

AD_____

Award Number:
W81XWH-08-2-0657

TITLE:
Opiate masking of stress-induced hypervigilance: The cause of
delayed symptom presentation in PTSD

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:
Kevin D. Beck Ph.D.

CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION:
Veterans Biomedical Research Institute, East Orange VAMC, East
Orange, NJ 07018

REPORT DATE:
April 2010

TYPE OF REPORT:
Final Report

PREPARED FOR: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT:

■ Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				<i>Form Approved</i> OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 01-04-2010		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 15 SEP 2008 - 14 MAR 2010	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Opiate masking of stress-induced hypervigilance: The cause of delayed symptom presentation in PTSD				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER W81XWH-08-2-0657	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Kevin D. Beck Ph.D.				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Veterans Biomedical Research Institute, East Orange VAMC, East Orange, NJ 07018				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT None provided.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS None provided.					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT U	b. ABSTRACT U	c. THIS PAGE U			USAMRMC
			UU	34	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	3
Body.....	4
Key Research Accomplishments.....	15
Reportable Outcomes.....	16
Conclusion.....	16
References.....	18
Supporting Data.....	21

Introduction

Post-traumatic stress disorder is a multi-symptom psychological disorder that includes, as one possible symptom, an exaggerated startle response [1-4]. As has been reported in longitudinal human studies, the change in startle reactivity occurs over a period of time following the associated trauma [5]. Increases in startle magnitudes can be elicited in rats by exposing them to inescapable shock, but, like the disorder, the change in this reflex response does not occur for a few days [6-9]. In contrast, startle response magnitude can be elicited within several minutes pharmacologically using several compounds, most notably corticotrophin-releasing hormone (CRH)[10-13]. CRH is a key element for the stress response as it is involved in communicating between centers of the brain that organize the autonomic and endocrine responses [14;15], and it is elevated in rats in the for several hours following shock exposure [16]. Given the discrepancy in the timing of stress-enhanced startle reactivity and CRH-enhanced startle reactivity, we hypothesized that there may be an additional physiological response to the stressor that overrides and masks the exaggerated startle that should be evident shortly after CRH is elevated. Likely candidates such a masking role are the endogenous opiates. In contrast, if it is shown that a delayed-expression exaggerated startle response can be elicited after exposure to a predictable and controllable stressor, then we would have to consider an alternative to the masking agent hypothesis.

Experiment 1: Inescapable stressor effects on startle reactivity

There has been some discussion in the literature as to whether there is a sufficient “dose” of stressor exposure that will cause lasting behavioral changes. Past results have been mixed with respect to an emergent enhanced startle response. Therefore, we tested whether a significant difference in the presentation of an exaggerated startle response could be elicited by either a single 2-h exposure to periodic inescapable shocks versus 3 2-h sessions of periodic inescapable shock.

Stressor Exposure Procedures: Rats are restrained in commercially purchased Plexiglas rodent restraint tubes. A tail-clip with exposed wire on the inside is attached securely to the tail (about 2-4 cm from the base of the tail – depending on the size of the rat). Conductive gel is administered to the tail on the location where the clip will be placed to minimize any tissue damage from the repeated shocks. Over approximately a 2 h period of time, up to a maximum of 40 scrambled shocks (2 mA, 3 sec in duration), are delivered to the tail. The shock cycles such that current is delivered 166 ms of every 200 ms. This either occurred on a single day or was repeated over 3 consecutive days.

Acoustic Startle Responses: Rats are placed in conditioning boxes in a light restrainer (for which they are habituated to prior to any stimulus presentation). The restrainer sits on an accelerometer which serves to transduce weight-shifts that occur in the restrainer in response to brief (100 ms) stimuli with sharp rise/fall characteristics (5 ms) at a frequency of 1000 Hz. A 102 dB stimulus intensity was used because it generally elicits 95-100% responding but is not too loud as to cause ceiling effects for the measured startle magnitudes.

Acoustic Startle Response Measures: Acoustic startle responses are measured by rectifying the signal and dividing those values by each rat’s body weight. This correction is important for stressed rats will exhibit an attenuated growth curve following stressor exposure. Baseline is determined from the 200 ms of signal that precedes sound onset. Six times the standard deviation of the baseline period signal is used as the threshold for detecting significant deviations in body movement occurring 5-125 ms following stimulus onset. For those trials where the signal does not exceed the threshold criterion within

the specific window, an "NA" was recorded and the trial was not used in the calculation of the mean startle magnitude.

Procedure: All rats were pre-tested to obtain mean startle response magnitudes prior to stressor exposure. Rats were then matched based on those mean startle values and one of each pair was randomly assigned to either receive inescapable tailshock or serve as a homecage control. Tailshock began between 0700 and 0800 h (within the first hour of the daily 12 h light phase). Subsequent startle testing was conducted between the hours of 0730 and 1130 1, 4, 7, and 11 days after stressor exposure. Body weights were measured following each startle test. The same procedures were repeated a second time with the stressor manipulation being 3 days of consecutive tailshock.

Results: As shown in Figure 1, those rats that were exposed to 1 session of inescapable tailshock did not exhibit any significant increase in startle reactivity above that displayed by the homecage controls or themselves (during the pretest). However, also shown in Figure 1 is evidence that the shock did cause a significant change in the physiology of the shock-exposed rats. Body weight differences were evident from the first post-stress startle test to the last (post stress day 11).

A subsequent experiment extended the shock period to 3 days. As is evident in Figure 2, startle magnitudes significantly increased in rats exposed to 3 days of tailshock. This was confirmed by a significant Stress x Day interaction, $F(4,776)=7.6$, $p<.001$. The increase in startle reactivity occurred 4 days following the last session of shock exposure and it gradually decreased over subsequent startle testing sessions. These behavioral changes were coupled by significant differences in body weight across all post-stress assessments.

Conclusion: These data suggested a 3-day exposure would be necessary to create the delayed-presentation, enhanced startle reaction. Despite there being similar effects of 1 and 3 shock-exposure sessions in attenuating the stressed rats' growth curves, apparently a different mechanism is the cause of the increased startle magnitudes observed 4 days following 3 days of tailshock.

Experiment 2: Naloxone effects on startle reactivity

Before we administered the opiate antagonist naloxone to rats subjected to tailshock, we conducted an experiment where we tested

whether any acute or persistent changes in startle reactivity occurred from the 2 doses proposed for use.

Procedure: All rats (n=12) were pre-tested to obtain mean startle response magnitudes prior to stressor exposure. Rats were then matched based on those mean startle values, stratified in triplicates, and were randomly assigned to receive 1 or 10 mg/kg naloxone or saline vehicle. The rats were administered the drugs and subsequently tested for startle reactivity 2 h later (Day 1) and periodically thereafter over the same timeframe as followed for the stress experiments.

Results: No changes in startle reactivity were found following naloxone administration with respect both to baseline startle reactivity or vehicle controls. Still, as evidenced in Figure 3, the 10 mg/kg dose did show a trend to possibly cause an acute (albeit very moderate) elevation in startle reactivity.

Conclusion: These data suggested that an acute effect of naloxone could increase startle reactivity regardless of exposure to the tailshock. Hence, for the subsequent experiment treating rats with naloxone following tailshock, we decided it best to treat the rats at a time further removed from the startle testing.

Experiment 3: Post-stress opiate receptor blocking and startle reactivity

Once we established an enhanced startle could be achieved with a 3-day tailshock regimen and naloxone had a non-significant increase in startle reactivity, our goal was to determine whether the delay in the presentation of the enhanced startle could be reduced by blocking opiate receptors following exposure to the stressor. In other words, we were testing whether opiate antagonist naloxone would reveal a hypothesized masked hypervigilant state the day after the last session of tailshock. Because of the possible acute effect of naloxone on startle reactivity, we administered the opiate antagonist at the end of each day of tailshock. If there is an opiate-dependent mechanism involved in masking the acute hypervigilance, then disrupting those processes following each tailshock exposure should block the development of any masking effect due to endogenous opiates.

Procedure: All rats were pre-tested to obtain mean startle response magnitudes prior to stressor exposure. Rats were then matched based on those mean startle values and one of each pair was randomly assigned to either receive inescapable tailshock or serve as a homecage control. As in the previous studies, tailshock began between

0700 and 0800 h on 3 consecutive days. Immediately following each session, naloxone (10 mg/kg) or saline vehicle was administered systemically (i.p.). Subsequent startle testing was conducted between the hours of 0730 and 1130 1, 4, 7, and 11 days after stressor exposure. Body weights were measured following each startle test.

Results: Startle magnitudes changed as a function of Day, $F(3,60)=3.1$, $p < .05$ and Trial Block, $F(9,180)=12.8$, $p < .001$, as repeated testing occurred following stressor exposure. As shown in Figure 4, mean startle magnitudes on post-stress day 4 were significantly different than those on post-stress day 7. Within session mean startle magnitudes differed from block 1 from all other trial blocks (data not shown). This is suggestive of a general pattern of within-session habituation across all groups. Unexpectedly, there was a trend toward the factor Stress being associated with lower startle magnitudes, $F(1,20)=3.7$, $p < .06$. There was no significant effect of naloxone administration on mean startle magnitudes.

Conclusion: Despite past experiments showing enhanced startle reactivity could be elicited by a 3-day intermittent tailshock protocol, there was no sign of an increase in startle responding following inescapable shock in this experiment. In fact, the main effect trend was a significant difference due to stressor exposure that was in the opposite direction as previously observed. Therefore, it was impossible to evaluate an unmasking hypothesis when there was no delayed presentation of an enhanced startle response.

Experiment 4: A different approach to startle enhancements associated with stress

The inescapable stress model of enhanced startle reactivity is largely based on the concept that PTSD-like startle hyper-reactivity is a product of a single traumatic event, but, there are other models that may track the progression of an anxiety state in rats – namely the development of avoidant behavior. Avoidance is a common symptom to all anxiety disorders, including PTSD, and the presentation of increased avoidant behavior has been found to track the general worsening of PTSD symptoms [17;18]. Given that increased avoidant behavior is associated with PTSD symptoms, we hypothesized that a procedure which allows for a slow, methodical progression of increasing avoidant behavior may cause an increase in startle reactivity.

There are various forms of active avoidance that can be modeled in rats, but the desire to track the development of increased avoidant

behavior over time led us to adopt distinct lever-press avoidance as our active avoidance procedure. Lever-press avoidance has been utilized for decades to study learning, but it also has a history as a prominent model of anxiety [19-24]. Derived initially from the 2-factor theory of threat/fear motivation and learned avoidance [25-28], the general premise of this approach is that a learned fear of signals is sufficient to support avoidant behavior without requiring a continued re-exposure to the actual noxious stimulus or event. To our knowledge, nobody has tracked how startle reactivity may change over time as a product of learned lever-press avoidance.

There are 3 possible periods of time startle reactivity may show changes as a function of acquiring lever-press avoidance and each would have associated with it a different theory of how the learning procedure was affecting general sensory reactivity. First, based on the above inescapable shock model, one could hypothesize that startle reactivity should be increased within days of the first few training trials, when the rats experience the most shock. Second, if the development of avoidant behavior follows the trajectory of developing anxiety, then one could hypothesize that startle reactivity should increase over acquisition. Yet, there is also a third option. That is, startle reactivity could increase if the association between the signals and the consequence becomes less certain. In this third possibility, startle reactivity could be increased if there is a change in the relationship between the signals that represent threat and the consequences following acquisition (such as conducting extinction trials). Importantly, these 3 timeframes also have associated with them different possible physiological correlates. For instance, only in early acquisition, when shock exposure is highest would we expect a possible endogenous opiate mechanism to be involved. If startle reactivity is increased during asymptotic performance or during extinction trials, then the likelihood that a direct-masking opiate mechanism may be involved in avoidance-related enhanced hypervigilance is substantially reduced.

Another consideration for this approach is that only certain animals may be affected in a way that increases their overall startle reactivity. It is well documented that approximately 10% of those people who experience a significant trauma develop PTSD; therefore, there has been recent interest in identifying vulnerability factors. We previously showed that Wistar-Kyoto (WKY) rats learn active avoidance generally quicker and to a higher asymptotic performance level than Sprague Dawley (SD) rats [29]. In that same study, we also showed WKY rats extinguish the avoidance response much slower than SD rats, suggesting that they are resistant to associating learned

warning signals in their environment with a lack of threat. This strain difference in both acquiring the avoidant behavior and resistance to extinguish it may be a sign of anxiety vulnerability that could also be reflected in a change in startle reactivity.

We hypothesized that any startle reactivity change that would be caused by exposure to shocks would be most evident in acquisition in SD rats. SD rats generally do not learn the response as well; hence, they would receive more shocks. In contrast, any observation of enhanced startle that is due to the learning of avoidant behavior or to the change in learned avoidance contingencies should be found in WKY rats. WKY rats become more avoidant than SD rats and are resistant to stop presenting the avoidant behavior once acquired.

Lever-press avoidance: Each rat is placed in a standard 30cm x 25cm x 30cm dimly lit (14W house-light) operant conditioning chamber that is contained in a sound-attenuating box fitted with a fan for air-circulation (Coulbourn Instruments). One side of the chamber has a lever (10.5 cm above the floor-bars), a white light (20.5 cm above the floor-bars), and a speaker (26 cm above the floor-bars). Each of the 20 trials (per session), begins with the presentation of the warning signal (1000 Hz tone). After 60 s of warning signal, 0.5 s intermittent shocks (1-2 mA) are delivered to the grid floor every 3 s until the lever is pressed (an escape response). The warning signal is presented throughout this time. If the lever is pressed during the initial 1min of warning signal, the shocks are avoided for that trial (an avoidance response). After the lever is pressed (either an escape or avoidance response) a 3 min inter-trial interval (ITI) occurs. The ITI period is explicitly distinguished by a 0.5Hz flashing light. During the 3 min ITI, no shocks are ever presented. Extinction sessions involve the removal of both the shock and the ITI signal.

Startle Sensitivity/Responsivity Assessment: Unlike the protocol described above, commonly used to assess differences in within session habituation and sensitization, a multi-stimulus intensity protocol was used in order to assess any changes in the threshold to elicit an acoustic startle response (sensitivity) or the magnitude of those elicited responses (responsivity). The stimuli had the same duration and rise-fall characteristics as the above experiments. The three different stimulus intensities (82, 92, 102 dBA) were presented 8 times in a pseudorandom order such that the same intensity was never presented consecutively. These 3 intensities were shown in the past to elicit startle responses in 10-20, 50-60, and 90-100% of trials, respectively. Therefore, any changes in stimulus sensitivity would be reflected in a change in the percentage of responses elicited.

Procedure: Prior to avoidance training rats of both strains were tested to obtain a baseline level of startle reactivity. Rats within each strain were matched, stratified, and randomly assigned to either the homecage-control or avoidance-learning condition. The following week, avoidance training commenced. Avoidance learning sessions occurred 3 days a week, with at least one day separating consecutive avoidance learning sessions. Startle testing occurred on one of the non-avoidance training days, once each week.

Results: Lever-press avoidance behavior was acquired in both strains. As shown in Figure 5, the acquisition patterns were similar, as reflected in a main effect of Day, $F(9,135)=25.6$, $p<.001$, but the WKY rats attained a higher asymptotic level of performance. Extinction followed the same pattern. WKY rats appeared to exhibit much slower extinction of the lever-press response, but only a main effect of Day, $F(9,135)=14.1$, $p<.001$, was significant. Analysis over both acquisition and extinction did almost yield a significant effect of Strain, $F(1,15)=4.0$, $p<.06$.

Startle sensitivity measures mildly changed during the avoidance training period in both strains. As shown in Figure 6, the number of startles elicited increased in the rats trained to perform the lever-press avoidance response. Following the first acquisition session (denoted as A1), those rats exposed to the avoidance training exhibit more startles to the mid-intensity stimulus. For WKY rats, this is still apparent after 4 days of acquisition. These impressions were confirmed by 2 significant interactions. A Strain x Stimulus Intensity interaction, $F(2, 60)=7.4$, $p<.001$, suggested that the 2 strains responded differently to the 3 intensities. A Condition x Intensity x Day interaction, $F(6, 180)=2.9$, $p<.01$, suggested the experience of avoidance learning differentially affected how the rats responded to each stimulus intensity and that effect was different depending on the test day. As rats of both strains attained asymptotic performance, no more differences in startle sensitivity were apparent between the avoidance and home-cage control condition of either strain. This trend continued throughout extinction with the avoidance condition failing to differ from those of the home-cage controls within both strains.

Because all subjects were initially matched, within strain, on startle responsivity, both between and within-subject analyses were conducted for this variable. For simplicity and the most appropriate representation of responsiveness, only the data from the high-intensity trials were analyzed. As shown in Figure 7, there was a clear difference in startle magnitudes between the strains. This was confirmed by a main effect of Strain, $F(1,30)=49.0$, $p<.001$. An

additional Condition x Day interaction, $F(11,330)=1.9$, $p<.05$, suggested that changes in startle magnitude occurred across the testing period and those changes were avoidance-experience dependent. Significant Strain x Condition x Day interactions were only evident during the extinction period, $F(2,60)=3.3$, $p<.05$. Between-group differences in startle magnitudes were evident following the 6th and 9th extinction sessions in both SD and WKY rats. Comparing session means to that of the baseline, we found within-group differences in both strains in those exposed to avoidance training following the 9th extinction session.

As with the inescapable stress protocols, active avoidance behavior acquisition affected the growth rate observed in both strains. As can be observed in Figure 8, the effect upon each strain was different depending on the phase of the experiment. For instance, during acquisition, when exposure to shocks occurred periodically, the growth curves for the SD rats diverged more than those of WKY rats. These impressions were confirmed by Strain x Condition, $F(1, 30)=6.5$, $p<.02$, and Condition x Day, $F(3,90)=2.9$, $p<.05$, interactions. Through extinction sessions, a significant Strain x Condition x Day interaction was evident, $F(2,60)=3.6$, $p<.05$. Examining the figure, this interaction reflects the beginning of the convergence of the SD growth curves and the first signs of divergence in the WKY curves. Interestingly, following extinction, a Strain x Condition x Day interaction is still apparent. Yet, as can be seen in the figure, the cause of this interaction has shifted from the SD rats showing an avoidance-dependent divergence in growth to the WKY rats exhibiting an avoidance-dependent divergence in growth.

Conclusion: These data provide an interesting example of how startle reactivity can be enhanced by prior exposure to an escapable and avoidable stressor. Moreover, as was observed following inescapable stress, the presentation of enhanced startle reactivity did not occur proximal to any period of significant shock exposure. Following this change in behavior the differences in the physiology of the 2 rat strains became apparent, as reflected in a switch in body weight differences within each strain from their respective controls. This finding is of utmost importance for 2 reasons. First, it shows that inescapable and uncontrollable stress is not necessary to increase startle reactivity, and yet, the appearance of the startle enhancement is still delayed. Second, these features are suggestive that a mechanism not specifically triggered by the shock is causing the startle response to increase over time. Therefore, the concept that the delayed presentation of enhanced startle responding following a significant trauma is due to the startle-enhancing mechanisms being

masked by other physiological responses for a period of time following the trauma is not supported.

The additional finding that these 2 strains exhibit a very different pattern of growth, through and following avoidance learning, is suggestive that the result of avoidant behavior acquisition has a short-term effect on SD rats, but a long-term effect on WKY rats. Further work will need to address whether this difference is due to the actual learning process or if it is a function of shock exposure.

Experiment 5: Exaggerated startles from avoidance – a product of perceived control or shock exposure

The confounds of shock exposure controllability and exposure to shock limited our ability to make firm conclusions regarding what caused the enhanced startle responses to occur in avoidance-trained rats in Experiment 4. Hence, we designed a follow-up study that added an additional control group to our baseline comparison of avoidance-trained rats versus homecage control rats. This added control group was placed in the training boxes at the same time the others were being trained to avoid the shock. The rats in this third condition were each paired to a rat in the avoidance-training condition such that when an avoidance rat was shocked, so was the paired control (yoked condition). Thus, the yoked rats in this experiment heard, saw, and felt the same stimuli as their avoidance-learning paired counterparts, but the lever in their chambers was disabled. For these yoked controls, they may learn the predictive relationship between the stimuli and the shocks, but they will not learn or experience any perceived control over the occurrence of shock.

Procedure: The procedures are identical to Experiment 4. Prior to avoidance training rats of both strains were tested to obtain a baseline level of startle reactivity. Rats within each strain were matched, stratified, and randomly assigned to the homecage-control, avoidance-learning, or yoked-control condition. The following week, avoidance training commenced. Avoidance learning sessions occurred 3 days a week, with at least one day separating consecutive avoidance learning sessions. Startle testing occurred on one of the non-avoidance training days, once each week.

Results:

As with Experiment 4, the rats of both strains exhibited a clear acquisition of a lever-press avoidance response (see Fig. 9, upper). This impression was confirmed by a main effect of Session, $F(9, 135) = 14.8$, $P < .001$. In addition, the difference in acquisition of the lever-press response between the SD and WKY rats was more apparent in

this experiment than in the previous experiment, as reflected by a main effect of Strain, $F(1, 15) = 9.2$, $p < .01$. WKY rats exhibited a much higher level of asymptotic performance than did SD rats. Furthermore, the subsequent extinction of the response was less apparent in WKY rats compared to SD rats, replicating the effect observed in Experiment 4 (see fig. 9, lower). These impressions were confirmed by main effects of both Strain, $F(1, 15) = 7.0$, $p < .02$ and Session, $F(9, 135) = 11.5$, $p < .001$.

The analysis of startle sensitivity, percent of startle elicited at different intensities, found that both strains of rats trained in avoidance learning increased their sensitivity to the acoustic stimuli the day following the first training session (A1) (see Fig. 10). These impressions were confirmed by significant interactions of Strain $\times$ Stimulus Intensity, $F(2, 90) = 33.0$, $p < .001$, Strain $\times$ Session, $F(3, 135) = 21.1$, $p < .001$, and Condition $\times$ Session, $F(6, 135) = 4.0$, $p < .001$. As was hypothesized from witnessing a similar effect in Experiment 4, the yoked controls showed a similar elevation in startle sensitivity during A1. This confirms that the short-term change in startle sensitivity is a product of shock exposure, not the acquisition of escape or avoidance behavior. Moreover, the effect is not strain dependent and dissipates as the rats are exposed to fewer shocks.

Similar to Experiment 4, WKY rats exhibited higher startle magnitudes than SD rats. This was reflected in a main effect of Strain, $F(1, 45) = 206.9$, $p < .001$ and a Strain $\times$ Session interaction, $F(3, 135) = 4.7$, $p < .005$. Within each strain, however, the effects of avoidance training and mere shock exposure did not show the expected differences in startle reactivity from home-cage controls. The startle magnitudes elicited in this experiment suggested that startle reactivity periodically decreased in SD rats and did not change in WKY rats throughout training. Moreover, this pattern strengthened throughout SD extinction sessions and home-cage conditions, as reflected by significant main effects of Strain, $F(1, 45) = 240.9$, $p < .001$, $F(1, 45) = 90.3$, $p < .001$, during extinction and home-cage conditions, respectively. Notably during extinction, the startle magnitudes increase over the 3 sessions, causing a significant Strain $\times$ Session interaction, $F(2, 90) = 6.4$, $p < .005$. A similar interaction was detected during the home-cage condition, $F(3, 135) = 12.8$, $p < .001$, but that is likely caused by the reduction in startle magnitudes when WKY rats were allowed to remain in the home-cage (rather than experience any training). We do not know the cause of this strain-specific change in startle reactivity with the removal of test-chamber exposure from their condition. It may be that the lack of exposure to

the avoidance chambers the day prior to testing caused a reduction in their overall arousal levels, except that it occurs in the home-cage controls as well. Nonetheless, these patterns are clearly different than what was found in Experiment 4 and is counter to what was expected from our theory that increased avoidant behavior, as a sign of increased anxiety, may lead to increased startle reactivity.

Conforming to the data derived from Experiment 4, we expected to observe blunted growth in all rats exposed to shock (avoidance-trained and yoke-control). As shown in Figure 12, there are very clear growth differences between the 2 strains, with WKY rats generally having a greater increase in their relative body weight. This was evident throughout all 3 phases of the experiment and confirmed by significant Strain x Session interactions during training, $F(3, 135) = 20.8, p < .001$, extinction, $F(3, 135) = 5.8, p < .005$, and home-cage period, $F(3, 135) = 4.7, p < .005$. Yet, within each strain, a different pattern emerged over the 3 phases. In the first phase, avoidance training, SD rats exposed to shock exhibited a blunted growth curve, but the WKY rats did not differ across condition. This impression is confirmed by a significant Stress x Condition x Session interaction, $F(6, 135) = 4.4, p < .001$. The growth curves during extinction begin to converge across the home-cage and shock-exposed SD groups but these same groups diverge in WKY rats, with avoidance-trained and yoked being identical. This effect is supported by significant Strain x Condition, $F(2, 45) = 9.3, p < .001$, and Condition x Session, $F(4, 90) = 4.7, p < .001$, interactions. An additional Strain x Condition interaction was found for the home-cage period, $F(2, 45) = 3.7, p < .05$, as the shock-exposed WKY groups continued to diverge from the home-cage controls but the 3 SD groups continued to overlap. Hence, the SD avoidance-trained and home-cage control groups replicated the effects observed in Experiment 4. Unexpectedly, the avoidance-trained WKY rats showed a progressive *increase* in the rate of growth above that of their respective home-cage controls. This is in clear opposition to what was observed in Experiment 4 for the WKY rats.

Conclusion: At this time, it is not clear what may have differed between experiments 4 and 5 that led to quite different effects in elicited startle reactivity after avoidant behavior had been acquired and established. In both experiments, an initial increase in startle sensitivity occurred in response to the initial experiences with shock. This supports our contention that an acute increase in startle sensitivity, meaning lower intensity acoustic stimuli cause a larger proportion of startles to be elicited, occurs as a function of shock exposure – not an increase in the magnitude of the startles. This supports the past work of us and others that found inescapable shock

only affects startle magnitude some period of time (in the range of days) after shock exposure [7-9], unless the subject under study is female [30;31]. Still, the consistency in the affect of shock exposure on startle sensitivity across these current experiments does not detract from the point that we have quite varying effects upon startle magnitude, again, days following the exposure to the shock. The SD rats showed the most difference between experiments if we consider the relationship between the avoidance-trained rats and both the home-cage controls and the yoked controls. The avoidance-trained SD rats never exhibit a mean startle magnitude above that of either the home-cage or yoked controls, but, a close inspection of the WKY data finds that the avoidance-trained rats show elevated startle magnitudes compared to their yoked controls (A10, E9, and H3). As with the previous experiment, this effect is not observed prior to the very end of the acquisition period, albeit not as consistent in appearance over the post-acquisition test sessions as was seen in Experiment 4. Hence, this is suggestive of a difference in startle reactivity across these two conditions in WKY rats, and this difference may be present despite the fact that each experienced the same number and duration of shock exposures. One could surmise then that this is a difference due to learning controllability over the aversive stimulus. Therefore, changes in startle reactivity can be dissociated from the experience of shock. Importantly, though, differences between the yoked control condition and the avoidance-acquisition condition were only observed in the stress-sensitive WKY rats, not the standard SD strain of rat. This suggests that some individuals may change their startle reactivity to stimuli as a result of the process they employ to cope with stressors, rather than the experience of the noxious stimulus itself.

Key Research Accomplishments

1. We demonstrated that 1 day of inescapable tailshock is not sufficient to increase startle reactivity in SD rats.
2. We demonstrated that 3 days of inescapable tailshock are sufficient to increase startle reactivity in SD rats.
3. We demonstrated that there is a dosage range where acute naloxone does not appreciably influence startle reactivity.
4. We demonstrated that naloxone does not affect startle reactivity following inescapable tailshock.
5. We demonstrated that inescapable stress is not necessary to increase startle reactivity. Both SD and WKY rats will exhibit increased startle reactivity several days following any exposure to escapable/avoidable shock.

6. We found that the simple exposure to shock during avoidance learning may be sufficient to cause acute increases in startle sensitivity.
7. We confirmed that the short-duration increase in startle sensitivity during the early phase of avoidance learning occurs in both strains.
8. We partially replicated the enhancement of startle magnitude during the later phase of avoidance training and extinction between avoidance trained and yoked-control WKY rats.
9. We found that the exposure to shocks during the acquisition of avoidant behavior causes a blunting of growth (as reflected by body weight) in SD rats (which generally receive more shocks than their avoidance-susceptible WKY counterparts), but this blunting of the growth curve subsides once the rats are approximately 1 month removed from their last exposure to any shocks.

Reportable Outcomes

The work supported herein was presented at the Military Health Research forum August 31-September 3, 2009 in Kansas City, Missouri. The data derived from this funding has lead to an additional 4 years of Merit Review support from the Department of Veterans Affairs to continue the study of the neurobiology of anxiety disorders. Portions of these data are serving as part of the doctoral thesis of Thomas Ricart, a UMDNJ - New Jersey Medical School MD/PhD student.

Conclusion

Gaining an understanding of how stress-induced hypervigilance develops following stressor exposure has been a difficult problem for many years. Others have examined mechanisms that are occurring *during* the period of stressor exposure which may affect the later presentation of exaggerated startle responses [9], but, little has been accomplished examining the period between stressor exposure and the development of exaggerated startle responses. Our working hypothesis posited that the removal of a pain-elicited opiate masking mechanism caused the appearance of a delayed post-stress hypervigilant state.

Our data using several different stressor paradigms, utilizing both inescapable and avoidable shock, suggest that a delayed-presentation hypervigilant state is not necessarily the product of a pain-dependent opiate mechanism. In fact, we showed rats that have

learned to avoid the shock could develop an enhanced startle reaction long after any significant amount of shock was experienced. Thus, the difference between 1 and 3-day inescapable shock on startle reactivity may not be due to the total number of shocks as much as it relates generally to more episodes (sessions) with experiencing some minimal level of stress and trying to cope with that stress. However, there is also the possibility that the increased startle reactivity is occurring because the stressed rats responding to the change in testing. This hypothesis could explain the effects found from the escapable stress paradigm as the rats learn the shock is not longer present during extinction sessions. In this case, we would be suggesting that anxiety comes from the rats being unsure about their environment. The addition of yoked-controls to the avoidance learning situation accounts for some aspects of what may be learned, the aspect of controllability but not predictability. Yoked WKY rats did have lower startle magnitudes than their avoidance-trained counterparts following acquisition. Because each yoked rat experienced the same stimuli as an avoidance-trained rat, they should have learned the predictability of the stimuli. However, what is not learned is that they have any controllability. The poorer learning by the SD rats in the yoked-avoidance experiment would conform to this idea. Because they did not acquire the response to the same level as those in the earlier experiment, this may have led them to also fail to show any difference in startle reactivity from their yoked controls (both being lower than home-cage controls). This logic would suggest that perceived controllability buffers against any endogenous mechanism (opiate or not) from dampening startle reactivity. This revised hypothesis will have to be evaluated in the future, and the concept of perceived controllability may serve as a worthwhile vulnerability factor to examine.

The problems associated with anxiety disorders, such as PTSD, are multifaceted and variable. We have tried to manipulate aspects of how stressor exposure can be perceived and coped. Using changes in startle reactivity, as it is a sensory-motor response that fails to habituate in PTSD patients, our data suggests that the mere experience of pain is not sufficient to change startle magnitude, but it is likely that the neural circuitry involved in the coping responses are involved in these processes. Given this theory, it is probable that non-pharmacological learning processes experienced during therapy may have beneficial effects on symptoms that initially may appear to be too fundamental for cognitive interpretations to influence.

Reference List

1. Butler,R.W.; Braff,D.L.; Rausch,J.L.; Jenkins,M.A.; Sprock,J.; Geyer,M.A. Physiological evidence of exaggerated startle response in a subgroup of Vietnam veterans with combat-related PTSD. *Am. J. Psychiatry* 147: 1308-1312; 1990.
2. Yehuda,R.; McFarlane,A.C.; Shalev,A.Y. Predicting the development of posttraumatic stress disorder from the acute response to a traumatic event. *Biol. Psychiatry* 44: 1305-1313; 1998.
3. Grillon,C.; Morgan,C.A., III Fear-potentiated startle conditioning to explicit and contextual cues in Gulf War veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* 108: 134-142; 1999.
4. Orr,S.P.; Metzger,L.J.; Pitman,R.K. Psychophysiology of post-traumatic stress disorder. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America* 25: 271-293; 2002.
5. Shalev,A.Y.; Freedman,S.; Peri,T.; Brandes,D.; Sahar,T.; Orr,S.P.; Pitman,R.K. Prospective study of posttraumatic stress disorder and depression following trauma. *Am. J. Psychiatry* 155: 630-637; 1998.
6. Servatius,R.J.; Ottenweller,J.E.; Bergen,M.T.; Soldan,S.; Natelson,B.H. Persistent stress-induced sensitization of adrenocortical and startle responses. *Physiol Behav.* 56: 945-954; 1994.
7. Servatius,R.J.; Ottenweller,J.E.; Natelson,B.H. Delayed startle sensitization distinguishes rats exposed to one or three stress sessions: further evidence toward an animal model of PTSD. *Biol. Psychiatry* 38: 539-546; 1995.
8. Beck,K.D.; Brennan,F.X.; Servatius,R.J. Effects of stress on nonassociative learning processes in male and female rats. *Integr. Physiol Behav. Sci.* 37: 128-139; 2002.
9. Manion,S.T.; Gamble,E.H.; Li,H. Prazosin administered prior to inescapable stressor blocks subsequent exaggeration of acoustic startle response in rats. *Pharmacol. Biochem. Behav.* 86: 559-565; 2007.
10. Swerdlow,N.R.; Britton,K.T.; Koob,G.F. Potentiation of acoustic startle by corticotropin-releasing factor (CRF) and by fear are both reversed by alpha-helical CRF (9-41). *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2: 285-292; 1989.
11. Lee,Y.; Schulkin,J.; Davis,M. Effect of corticosterone on the enhancement of the acoustic startle reflex by corticotropin releasing factor (CRF). *Brain Res.* 666: 93-98; 1994.
12. Risbrough,V.B.; Hauger,R.L.; Pellemounter,M.A.; Geyer,M.A. Role of corticotropin releasing factor (CRF) receptors 1 and 2 in CRF-potentiated acoustic startle in mice. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 170: 178-187; 2003.
13. Servatius,R.J.; Beck,K.D.; Moldow,R.L.; Salameh,G.; Tumminello,T.P.; Short,K.R. A stress-induced anxious state in male rats: Corticotropin-releasing hormone induces persistent changes in associative learning and startle reactivity. *Biol. Psychiatry* 57: 865-872; 2005.

14. Takahashi,L.K. Role of CRF(1) and CRF(2) receptors in fear and anxiety. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 25: 627-636; 2001.
15. Rivier,C.L.; Grigoriadis,D.E.; Rivier,J.E. Role of corticotropin-releasing factor receptors type 1 and 2 in modulating the rat adrenocorticotropin response to stressors. *Endocrinology* 144: 2396-2403; 2003.
16. Servatius,R.J.; Natelson,B.H.; Moldow,R.; Pogach,L.; Brennan,F.X.; Ottenweller,J.E. Persistent neuroendocrine changes in multiple hormonal axes after a single or repeated stressor exposures. *Stress.* 3: 263-274; 2000.
17. Karamustafalioglu,O.K.; Zohar,J.; Guveli,M.; Gal,G.; Bakim,B.; Fostick,L.; Karamustafalioglu,N.; Sasson,Y. Natural course of posttraumatic stress disorder: a 20-month prospective study of Turkish earthquake survivors. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* 67: 882-889; 2006.
18. O'Donnell,M.L.; Elliott,P.; Lau,W.; Creamer,M. PTSD symptom trajectories: from early to chronic response. *Behav. Res. Ther.* 45: 601-606; 2007.
19. Pearl,J. Intertrial interval and acquisition of a lever press avoidance response. [References]. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology* 56: 710-712; 1963.
20. D'Amato,M.R.; Fazzaro,J. Discriminated lever-press avoidance learning as a function of type and intensity of shock. [References]. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology* 61: 313-315; 1966.
21. Hurwitz,H.M.; Dillow,P.V. The effects of the warning signal on response characteristics in avoidance learning. *Psychological Record* 18: 351-360; 1968.
22. Gilbert,R.M. Signal functions in discriminated avoidance behavior. *J. Exp. Anal. Behav.* 15: 97-108; 1971.
23. Dillow,P.V.; Myerson,J.; Slaughter,L.; Hurwitz,H.M. Safety signals and the aquisition and extinction of lever-press discriminated avoidance in rats. *British Journal of Psychology* 63: 583-591; 1972.
24. Berger,D.F.; Brush,F.R. Rapid acquisition of discrete-trial lever-press avoidance: Effects of signal-shock interval. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior* 24: 227-239; 1975.
25. Mowrer,O.H. A stimulus-response analysis of anxiety and its role as a reinforcing agent. *Psychological Review* 46: 553-566; 1939.
26. Mowrer,O.H. Anxiety and learning. *Psychological Bulletin* 36: 517-518; 1939.
27. Mowrer,O.H.; Lamoreaux,R.R. Avoidance conditioning and signal duration--a study of secondary motivation and reward. *Psychological Monographs* 54, No. 5: 34; 1942.
28. Mowrer,O.H.; Lamoreaux,R.R. Fear as an intervening variable in avoidance conditioning. *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 39: 29-50; 1946.

29. Servatius,R.J.; Jiao,X.; Beck,K.D.; Pang,K.C.; Minor,T.R. Rapid avoidance acquisition in Wistar-Kyoto rats. *Behav. Brain Res.* 192: 191-197; 2008.
30. Beck,K.D.; Servatius,R.J. Stress-induced reductions of sensory reactivity in female rats depend on ovarian hormones and the application of a painful stressor. *Horm. Behav.* 47: 532-539; 2005.
31. Beck,K.D.; Jiao,X.; Cominski,T.P.; Servatius,R.J. Estrus cycle stage modifies the presentation of stress-induced startle suppression in female Sprague-Dawley rats. *Physiol Behav.* 93: 1019-1023; 2008.

SUPPORTING DATA




Figure 1: Mean startle response magnitudes and body weights for rats exposed to a single session of inescapable tailshock or served as homecage controls (n=4/group) .




Figure 2: Mean startle response magnitudes and body weights for rats exposed to 3 sessions of inescapable tailshock or served as homecage controls(n=8/group).




Figure 3: Mean startle response magnitudes for rats administered 1 of 2 possible doses of naloxone 30 min prior to startle testing (n=4/group).





Figure 4: Mean startle response magnitudes for rats administered 10 mg/kg naloxone (bottom) or saline vehicle (top) following each 2 h session of shock or at the same time in the homecage (n=8/group).

Acquisition



Extinction




Figure 5: Sprague Dawley (SD) and Wistar-Kyoto (WKY) rats were trained over 10 sessions to avoid footshock (top). Subsequent sessions had the shock absent to assess the rate by which the behavior is extinguished (bottom).





Figure 6: The percent of trials for which a startle response was elicited at 3 different stimulus intensities in rats trained in avoidance behavior (open) versus homecage control (darkened). For each session, the columns represent 102, 92, and 82 dBA, moving from left to right.




Figure 7: Mean startle response magnitudes for rats either exposed to avoidance learning (open) or served as homecage controls (filled). Testing began with a pretest (P) from which rats were matched prior to group assignment. Subsequent startle testing occurred weekly during 4 weeks of avoidance training (A), 3 weeks of extinction (E), and the last 4 weeks remaining in the homecage (H).




Figure 8: Shown are the mean body weights for each rat strain exposed to avoidance learning (open) or served as homecage controls (filled). All rats had their bodyweights measured following each startle test during avoidance training (A), extinction (E), and the last 4 weeks staying in the homecage (H).




Figure 9: Additional Sprague Dawley (SD) and Wistar-Kyoto (WKY) rats were trained over 10 sessions to avoid footshock (top). Subsequent sessions had the shock absent to assess the rate by which the behavior is extinguished (bottom). Not represented are the yoked rats of each strain that were in similar chambers with all the same stimuli.




Figure 10: The percent of trials for which a startle response was elicited at 3 different stimulus intensities in rats left in the homecage (darkest), trained in avoidance behavior (open), and avoidance-yoke controls (darkened), respectively. For each session, the columns represent 102, 92, and 82 dBA, moving from left to right.




Figure 11: The percent of trials for which a startle response was elicited at 3 different stimulus intensities in rats left in the homeage (black), trained in avoidance behavior (open), and avoidance-yoke controls (darkened), respectively. Subsequent startle testing occurred weekly during 4 weeks of avoidance training (A), 3 weeks of extinction (E), and the last 4 weeks remaining in the homeage (H).



Figure 12: Shown are the mean body weights for each rat strain exposed to avoidance learning (squares), served as yoked controls (triangles), or served as home-cage controls (circles). All rats had their bodyweights measured following each startle test during avoidance training (A), extinction (E), and the last 4 weeks staying in the home-cage (H).