingent presentations of a discrete compound cue can elicit robust conditioned locomotor activity, which persisted for up to one month despite repeated testing. Unlike tests employing contingent presentations of conditioned cues (Pickens et al., 2011), we did not observe an incubation effect whereby the magnitude of the conditioned response sensitized across drug withdrawal. It is unclear whether this is a fundamental difference between contingent and non-contingent presentations of drug-associated cues or whether the testing parameters were such that we could not observe the incubation effect. Finally, this research adds to a growing body of evidence linking the BLA to the expression of learned associations between drug rewards and discrete environmental cues. Using this model, future research may be able to disentangle the neural mechanisms mediating conditioned responses to non-contingent presentations of drug-associated cues; this may lead to more effective relapse prevention strategies.

## 5. References

Ambroggi F, Ishikawa A, Fields HL, Nicola SM. Basolateral amygdala neurons facilitate reward-seeking behavior by exciting nucleus accumbens neurons. *Neuron* 2008; 59: 648-661

Berridge KC. Motivation concepts in behavioral neuroscience. *Physiol Behav* 2004; 81:179-209.

Bonson KR, Grant SJ, Contoreggi CS, Links JM, Metcalfe J, Weyl HL, Kurian V, Ernst M, London ED. Neural systems and cue-induced cocaine craving. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2002; 26: 376-386.

Brabant C, Quertemont E, Tirelli E. Influence of the dose and the number of drug-context pairings on the magnitude and the long-lasting retention of cocaine-induced conditioned place preference in C57BL/6J mice. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2005; 180: 33-40.

Childress AR, Mozley PD, McElgin W, Fitzgerald J, Reivich M, O'Brien CP. Limbic activation during cue-induced cocaine craving. *Am J Psychiatry* 1999; 156: 11-18.

Ciccocioppo R, Sanna PP, Weiss F. Cocaine-predictive stimulus induces drug-seeking behavior and neural activation in limbic brain regions after multiple months of abstinence: reversal by D(1) antagonists. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2001; 98: 1976-1981.

Crombag HS, Bossert JM, Koya E, Shaham Y. Context-induced relapse to drug seeking: a review. *Phil Trans R Soc B*. 2008; 363: 3233-3243.

Di Ciano P, Everitt BJ. Direct interactions between the basolateral amygdala and nucleus accumbens core underlie cocaine-seeking behavior by rats. *J Neurosci* 2004; 24: 7167-7173.

Ehrman RN, Robbins SJ, Childress AR, O'Brien CP. Conditioned responses to cocaine-related stimuli in cocaine abuse patients. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 1992; 107: 523-529.

Gabriele A, See RE. Reversible inactivation of the basolateral amygdala, but not the dorsolateral caudate putamen, attenuates consolidation of cocaine-cue associative learning in a reinstatement model of drug-seeking. *Eur J Neurosci* 2010; 32:1024-1029.

Gawin F, Kleber H. Pharmacologic treatments of cocaine abuse. *Psychiatr Clin North Am* 1986; 9: 573-583.

Grimm JW, See RE. Dissociation of primary and secondary reward-relevant limbic nuclei in an animal model of relapse. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2000; 22: 473-479.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Grimm JW, Hope BT, Wise RA, Shaham Y. Neuroadaptation. Incubation of cocaine craving after withdrawal. *Nature* 2001; 412: 141-142.

Grimm JW, Harkness JH, Ratliff C, Barnes J, North K, Collins S. Effects of systemic or nucleus accumbens-directed dopamine D1 receptor antagonism on sucrose seeking in rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2011; 216: 219-233.

Helmstetter FJ, Bellgowan PS. Effects of muscimol applied to the basolateral amygdala on acquisition and expression of contextual fear conditioning in rats. *Behav Neurosci*. 1994; 108: 1005-1009.

Hotsenpiller G, Horak BT, Wolf ME. Dissociation of conditioned locomotion and Fos induction in response to stimuli formerly paired with cocaine. *Behav Neurosci* 2002; 116: 634-645.

Hoover WB, Vertes RP. Anatomical analysis of afferent projections to the medial prefrontal cortex in the rat. *Brain Struct Funct* 2007; 212: 149-79.

Hotsenpiller G, Giorgetti M, Wolf ME. Alterations in behaviour and glutamate transmission following presentation of stimuli previously associated with cocaine exposure. *Eur J Neurosci* 2001; 14: 1843-1855.

Ishikawa A, Ambroggi F, Nicola SM, Fields HL. Contributions of the amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex to incentive cue responding. *Neuroscience* 2008; 155: 573-584.

Kantak KM, Black Y, Valencia E, Green-Jordan K, Eichenbaum HB. Dissociable effects of lidocaine inactivation of the rostral and caudal basolateral amygdala on the maintenance and reinstatement of cocaine-seeking behavior in rats. *J Neurosci* 2002; 22: 1126-1136.

Kilts CD, Schweitzer JB, Quinn CK, Gross RE, Faber TL, Muhammad F, Ely TD, Hoffman JM, Drexler KP. Neural activity related to drug craving in cocaine addiction. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2001; 58: 334-341.

Kruzich PJ, See RE. Differential contributions of the basolateral and central amygdala in the acquisition and expression of conditioned relapse to cocaine-seeking behavior. *J Neurosci* 2001; 21: RC155.

Kufahl PR, Zavala AR, Singh A, Thiel KJ, Dickey ED, Joyce JN, Neisewander JL. c-Fos expression associated with reinstatement of cocaine-seeking behavior by response-contingent conditioned cues. *Synapse* 2009; 63: 823-835.

LeDoux J. The amygdala. *Curr Biol* 2007; 17: R868-R874.



1  
2  
3  
4 Li YQ, Li FQ, Wang XY, Wu P, Zhao M, Xu CM, Shaham Y, Lu L. Central amygdala  
5 extracellular signal-regulated kinase signaling pathway is critical to incubation of opiate  
6 craving. *J Neurosci* 2008; 28:13248-13257.  
7

8  
9 Lu L, Grimm JW, Dempsey J, Shaham Y. Cocaine seeking over extended withdrawal  
10 periods in rats: different time courses of responding induced by cocaine cues versus  
11 cocaine priming over the first 6 months. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2004; 176: 101-  
12 108.  
13

14  
15 Martin JH. Autoradiographic estimation of the extent of reversible inactivation produced  
16 by microinjection of lidocaine and muscimol in the rat. *Neurosci Lett* 1991; 127:160-  
17 164.  
18

19  
20 Mashhoon Y, Wells AM, Kantak KM. Interaction of the rostral basolateral amygdala and  
21 prelimbic prefrontal cortex in regulating reinstatement of cocaine-seeking behavior.  
22 *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 2010; 96: 347-353.  
23

24  
25 Mashhoon Y, Tikitak LA, Kantak KM. Dissociable effects of cocaine-seeking behavior  
26 following D<sub>1</sub> receptor activation and blockade within the caudal and rostral basolateral  
27 amygdala. *Eur J Neurosci* 2009; 29: 1641-1653.  
28

29  
30 McLaughlin J, See RE. Selective inactivation of the dorsomedial prefrontal cortex and  
31 the basolateral amygdala attenuates conditioned-cued reinstatement of extinguished  
32 cocaine-seeking behavior in rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2003; 168: 57-65.  
33

34  
35 Miller CA, Marshall JF. Altered Fos expression in neural pathways underlying cue-  
36 elicited drug seeking in the rat. *Eur J Neurosci* 2005; 21: 1385-1393.  
37

38  
39 Mueller D, Stewart J. Cocaine-induced conditioned place preference: reinstatement by  
40 priming injections of cocaine after extinction. *Behav Brain Res* 2000; 115: 39-47.  
41

42  
43 Mueller D, Perdikaris D, Stewart J. Persistence and drug-induced reinstatement of a  
44 morphine-induced conditioned place preference. *Behav Brain Res* 2002; 136: 389-397.  
45

46  
47 National Academy Press. *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*. National  
48 Academy Press: Washington, DC; 1996.

49  
50 Panlilio LV, Schindler CW. Conditioned locomotor-activating and reinforcing effects of  
51 discrete stimuli paired with intraperitoneal cocaine. *Behav Pharmacol* 1997; 8: 691-698.  
52

53  
54 Paxinos, G., Watson, C. *The rat brain in stereotaxic coordinates*, 6<sup>th</sup> Ed. Amsterdam,  
55 Netherlands: Academic Press; 2009.

56  
57 Pickens CL, Airavaara M, Theberge F, Fanous S, Hope BT, Shaham Y. Neurobiology  
58 of the incubation of drug craving. *Trends Neurosci* 2011; 34: 411-20.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Pitkänen A, Savander V, LeDoux JE. Organization of intra-amygdaloid circuitries in the  
5 rat: an emerging framework for understanding functions of the amygdala. Trends  
6 Neurosci 1997; 20: 517-523.  
7

8  
9 See RE. Neural substrates of cocaine-cue associations that trigger relapse. Eur J  
10 Pharmacol 2005; 526: 140-146.  
11

12 Volkow ND, Wang GJ, Telang F, Fowler JS, Logan J, Childress AR, Jayne M, Ma Y,  
13 Wong C. Cocaine cues and dopamine in dorsal striatum: mechanism of craving in  
14 cocaine addiction. J Neurosci 2006; 26: 6583-6588.  
15  
16

17 Wachtel JM, Paine TA. Ability of different conditioning procedures to cause cue-  
18 induced hyperactivity. Society for Neuroscience Abstracts, Washington DC, 41<sup>st</sup> Annual  
19 Meeting; 2011.  
20  
21

22 Weiss F, Maldonado-Vlaar CS, Parsons LH, Kerr TM, Smith DL, Ben-Shahar O.  
23 Control of cocaine-seeking behavior by drug-associated stimuli in rats: effects on  
24 recovery of extinguished operant-responding and extracellular dopamine levels in  
25 amygdala and nucleus accumbens. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2000; 97: 4321-4326.  
26  
27

28 Yun IA, Fields HL. Basolateral amygdala lesions impair both cue- and cocaine-induced  
29 reinstatement in animals trained on a discriminative stimulus task. Neuroscience 2003;  
30 121: 747-757.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Figure Captions**  
5  
6  
7

8 **Fig 1.** Schematic of the cocaine cue conditioning protocol. Rats underwent three 60-  
9 min habituation (H) sessions prior to training. Each training day began with a 30-min  
10 baseline session (B) during which rats were placed in the locomotor boxes in the  
11 absence of cues; the rats were then removed from the boxes, treated and then returned  
12 to the boxes for a 30-min conditioning session. Conditioning sessions were divided into  
13 CS+ (cue present) and CS- (cue absent) sessions, which occurred on alternating days.  
14 Prior to CS+ sessions rats were administered cocaine (15 mg/kg, IP) or saline (1 ml/kg,  
15 IP) and then placed into the activity chamber in the presence of an audiovisual cue  
16 (flashing bicycle light + metronome). Prior to CS- sessions all rats were administered  
17 saline and then placed into the activity chamber without the audiovisual cue. Following  
18 training rats were tested on three occasions. Test sessions were similar to training  
19 sessions with the exception that all rats were administered saline (1 ml/kg) prior to both  
20 CS+ and CS- sessions. Numbers on the bottom indicate experimental day.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 **Fig 2.** Locomotor activity across habituation and training sessions. A) Activity  
34 decreased across habituation sessions. B) Activity during the 30-min baseline sessions  
35 prior to cue present (CS+) and cue absent (CS-) conditioning sessions. C) Activity  
36 during the 30-min conditioning sessions. Cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more  
37 activity during CS+ sessions (following cocaine injection) than CS- sessions (following  
38 saline injection).  $^{\ddagger}P < 0.01$ , from session 1;  $^{\#\#}P < 0.01$ , saline CS+ vs. cocaine CS+;  
39  $^{**}P < 0.01$ , cocaine CS+ vs. CS-.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 **Fig 3.** Re-exposure to a cocaine-associated cue increases locomotor activity. **Rats**  
49 **were tested 3, 14 and 28 days following conditioning (indicated on the x-axis).** A)  
50 Activity during the 30-min baseline session increased across test sessions. B) Although  
51 both cocaine and saline-conditioned rats exhibited more activity in the presence of the  
52 cue, the activity of cocaine-conditioned rats was greater than that of saline-conditioned  
53 rats in the presence of the cue.  $^{\ddagger}P < 0.01$ , different from session 1;  $^{\#\#}P < 0.01$ , saline  
54 CS+ vs. cocaine CS+;  $^{**}P < 0.01$ , cocaine CS+ vs. CS-;  $^{\wedge}P < 0.05$ , saline CS+ vs. CS-.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **Fig 4.** Locomotor activity across habituation and training sessions. A) Activity  
7 decreased across habituation sessions. B) Activity during the 30-min baseline  
8 sessions prior to cue present (CS+) and cue absent (CS-) conditioning sessions. On  
9 several occasions activity was higher during baseline sessions preceding CS- sessions  
10 than it was during baseline session preceding CS+ sessions. C) Activity during the 30-  
11 min conditioning sessions. Cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity during CS+  
12 sessions (following cocaine injection) than CS- sessions (following saline injection). <sup>‡</sup>*P*  
13 < 0.05, 3-day group from session 1; <sup>†</sup>*P* < 0.05, 28-day group from session 1; <sup>§</sup>*P* < 0.05,  
14 3-day vs. 28-day group; <sup>ψ</sup>*P* < 0.05, saline 3-day vs. 28-day; <sup>θ</sup>*P* < 0.05, cocaine 3-Day vs.  
15 28-Day; <sup>##</sup>*P* < 0.01, saline CS+ vs. cocaine CS+; <sup>\*\*</sup>*P* < 0.01, cocaine CS+ vs. CS-; <sup>θ</sup>*P* <  
16 0.05, 3-day cocaine CS+ vs. CS-; <sup>□</sup>*P* < 0.05 28-day cocaine CS+ vs. CS-; <sup>□</sup>*P* < 0.05, 3-day  
17 saline CS+ vs. CS-; <sup>∞</sup>*P* < 0.05, 28-day saline CS+ vs. CS-.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 **Fig 5.** Effects of testing either 3-days or 28-days after conditioning on the expression of  
33 cue-induced activity. A) Activity during the 30-min baseline session was higher in rats  
34 tested 28-days following conditioning than it was in rats tested 3-days following  
35 conditioning. B) Regardless of time since conditioning, cocaine-conditioned rats, had  
36 greater activity than saline conditioned rats in the presence of the cue (CS+).  
37 Furthermore, cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity in the presence of the cue  
38 (CS+) compared to in its absence (CS-). <sup>§</sup>*P* < 0.05, 3-day vs. 28-day group; <sup>#</sup>*P* < 0.05,  
39 saline CS+ vs. cocaine CS+; <sup>\*</sup>*P* < 0.05, cocaine CS+ vs. CS-;

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 **Fig 6. Histological representation of BLA cannulae placements. A)**  
49 **Photomicrographs depicting left and right BLA cannula placements. Dotted line**  
50 **shows location of the BLA.** B) Schematic showing the location of the cannula tips for  
51 saline-conditioned rats (O, n=10) and cocaine-conditioned rats (★, n=9). BLA,  
52 basolateral amygdala; CeA, central amygdala. Adapted from Paxinos and Watson  
53 (2009).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Fig 7.** Locomotor activity across habituation and training sessions. A) Activity  
5 decreased across habituation sessions. B) Activity during the 30-min baseline sessions  
6 prior to cue present (CS+) and cue absent (CS-) conditioning sessions. C) Activity  
7 during the 30-min conditioning session. Cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more  
8 activity during CS+ sessions (following cocaine injection) than CS- sessions (following  
9 saline injection) and exhibited more activity than saline-treated rats in both CS+ and CS-  
10 sessions.  $\ddagger P < 0.01$ , from session 1;  $\# P < 0.05$ ,  $\#\# P < 0.01$ , saline CS+ vs. cocaine  
11 CS+;  $* P < 0.05$ ,  $** P < 0.01$ , cocaine CS+ vs. CS-;  $\wedge P < 0.05$ , saline CS+ vs. CS-.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 **Fig 8.** Effect of basolateral amygdala inactivation on the expression of cue-induced  
22 locomotor activity. A) Cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited more activity than saline-  
23 conditioned rats during the baseline session. Muscimol (MUS) infusions decreased  
24 activity. B) Following a vehicle infusion (VEH), cocaine-conditioned rats exhibited  
25 increased activity in the presence of the cocaine-associated cue (CS+) compared to in  
26 its absence (CS-); an effect that was blocked by a MUS infusion. Cocaine conditioned  
27 rats, irrespective of infusion, exhibited more activity than saline-conditioned rats.  $\ddagger P <$   
28  $0.05$ ,  $\ddagger P < 0.01$ , VEH vs. MUS;  $\#\# P < 0.01$ , saline vs. cocaine;  $** P < 0.01$ , cocaine CS+  
29 vs. CS-.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Figure(s)

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

















