Published in final edited form as:

J Med Chem. 2008 November 13; 51(21): 6866–6875. doi:10.1021/jm800506v.

Prevention of Drug-induced Memory Impairment by Immunopharmacotherapy

Jennifer B. Treweek[†], Chengzao Sun[†], Alexander V. Mayorov^{†,*}, Longwu Qi[†], Coree L. Levy[§], Amanda J. Roberts[§], Tobin J. Dickerson^{†,*}, and Kim D. Janda^{†,*}

Departments of Chemistry and Immunology, Molecular and Integrated Neurosciences Department (MIND), The Skaggs Institute for Chemical Biology, and Worm Institute for Research and Medicine (WIRM), The Scripps Research Institute, 10550 North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, CA 92037.

[†]*Departments of Chemistry and Immunology, The Skaggs Institute for Chemical Biology*

[§]*Molecular and Integrated Neurosciences Department (MIND)*

^{*}*Worm Institute for Research and Medicine (WIRM)*

Abstract

One approach to treating drug abuse uses anti-drug antibodies to immunize subjects against the illicit substance rather than administering therapeutics that target the specific CNS site of action. At present, passive vaccination has recognized efficacy in treating certain gross symptoms of drug misuse, namely motor activation, self-administration, and overdose. However, the potential for antibodies to prevent drug-induced changes involving finer cognitive processes, such as benzodiazepine-associated amnesia, remains unexplored. To address this concept, a flunitrazepam hapten was synthesized and employed in the generation of a panel of high affinity monoclonal antibodies. Anti-flunitrazepam mAb RCA3A3 ($K_{d,app}$ = 200 nM) was tested in a mouse model of passive immunization and subsequent mole-equivalent challenge with flunitrazepam. Not only was flunitrazepam-induced sedation prevented, but immunization also conferred protection to memory consolidation as assessed through contextual and cued fear conditioning paradigms. These results provide evidence that immunopharmacotherapeutic blockade of drug intoxication also preserves complex cognitive function.

Keywords

Flunitrazepam; Immunopharmacotherapy; Conditioned fear; Memory (Amnesia); Benzodiazepine; Antibody; Immunization

INTRODUCTION

The challenge of drug development rests not only in identifying a novel lead compound for a given therapeutic application but also in finding a delivery method through which the druggable compound may reach its *in vivo* target. Small molecule therapeutics prescribed to modify

tobin@scripps.edu
kdjanda@scripps.edu

^{*}**CORRESPONDING AUTHOR FOOTNOTE.** T.J.D. (email: tobin@scripps.edu) or K.D.J. (e-mail: kdjanda@scripps.edu); The Scripps Research Institute, BCC-582, 10550 North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, CA 92037. Telephone: (858) 784-2516, fax: (858) 784-2595.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION AVAILABLE: ¹H and ¹³C NMR spectra and HPLC traces of compounds 4-6 and the RCA hapten. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

mental or psychological states require a mechanism for transport across the blood-brain barrier when their site of action is within the central nervous system (CNS). For example, catecholamine and serotonin mimetics, which often contain the arylethylamine moiety common to monoamine neurotransmitters, function as agonists or antagonists of the respective neurotransmitter system. However, such direct manipulation of neural pathways by CNS-targeted therapies may incur noticeable side effects. To treat drug abuse, other routes have been explored for affecting the signaling networks altered by the illicit substance. For example, small molecule therapies that compete for the same CNS site may block drug binding. This technique either circumvents the corresponding drug high or overdose, or it supports user abstinence by supplying a drug substitute which endows a similar high of diminished intensity but prolonged duration. The latter instance has been used with limited success in drug-specific cases for the management of addiction (e.g., methadone, buprenorphine, and naloxone to treat heroin abuse). However, this strategy is not without drawbacks, with the most notable being the inherent addictive quality of the therapeutic agent. Further diminishing the utility of small molecule therapeutics is their incompatibility with prophylactic treatment.

In this study, we sought to demonstrate the use of immunopharmacotherapy as a prophylactic anti-drug therapeutic with the capacity to stave off drug-induced cognitive impairment despite its exclusion from the CNS. Whereas immunopharmacotherapy has been validated within the scenario of attenuating the psychomotor symptoms of drug intoxication from a comparatively large drug dose that potentially overwhelms the drug-binding capacity of the administered mAbs, the opposite scenario is rarely examined. As an immunotherapeutic target, benzodiazepines contrast with the traditional psychostimulants because a comparatively small number of drug molecules escaping mAb-mediated sequestration may precipitate measurable changes in cognitive processes. Protection from benzodiazepines does not probe the efficacy of a maximum mAb dose against a potential molar excess of drug, but instead it examines whether the rate of mAb-mediated drug scavenging in the periphery is sufficient to block even a minimal amount of drug from entering the CNS. To explore passive immunization against a highly potent abused small molecule, a hapten against flunitrazepam was designed, and the monoclonal antibody (mAb) therapy evaluated for its ability to prevent flunitrazepam-induced memory deficits.

To date, the implementation of passive immunization strategies has been limited in scope despite a major recognized benefit over other anti-addiction therapies (methadone maintenance, nicotine patch). In particular, immunization incurs minimal physiological consequences when drug use or exposure is avoided. Currently, attempts to diminish drug dependence or attenuate drug inebriation with anti-drug mAbs have been explored for morphine, PCP, cocaine, methamphetamine, mescaline, and nicotine¹⁻⁴. These investigations into mAb-mediated pharmacokinetic antagonism have focused on the attenuation of drug self-administration, restoration or protection of basic motor skills, prevention of intoxication upon future drug intake, and reversal of lethality from drug overdose in rodent models⁵⁻¹⁰. Here, immunopharmacotherapy has been proven effective, and consequently, the pursuit of mAb therapeutics for nicotine and cocaine has advanced into clinical trials^{1, 2, 11}. All of the drugs previously targeted by immunopharmacotherapy produce gross symptoms of intoxication that obstruct an examination of more subtle drug-induced cognitive deficits. Alternatively, the CNS depressant flunitrazepam (Fig. 1A) was selected for this study because of its ability to effect higher order cognitive processes and its suitability for immunopharmacotherapy as a DEA Schedule IV abused substance¹². Flunitrazepam binds with high affinity to benzodiazepine sites (BZ₁ and BZ₂⁺) on GABA receptors to allosterically modulate GABA neurotransmission¹³. The requirement for pre-existing GABAergic tone for flunitrazepam-induced intoxication reinforces the coabuse of flunitrazepam with other drugs by potentiating the effect of GABA receptor agonists¹⁴. Indeed, addicts often combine flunitrazepam with other substances to temper a given drug high, or to self-medicate during drug withdrawal¹⁵⁻¹⁷. In such potentially

lethal cases, the available post-hoc treatment is limited to administration of the benzodiazepine site antagonist flumazenil or activated charcoal¹⁸. The more alarming use statistic is the dramatic rise of facilitated sexual assault using “rophies”, in which even mild exposure to flunitrazepam spurs behavioral disinhibition^{18, 19}. In response, the World Health Organization moved this benzodiazepine from a Schedule IV to III class drug, and the DEA began to track flunitrazepam use statistics more closely²⁰. While administration of flunitrazepam results in the sedation and muscle-relaxation characteristic of benzodiazepines, the concurrent hypnotic and amnesic effects have also promoted its abuse. Correspondingly, the ability of flunitrazepam to cause impairment at comparatively low doses¹² make flunitrazepam intoxication amenable for study using classical rodent behavioral assays. Targeting flunitrazepam by immunopharmacotherapy presents both a worthwhile and pharmacologically interesting endeavor; the former point concerns the social hazards inherent to its abuse and the latter point relates to the necessity of preventing the sedative as well as cognitive effects of flunitrazepam.

RESULTS

Generation of an Anti-Flunitrazepam Monoclonal Antibody

The synthesis of hapten **RCA** commenced from isatoic anhydride to generate 2'-fluoro-2-aminobenzophenone **3** in two steps (Fig. 1B). Slight modifications of the published methods were made in order to increase the resulting yield; specifically, the intermediate Weinreb amide **2** was pretreated with *n*BuLi to form a lithium amide before it was added to preformed 2-fluorophenyllithium²¹. This procedure limited the formation of the major side product 2-butylcarbonylaniline and generated **3** in 57% yield. Coupling of **3** with stoichiometric amount of Boc-Glu(O*t*Bu)-OH in the presence of HBTU at 75 °C over two days proved slow and inefficient producing only < 10% conversion, however, the reaction rate and the yield were increased by switching to HATU²² as coupling reagent and using a 6-fold excess of Boc-Glu(O*t*Bu)-OH. Using methods previously described by Hoffmann-LaRoche, deprotection of the tert-butyl ester, followed by heating in pyridine yielded the seven-membered ring in excellent yield²⁶. Subsequent 1-*N*-methylation and paranitration proceeded smoothly in the presence of the free carboxylic acid group of the linker to afford **7**²⁷. The linker was extended to a total length of 10-12 Å by addition of an aminobutyrate moiety to give the hapten **RCA**. To generate the immunoconjugates, hapten **RCA** was coupled to BSA or KLH carrier proteins using EDC and sulfo-NHS activation, as previously reported²⁵. MALDI-TOF analysis revealed that an average of 12 hapten molecules were conjugated to BSA.

Immunization of two 4-week old 129 GIX+ mice with **RCA** immunoconjugates and RIBI adjuvant generated specific antibody titers (>12,800) to the **RCA** hapten. In this immunization procedure, four injections were delivered 3-4 days apart, and then one month later, a fifth injection containing 50 µg immunoconjugate and 250 µg alum was administered. Mice were bled one week after the fourth and fifth injections for monitoring of antibody titers and specificities using ELISA. Two months after the last bleed, a final booster injection of immunoconjugate (50 µg) was administered, followed by removal of the spleen three days later. The spleen cells were fused with a myeloma cell line to produce hybridomas according to standard techniques²³. The hybridomas were cloned into 96-well plates and screened against the respective **RCA**-BSA conjugate by ELISA during the cloning process. Colonies producing antibodies that bound **RCA**-BSA were subcloned twice, after which 29 retained hapten binding. These were injected into mice to generate ascitic fluid, and IgG was obtained and purified using salt precipitation, anion exchange chromatography (DEAE), and affinity chromatography (protein G). In addition, the 29 members of the final panel were assessed for hapten binding and specificity to flunitrazepam using competition ELISA ($K_{d,app} = 24 \mu\text{M}$ to

200 nM). Of these antibodies, mAb RCA3A3 was shown to have the highest affinity for flunitrazepam ($K_{d,app} = 200$ nM) and was selected for further *in vivo* study.

Optimization of *in vivo* Flunitrazepam Dose

After undergoing rotarod training, drug naïve mice were randomly divided into groups according to flunitrazepam dose (0.03, 0.06, and 0.09 mg/kg) and then tested on rotarod after drug injection. The normalized data for speed at fall of each subject was averaged across group, and a one-way ANOVA (group: 0.0 mg/kg, 0.03 mg/kg, 0.06 mg/kg, 0.09 mg/kg dose) confirmed the significant effect of drug dose on rotarod agility [$F(3, 20) = 32.731$, $p < 0.0001$] (Fig. 2). Mice receiving the 0.09 mg/kg drug dose were significantly impaired relative to vehicle control, 0.03 mg/kg, and 0.06 mg/kg groups ($p < 0.0001$), but were not sedated; thus, the 0.09 mg/kg dose was selected for subsequent experiments. Motor skills returned to within baseline levels in all mice 24 h after drug exposure (data not shown).

Immunization with RCA3A3 prevents flunitrazepam-induced sedation

The rotarod test, which aided in the flunitrazepam dose selection, was also employed as an initial screen of the therapeutic value of RCA3A3. Administration of the flunitrazepam-based mAb prior to drug exposure attenuated the deterioration of motor skills caused by flunitrazepam intoxication. Three-way repeated measures ANOVA (group $\times$ treatment $\times$ balance trials in a session) confirmed the significance of flunitrazepam-induced impairment and RCA3A3-mediated protection (Table 2), in that there was a significant interaction between treatment and the repeated measure [$F(2,82) = 3.805$ ($p < 0.05$)]. Thus, two-way ANOVA (group $\times$ treatment) and Fisher's PLSD were implemented for comparisons within balance sessions and between groups, respectively. Intoxication significantly impacted motor ability of VF mice relative to VS, RS, and GS groups ($p < 0.005$), while immunization against flunitrazepam protected RF mice from drug effects as compared to VF mice ($p < 0.0001$) (Fig. 3). Importantly, the immunization procedure had little effect on mice as demonstrated by the comparison of the performance of RF mice to RS mice in the rotarod assay ($p = 0.95$).

Given the utility of the rotarod test in highlighting the potential of our anti-flunitrazepam vaccine to influence agility and motor skills, we conducted a locomotor activity test in order to observe the time-sensitive progression of both flunitrazepam-induced sedation and RCA3A3-mediated protection. One-way repeated measures ANOVA revealed the significance of time interval on activity level in all locomotor activity recording sessions. Specifically, all mice demonstrated transient arousal to a novel environment, a trait inherent to the assay (Fig. 4). This arousal or hyperactivity decreased across time intervals and over subsequent sessions as mice became habituated to the testing cage. To confirm that locomotor activity data of VF mice portrayed the initial motor activation and then stereotyped sedative effects characteristic of benzodiazepines, interactions between interval and group, or interval and treatment were examined for the five intervals of the test session via three-way ANOVA (Table 2). Further comparative statistics using two-way ANOVA indicated that treatment had a significant main effect on locomotion in the first time interval [$F(1,42) = 6.044$, $p < 0.05$], which was attributed to the initial motor activation caused by flunitrazepam. A significant interaction between group $\times$ treatment ($p < 0.05$) persisted in the third through fifth time intervals, in which flunitrazepam caused sedation in the VF group but not in the immunized RF group.

Locomotor data analysis by three-way ANOVA with repeated measures (group $\times$ treatment $\times$ time interval) and the Student's t-test proved that immunization with RCA3A3 prevented flunitrazepam-induced sedation (Table 2, Fig. 4). Specifically, statistical analysis confirmed the significant differences in locomotor activity between VS and VF mice, between VF and RF mice, and between RF and RS mice. This latter result that the behavior of RS and RF mice is statistically distinguishable suggests that a portion of the injected flunitrazepam may have

entered the CNS in RF mice. However, upon performing the Student's t-test for between group comparisons at individual time intervals, the repeated measures ANOVA result for the RS versus RF comparison is refuted (Table 2). Analysis of shorter observation intervals allows for more sensitive detection of dynamic changes in activity level specific to group or treatment effects as opposed to overall behavioral trends. No statistically significant difference was found in locomotor activity for comparisons between VS and RF groups, RS and RF groups, and RS and VS groups when intervals were analyzed separately. This substantiated the conclusion that passive immunization alone imparted no significant change in locomotor activity (*vide supra*). The Student's t-test was also employed to verify that immunization prevented flunitrazepam intoxication and the corresponding activity changes. Gratifyingly, the locomotor activity of VF mice was significantly altered in comparison to VS and RF mice in the third, fourth, and fifth time intervals (Table 2). In sum, when flunitrazepam was given to RCA3A3-immunized mice, drug-induced changes in locomotor activity were prevented (Fig. 4).

Acquisition of fear memory in flunitrazepam-intoxicated and RCA3A3-immunized mice

Of the four testing days (habituation, conditioning, context test, and CS+ test), data was analyzed for total time spent freezing within each test session. There were no differences between the groups in freezing behavior during the habituation trials. In addition, all mice were examined for freezing and/or hyperactivity in response to the foot shocks during the conditioning session. The presence of altered activity in all mice reflected that flunitrazepam did not severely interrupt either proprioception or motor response to the aversive foot shock despite heavy sedation. It follows that changes in freezing behavior of intoxicated mice were directly attributable to disruption of associative fear memory, and the potential antinociceptive effect of flunitrazepam was not sufficient to minimize the perception of the shock as aversive. Lastly, to ensure that no negative effects resulted from the immunization procedure, one experimental group (GS) included mice immunized with the anti-cocaine mAb GNC92H2 and injected with saline (i.p.) as the treatment condition. The freezing behavior of GS, VS, and RS mice was statistically indistinguishable in the context test session, as evaluated by one-way ANOVA [group: $F(2,30) = 1.305$ $p > 0.05$] and two-way repeated measures ANOVA [group $\times$ time interval: $F(1,19) = 0.508$ $p = 0.48$]. Furthermore, GS mice displayed freezing behavior similar to VS and RS mice in the CS+ test [group $\times$ time interval: $F(1,19) = 0.185$ $p > 0.5$]. In light of this data, we concluded that mAb therapy conferred minimal effects on fear conditioning and memory, and as such, the GS group data was excluded from subsequent analyses of conditioned fear test data.

Restoration of contextual fear memory formation

Conditioned mice were examined for their contextual memory of the environment in which they received the tone-foot shock pairing 24 h prior (Fig. 5). There were dramatic differences in freezing behavior between mice conditioned during flunitrazepam exposure (VF) and mice receiving the immunotherapy (RF), as confirmed by three-way ANOVA, two-way ANOVA (group $\times$ treatment) for individual time intervals, and two-way repeated measures ANOVA (group $\times$ time interval) (Table 3). Specifically, VF mice failed to freeze in response to the contextual stimulus whereas control and immunized mice froze upon re-exposure to the conditioning box during context test sessions (Fig. 5). The freezing behavior of RF mice was restored to levels statistically indistinguishable from VS and RS groups as evaluated by ANOVA and unpaired Student's t-tests (data not shown), confirming that immunization with RCA3A3 effectively blocked flunitrazepam-induced impairment of contextual memory. Analysis by Student's t-test for each time interval supported the above conclusions in that VF mice showed significantly less freezing relative to VS mice (1st interval: $p < 0.0001$, 2nd interval: $p = 0.016$) and RF mice (1st interval: $p = 0.0017$, 2nd interval: $p < 0.005$). Any differences in freezing behavior between RF, VS, and RS groups were statistically undetectable, implying that immunization alone incurred no changes to freezing response, and

that immunization with RCA3A3 before flunitrazepam exposure protected the formation of contextual fear memory.

Immunization protects associative aversive learning cued stimulus

The CS+ test assessed the presence of a lingering associative memory between the tone and the aversive shock despite the novel context. CS+ test session data was divided into two parts with the first three minutes representing baseline activity in the novel context (Fig. 6A), and the last three minutes testing memory of the cued stimulus by exposing mice to the conditioned tone (Fig. 6B). As with the context session, there was no significant difference in freezing behavior between GS and RS mice either before the tone [group $\times$ time interval: $F(1,17) = 3.350$, $p > 0.05$] or during the tone [group $\times$ time interval: $F(1,17) = 0.022$, $p > 0.5$]. All mice behaved similarly during the first 3 min of the CS+ session in that they exhibited hyperactive, exploratory activity in response to the novel environment, and thus spent minimal time freezing regardless of group or treatment (Table 4, Fig. 6A).

During the second 3 min of the CS+ session during which mice were exposed to the conditioned stimulus, freezing behavior reappeared in all mice but those in the VF group (Fig. 6B). Results of a three-way ANOVA with group and treatment as between factors and time interval as the within factor justified further statistical analysis (Table 4). VF mice exhibited significantly less freezing behavior than mice in all other groups (H_0 : VF = VS, $p < 0.01$, H_0 : VF = RF, $p = 0.014$), while there was no statistically significant difference in behavior between RF, RS, and VS mice, as concluded using the Student's *t*-test.

DISCUSSION

To test the hypothesis that passive immunization offers an effective treatment against drug-induced cognitive impairment, we embarked upon the design of a hapten capable of eliciting antibodies that could bind flunitrazepam with high affinity (Fig. 1A). This process followed from previous experience in the preparation of haptens for other drugs of abuse including cocaine, nicotine, and Δ^9 -tetrahydrocannabinol^{25, 28-32}. The molecular features of flunitrazepam, specifically the rigid hydrophobic core, was expected to elicit complementary aromatic residues that are favored in antibody binding pockets³³. In addition, the general structure of flunitrazepam-like hapten **RCA** incorporated a linker at the C-3 position of the 1,4-benzodiazepine-2-one ring for covalent attachment to carrier proteins (Fig. 1B). An aminobutyrate moiety was incorporated into the linker given that increased linker length has been shown to afford superior hapten recognition upon immunization^{29, 34}.

To examine the efficacy of flunitrazepam binding and sequestration by RCA3A3, a dose-response relationship for flunitrazepam-induced locomotor effects was generated in a mouse model. While reports of flunitrazepam-induced immobilization, decreased exploratory behavior, and overall sedation were used for initial drug dose parameters^{35, 36}, the limited number of studies using this specific benzodiazepine necessitated further pharmacodynamic characterization of drug effects in mice. The rotarod assay for motor coordination was used to create a qualitative dose-motor response curve and thereby confirm reports in the literature of the appropriate dose of flunitrazepam conferring substantial locomotor impairment. The dose range tested here illustrated the biphasic dose response curve common to benzodiazepines, ethanol, and other abused substances in that agility and coordination improved with a low flunitrazepam dose (0.03 mg/kg), while motor impairment and sedation resulted at higher doses (Fig. 2)³⁷. Doses exceeding 0.09 mg/kg were not explored, as it was critical that sedated mice maintain consciousness for assessment of the drug-induced memory deficits in behavioral tests. The rotarod assay thus served as an appropriate behavioral screen for measuring motor deficits upon intoxication and permitted selection of the 0.09 mg/kg drug dose for subsequent psychomotor testing.

The primary behavioral paradigms employed to investigate mAb efficacy *in vivo* have included tests of locomotor activity and drug self-administration. Analogous to these studies, locomotor activity and agility were measured to assess flunitrazepam-induced sedation and the corresponding benefit derived from passive immunization with mAb RCA3A3. Intoxicated mice (VF) exhibited some hyperlocomotion during the first time interval of the locomotor assay, reflecting both the initial motor activating effect of the drug, which precedes sedation, and the anxiolytic effect of benzodiazepines, with heightened 'fearlessness' translating to increased exploratory behavior. When flunitrazepam was administered to RCA3A3-treated mice (RF), these drug-induced changes in locomotor activity were prevented (Fig. 4). Similarly, RCA3A3 also protected mice from the acute deterioration in motor coordination following drug exposure, as assessed by the rotarod test (Fig. 3). Given the severe memory deficits produced by flunitrazepam alongside this demonstrated motor impairment, testing of the *in vivo* efficacy of RCA3A3 also presented an ideal scenario for extending immunopharmacotherapeutic strategies to the prevention of drug-mediated cognitive impairment. Thus, following rotarod and locomotor activity testing, the conditioned fear assay was implemented to then examine the potential of mAb RCA3A3 to protect normal memory consolidation in drug-exposed mice.

Conditioned fear is commonly used to probe the neural mechanisms of memory. Not only is fear memory comparatively robust, facilitating comparison between initial memory consolidation versus long-term memory, but also fear-potentiated startle experiments are easily adapted to rodent models for studies of learning and memory processes. More importantly, the conditioned fear assay has previously been implemented to show the propensity of benzodiazepines or benzodiazepine site ligands to elicit anterograde amnesia as assessed by weakened associations between an environmental context and cue to an aversive foot shock in mice and in other animal models³⁸⁻⁴¹. In this study, we determined the ability of an anti-flunitrazepam mAb that is inherently localized to the periphery to protect fear memory of such associations despite flunitrazepam administration during the conditioning phase of the experiment. Subjects administered drug or saline (control) injections were twice exposed to a 30 s tone and white light, both co-terminating with a 1.0 mA foot shock during the conditioning session. Upon re-exposure to the foot shock chamber 24 h after conditioning, mice which spend a substantial amount of time freezing possess intact memory of the aversive foot shock delivered in the conditioning cage. However, any flunitrazepam-induced deficit in fear learning translates to a blunted freezing response in mice. Our results were in agreement with the initial hypothesis because drug-naïve mice (VS) spent more time freezing to the contextual stimuli than intoxicated mice (VF). This flunitrazepam-induced deficit in the retrieval of fear memory seen in VF mice was not observed in RF mice. Passive immunization with RCA3A3 enabled the formation and retention of memory for the shock-associated context as shown by their normal freezing response (Fig. 5).

Because the conditioned fear assay discriminates between contextual hippocampal-dependent and cued hippocampal-independent learning⁴², it has been used previously to show that the effect of benzodiazepines on fear conditioning may be specific to the environmental context^{43, 44}, a conclusion supported by our results. However, we obtained similar results for the CS + test as in the context test. Analysis of freezing behavior during tone presentation in CS+ sessions confirmed the significant detrimental effect of flunitrazepam on fear memory, which was blocked by pretreatment with RCA3A3 (Fig. 6B). This finding challenges previous studies which found benzodiazepine-mediated disruption of associations between the conditioned stimulus (cue) and unconditioned stimulus (foot shock) to be under contextual control^{43, 44}. As evidenced by the absence in freezing of VF mice to the tone, flunitrazepam-induced inhibition of fear memory of the cued stimulus-foot shock association. VS, RS, and RF mice all exhibited freezing upon tone presentation, or retrieval of intact associative memory between the tone and the aversive shock, regardless of the novel context. There was no significant

difference in freezing behavior between RF, RS, and VS groups, suggesting that treatment with RCA3A3 protected memory of the aversive stimulus and the associated auditory cue. In addition, passive immunization had no detectable effect on general anxiety-like behavior given the similar fear responses shown by VS, RS, and GS mice in both the context and CS+ tests. The first interval of the CS+ test, which entailed monitoring the exploratory behavior of all mice in response to the disguised cage, served as an internal assay control (Fig. 6A). All groups displayed similar behavior before exposure to the conditioned tone.

The value of applying immunopharmacotherapy to the treatment of cognitive dysfunction has been highlighted by the procurement of an anti-flunitrazepam mAb capable of attenuating both the sedative and amnesic central effects of intoxication. In terms of therapeutic value, mAb RCA3A3 blocked the appearance of contextual learning impairments caused by exposure to a benzodiazepine, and it preserved the subsequent retrieval of fear memory for the conditioned cue, or tone, when it was presented outside of the conditioning context. This result, a finding of pharmacological relevance in addition to validation of our original hypothesis, refutes the assumption that the conditioned-unconditioned stimuli association was solely under contextual control. Because mAb RCA3A3 abolished deficits in both motor activity and memory, this study illustrates that immunopharmacotherapeutic strategies possess applications beyond the treatment of addictive behavior and the prevention of gross symptoms of intoxication, such as overdose, hyperlocomotion, and seizures. Instead, immunopharmacotherapy represents a valid approach for addressing even the more subtle cognitive effects incurred by drug exposure.

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Hapten synthesis

^1H and APT ^{13}C -NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker DRX-500 spectrometer, chemical shifts (ppm) were referenced to internal CDCl_3 standard (^1H , 7.26 ppm and ^{13}C , 77.0 ppm). Carbon signals marked with an asterisk represent methyl and methyne carbons as determined by APT experiments. High-resolution mass spectra were recorded using electrospray ionization (ESI) or MALDI-TOF techniques. All chemical reagents and solvents were from Aldrich Chem. Co., unless otherwise noted, and used without further purification. Glassware and solvents were dried by standard methods. Flash chromatography was performed on silica gel 60 (230-400 mesh) and thin layer chromatography on glass plates coated with a 0.02, 0.5, or 1.0 mm layer of silica gel 60 F-254. Analytical RP-HPLC was performed on a Hitachi Elite La Chrom L-2000 series HPLC chromatograph using a Vydac 218TP5415 column at a flow rate of 1 mL/min, with detection at 254 nm during a linear gradient of 10-95% acetonitrile/0.09% TFA over 40 min at 35°C. Preparative RP-HPLC was performed using a custom-packed, 2-inch bore C18 column at a flow rate of 10 mL/min, with detection at 254 and 280 nm; fractions were analyzed off-line using an ABI/Sciex 150EX single quadrupole mass spectrometer. Compounds **2** and **3** have been previously reported and their spectral data were consistent with prior literature.²¹

2'-Fluoro-2-aminobenzophenone (**3**)

To a stirred solution of **2** (4.90 g, 27.2 mmol) in THF at -100 °C under argon was added 1.5 M $n\text{BuLi}$ in hexanes (18.1 mL, 27.2 mmol). In a separate flask, 1.5 M $n\text{BuLi}$ in hexanes (18.1 mL, 27.2 mmol) was added to a solution of 2-fluorobromobenzene (4.76 g, 27.2 mmol) in THF at -100 °C under argon. After 10 min, the solution of 2-fluorophenyllithium was transferred to the first flask containing the lithium amide *via* cannula. After a further 10 min stirring, 1 M HCl (aq) was added and the resulting mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate. The organic layer was washed with water and brine, dried over Na_2SO_4 and concentrated *in vacuo*. The crude product was purified on silica gel with EtOAc/hexanes (15:85) as the eluent to give **3** (3.33 g, 57%).

tert-Butyl 4-(tert-butoxycarbonylamino)-5-(2-(2-fluorobenzoyl)phenylamino)-5-oxopentanoate (4)

Boc-Glu(tBu)-OH (3.38 g, 11.1 mmol) and HATU (4.24 g, 11.1 mmol) were suspended in anhydrous 1,2-dichloroethane (20 mL). Diisopropylethylamine (5.8 mL, 33.3 mmol) was added and the mixture was stirred under atmosphere of argon at ambient temperature until a nearly clear yellow solution was obtained (15 min). **3** (400 mg, 1.86 mmol) was added, and the mixture was heated at 75 °C for 16h, after which the mixture was cooled, diluted with ethyl acetate (40 mL) and transferred into a separatory funnel. The organic phase was washed consecutively with water, saturated aqueous sodium bicarbonate (3x), 10% aqueous citric acid (2x), and dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate. The organic solvents were evaporated under reduced pressure and the dark syrupy residue was purified by column chromatography on silica gel using hexane-ethyl acetate (5:1 → 3:1 → 2:1, v/v) as eluent, yielding 0.74 g (80%) of **4** as yellow syrup. ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz) δ 11.85 (s, 1H), 8.76 (d, 1H, J=8.4 Hz), 7.58 (t, 1H, J=7.6 Hz), 7.55-7.48 (m, 2H), 7.44 (dt, 1H, J=1.6, 7.5 Hz), 7.26 (dt, 1H, J=0.7, 7.6 Hz), 7.16 (t, 1H, J=9.1 Hz), 7.07 (t, 1H, J=7.5 Hz), 5.45 (d, 1H, J=6.1 Hz), 4.32 (m, 1H), 2.42 (m, 2H), 2.28 (m, 1H), 2.05 (ddd, 1H, J=7.4, 14.8, 15.0 Hz), 1.43 (s, 18H). ¹³C (CDCl₃, 125 MHz) δ 196.5, 172.3, 171.3, 160.4, 158.4, 155.5, 140.6, 135.3*, 134.0*, 132.9*, 132.9*, 130.2*, 127.6, 127.5, 124.2*, 122.8, 122.6*, 120.8*, 116.3*, 116.1*, 80.8, 80.2, 56.0*, 32.0, 28.2*, 28.0*, 27.4. FTMS calcd for C₂₇H₃₃N₂O₆F [M+Na]⁺: 523.2220, found 523.2230.

3-(5-(2-Fluorophenyl)-2-oxo-2,3-dihydro-1H-benzo[e][1,4]diazepin-3-yl)propanoic acid (5)

4 (345 mg) was dissolved in dichloromethane (10 mL), and trifluoroacetic acid (10 mL) was added while stirring. Stirring was continued for 1h, after which the volatile components were evaporated under reduced pressure. The dark syrupy residue was dissolved in pyridine (10 mL) and heated at 75 °C for 14h. The reaction was monitored by TLC (10:1 CH₂Cl₂/MeOH) and ESIQ MS. Pyridine was evaporated under vacuum and the dark syrupy residue was purified by column chromatography on silica gel using dichloromethane-methanol (20:1, v/v) as eluent, yielding **5** (221 mg, 98%) as amber syrup. ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz) δ 9.90 (d, 1H, J = 4.2 Hz), 7.53 (dt, 1H, J = 1.4, 7.5 Hz), 7.49 (m, 1H), 7.41 (m, 1H), 7.20 (m, 3H), 7.12 (t, 1H, J = 7.6 Hz), 7.03 (t, 1H, J = 9.2 Hz), 3.73 (dd, 1H, J = 5.2, 8.1 Hz), 2.74 (m, 2H), 2.61 (ddd, 1H, J = 6.6, 14.5 Hz), 2.46 (ddd, 1H, J = 7.1, 14.0 Hz). ¹³C (CDCl₃, 125 MHz) δ 177.8, 171.8, 167.0, 161.4, 159.4, 137.2*, 132.2*, 132.1*, 131.6*, 130.1*, 128.1, 127.3, 127.2, 125.3*, 124.3*, 124.3*, 124.0*, 121.3*, 116.2*, 116.1*, 61.8*, 53.4, 30.6, 25.7. FTMS calcd for C₁₈H₁₅N₂O₃F [M+H]⁺: 327.1145, found: 327.1125.

3-(5-(2-Fluorophenyl)-1-methyl-2-oxo-2,3-dihydro-1H-benzo[e][1,4]diazepin-3-yl)propanoic acid (6)

A 60% suspension of NaH in mineral oil (84 mg, 2.1 mmol) was washed thrice with hexane, suspended in dry THF and added to a stirred solution of the **5** (229 mg, 0.70 mmol) in dry THF (1 mL) at 0 °C. The mixture was stirred for 10 min at 0 °C, and methyl iodide (175 μL, 2.8 mmol) was added *via* syringe. The mixture was stirred at 0 °C for 1h, then allowed to warm up to ambient temperature and stirred for 1h. The excess sodium hydride was quenched by addition of glacial acetic acid (500 μL), and the volatile components were evaporated under vacuum. The dark gummy residue was triturated with dichloromethane-methanol (10:1, v/v), and the resulting suspension was filtered through a pad of silica gel. The yellow filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure and the residue was purified by column chromatography on silica gel using dichloromethane-methanol (20:1 → 10:1, v/v) as eluent, yielding **6** (153 mg, 64%) as light yellow syrup, which solidifies upon standing. ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz) δ 12.08-10.36 (br.s., 1H), 7.61 (dt, 1H, J = 1.7, 7.5 Hz), 7.55 (m, 1H), 7.43 (m, 1H), 7.35 (d, 1H, J = 8.2 Hz), 7.22 (m, 2H), 7.16 (t, 1H, J = 7.5 Hz), 7.03 (m, 1H), 3.69 (dd, 1H, J = 5.5, 7.6 Hz), 3.45 (s, 3H), 2.81 (m, 1H), 2.70 (m, 2H), 2.60 (ddd, 1H, J = 6.6, 14.0 Hz), 2.41 (m,

1H). ^{13}C (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz) δ 178.1, 169.9, 166.3, 161.5, 159.5, 142.4, 132.2*, 132.2*, 131.8*, 131.4*, 131.4*, 129.9, 129.0*, 126.9, 126.8, 124.4*, 124.3*, 124.3*, 121.4*, 116.2*, 116.0*, 61.9*, 35.3*, 30.7, 26.1. FTMS calcd for $\text{C}_{19}\text{H}_{18}\text{N}_2\text{O}_3\text{F}$ $[\text{M}+\text{H}]^+$: 341.1301, found: 341.1311.

3-(5-(2-Fluorophenyl)-1-methyl-7-nitro-2-oxo-2,3-dihydro-1H-benzo[e][1,4]diazepin-3-yl) propanoic acid (7)

KNO_3 (59 mg, 0.58 mmol) was added to a stirred solution of **6** (99 mg, 0.29 mmol) in fuming H_2SO_4 (2 mL) was allowed to stir at ambient temperature (4h). Small ($\sim 20 \mu\text{L}$) aliquots were taken after 2h of stirring, partitioned between dichloromethane and water ($\sim 200 \mu\text{L}$ each), the organic layer was carefully separated off with a pipette, dried over Na_2SO_4 , passed through a small pad of silica gel, and evaporated. The residue was dissolved in 100 μL methanol and analyzed by ESI-Q MS. When the reaction was judged as complete, the mixture was transferred to an ice-cold mixture of dichloromethane and water. The organic layer was dried over Na_2SO_4 , concentrated, and used toward the next step without further purification.

4-(3-(5-(2-Fluorophenyl)-1-methyl-7-nitro-2-oxo-2,3-dihydro-1H-benzo[e][1,4]diazepin-3-yl) propanamido)butanoic acid (hapten RCA)

A solution of the crude **7**, PyBOP (170 mg, 0.33 mmol), and diisopropylethylamine (130 μL , 0.75 mmol) in dichloromethane (3 mL) was stirred under atmosphere of argon for 15 min. *t*-Butyl aminobutyrate hydrochloride (65 mg, 0.33 mmol) was added and the reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 3 h. The mixture was partitioned between EtOAc and water, the organic layer was washed consecutively with saturated aqueous sodium bicarbonate (3x), 10% aqueous citric acid (2x), then dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate, and evaporated. The residue was purified by flash chromatography on silica gel with dichloromethane-acetone (3:1) as the eluent to give the *t*-butyl protected intermediate, which was treated with 50% TFA/ CH_2Cl_2 (2 mL) for 1h. The volatile components were evaporated and the syrupy residue was purified by preparative reverse-phase HPLC using a linear gradient of 15% acetonitrile/0.09% TFA to 40% acetonitrile/0.09% TFA in 0.1% TFA/water over 30 min while monitoring at 254 and 280 nm. The fractions containing the target material were pooled and lyophilized to give RCA hapten (46 mg, 30% over three steps from **6**). The purity of the product was checked by analytical HPLC and found to be greater than 95%. ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 500 MHz) δ 10.12 (br. s, 1H), 8.50 (dd, 1H, $J = 2.6, 5.8$ Hz), 8.36 (m, 1H), 7.64 (t, 1H, $J = 7.5$ Hz), 7.43 (d, 1H, $J = 8.3$ Hz), 7.16-7.29 (m, 3H), 6.97 (m, 1H), 3.74 (m, 1H), 3.48 (s, 3H), 3.32 (m, 2H), 2.55 (m, 4H), 2.35 (t, 2H, $J = 6.8$ Hz), 1.82 (p, 2H, $J = 6.7$ Hz). ^{13}C (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz) δ 176.7, 175.1, 169.5, 164.6, 162.8, 157.2, 144.3, 142.7, 132.9*, 128.8*, 128.4, 127.9*, 127.8*, 127.6*, 127.6*, 127.4, 125.0*, 122.0*, 117.7*, 117.5*, 62.7*, 39.3, 35.7*, 32.5, 31.2, 27.3, 24.2. FTMS calcd for $\text{C}_{23}\text{H}_{23}\text{N}_4\text{O}_6\text{F}$ $[\text{M}+\text{H}]^+$: 471.1680, found: 471.1685.

Preparation of immunoconjugates

The RCA hapten (5 mg) was treated with 1.3 equiv of 3-sulfo-*N*-hydroxysuccinimide and 1.2 equiv of 1-(3-dimethylaminopropyl)-3-ethylcarbodiimide hydrochloride for 24 h in DMF. This reaction was then added to solutions (5 mg/mL) of keyhole limpet hemocyanin (KLH) and bovine serum albumin (BSA) in PBS (50 mM, pH 7.4), and allowed to react 24 h at 4 °C. The resulting conjugate was used without further purification.

Hybridoma production

Hybridoma production followed standard protocols²³.

Flunitrazepam competition ELISA

An ELISA plate (Costar; 96 well) was coated uncovered overnight at 37 °C with 25 μL of the RCA-KLH conjugate. To this, methanol (50 μL /well) was added and allowed to sit 5 min at

room temperature. The methanol was then removed from the wells and the plates allowed to dry. Wells were then blocked with 50 μ L of Blotto (5% skim milk powder in PBS) for 5 min at 37 °C. Typically, 25 μ L of a solution containing a 1:100 dilution of mAb in Blotto along with varied serial dilutions of flunitrazepam (24 μ M–24 nM) was then added and incubated 1 h at 37 °C. After washing, 25 μ L of a 1:1000 dilution of a goat anti-mouse/horse-radish peroxidase conjugate in Blotto was added and incubated for 30 min. The plate was developed with the colorimetric reagent 2,2'-azino-bis-(3-ethylbenzthiazoline-6-sulfonic acid) (ABTS) for 30 min and the absorbance measured on an ELISA plate reader at $\lambda = 405$ nm. Binding constants were determined by analysis of plots of A_{405} versus flunitrazepam concentration. The $K_{d,app}$ was defined as the concentration at which A_{405} was half-maximal.

***In vivo* testing of RCA3A3**

Subjects—Female CD-1 mice (20–40 g; Dose determination: N = 24 mice; Passive immunization: N = 110 mice) were purchased from a breeding colony at The Scripps Research Institute at 6 weeks of age. Animals were housed four per cage in a temperature-controlled vivarium under a reversed 12 h:12 h light/dark cycle (lights off at 06:00 h). Food and water were available *ad libitum* throughout the study. All experiments were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of The Scripps Research Institute and conducted in accordance with the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals as adopted and promulgated by the National Institutes of Health. Every effort was made to reduce the number of animals used.

Flunitrazepam—In all cases, flunitrazepam [5-(2-fluorophenyl)-1,3-dihydro-1-methyl-7-nitro-2H-1,4-benzodiazepin-2-one] (Sigma) was prepared in 0.5% tween-80 in sterile 0.9% saline and administered by intraperitoneal injection.

Determination of flunitrazepam dose—One week after arrival, animals were weighed and randomly divided into four experimental groups (n = 6) based on drug dose, administered by intraperitoneal injection: vehicle with 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline, 0.03 mg/kg flunitrazepam in 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline, 0.06 mg/kg flunitrazepam in 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline, and 0.09 mg/kg flunitrazepam in 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline. The motor impairment conveyed by a particular drug dose was assessed via the rotarod test. Mice were trained on the rotarod three consecutive days prior to drug administration. On the fourth test day, subjects were injected with drug (or saline) and then returned to their home cages for 20 min before rotarod testing. Rotarod testing was repeated 24 h after drug administration to ensure motor activity had returned to baseline ability.

Effect of passive immunization against flunitrazepam—One week after arrival, animals were labeled, weighed, and subjected to intravenous catheterization. Detailed methods on surgery and apparatus are described elsewhere²⁴. After a five day recovery period, mice were randomly assigned to the following experimental groups (n = 22, Table 1): VS: vehicle control, saline (i.p.); VF: vehicle control, saline (i.v.) flunitrazepam (i.p.); GS: GNC92H2 (i.v.), saline (i.p.); RS: RCA3A3 (i.v.), saline (i.p.); and RF: RCA3A3 (i.v.), flunitrazepam (i.p.). The GS test group, in which mice were immunized with the anti-cocaine mAb GNC92H2, was included as a control for effects of antibody administration. The animals were treated and tested in Latin square fashion. Flunitrazepam solution, prepared in 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline (at a dose appropriate for i.p. administration, about 0.01 mg/mL) was injected three days after passive immunization or saline i.v. infusion. Passive immunization involved attaching a 4-inch polyethylene tube to the indwelling catheter on the animal's back, and then slowly delivering the bolus infusion of antibody or saline through the tube over the course of ~ 1 minute.

Of the original test groups (VS, VF, RF, RS, GS; $n = 22$ per test group) half of the mice were trained on the rotarod assay before receiving drug or saline injection and subsequent rotarod testing. The remaining mice were habituated to the locomotor activity cages and conditioned fear set-up. Upon drug or saline injection, these mice were then tested using the locomotor activity and conditioned fear behavioral assays to examine the ability of RCA3A3 to prevent flunitrazepam-induced cognitive impairment.

Immunization—Passive immunization was conducted by a bolus infusion of mAb (10.2 mg/kg; i.v. in a volume of 1 mL/kg) before onset of behavioral testing, or three days before flunitrazepam treatment or control saline injection. Animals in test groups receiving the nonspecific antibody (i.v.) were infused with the anti-cocaine mAb GNC92H2²⁵ at the same dose and volume. Control groups were infused with isotonic saline (1 mL/kg, i.v.). The infusion was delivered at a slow flow over 1 min, and antibody infusions were followed by a small amount of saline to clear the catheter of any antibody and ensure the entire amount reached the jugular vein. Animals were then returned to their home cages.

Rotarod testing—The rotarod (IITC, Inc., Life Sciences, Woodland Hills, CA, USA) consisted of a rubber matting-covered 3.8 cm diameter rod suspended in a test box and divided into five lanes for simultaneous testing of mice. The rotarod treadmill was programmed to reach a top speed of 30 rpm via a constant acceleration of 10 rpm per minute. The chamber and rotarod were cleaned between mice. All test groups of mice were randomly subdivided into five, and sequentially placed on the rotarod (one mouse per lane). Once all five mice in a subgroup were situated on and acclimated to balancing on the rod, the rod was set to accelerate at a constant rate of 10 rotations/min² over the course of 3 min to a maximum speed of 30 rpm. Upon falling from the rod, mice crossed through a light beam sensor located just below the rod, and the resulting beam break was recorded by the computer. After all five mice had fallen, they were immediately placed back on the rod for another attempt. One session consisted of three consecutive balance attempts before proceeding to the next set of five mice. Recordings were measured in terms of rod speed at fall, and a speed of 30 rpm was recorded for mice remaining on the rotarod for the entire 3 min. The training process was repeated for a total of three sessions per day over three consecutive days. The data from the last day (three sessions of three balance attempts per session) was averaged for each mouse to calculate individual peak baseline performance. On the fourth day, mice underwent one session of rotarod testing 15–20 min after administration of flunitrazepam or saline. The rotarod balance test was repeated in the same manner (i.e. one session, with saline injections substituting for drug injections) 24 h after drug administration. This last session on the fifth day was implemented to verify that rotarod performance returned to baseline levels. For data analysis, the speed of the rotarod at fall for each balance attempt of the test day was divided by the average peak baseline performance of the individual mouse (calculated from the last day of rotarod training). This normalized data for each mouse was then averaged across test group (Fig. 2, 3).

Locomotor activity testing—Locomotor activity was measured in Plexiglas cages (42 × 22 × 20 cm) placed into frames (25.5 × 47 cm) mounted with two levels of photocell beams at 2 and 7 cm above the bottom of the cage (San Diego Instruments, San Diego, CA USA). These two sets of beams allowed for the recording of both horizontal (locomotion) and vertical (rearing) behavior. A thin layer of bedding material was scattered across the bottom of the cage. On the two days preceding drug administration, mice received daily locomotor box habituation sessions to minimize transient arousal during the test session produced by exposure to the novel environment. Mice were placed singly in the activity boxes for 15 min of monitoring directly following saline or drug injection, and then subjects were either returned to their home cages (locomotor activity habituation days) or transferred to the conditioned fear apparatus (test days). All mice received i.p. injections of isotonic saline (10 mL/kg)

immediately prior to all habituation sessions as well as before the locomotor activity retest session in order to reproduce the environment of drug administration.

Cued and contextual conditioned fear testing—The conditioning system consisted of a sound-proofed box of white interior housing a Freeze Monitor chamber (San Diego Instruments). The Plexiglas conditioning chamber (26 × 26 × 17 cm) was equipped with a speaker, a light, and a shockable grid floor under which orange oil-scented cedar chips were scattered. The stainless steel rod grid was connected to a shocker-scrambler unit delivering shocks of defined duration and intensity (1.0 mA). On the first day of the conditioned fear assay, mice were individually acclimated to the chamber via a 5-min habituation session. On the second day, mice were trained to associate an aversive foot shock with the conditioned stimuli, or cage context and an auditory cue, during a 5.5-min conditioning session. Specifically, a tone (3000 Hz, 80 dB) lasting 30 s was emitted 120 s and 270 s into the session, and upon termination of each tone, the unconditioned stimulus (a 2 s continuous foot shock at 1.0 mA) was delivered. Testing of contextual memory was conducted on the third day by placing the subject in the conditioning chamber for a 5-min test session and monitoring freezing behavior. Neither a tone nor a shock was administered as this session examined recognition of the association between the shock and the context. The mice were then analyzed for cued conditioning on the fourth day via the 6-min CS+ test. Here, the context of the conditioning chamber was disguised by the addition of a floormat over the metal grid floor, the insertion of patterned walls, and the replacement of orange oil soaked cedar chips with vanilla oil soaked chips in the bedding tray beneath the flooring. After exposure to this novel context for the first 3 min, the association between the foot shock and the tonal cue was assessed by sounding the tone for the latter 3 min of the test session. Mice were tested during their active (dark) cycle and were returned to their home cages after each day of testing. Freezing behavior, or the absence of all voluntary movements except breathing, was measured in all four sessions (habituation, conditioning, context test, and CS+ test) by a validated computer-controlled recording of photocell beam interruptions. Scoring of the freezing response entailed summing time spent freezing (the absence of laser beam breaks for ≥ 2 s) across 5-s intervals for the entire test session duration.

Statistical analyses—All values were expressed as mean $\pm$ SEM. For mean freezing times within the conditioned fear assay sessions, values differing by more than two standard deviations from the mean were excluded (approximately one mouse per test group). Test scores of rotarod, locomotor, and fear conditioning behavioral assays were analyzed for homogeneity of variance. Assuming scores met this criterion, appropriate analyses of variance (ANOVA) were performed with group (vehicle or immunized) and/or treatment (saline or flunitrazepam injection) as the between subject factors and, where appropriate, time interval within a session as the within subject factor. Differences were considered statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. Subsequently, individual means were compared using the Student's t-test for comparison between two groups, Fisher's PLSD, or the Scheffe's test in the case of unequal group size. Data from the GS, VS, and RS groups was compared by one-way ANOVA for all behavioral tests, and given no statistically detectable difference between groups, the GS data was eliminated from further analysis. The GS group was originally included to confirm the lack of adverse effects of passive immunization, and its subsequent exclusion from analysis allowed the 2 × 2 structure of ANOVA tests on VS, VF, RS, and RF group data to be upheld (Table 1).

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Skaggs Institute for Chemical Biology and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (DA 21939 to J.B.T., DA 98590 to K.D.J.).

ANONSTANDARD ABBREVIATIONS FOOTNOTE

mAb, monoclonal antibody
 IgG, immunoglobulin
 GABA, γ -aminobutyric acid
 i.v., intravenous
 i.p., intraperitoneal
 VS, vehicle saline (i.p.)
 VF, vehicle flunitrazepam (i.p.)
 RS, RCA3A3-immunized saline (i.p.)
 RF, RCA3A3-immunized flunitrazepam (i.p.)
 GS, GNC92H2-immunized saline (i.p.)
 CS, conditioned stimulus (tone)
 US, unconditioned stimulus (foot shock)
 CS+ test, conditioned stimulus test session of the conditioned fear assay
 NIDA, National Institute on Drug Abuse

REFERENCES

1. Meijler MM, Matsushita M, Wirsching P, Janda KD. Development of immunopharmacotherapy against drugs of abuse. *Curr Drug Discov Technol* 2004;1(1):77–89. [PubMed: 16472221]
2. Kosten T, Owens SM. Immunotherapy for the treatment of drug abuse. *Pharmacol Ther* 2005;108(1):76–85. [PubMed: 16023218]
3. Pentel PR, Dufek MB, Roiko SA, Lesage MG, Keyler DE. Differential effects of passive immunization with nicotine-specific antibodies on the acute and chronic distribution of nicotine to brain in rats. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2006;317(2):660–666. [PubMed: 16407464]
4. Utzinger R. Hapten-immunological studies on mescaline. *Psychopharmacologia* 1975;41(3):301–304. [PubMed: 807928]
5. Fox BS, Kantak KM, Edwards MA, Black KM, Bollinger BK, Botka AJ, French TL, Thompson TL, Schad VC, Greenstein JL, Geftter ML, Exley MA, Swain PA, J. BT. Efficacy of a therapeutic cocaine vaccine in rodent models. *Nat Med* 1996;2:1129–1132. [PubMed: 8837612]
6. Valentine JL, Mayersohn M, Wessinger WD, Arnold LW, Owens SM. Antiphencyclidine monoclonal Fab fragments reverse phencyclidine-induced behavioral effects and ataxia in rats. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 1996;278(2):709–716. [PubMed: 8768722]
7. Kantak KM, Collins SL, Lipman EG, Bond J, Giovanoni K, Fox BS. Evaluation of anti-cocaine antibodies and a cocaine vaccine in a rat self-administration model. *Psychopharmacology* 2000;148(3):251–262. [PubMed: 10755738]
8. Hardin JS, Wessinger WD, Wenger GR, Proksch JW, Laurenzana E, Owens SM. A single dose of monoclonal anti-phencyclidine IgG offers long-term reductions in phencyclidine behavioral effects in rats. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2002;302:119–126. [PubMed: 12065708]
9. Gentry WB, Laurenzana EM, Williams DK, West JR, Berg RJ, Terlea T, Owens SM. Safety and efficiency of an anti-(+)-methamphetamine monoclonal antibody in the protection against cardiovascular and central nervous system effects of (+)-methamphetamine in rats. *Int Immunopharmacol* 2006;6:968–977. [PubMed: 16644483]
10. Carrera MRA, Trigo JM, Wirsching P, Roberts AJ, Janda KD. Evaluation of the anticocaine monoclonal antibody GNC92H2 as an immunotherapy for cocaine overdose. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 2005;81:709–714. [PubMed: 16005948]

11. Malin DH, Lake JR, Lin A, Saldana M, Balch L, Irvin MLL, Chandrasekara H, Alvarado CL, Hieda Y, Keyler DE. Passive immunization against nicotine prevents nicotine alleviation of nicotine abstinence syndrome. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 2001;68(1):87–92. [PubMed: 11274712]
12. Mattila MAK, Larni HM. Flunitrazepam: a review of its pharmacological properties and therapeutic use. *Drugs* 1980;20(5):353–374. [PubMed: 6108205]
13. Berezhnoy D, Nyfeler Y, Gonthier A, Schwob H, Goeldner M, Sigel E. On the benzodiazepine binding pocket in GABAA receptors. *J Biol Chem* 2004;279(5):3160–3168. [PubMed: 14612433]
14. Drummer OH, Syrjanen ML, Cordner SM. Deaths involving the benzodiazepine flunitrazepam. *Am J Forensic Med Pathol* 1993;14(3):238–243. [PubMed: 8311057]
15. Farre M, Teran M-T, Roset PN, Mas M, Torrens M, Cami J. Abuse liability of flunitrazepam among methadone-maintained patients. *Psychopharmacology* 1998;140:486–495. [PubMed: 9888625]
16. Gambi F, Conti CM, Grimaldi MR, Giampietro L, De Bernardis B, Ferro FM. Flunitrazepam a benzodiazepine most used among drug abusers. *Int J Immunopathol Pharmacol* 1999;12(3):157–159. [PubMed: 12783645]
17. Mintzer MZ, Griffiths RR. An abuse liability comparison of flunitrazepam and triazolam in sedative drug abusers. *Behav Pharmacol* 2005;16(7):579–584. [PubMed: 16170235]
18. Schwartz RH, Weaver AB. Rohypnol, the date rape drug. *Clin Pediatr* 1998;37:321.
19. Smith KM. Drugs used in acquaintance rape. *J Am Pharm Assoc* 1999;39:519–583.
20. House Commerce Committee Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. Vol. 106th Cong., 1st Session. US Drug Enforcement Administration; 1999. DEA Congressional Testimony.
21. Frye SV, Johnson MC, Valvano NL. Synthesis of 2-aminobenzophenones via rapid halogen-lithium exchange in the presence of a 2-amino-N-methoxy-N-methylbenzamide. *J Org Chem* 1991;56:3750–3752.
22. Carpino LA. 1-Hydroxy-7-azabenzotriazole. An efficient peptide coupling additive. *J Am Chem Soc* 1993;115:4397–4398.
23. Carrera MRA, Ashley JA, Zhou B, Wirsching P, Koob GF, Janda KD. Cocaine vaccines: antibody protection against relapse in a rat model. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2000;97(11):6202–6206. [PubMed: 10823960]
24. Deroche V, Caine SB, Heyser CJ, Polis I, Koob GF, Gold LH. Differences in the liability to self-administer intravenous cocaine between C57BL/6 × SJL and BALB/cByJ mice. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 1997;57(3):429–440. [PubMed: 9218267]
25. Carrera MRA, Ashley JA, Parsons LH, Wirsching P, Koob GF, Janda KD. Suppression of psychoactive effects of cocaine by active immunization. *Nature* 1995;378(6558):727–730. [PubMed: 7501020]
26. Sternbach LH, Fryer RI, Metlesics W, Sach G, Stempel A. Quinazolines and 1,4-Benzodiazepines. V. o-Aminobenzophenones. *J Org Chem* 1962;27(11):3781–3788.
27. Sternbach LH, Fryer RI, Keller O, Metlesics W, Sach G, Steiger N. Quinazolines and 1,4-benzodiazepines. X. nitro-substituted 5-phenyl-1,4-benzodiazepine derivatives. *J Med Chem* 1963;6:261–265. [PubMed: 14185980]
28. Isomura S, Wirsching P, Janda KD. An immunotherapeutic program for the treatment of nicotine addiction: hapten design and synthesis. *J Org Chem* 2001;66(12):4115–4121. [PubMed: 11397142]
29. Matsushita M, Hoffman TZ, Ashley JA, Zhou B, Wirsching P, Janda KD. Cocaine catalytic antibodies: the primary importance of linker effects. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 2001;11(2):87–90. [PubMed: 11206477]
30. Meijler MM, Matsushita M, Altobelli L J. r. Wirsching P, Janda KD. A new strategy for improved nicotine vaccines using conformationally constrained haptens. *J Am Chem Soc* 2003;125(47):164–165.
31. Ino A, Dickerson TJ, Janda KD. Positional linker effects in haptens for cocaine immunopharmacotherapy. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 2007;17(15):4280–4283. [PubMed: 17531484]
32. Qi L, Yamamoto N, Meijler MM, Altobelli LJ, Koob GF, Wirsching P, Janda KD. Delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol immunochemical studies: haptens, monoclonal antibodies, and a convenient synthesis of radiolabeled delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol. *J Med Chem* 2005;48(23):7389–7399. [PubMed: 16279798]

33. Fryer RI, Gu ZQ. The rational design and synthesis of haptens having specific activity as full agonists or full antagonists at the benzodiazepine receptor. *Life Sci* 1990;47(10):833–840. [PubMed: 2170789]
34. Peterson EC, Gunnell M, Che Y, Goforth RL, Carroll FI, Henry R, Liu H, Owens SM. Using hapten design to discover therapeutic monoclonal antibodies for treating methamphetamine abuse. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2007;322(1):30–39. [PubMed: 17452421]
35. Castellano C, Pavone F. Effects of flunitrazepam on passive avoidance behaviour in mice subjected to immobilization stress or familiarized with the testing apparatus. *Behav Brain Res* 1986;22(1):91–95. [PubMed: 3024662]
36. Bowers BJ, Elliott KJ, Wehner JM. Differential sensitivity to the anxiolytic effects of ethanol and flunitrazepam in PKC γ null mutant mice. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 2001;69:99–110. [PubMed: 11420074]
37. Savić MM, Obradović DI, Ugresić ND, Cook JM, Yin W, Van Linn M, Bokonić DR. Benzodiazepine site inverse agonists and locomotor activity in rats: bimodal and biphasic influence. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 2006;84(1):35–42. [PubMed: 16725185]
38. DeLorey TM, Lin RC, McBrady B, He X, Cook JM, Lameh J, Loew GH. Influence of benzodiazepine binding site ligands on fear-conditioned contextual memory. *Eur J Pharmacol* 2001;426(12):45–54. [PubMed: 11525770]
39. Blanchard DC, Griebel G, Blanchard RJ. The Mouse Defense Test Battery: pharmacological and behavioral assays for anxiety and panic. *Eur J Pharmacol* 2003;463(13):97–116. [PubMed: 12600704]
40. Guscott MR, Cook GP, Bristow LJ. Contextual fear conditioning and baseline startle responses in the rat fear-potentiated startle test: a comparison of benzodiazepine/gamma-aminobutyric acid-A receptor agonists. *Behav Pharmacol* 2000;11(6):495–504. [PubMed: 11103915]
41. Brignell CM, Curran HV. Drugs, sweat, and fears: a comparison of the effects of diazepam and methylphenidate on fear conditioning. *Psychopharmacology* 2006;186(4):504–516. [PubMed: 16758238]
42. Fendt M, Fanselow MS. The neuroanatomical and neurochemical basis of conditioned fear. *Neurosci Behav Rev* 1999;23(5):743–760.
43. Harris JA, Westbrook RF. Contextual control over the expression of fear in rats conditioned under a benzodiazepine. *Psychopharmacology* 2001;156:92–97. [PubMed: 11465639]
44. Harris JA, Westbrook RF. The benzodiazepine midazolam does not impair Pavlovian fear conditioning but regulates when and where that fear is expressed. *J Exp Psychol Anim Behav Process* 1999;25:236–246. [PubMed: 10331922]

Figure 1.

Design and preparation of flunitrazepam hapten **RCA**. A. Molecular structure of flunitrazepam, B. Synthesis of hapten **RCA**. Reagents and conditions: i) *N,O*-dimethylhydroxylamine, EtOH; ii) *n*BuLi, 2-fluorobromobenzene, -100°C , THF, then HCl; iii) Boc-Glu-(*O**t*Bu)-OH, HATU, DIEA, 75°C , 1,2-dichloroethane; iv) TFA/ CH_2Cl_2 , then pyridine, 75°C ; v) NaH, 0°C , THF, then CH_3I ; vi) KNO_3 , fuming H_2SO_4 , RT, then ice-cold DCM/water; vii) *t*-butyl aminobutyrate hydrochloride, PyBOP, DIEA, DCM, then TFA/ CH_2Cl_2 .

Figure 2.

Flunitrazepam dose dependent impairment on rotarod performance. Approximately 20 min before testing, mouse groups received an i.p. injection of 0.03, 0.06, or 0.09 mg/kg flunitrazepam dissolved in 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline, or an equivalent volume of 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline. Values are expressed as means $\pm$ SEM of three balance attempts on the test day, with the speed of the rotating rod at fall for each attempt normalized to the subject's average peak performance during rotarod training.

Figure 3.

Effect of flunitrazepam intoxication and immunization with mAb RCA3A3 (RF, RS groups) on rotarod performance. Flunitrazepam (VF, RF; black bars) or 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline (VS, RS; grey bars) i.p. injections were given 20 min prior to rotarod testing. Bars indicate group means $\pm$ S.E.M. for all rotarod balance trials on the day of drug administration. Individual subject data was calculated by normalizing the speed of the rotating rod upon the subject's fall for all balance attempts on the test day to the average peak performance (e.g., mean speed upon fall) of that subject from the last training day. A repeated measures ANOVA was used to evaluate the statistical significance of rotarod impairment in VF mice compared VS, RS, and RF mice (* $p < 0.05$, † $p = 0.058$).

Figure 4.

Flunitrazepam-induced sedation as depicted by locomotor activity response. Mice were passively immunized (i.v.) with mAb RCA3A3 (dashed line) or vehicle isotonic saline solution (solid line) three days before i.p. injection of flunitrazepam (■ VF, ● RF) or 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline (□ VS, ○ RS). Data, which reflect locomotor activity monitoring for 15 min following i.p. injection, are expressed as group means $\pm$ SEM of activity counts (photobeam breaks) summated across 3 min intervals for each mouse. Statistical significance is shown for the third through fifth time intervals; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, for comparison of VF and VS mice; † $p < 0.05$ for comparison of VF and RF mice.

Figure 5.

Fear behavior resulting from contextual conditioning in vehicle (left) and RCA3A3-immunized (right) mice. Grey bars depict i.p. injection of vehicle (0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline; VS, VF), and black bars indicate i.p. injection of flunitrazepam (dissolved in 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline; VF, RF). Mice were fear conditioned to the cage context 20 min after i.p. injection and then tested for their contextual fear memory 24 h later. A decrease in freezing behavior reflects a disruption of fear memory consolidation. Data for time spent freezing over the entire context test session are presented as means $\pm$ SEM. Statistical significance, as calculated using the unpaired Student's t-test, compares the freezing behavior of the VF group to that of VS, RS, and RF groups; ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.005$, † $p < 0.0001$.

Figure 6.

Freezing response to the cued stimulus in the CS+ test. Vehicle (VS, VF) and immunized (RS, RF) mice were evaluated for their cued fear memory 48 h after i.p. injection (VF, RF: flunitrazepam, black bars; VS, RS: vehicle, grey bars) and fear conditioning. All mice spent minimal time freezing before presentation of the tone (A), which indicates that the cage was adequately disguised to mask any contextual cues. Upon exposure to the cued stimulus (tone) during the second time interval (B), VS, RS and RF mice showed significant increases in freezing behavior while VF mice display less freezing compared to control levels. Data are expressed as means $\pm$ SEM of time spent freezing within either interval (A or B) of the CS+ test, and statistical significance represents results from the unpaired Student's t-test comparing VF group data to VS, RS, and RF group data; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

Table 1

Experimental design for mouse group and treatment assignments. Of the three grouping categories, vehicle, RCA3A3, and GNC92H2, only vehicle and RCA3A3-immunized mice were subsequently challenged with flunitrazepam treatment.

Group	Treatment	
	<i>0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline</i>	<i>flunitrazepam in 0.5% tween-80 in isotonic saline</i>
<i>vehicle</i>	VS	VF
<i>RCA3A3</i>	RS	RF
<i>GNC92H2</i>	GS	(not included)

Table 2

Statistical analysis of rotarod agility and locomotor activity test results.

Motor Activity				
	<u>VS, VF, RS, RF</u>	<u>VF vs VS</u>	<u>VF vs RF</u>	<u>RF vs RS</u>
	<i>Three-way ANOVA</i>	<i>Two-way ANOVA (group × treatment)</i>		
Rotarod	$F(2,82) = 3.805$, ($p < 0.05$) ^a	$p < 0.005$	$p < 0.0001$	$p = 0.95$
Locomotor	$F(4,186) = 4.017$, ($p < 0.005$) ^b	<i>Three-way ANOVA of repeated measures (group × treatment × time intervals)</i>		
	$F(4,186) = 10.656$, ($p < 0.0001$) ^c	$F(4,92) = 8.645$, ($p < 0.0001$)	$F(4,84) = 3.967$, ($p = 0.006$)	$F(4,76) = 3.505$, ($p < 0.05$)
	$F(4,186) = 4.017$, ($p < 0.05$) ^d	$p < 0.05, 0.05$, 0.005	$p < 0.05$, all	$p >> 0.05$, all

^a(group × treatment × balance trial), balance trials as repeated measure^b(group × time interval × session)^c(treatment × time interval × session)^d(group × time interval × treatment)

Table 3

Statistical analysis of conditioned fear context test results.

Text Test		
$\times$ treatment)	$F(1,38) = 8.543, (p = 0.0058)^a$	
$\times$ time interval)	$F(1,38) = 10.578, (p < 0.005)^a$	
$\times$ treatment)	$F(1,38) = 12.026, (p = 0.0013)$	
VS, RS	statistically indistinguishable ^b	
VS	$F(1,20) = 22.162, (p = 0.0001)^b$	
RF	$F(1,18) = 12.838, (p < 0.005)^b$	

^agroup × treatment × time interval, repeated measure^bgroup × time intervals, repeated measure

Table 4

Statistical analysis of conditioned fear CS+ test results.

Conditioned Fear: CS+ test, before tone		
<i>Three-way ANOVA^a</i>	(group × time interval)	$F(1,37) = 0.358, (p > 0.5)$
	(group × treatment)	$F(1,37) = 0.474, (p = 0.495)$
	(treatment × time interval)	$F(1,37) = 1.621, (p = 0.211)$
Conditioned Fear: CS+ test, after tone		
<i>Three-way ANOVA^a</i>	(group × time interval)	$F(1,38) = 4.168, (p < 0.05)$
<i>Student's T-test</i>	$H_0: VF = VS$	$p < 0.01$
	$H_0: VF = RF$	$p = 0.014$
	$H_0: RF = VS,$ $VS = RS,$ $RF = RS$	statistically indistinguishable

^a group × treatment × time interval