Published in final edited form as:

Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2013 November ; 37(0): . doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.04.017.

Conflation of Cocaine Seeking and Cocaine Taking Responses in IV Self-administration Experiments in Rats: Methodological and Interpretational Considerations

David C.S. Roberts, Amanda Gabriele, and Benjamin A. Zimmer

Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Wake Forest Health Sciences, Winston-Salem, NC, 27101, USA

Abstract

IV drug self-administration is a special case of an operant task. In most operant experiments, the instrumental response that completes the schedule requirement is separate and distinct from the consumptive response (e.g. eating or drinking) that follows the delivery of the reinforcing stimulus. In most IV self-administration studies drug seeking and drug taking responses are conflated. The instrumental lever press or nose poke is also a consumptive response. The conflation of these two response classes has important implications for interpretation of the data as they are differentially regulated by dose and price. The types of pharmacological pretreatments that affect appetitive responses are not necessarily the same as those that affect consumptive responses suggesting that the neurobiology of the two response classes are to some extent controlled by different mechanisms. This review discusses how schedules of reinforcement and behavioral economic analyses can be used to assess the regulation of drug seeking and drug taking separately. New methods are described that allow the examination of appetitive or consumptive responding in isolation and provide subjects with greater control over the self-administered dose. These procedures provide novel insights into the regulation of drug intake. Cocaine intake patterns that result in large, intermittent spikes in cocaine levels are shown to produce increases in appetitive responding (i.e. drug seeking). The mechanisms that control drug intake should be considered distinct from appetitive and motivational processes and should be taken into consideration in future IV self-administration studies.

Keywords

cocaine; self-administration; addiction; consummatory behavior; appetitive behavior; drug seeking; drug taking; schedules of reinforcement; motivation; reward

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Correspondence: David C.S. Roberts, Ph.D., Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Wake Forest University Health Sciences, Medical Center Boulevard, Winston-Salem, NC, 27101, USA, Phone: 1-336-716-8697, Fax: 1-336-716-8501, dcsrobt@wakehealth.edu.

Conflict of interest: None

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1. Introduction

The addiction process is an interaction between patterns of drug taking and subsequent drug seeking. With cocaine, and presumably all drugs, particular patterns of consumption emerge over time (such as binge-abstinence cycles), and it is assumed that these patterns make drug seeking more likely (Epstein and Preston, 2010; Epstein et al. 2009; Gawin, 1991, Levin et al. 1993, 1996; Myers et al. 1995; Preston et al. 2009). The theme of this review will be that the neural systems that underlie drug taking and drug seeking are to some extent dissociable and that different procedures must be used to isolate the factors that control these two classes of behavior. We will use the term “drug seeking” to describe the behaviors involved in obtaining access to a drug. For human drug users this entails behaviors involved in the search for and acquisition of the drug. In preclinical IV self-administration experiments, the seeking behavior generally takes the form of a lever response or a nose poke. We will use the term “drug taking” to refer to behaviors involved in the act of drug ingestion. In the clinical population, the “taking” response could take many forms depending on the substance. For cigarettes, it would be the act of smoking and for alcohol it would be the act of drinking. Cocaine taking could involve snorting, smoking or intravenous injection. In cocaine self-administration studies in rats however, the taking response is typically the same lever press or nose poke as the appetitive response. This review will discuss the implications of having two very different classes of behavior being represented by the same instrumental response and how this might pose problems for interpretation. Behavioral strategies for studying drug taking and drug seeking separately will be described.

The distinction between drug taking and drug seeking can be viewed in the larger context of consummatory and appetitive behaviors¹. The work of Dr. Ann Kelley, to whom this review is dedicated, illustrates the utility of distinguishing between appetitive and consummatory behaviors by demonstrating that they have different anatomical and neurochemical substrates. The pharmacological influences on free feeding are different from those that affect the instrumental response for the attainment of food. For example, injections of glutamate antagonists or GABA agonists into the shell of the nucleus accumbens was shown to increase food intake in tests with free-feeding; however, these same manipulations had no effect on food-reinforced operant responding (Hanlon et al. 2004; Zhang et al. 2003). In contrast, depletion of dopamine in the accumbens decreased responding on a progressive ratio (PR) task for food, but had no effect on intake under free-feeding conditions (Aberman and Salamone 1999). Similarly, facilitation of dopamine signaling (via intra-accumbal amphetamine injections) dramatically increased PR responding for a food reinforcer, but had no effect on food intake (Bakshi and Kelley 1991; Zhang et al. 2003). Just as the mechanisms that regulate food intake are different than those that plan for their attainment, it appears that the mechanisms that serve to regulate drug intake can be dissociated from those that influence drug seeking (Gan et al. 2010; Nicola and Deadwyler 2000; Pettit and Justice

¹The terms “appetitive” and “consummatory” appear to have quite different meanings that have evolved over time. For example, in the alcohol literature, the terms appetitive and consummatory have been used synonymously with drug seeking and drug taking (Czachowski and Samson 1999; Samson and Czachowski 2003; Sharpe and Samson 2001). However, other authors might point to the early work of Craig (1918) and infer a completely different meaning. Craig sought to explain the termination of instinctual behavior following the presentation of an “appetized” stimulus. In his view, a consummatory act is the last act in a series that results in satisfaction or satiety. The terminology has evolved with the study of motivated behavior. Two distinct phases are defined: an appetitive phase characterized by arousal, exploration, instrumental responding, and flexible approach behavior directed towards obtaining a goal; and a consummatory phase that results in cessation of the approach behavior and is characterized by interactions with the goal object that are typically highly stereotyped patterns of repetitive movements (e.g. chewing, swallowing, licking, drinking) (Berridge 2004; Craig 1918; Kelley et al. 2005). In cases where the goal involves an ingestible object (e.g. food or water) the consummatory phase involves consumption of the goal. However, the consummatory phase can proceed with no consumption at all (e.g. sex). That is the consummatory phase reflects the consummation of the appetitive phase behavior which may or may not involve consuming the goal object. For the purposes of this review, we will use the word “consummatory” to mean the terminal action in an appetitive sequence. In order to avoid confusion, we will use “consumptive” and “ingestive” to refer to any behaviors involved in intake of a commodity such as cocaine, food or alcohol.

1989). Therefore it becomes increasingly important to distinguish these classes of behavior in our animal models.

2. The study of drug seeking and drug consumption: clinical and preclinical strategies

With human subjects it is relatively straightforward to separate the study of drug consumption from appetitive behaviors. Drug ingestion can be studied by giving the subject free access to drug and investigating the physiological processes that regulate intake. For example, patterns of tobacco smoking are assessed by giving access to cigarettes and measuring puff size and frequency (Woodward & Tunstall-Pedoe, 1993; Ashton et al., 1979; Agué, 1973). Similarly, the clinical alcohol field allows access to alcoholic beverages and examines the patterns of consumption. These studies show that differences in consumption patterns can distinguish alcoholics from non-alcoholic individuals (Schaefer et al. 1971; Sobell et al., 1972) and predict impairment on cognitive and behavioral tasks (Bernosky-Smith et al., 2012).

It must be emphasized, however, that the rate of drug intake when the drug is freely available is not necessarily predictive of how much energy a subject will expend to gain access to the drug. A good clinical example was offered by Schuster (1973). Groups of hospital patients who had been detoxified from heroin were assigned to receive codeine, pentazocine or placebo. Subjects could receive their drug simply by reporting to the nursing station every four hours. Both codeine and pentazocine were requested at high rates. After patients were discharged, they were allowed to come back as out-patients for their medication. Only the patients in the codeine group continued to return. When response cost was minimal, the consumption of codeine and pentazocine were the same. However, when the response cost was increased - by time, bus fare and effort to return to the clinic - drug seeking for the two drugs was clearly different. To be clear, *ad libitum* drug consumption does not necessarily predict drug seeking, and cost may be an effective way to dissociate these behaviors.

Appetitive responding for drugs of abuse has been investigated in clinical settings using operant procedures traditionally used in preclinical studies (Comer et al. 2008). For example, various schedules of reinforcement have been used with human subjects to control access to a cigarette that can be smoked at a preferred rate (Griffiths et al., 1976) or unit doses of alcohol (10 cc) that can be combined to create larger doses (Mendelson and Mello, 1966). Similarly, a PR procedure has been used with human cocaine users to control access to cocaine powder, a mirror and a razor blade (Stoops et al., 2010). The rate and pattern of intra-nasal cocaine use is under the subject's control.

The use of operant procedures to assess IV self-administration in rats differ from both the clinical operant experiments for drugs mentioned above, as well as typical animal operant experiments for non-drug reinforcers such as food in one important respect; there is no separate consumption phase. The procedures developed by the pioneering work of Weeks (1962) and other early investigators (Deneau et al. 1969; Goldberg et al. 1971; Hoffmeister et al. 1970; Thompson and Pickens 1970; Wilson et al. 1971) created a special case of an operant experiment (see Wise, 1987). Normally there is what is referred to as an instrumental-consummatory response chaining. The appetitive phase is separated from the phase in which the reward is ingested. In the most common case of food reward, the appetitive response is a lever press; after completion of the response requirement the reinforcing stimulus is presented and the subject then has the opportunity to consume the reward (or not). There is a distinct period during which the subject engages in behaviors specific to the particular reinforcing stimulus being used (i.e. licking, chewing and

swallowing). Importantly, these consumptive behaviors are separate and distinct from the operant response. That is, there are instrumental responses (lever pressing) and consumptive responses (eating and drinking). However, Wise et al. (1987) has argued that IV self-administration procedures are a special case of an operant task in that the lever-press is not only an instrumental response involved in drug seeking but also a consummatory response (i.e. a terminal act in the goal-directed sequence). The lever press immediately prior to the drug injection is a drug taking response since it results in the automatic delivery of drug directly into the venous system. There is no separation between the consumptive and appetitive response.

It is critical to distinguish the appetitive responding from the act of drug consumption because the rules that govern these two classes of behavior appear to be quite different. The clearest example is that reducing the unit dose has opposite effects on consumption and appetitive behaviors. To use a real life example, if a bartender were to dilute a customer's whiskey it would be predicted that the patron would compensate by drinking proportionally more; however it would also be predicted that he or she would be less satisfied and pay less for the drink. Thus, the regulatory influences on *ad libitum* drug consumption are often opposite to those involved in assessing its worth.

This distinction between regulation of *ad libitum* consumption and behavioral price can be seen in dose-response studies using schedules with high or low behavioral cost. When schedules of reinforcement with high response requirements are used, there is a dose-dependent increase in rate of responding (Depoortere et al., 1993; Goldberg, 1973; Li et al., 1994; Spear and Katz, 1991) resulting in an ascending dose-response curve. These data are explained well by operant theory and are consistent with other measures of reinforcing efficacy. Higher doses are chosen over smaller doses in choice studies (Johanson and Schuster, 1975; Llewellyn et al., 1976; Lynch et al., 1998; Ward et al., 2005) and support higher breakpoints on a PR schedule (Richardson and Roberts, 1996). By contrast, data from self-administration studies using fixed ratio (FR1) schedules show quite different dose-response profiles. Early studies demonstrated quite clearly that rate of drug intake is inversely related to dose (Pickens and Thompson, 1968; Dougherty and Pickens, 1973); larger unit doses produced longer post-reinforcement pauses in responding. The contrasting shapes of the dose-effect curves (descending vs ascending) is accounted for by the idea that responding on an FR1 is entirely related to drug consumption whereas other higher order schedules, (i.e those more typical of the operant literature) are influenced by appetitive processes.

Note that the degree to which lever responding reflects appetitive behavior or regulation of drug intake depends on the experimental situation and the schedule of reinforcement. Rats undergoing extinction or reinstatement testing (for review see Epstein et al. 2006; Kalivas and McFarland, 2003; Shaham et al. 2003) would be immune from the consumptive influence since the drug is never offered during the session. Since no drug is self-administered, every lever press or nose poke is an uncontaminated appetitive response. However, in most other IV self-administration experiments drug seeking and drug taking behaviors are conflated to some degree although the extent of this confound can vary over a wide range. With higher order schedules of reinforcement that generate high rates of responding the distinction between drug seeking and drug taking is only slightly contaminated. While virtually every response could be considered appetitive and would be expected to conform to operant principles, only the final response before an injection is a consumptive act. The opposite end of this continuum is an FR1 schedule which provides *ad libitum* access to cocaine. In this case, essentially all of the responses can be considered an act of drug consumption.

The clearest evidence that cocaine taking and cocaine seeking are different classes of behavior is that the types of drugs that modulate cocaine consumption are different from those that modulate appetitive responding (Table 1). These results parallel the work of Ann Kelley and colleagues on feeding behavior discussed above. The top portion of Table 1 illustrates experimental manipulations that produce opposite effects on responding under FR1 and PR schedules. As discussed previously, reducing the unit dose produces decreases in breakpoints and increases in FR1 response rates. Similarly, pretreatment with DA receptor antagonists decreases breakpoints and increases FR1 response rates in keeping with the interpretation that neuroleptics produce an effect analogous to a reduction in dose (Yokel and Wise, 1975; De Wit and Wise, 1977). There is a consistent and predictable effect on drug seeking and drug taking with pretreatment of drugs that affect the DA system. Treatments that increase drug intake result in reduced appetitive responding and vice versa. With other manipulations, however, the relationship between appetitive and consumptive responding becomes more complicated. The lower portion of Table 1 shows examples of treatments that affect PR breakpoint and FR1 rate in the same direction or, in some cases, one measure might be affected and not the other. A physiological, rather than pharmacological, example is the effect of the female reproductive cycle. PR breakpoints are increased by 100% during estrus compared to other phases of the estrous cycle yet there is no discernible effect on the rate of intake on an FR1 (Roberts et al. 1987, 1989a; Lynch 2008). The most parsimonious explanation for these discordant results is that appetitive responding (as measured by PR) and *ad libitum* drug consumption (as measured by FR1) are regulated by different (but in some cases overlapping) mechanisms.

Above it was emphasized that the schedule of reinforcement was a critical factor in whether appetitive responding or regulation of drug intake was the major determinant of the response rate. It was argued that *ad libitum* drug consumption on an FR1 appears to be regulated differently from responding on schedules requiring higher response output. The dissociation between the two classes of behavior seems to be effectively captured by manipulation of response cost or “price”.

Behavioral economics (Hursch, 1991; Hursch and Silberberg, 2008; Hursch and Winger, 1995) provides a useful framework for studying the interaction between drug seeking and drug taking. The manner in which consumption varies as a function of price is the essence of the demand curve. There are two ways to increase the behavioral price of the drug. One way is to raise the response requirement as illustrated above with a PR schedule. Alternatively, a decrease in the unit dose on an FR1 schedule would have the effect of increasing the price per mg of drug. For example, a dose of 0.1 mg/kg/inj would “cost” 10 responses/mg; one tenth of this dose (0.01 mg/kg/inj) would cost 100 responses/mg.

Figure 1 shows data from a within-session threshold procedure in which a descending series of eleven unit doses (FR1) were offered in 10 min bins, resulting in a progressively greater response cost over time. As shown in the cumulative record (Figure 1A), responding increased every 10 minutes as the available cocaine dose decreased until a threshold dose (Bin 8) was reached. These data are replotted in Figure 1B to demonstrate that a relatively stable rate of cocaine intake was established during the first part of the session. The level of cocaine consumption unconstrained by price (Q_0) was 0.61 mg/10 min bin. Later in the session, as the behavioral cost increased, the response rate of the animal began to be affected. The maximal price paid (P_{max}) for cocaine was determined by assessing the unit price at which maximal responding occurred. In this example, P_{max} was determined to be 133.9 resp/mg which corresponded to the apex of the price-response function (Figure 1C). Note that the two dependent measures provided by the behavioral economic analysis are directly related to appetitive responding (P_{max}) and drug consumption unconstrained by price (Q_0).

Oleson et al. (2011) has shown that P_{max} and Q_0 are differentially sensitive to pharmacological pretreatments. Table 2 summarizes the effects of haloperidol, amphetamine, fluoxetine and baclofen on P_{max} and Q_0 . Specifically – the dopamine receptor antagonist haloperidol increased Q_0 (i.e. cocaine consumption unconstrained by price) but decreased P_{max} . In contrast, the indirect dopamine agonist d-amphetamine increased the price paid for cocaine but had no effect on Q_0 . The serotonin uptake inhibitor fluoxetine decreased consumption and price paid. Baclofen, a GABA_B receptor agonist, selectively decreased price paid for cocaine. These results reveal that cocaine consumption (unconstrained by price) and P_{max} are differentially sensitive to various classes of drug, suggesting that neurobiological substrates of consumption and price paid involve separate mechanisms.

3. Regulation of Cocaine Consumption

3.1 Regulation of cocaine intake on an FR1 schedule

As discussed above, operant behavior is conflated in typical IV drug self-administration studies, and depending on the contingencies the observed behavior may conform to consumptive or appetitive principles. This section will focus on procedures that appear to be primarily driven by principles of drug consumption. First we will describe results from studies using the FR1 schedule of reinforcement examining consumption regulation. Second, we will introduce a new self-administration procedure that provides the animal with greater control over the size of each dose.

The FR1 schedule of reinforcement offers access to cocaine with a very low response cost, and therefore results from this schedule have been very useful in advancing our understanding of the regulation of cocaine consumption. It has been noted many times that self-administration behavior under an FR1 schedule of reinforcement produces a remarkably stable rate of cocaine intake, and that this rate is inversely related to the size of the unit dose (Pettit and Justice 1991; Pickens and Thompson 1968; Wilson et al. 1971). That is, the highest rates of responding are seen at the lowest unit doses. There has been some discussion as to whether there is an ascending limb to this curve (Mello and Negus 1996; Zittel-Lazarini et al. 2007). However, there is growing consensus that the initial jump in the dose-response curve could be considered a threshold dose (i.e. responding is all or nothing) after which the injection rate decreases with increasing doses (Tsibulsky and Norman, 1999; Wise et al. 1995; Zittel-Lazarini et al. 2007; but see Flory and Woods, 2003).

These FR1 studies have led to the development of a hypothesis that the rates and patterns of cocaine self-administration on an FR1 schedule reflect a titration phenomenon. It has been observed that brain levels of drug are maintained within a relatively narrow range during FR1 self-administration sessions (Yokel and Pickens, 1974; Wise et al. 1995; Tsibulsky and Norman 1999; Ranaldi et al. 1999). The hypothesis reached from these studies is that satiety mechanisms are triggered when cocaine concentrations reach a certain level. This satiety titration hypothesis fits well with long-standing behavioral observations. At the beginning of a typical session, several unit doses are quickly self-administered, suggestive of a “loading” phase where brain levels are quickly elevated above a satiety threshold; subsequently a “maintenance” phase occurs during which consistent post-infusion pauses are observed that maintain brain levels above this threshold (Carelli and Deadwyler 1996; Pickens and Thompson, 1968; Wilson et al., 1971; Wise et al. 1995). Mathematical estimates of brain levels have helped illustrate this idea. The temporal pattern of cocaine infusions can be used to calculate brain-cocaine concentrations at any point during a self-administration session (as described by Pan et al., 1991). The equations have been used by several labs to examine the relationship between estimated drug levels and behavioral (Shou et al., 2006; Samaha et al., 2002; Zimmer et al., 2011, 2012a, 2012b), electrophysiological (Nicola and Deadwyler,

2000; Peoples and Cavanaugh, 2003; Peoples et al., 2007; Peoples et al., 2004) and neurochemical responses (Wise et al., 1995; Hermans et al., 2008; Stuber et al., 2005a; Stuber et al., 2005b). Figure 3A-B (Figure 3 is discussed in greater detail in section 4) shows the estimated levels of cocaine during an FR1 session. The modeling clearly illustrates the rapid loading phase (within the first few minutes) and the oscillating levels within a relatively tight range during the maintenance phase.

While there appears to be a consensus on the general idea of drug titration (although see Panlilio et al., 2003), there is some debate about the specific mechanism involved. One possibility (Katz 1989; Lynch and Carroll, 2001; Pickens and Thompson, 1968; Rose and Corrigall, 1997; Wilson et al. 1971) is that the titration range is determined by an upper aversive boundary, such that animals maintain brain levels below some ceiling to avoid punishing effects. This hypothesis is certainly plausible given findings that cocaine can produce avoidance behavior (DeVries and Pert 1998; Ettenberg and Geist 1991, 1993) as well as conditioned taste aversions (Booth et al. 1977; Goudie et al. 1978) suggesting it has anxiogenic properties. If aversive properties were primarily responsible for the regularity of responding then it would be predicted that rats should choose a frequent small dose over a larger one (Ranaldi et al. 1999). However, this prediction is not supported; animals consistently choose larger doses over small ones (Johanson and Schuster 1975; Llewellyn et al. 1976; Lynch et al. 1998; Ward et al. 2005) suggesting that aversive properties are not likely to be the most important contribution to the observed regularity of inter-injection intervals.

3.2 Using a Hold-Down procedure to study cocaine consumption

Human drug users interact with and have precise control over their drugs when they consume them. However, in IV self-administration procedures using an FR1 schedule with a fixed unit dose, animals do not have this opportunity. Completion of the response requirement results in an automatic infusion of a preselected dose. In this section we will highlight key findings from a new procedure recently developed that gives animals control over the size of the dose essentially making it a dependent measure. This procedure has provided some key insights into regulation of intake within a session that would otherwise be impossible to measure.

The original impetus to give animals control over the dose size came from observations that human drug users are able to manipulate dose and frequency in dynamic ways. Nicotine smokers regulate their intake throughout the day by adjusting factors such as puff rate and puff size (Ashton et al., 1979; McMorro and Foxx, 1983; DeGrandpre et al., 1992). Similarly, drinkers regulate their alcohol intake by adjusting dose size (e.g. small sips or large gulps) and frequency (Schaefer et al., 1971; Sobell et al., 1972; Bernosky-Smith et al., 2012). This is in stark contrast to normal rodent self-administration studies in which dose is an independent variable, fixed by the experimenter. Since rats have no control over the injection dose size they adjust the time between injections, which is the only titration strategy available to them.

To address this, Morgan et al. (2009) made a simple and elegant modification of the contingencies to give animals dynamic control over drug intake in an unprecedented way. In this procedure, termed “hold down”, the duration of time the lever was pressed down directly determined the volume of drug injected. That is, when the lever was pressed down, the pump turned on, and when the lever was released, the pump turned off. Using this procedure for self-administration resulted in similar total intake rates as an FR1 schedule suggesting that rats successfully consumed cocaine using the hold down procedure. It was observed that the majority of selected doses² (Zimmer et al., 2011, 2012a) appeared to fall well within a range (0.5-1.0 mg/kg/inj) commonly reported in typical self-administration

studies (Caine and Koob, 1994; Ito et al., 2002; Liu et al., 2005a; Pettit and Justice, 1991; Quadros and Miczek, 2009). However, a number of the doses selected were surprisingly large (~4 mg/kg). The observation that rats would self-administer a dose of 4 mg/kg in ~20 sec is, to our knowledge, unprecedented. These large doses were always selected at the beginning of a session (Zimmer et al., 2011). Thus, there appeared to be *two* categories of doses within the same session - very large ones associated with the “loading” phase and the remaining much smaller ones associated with the “maintenance” phase. These findings would not have been possible using fixed, experimenter-selected doses.

The hold down procedure also provided a unique opportunity to examine the factors that were involved in the selection of the large, “loading” doses. Zimmer et al. (2011) introduced a series of timeout periods (10-25 min) throughout daily 6-h sessions. This manipulation forced estimated brain-levels of cocaine to decrease by predictable amounts before access to cocaine was reinitiated (Fig 2). Because the animal could control the size of each dose, once access was resumed the subject could self-administer a loading dose of any size. This procedure, in effect, produced a session with multiple loading phases resulting in repeated “spiking” brain levels. Results showed that larger doses – again, sometimes as large as 4 mg/kg - were self-administered when estimated brain levels of cocaine were very low, whereas much smaller doses were self-administered when levels were higher. It appears that the size of large, loading doses can be accounted for by current estimates of brain cocaine levels as evidenced by the highly significant negative correlation ($r = -0.77$) shown in Figure 2B (Zimmer et al., 2011). These data show that during the loading phase the dose is inversely related to the current brain levels of cocaine and suggest that the self-administered dose closely matched the amount necessary to elevate drug levels into a theoretically preferred range.

The dynamic control over dose size that the hold down procedure provides also allows a sophisticated investigation of factors that regulate the smaller, maintenance doses. Zimmer et al. (2012a) examined whether the size of the self-administered dose and the delay in responding (post-infusion pause) interacted in the control of drug intake. The concentration of cocaine was changed across daily sessions during which rats self-administered cocaine using a hold down procedure. The total pump-time self-administered decreased in a near proportional manner to the change in cocaine concentration, and the size of each self-administered dose was highly correlated with the subsequent, *but not previous*, inter-dose interval (Zimmer et al., 2012a). Thus the size of each dose self-administered determined how long the animal waited for the next infusion.

In summary, results from experiments using a hold down procedure to change dose size into a dependent measure have yielded three primary insights that could not have been examined using fixed unit doses of cocaine. First, rats will rapidly self-administer unprecedented doses of cocaine (4 mg/kg). Second, the “preferred” dose can change dramatically within a session depending on brain cocaine levels. Third, the self-administered dose is tightly correlated with the inter-infusion interval. These data corroborate the titration hypothesis and add to our understanding of the mechanisms regulating cocaine consumption. Results from studies using hold down procedures have demonstrated that, when given the opportunity to dynamically control the dose size, rats are surprisingly accurate at pharmacologically maintaining cocaine levels within a preferred range.

²In this review, the hold down “dose” refers to the total amount of drug self-administered within a cluster using a 1 sec criterion. That is, any response occurring within one second of the end of the previous response is accumulated. A pause of one second would denote the start of the next cluster (Zimmer et al. 2012a).

4. Interaction between consumption and appetitive behaviors

Our premise is that the addiction process is an interaction between patterns of drug taking and subsequent drug seeking. To this point we have argued that appetitive and consumptive behaviors are regulated by distinct neurobiological mechanisms and that they should be considered separately in order to evaluate how each contributes to self-administration behavior. A different question, however, is how the two types of behaviors interact. That is, what patterns of drug taking are more likely to accelerate future drug seeking? Identifying the access conditions that alter the subsequent motivation to seek drugs is fundamental to understanding the addiction process. A number of access parameters that produce unique consumption patterns have been shown to produce changes in subsequent appetitive behavior, such as increased access (Ahmed and Koob, 1998, 1999), abstinence (Grimm et al., 2001; Pickens et al., 2011), speed of injection (Liu et al., 2005b; Wakabayashi et al., 2010), and intermittency (Morgan et al., 2002; Morgan and Roberts, 2004).

As discussed above, results using hold down procedures have demonstrated that rats will self-administer repeated spikes of cocaine when intermittency is introduced into the session and will maintain high, constant levels in sessions with no timeout periods. Recent work has examined the effects of these different consumption phenomena on subsequent appetitive responding (Zimmer et al. 2012b). Animals self-administered cocaine under short access (ShA) or long access (LgA) conditions (as described by Ahmed and Koob 1998, 1999, 2004) as a measure of sustaining high levels of intake (for 2 or 6 hrs respectively – Fig 3 A-B). A third group self-administered under intermittent access (IntA) conditions, which consisted of repeating 5min access and 25 min timeout periods (see Figure 3C). This contingency did not allow drug levels to be sustained and instead produced spiking cocaine levels. Figure 3C illustrates that each 5 min access period produced a spike in estimated cocaine levels that was almost completely cleared during the 25 min timeout period. Each group subsequently self-administered cocaine in a within-session threshold schedule (as discussed in detail in section 2). As expected, behavioral economic analysis revealed that Pmax values for LgA subjects were significantly increased compared to ShA rats, confirming previous data demonstrating that LgA increases motivated responding for cocaine (Paterson and Markou, 2003; Mantsch et al., 2008; Wee et al., 2008) (Fig 3D). The IntA group showed significantly higher Pmax values relative to both LgA and ShA animals (Fig 3D). It should be emphasized that the total amount of cocaine self-administered did not predict the resulting differences in appetitive responding since LgA animals had by far the highest intake rates and IntA and ShA intake was not significantly different (Zimmer et al. 2012b). These data suggest that the experience of repeated spiking cocaine intake leads to increased drug seeking relative to a history of sustained cocaine intake.

IntA and LgA procedures may offer models of two different phases of the addiction process. LgA can be thought to model binge-like behavior which results in prolonged and sustained drug levels. The IntA procedure illustrates that discrete intoxicating effects (that produce rapid and high drug levels) are able to change subsequent drug seeking. This may be important for understanding the neuroadaptations responsible during the early transition from recreational to habitual drug use.

In summary, different daily consumptive patterns of cocaine can have very different effects on subsequent appetitive behaviors. High sustained levels of drug intake do not appear to be necessary to produce an increase in subsequent appetitive behavior.

5. Separating appetitive and consumptive behaviors with a two lever task

In this review we have argued that characterizing the factors at work in cocaine self-administration experiments necessarily involves an assessment of consumptive and

appetitive responding. This is essential as these two classes of behavior are differentially regulated, sometimes in opposite ways (see Table 1). However, as we have stated above, most self-administration paradigms conflate appetitive and consumptive responding in a single operant response, and we have discussed interpretations that take this conflation into consideration. However, another strategy is to separate appetitive and consumptive responding entirely. Below we will discuss strategies that distinguish the relative involvement of appetitive and consumptive behaviors using two responses or levers operants within the same behavioral paradigm.

Our work builds on a considerable background literature in which drug seeking and drug taking are procedurally separated. In the alcohol field, for example, Czachowski and Samson (1999) introduced a method to investigate the mechanisms that mediate ethanol-seeking versus ethanol consumption. A PR schedule controlled access to a 20 min period of alcohol availability. The procedure allowed for the assessment of appetitive (number of lever presses) and consumption (number of licks and intake volume) behaviors. Separating the seeking and taking components has been applied to IV self-administration procedures as well. A variety of schedules have been used (eg. random interval, FR, PR) with the drug seeking lever controlling access to the drug taking lever (Economidou et al., 2009; Vanderschuren and Everitt 2004; Pelloux et al., 2007; Olmstead et al., 2000, 2001; Gancarz et al. 2012). In some cases, the drug taking component has included the opportunity to self-administer a single injection (Economidou et al., 2009; Vanderschuren and Everitt 2004; Pelloux et al., 2007; Olmstead et al., 2001; Olmstead et al., 2000), or in others has provide access to a 2h session on an FR1 schedule (Gancarz et al., 2012). Note that the consumptive component typically involves an FR1 schedule and fixed unit doses. Because of the insights into consumption obtained from experiments using the hold down procedure (see section 3.2), we have recently attempted to apply this technique to the consumptive phase of a two lever seeking-taking procedure. Thus changes in the self-administered dose could be monitored throughout the session (figure 4). This two lever progressive ratio (2L-PR) procedure has allowed us the unique opportunity to assess appetitive responding for a self-selected dose in the rat.

Because the 2L-PR paradigm procedurally separates the two phases of behavior, results have yielded an uncontaminated assessment of consumptive and appetitive responding for cocaine. In regard to consumption, we have demonstrated that the dose animals self-administer changes dramatically within a 2L-PR procedure (Fig 4). At the beginning of the session, the animal self-administers an extremely high dose (sometimes as high as 4-5 mg/kg). Subsequent dose are small and the animal is able to maintain brain cocaine levels while the response requirement is low. However, as the response requirement to complete each ratio increases, and therefore the time between each drug access period increases, animals begin to take increasingly higher doses (Fig 4, panel D, F). This change in dose throughout the session directly correlates with estimated brain levels (Fig 4, panel B inset) again confirming results from our previous hold down procedures (Zimmer et al 2011, 2012a). That animals can manipulate dose size to compensate for the increasing time to complete each ratio means that animals can continue appetitive responding even when estimated cocaine levels are essentially zero (see Fig 4F). This stands in stark contrast to the traditional PR procedure using unit doses, where the animal eventually is unable to maintain a preferred brain cocaine level regardless of effort (figure 4, panel E; Nicola and Deadwyler, 2000). Therefore, results from 2L-PR procedures represent a far more pure assessment of appetitive responding without the typical conflation of consumption levels.

In summary, since the size of the dose self-administered at any point during the session depends largely on the amount of cocaine already on board, it is likely that the most preferred or most reinforcing dose of cocaine might fluctuate according to the brain levels at

any particular moment. Thus, using the 2L-PR procedure to separate appetitive and consumptive behaviors has allowed for the discovery that the dose that the animal is working for changes throughout the session.

6. Concluding remarks

This review has drawn attention to the mechanisms that control drug intake and highlighted how different patterns of consumption can feed forward in the addiction process to influence subsequent drug seeking. We wish to re-emphasize that, while there may be overlap, the mechanisms that control drug intake should be considered distinct from appetitive and motivational processes.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the contribution of Rhiannon Mayhugh. This study was supported by the NIDA research grants R01 DA14030 and P50 DA06634

References

- Aberman JE, Salamone JD. Nucleus accumbens dopamine depletions make rats more sensitive to high ratio requirements but do not impair primary food reinforcement. *Neuroscience*. 1999; 92(2):545–52. [PubMed: 10408603]
- Agué C. Smoking patterns, nicotine intake at different times of day and changes in two cardiovascular variables while smoking cigarettes. *Psychopharmacologia*. 1973; 30:135–144. [PubMed: 4711371]
- Ahmed SH, Koob GF. Transition from moderate to excessive drug intake: change in hedonic set point. *Science*. 1998; 282:298–300. [PubMed: 9765157]
- Ahmed SH, Koob GF. Long-lasting increase in the set point for cocaine self-administration after escalation in rats. *Psychopharmacology*. 1999; 146:303–312. [PubMed: 10541731]
- Ahmed SH, Koob GF. Changes in response to a dopamine receptor antagonist in rats with escalating cocaine intake. *Psychopharmacology*. 2004; 172:450–454. [PubMed: 14647962]
- Ashton H, Stepney R, Thompson JW. Self-titration by cigarette smokers. *Br Med J*. 1979; 2:357–360. [PubMed: 486932]
- Aston-Jones G, Smith RJ, Moorman DE, Richardson KA. Role of lateral hypothalamic orexin neurons in reward processing and addiction. *Neuropharmacology*. 2009; 56(Suppl 1):112–121. [PubMed: 18655797]
- Bakshi VP, Kelley AE. Dopaminergic regulation of feeding behavior: II. Differential effects of amphetamine microinfusion into three striatal subregions. *Psychobiology*. 1991; 19(3):233–42.
- Bernosky-Smith KA, Aston ER, Liguori A. Rapid drinking is associated with increases in driving-related risk-taking. *Human Psychopharmacology: Clinical & Experimental*. 2012; 27(6):622–625. [PubMed: 23027650]
- Berridge KC. Motivation concepts in behavioral neuroscience. *Physiology & Behavior*. 2004; 81:179–209. [PubMed: 15159167]
- Booth DA, Pilcher CW, D’Mello GD, Stolerman IP. Comparative potencies of amphetamine, fenfluramine and related compounds in taste aversion experiments in rats. *Br J Pharmacol*. 1977; 61:669–677. [PubMed: 597669]
- Borgland SL, Chang SJ, Bowers MS, Thompson JL, Vittoz N, Floresco SB, Chou J, Chen BT, Bonci A. Orexin A/hypocretin-1 selectively promotes motivation for positive reinforcers. *J Neurosci*. 2009; 29:11215–11225. [PubMed: 19741128]
- Brebner K, Phelan R, Roberts DCS. Effect of baclofen on cocaine self-administration in rats reinforced under fixed-ratio 1 and progressive-ratio schedules. *Psychopharmacology*. 2000; 148:314–321. [PubMed: 10755745]
- Caine SB, Koob GF. Effects of mesolimbic dopamine depletion on responding maintained by cocaine and food. *J Exp Anal Behav*. 1994; 61:213–221. [PubMed: 8169570]

- Campbell UC, Lac ST, Carroll ME. Effects of baclofen on maintenance and reinstatement of intravenous cocaine self-administration in rats. *Psychopharmacology*. 1999; 143:209–214. [PubMed: 10326784]
- Carelli RM, Deadwyler SA. Dose-dependent transitions in nucleus accumbens cell firing and behavioral responding during cocaine self-administration sessions in rats. *Journal of pharmacology and experimental therapeutics*. 1996; 277(1):385–93. [PubMed: 8613945]
- Carroll ME, Lac ST, Asencio M, Kragh R. Fluoxetine reduces intravenous cocaine self-administration in rats. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1990; 35:237–244. [PubMed: 2315363]
- Comer SD, Ashworth JB, Foltin RW, Johanson CE, Zacny JP, Walsh SL. The role of human drug self-administration procedures in the development of medications. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2008; 96:1–15. [PubMed: 18436394]
- Craig W. Appetites and aversions as constituents of insects. *Biol Bull*. 1918; 34:91–107.
- Czachowski CL, Samson HH. Breakpoint determination and ethanol self-administration using an across-session progressive ratio procedure in the rat. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 1999; 23:1580–1586. [PubMed: 10549988]
- De Wit H, Wise RA. Blockade of cocaine reinforcement in rats with the dopamine receptor blocker pimozide, but not with the noradrenergic blockers phentolamine or phenoxybenzamine. *Can J Psychol*. 1977; 31:195–203. [PubMed: 608135]
- DeGrandpre RJ, Bickel WK, Hughes JR, Higgins ST. Behavioral economics of drug self-administration. III. A reanalysis of the nicotine regulation hypothesis. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1992; 108:1–10. [PubMed: 1410127]
- Deneau G, Yanagita T, Seevers MH. Self-administration of psychoactive substances by the monkey. *Psychopharmacologia*. 1969; 16:30–48. [PubMed: 4982648]
- Depoortere RY, Li DH, Lane JD, Emmett-Oglesby MW. Parameters of self-administration of cocaine in rats under a progressive-ratio schedule. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1993; 45:539–548. [PubMed: 8332614]
- DeVries AC, Pert A. Conditioned increases in anxiogenic-like behavior following exposure to contextual stimuli associated with cocaine are mediated by corticotropin-releasing factor. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1998; 137:333–340. [PubMed: 9676892]
- Dougherty J, Pickens R. Fixed-interval schedules of intravenous cocaine presentation in rats. *J Exp Anal Behav*. 1973; 20:111–118. [PubMed: 4714574]
- Economidou D, Pelloux Y, Robbins TW, Dalley JW, Everitt BJ. High impulsivity predicts relapse to cocaine-seeking after punishment-induced abstinence. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2009; 65:851–856. [PubMed: 19181308]
- Epstein DH, Preston KL. Daily life hour by hour, with and without cocaine: an ecological momentary assessment study. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2010; 211:223–232. [PubMed: 20532873]
- Epstein DH, Preston KL, Stewart J, Shaham Y. Toward a model of drug relapse: an assessment of the validity of the reinstatement procedure. *Psychopharmacology*. 2006; 189:1–16. [PubMed: 17019567]
- Epstein DH, Willner-Reid J, Vahabzadeh M, Mezghanni M, Lin JL, Preston KL. Real-time electronic diary reports of cue exposure and mood in the hours before cocaine and heroin craving and use. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2009; 66:88–94. [PubMed: 19124692]
- España RA, Oleson EB, Locke JL, Brookshire BR, Roberts DCS, Jones SR. The hypocretin-orexin system regulates cocaine self-administration via actions on the mesolimbic dopamine system. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2010; 31:336–348. [PubMed: 20039943]
- Ettenberg A, Geist TD. Animal model for investigating the anxiogenic effects of self-administered cocaine. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1991; 103:455–461. [PubMed: 2062985]
- Ettenberg A, Geist TD. Qualitative and quantitative differences in the operant runway behavior of rats working for cocaine and heroin reinforcement. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1993; 44:191–198. [PubMed: 8430122]
- Flory GS, Woods JH. The ascending limb of the cocaine dose-response curve for reinforcing effect in rhesus monkeys. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2003; 166:91–94. [PubMed: 12529810]
- Gan JO, Walton ME, Phillips PE. Dissociable cost and benefit encoding of future rewards by mesolimbic dopamine. *Nat Neurosci*. 2010; 13:25–27. [PubMed: 19904261]

- Gancarz AM, Kausch MA, Lloyd DR, Richards JB. Between-session progressive ratio performance in rats responding for cocaine and water reinforcers. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2012; 222:215–223. [PubMed: 22277988]
- Gawin FH. Cocaine addiction: psychology and neurophysiology. *Science*. 1991; 251:1580–1586. [PubMed: 2011738]
- Goldberg SR. Comparable behavior maintained under fixed-ratio and second-order schedules of food presentation, cocaine injection or d-amphetamine injection in the squirrel monkey. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther*. 1973; 186:18–30. [PubMed: 4198773]
- Goldberg SR, Hoffmeister F, Schlichting UU, Wuttke W. A comparison of pentobarbital and cocaine self-administration in rhesus monkeys: effects of dose and fixed-ratio parameter. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther*. 1971; 179:277–283. [PubMed: 5002482]
- Goudie AJ, Dickins DW, Thornton EW. Cocaine-induced conditioned taste aversions in rats. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1978; 8:757–761. [PubMed: 693561]
- Griffiths RR, Bigelow GE, Liebson I. Facilitation of human tobacco self-administration by ethanol: a behavioral analysis. *J Exp Anal Behav*. 1976; 25:279–292. [PubMed: 1270971]
- Grimm JW, Hope BT, Wise RA, Shaham Y. Neuroadaptation. Incubation of cocaine craving after withdrawal. *Nature*. 2001; 412:141–142. [PubMed: 11449260]
- Hanlon EC, Baldo BA, Sadeghian K, Kelley AE. Increases in food intake or food-seeking behavior induced by GABAergic, opioid, or dopaminergic stimulation of the nucleus accumbens: is it hunger? *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2004; 172(3):241–7. [PubMed: 14598017]
- Hermans A, Keithley RB, Kita JM, Sombers LA, Wightman RM. Dopamine detection with fast-scan cyclic voltammetry used with analog background subtraction. *Anal Chem*. 2008; 80:4040–4048. [PubMed: 18433146]
- Hoffmeister F, Goldberg SR, Schlichting U, Wuttke W. Self-administration of d-amphetamine, morphine and chlorpromazine by cocaine “dependent” rhesus monkeys. *Naunyn Schmiedeberg Arch Pharmacol*. 1970; 266:359–360. [PubMed: 4253797]
- Hubner CB, Koob GF. The ventral pallidum plays a role in mediating cocaine and heroin self-administration in the rat. *Brain Res*. 1990; 508:20–29. [PubMed: 2337788]
- Hubner CB, Moreton JE. Effects of selective D1 and D2 dopamine antagonists on cocaine self-administration in the rat. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1991; 105:151–156. [PubMed: 1839063]
- Hursh SR. Behavioral economics of drug self-administration and drug abuse policy. *J Exp Anal Behav*. 1991; 56:377–393. [PubMed: 1955823]
- Hursh SR, Winger G. Normalized demand for drugs and other reinforcers. *J Exp Anal Behav*. 1995; 64:373–384. [PubMed: 8551194]
- Hursh SR, Silberberg A. Economic demand and essential value. *Psychol Rev*. 2008; 115:186–198. [PubMed: 18211190]
- Ito R, Dalley JW, Robbins TW, Everitt BJ. Dopamine release in the dorsal striatum during cocaine-seeking behavior under the control of a drug-associated cue. *J Neurosci*. 2002; 22:6247–6253. [PubMed: 12122083]
- Johanson CE, Schuster CR. A choice procedure for drug reinforcers: cocaine and methylphenidate in the rhesus monkey. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther*. 1975; 193:676–688. [PubMed: 1142112]
- Kalivas PW, McFarland K. Brain circuitry and the reinstatement of cocaine-seeking behavior. *Psychopharmacology*. 2003; 168:44–56. [PubMed: 12652346]
- Katz, JL. Drugs as reinforcers: pharmacological and behavioral factors. In: Lieberman, JM.; Cooper, SJ., editors. *The neuropharmacological basis of reward*. Oxford University Press; Oxford: 1989. p. 164–213.
- Kelley AE, Baldo BA, Pratt WE, Will MJ. Corticostriatal-hypothalamic circuitry and food motivation: Integration of energy, action and reward. *Physiology & Behavior*. 2005; 86:773–795. [PubMed: 16289609]
- Koob, GF.; Vaccarino, FJ.; Amahic, M.; Bloom, FE. Positive reinforcement properties of drugs: search for neural substrates. In: Engel, J.; Orelund, L., editors. *Brain Reward Systems and Abuse*. Raven Press; New York: 1987. p. 35–50.
- Levin FR, Foltin RW, Fischman MW. Pattern of cocaine use in methadone-maintained individuals applying for research studies. *J Addict Dis*. 1996; 15:97–106. [PubMed: 8943584]

- Levin FR, Hess JM, Gorelick DA, Kreiter NA, Fudala PJ. Patterns of cocaine use among cocaine-dependent outpatients. *Am J Addict*. 1993; 2(2):109–115.
- Li DH, Depoortere RY, Emmett-Oglesby MW. Tolerance to the reinforcing effects of cocaine in a progressive ratio paradigm. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1994; 116:326–332. [PubMed: 7892423]
- Lin SJ, Epps SA, West CH, Boss-Williams KA, Weiss JM, Weinshenker D. Operant psychostimulant self-administration in a rat model of depression. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 2012; 103:380–385. [PubMed: 23010383]
- Liu Y, Roberts DCS, Morgan D. Effects of extended-access self-administration and deprivation on breakpoints maintained by cocaine in rats. *Psychopharmacology*. 2005a; 179:644–651. [PubMed: 15650844]
- Liu Y, Roberts DCS, Morgan D. Sensitization of the reinforcing effects of self-administered cocaine in rats: effects of dose and intravenous injection speed. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2005b; 22:195–200. [PubMed: 16029209]
- Llewellyn ME, Iglauer C, Woods JH. Relative reinforcer magnitude under a nonindependent concurrent schedule of cocaine reinforcement in rhesus monkeys. *J Exp Anal Behav*. 1976; 25:81–91. [PubMed: 814191]
- Loh EA, Fitch T, Vickers G, Roberts DCS. Clozapine increases breaking points on a progressive-ratio schedule reinforced by intravenous cocaine. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1992; 42:559–562. [PubMed: 1409791]
- Loh EA, Roberts DCS. Break-points on a progressive ratio schedule reinforced by intravenous cocaine increase following depletion of forebrain serotonin. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1990; 101:262–266. [PubMed: 2349367]
- Lynch WJ. Acquisition and maintenance of cocaine self-administration in adolescent rats: effects of sex and gonadal hormones. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2008; 197:237–246. [PubMed: 18066534]
- Lynch WJ, Carroll ME. Regulation of drug intake. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2001; 9:131–143. [PubMed: 11518086]
- Lynch WJ, LaBounty LP, Carroll ME. A novel paradigm to investigate regulation of drug intake in rats self-administering cocaine or heroin intravenously. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol*. 1998; 6:22–31. [PubMed: 9526143]
- Mantsch JR, Baker DA, Francis DM, Katz ES, Hoks MA, Serge JP. Stressor- and corticotropin releasing factor-induced reinstatement and active stress-related behavioral responses are augmented following long-access cocaine self-administration by rats. *Psychopharmacology*. 2008; 195:591–603. [PubMed: 17899015]
- McGregor A, Lacosta S, Roberts DCS. L-tryptophan decreases the breaking point under a progressive ratio schedule of intravenous cocaine reinforcement in the rat. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1993; 44:651–655. [PubMed: 8451268]
- McGregor A, Roberts DCS. Effect of medial prefrontal cortex injections of SCH 23390 on intravenous cocaine self-administration under both a fixed and progressive ratio schedule of reinforcement. *Behav Brain Res*. 1995; 67:75–80. [PubMed: 7748503]
- McMorrow MJ, Foxx RM. Nicotine's role in smoking: an analysis of nicotine regulation. *Psychol Bull*. 1983; 93:302–327. [PubMed: 6844475]
- Mello NK, Negus SS. Preclinical evaluation of pharmacotherapies for treatment of cocaine and opioid abuse using drug self-administration procedures. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 1996; 14(6):375–424. [PubMed: 8726752]
- Mendelson JH, Mello NK. Experimental analysis of drinking behavior of chronic alcoholics. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 1966; 133:828–845. [PubMed: 5230199]
- Morgan D, Brebner K, Lynch WJ, Roberts DCS. Increases in the reinforcing efficacy of cocaine after particular histories of reinforcement. *Behav Pharmacol*. 2002; 13:389–396. [PubMed: 12394415]
- Morgan D, Liu Y, Oleson EB, Roberts DCS. Cocaine self-administration on a hold-down schedule of reinforcement in rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2009; 201:601–609. [PubMed: 18797847]
- Morgan D, Roberts DCS. Sensitization to the reinforcing effects of cocaine following binge-abstinent self-administration. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2004; 27:803–812. [PubMed: 15019429]

- Myers MG, Rohsenow DJ, Monti PM, Dey A. Patterns of cocaine use among individuals in substance abuse treatment. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse*. 1995; 21:223–231. [PubMed: 7639208]
- Nicola SM, Deadwyler SA. Firing rate of nucleus accumbens neurons is dopamine-dependent and reflects the timing of cocaine-seeking behavior in rats on a progressive ratio schedule of reinforcement. *J Neurosci*. 2000; 20:5526–5537. [PubMed: 10884336]
- Oleson EB, Richardson JM, Roberts DCS. A novel IV cocaine self-administration procedure in rats: differential effects of dopamine, serotonin, and GABA drug pre-treatments on cocaine consumption and maximal price paid. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2011; 214:567–577. [PubMed: 21110008]
- Oleson EB, Roberts DCS. Behavioral economic assessment of price and cocaine consumption following self-administration histories that produce escalation of either final ratios or intake. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2009; 34:796–804. [PubMed: 18971927]
- Olmstead MC, Lafond MV, Everitt BJ, Dickinson A. Cocaine seeking by rats is a goal-directed action. *Behav Neurosci*. 2001; 115:394–402. [PubMed: 11345964]
- Olmstead MC, Parkinson JA, Miles FJ, Everitt BJ, Dickinson A. Cocaine-seeking by rats: regulation, reinforcement and activation. *Psychopharmacology*. 2000; 152:123–131. [PubMed: 11057515]
- Pan HT, Menacherry S, Justice JB. Differences in the pharmacokinetics of cocaine in naive and cocaine-experienced rats. *J Neurochem*. 1991; 56:1299–1306. [PubMed: 2002342]
- Panlilio LV, Katz JL, Pickens RW, Schindler CW. Variability of drug self-administration in rats. *Psychopharmacology*. 2003; 167:9–19. [PubMed: 12644888]
- Panlilio LV, Thorndike EB, Schindler CW. Cocaine self-administration under variable-dose schedules in squirrel monkeys. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 2006; 84:235–243. [PubMed: 16814853]
- Paterson NE, Markou A. Increased motivation for self-administered cocaine after escalated cocaine intake. *Neuroreport*. 2003; 14:2229–2232. [PubMed: 14625453]
- Pelloux Y, Everitt BJ, Dickinson A. Compulsive drug seeking by rats under punishment: effects of drug taking history. *Psychopharmacology*. 2007
- Peoples LL, Cavanaugh D. Differential changes in signal and background firing of accumbal neurons during cocaine self-administration. *J Neurophysiol*. 2003; 90:993–1010. [PubMed: 12904500]
- Peoples LL, Kravitz AV, Lynch KG, Cavanaugh DJ. Accumbal neurons that are activated during cocaine self-administration are spared from inhibitory effects of repeated cocaine self-administration. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2007; 32:1141–1158. [PubMed: 17019407]
- Peoples LL, Lynch KG, Lesnock J, Gangadhar N. Accumbal neural responses during the initiation and maintenance of intravenous cocaine self-administration. *J Neurophysiol*. 2004; 91:314–323. [PubMed: 14523071]
- Pettit HO, Justice JB. Effect of dose on cocaine self-administration behavior and dopamine levels in the nucleus accumbens. *Brain Res*. 1991; 539:94–102. [PubMed: 2015506]
- Pettit HO, Justice JB Jr. Dopamine in the nucleus accumbens during cocaine self-administration as studied by in vivo microdialysis. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1989; 34:899–904. [PubMed: 2623043]
- Pfaus JG, Phillips AG. Differential effects of dopamine receptor antagonists on the sexual behavior of male rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1989; 98:363–368. [PubMed: 2568656]
- Pickens CL, Airavaara M, Theberge F, Fanous S, Hope BT, Shaham Y. Neurobiology of the incubation of drug craving. *Trends Neurosci*. 2011; 34:411–420. [PubMed: 21764143]
- Pickens R, Thompson T. Cocaine-reinforced behavior in rats: effects of reinforcement magnitude and fixed-ratio size. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther*. 1968; 161:122–129. [PubMed: 5648489]
- Preston KL, Vahabzadeh M, Schmittner J, Lin JL, Gorelick DA, Epstein DH. Cocaine craving and use during daily life. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2009; 207:291–301. [PubMed: 19777216]
- Quadros IM, Miczek KA. Two modes of intense cocaine bingeing: increased persistence after social defeat stress and increased rate of intake due to extended access conditions in rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2009; 206:109–120. [PubMed: 19513697]
- Ranaldi R, Pocock D, Zereik R, Wise RA. Dopamine fluctuations in the nucleus accumbens during maintenance, extinction, and reinstatement of intravenous D-amphetamine self-administration. *J Neurosci*. 1999; 19:4102–4109. [PubMed: 10234038]

- Ranaldi R, Roberts DCS. Initiation, maintenance and extinction of cocaine self-administration with and without conditioned reward. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1996; 128:89–96. [PubMed: 8944411]
- Richardson NR, Roberts DCS. Fluoxetine pretreatment reduces breaking points on a progressive ratio schedule reinforced by intravenous cocaine self-administration in the rat. *Life Sci*. 1991; 49:833–840. [PubMed: 1875791]
- Richardson NR, Roberts DC. Progressive ratio schedules in drug self-administration studies in rats: a method to evaluate reinforcing efficacy. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*. 1996; 66(1):1–11. [PubMed: 8794935]
- Richardson NR, Smith AM, Roberts DCS. A single injection of either flupenthixol decanoate or haloperidol decanoate produces long-term changes in cocaine self-administration in rats. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 1994; 36:23–25. [PubMed: 7988355]
- Roberts DCS, Andrews MM, Vickers GJ. Baclofen attenuates the reinforcing effects of cocaine in rats. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 1996; 15:417–423. [PubMed: 8887996]
- Roberts DCS, Bennett SA, Vickers GJ. The estrous cycle affects cocaine self-administration on a progressive ratio schedule in rats. *Psychopharmacology*. 1989a; 98:408–411. [PubMed: 2501818]
- Roberts DCS, Corcoran ME, Fibiger HC. On the role of ascending catecholaminergic systems in intravenous self-administration of cocaine. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1977; 6:615–620. [PubMed: 122445]
- Roberts DCS, Dalton JC, Vickers GJ. Increased self-administration of cocaine following haloperidol: effect of ovariectomy, estrogen replacement, and estrous cycle. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1987; 26:37–43. [PubMed: 3562496]
- Roberts DCS, Loh EA, Baker GB, Vickers G. Lesions of central serotonin systems affect responding on a progressive ratio schedule reinforced either by intravenous cocaine or by food. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1994; 49:177–182. [PubMed: 7816870]
- Roberts DCS, Loh EA, Vickers G. Self-administration of cocaine on a progressive ratio schedule in rats: dose-response relationship and effect of haloperidol pretreatment. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1989b; 97:535–538. [PubMed: 2498950]
- Roberts DCS, Morgan D, Liu Y. How to make a rat addicted to cocaine. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry*. 2007; 31:1614–1624. [PubMed: 17888555]
- Roberts DCS, Vickers G. Atypical neuroleptics increase self-administration of cocaine: an evaluation of a behavioural screen for antipsychotic activity. *Psychopharmacology*. 1984; 82:135–139. [PubMed: 6141584]
- Robinson TE, Berridge KC. Review. The incentive sensitization theory of addiction: some current issues. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2008; 363:3137–3146. [PubMed: 18640920]
- Rose JE, Corrigall WA. Nicotine self-administration in animals and humans: similarities and differences. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1997; 130:28–40. [PubMed: 9089846]
- Sachs BD, Barfield RJ. Functional analysis of masculine copulatory behavior in the rat. In: Rosenblatt, JS.; Hinde, RA.; Shaw, E.; Beer, C., editors. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*. Vol. 7. Academic Press; Cambridge: 1976. p. 91–154.
- Sachs BD, Garinello LD. Interaction between penile reflexes and copulation in male rats. *J Comp Physiol Psychol*. 1978; 92:759–767. [PubMed: 690295]
- Samaha AN, Li Y, Robinson TE. The rate of intravenous cocaine administration determines susceptibility to sensitization. *J Neurosci*. 2002; 22:3244–3250. [PubMed: 11943825]
- Samson HH, Czachowski CL. Behavioral measures of alcohol self-administration and intake control: rodent models. *Int Rev Neurobiol*. 2003; 54:107–143. [PubMed: 12785286]
- Sanchez-Ramos JR, Schuster CR. Second-order schedules of intravenous drug self-administration in rhesus monkeys. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1977; 7:443–450. [PubMed: 413115]
- Schaefer HH, Sobell MB, Mills KC. Baseline drinking behaviors in alcoholics and social drinkers. Kinds of drinks and sip magnitude. *Behav Res Ther*. 1971; 9:23–27. [PubMed: 5575907]
- Schuster CR. Self-administration of drugs. *Bayer-Symposium IV, Psychic Dependence*. 1973:68–74.
- Shaham Y, Shalev U, Lu L, De Wit H, Stewart J. The reinstatement model of drug relapse: history, methodology and major findings. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2003; 168:3–20. [PubMed: 12402102]

- Sharpe AL, Samson HH. Effect of naloxone on appetitive and consummatory phases of ethanol self-administration. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2001; 25:1006–1011. [PubMed: 11505025]
- Shoaib M, Swanner LS, Beyer CE, Goldberg SR, Schindler CW. The GABAB agonist baclofen modifies cocaine self-administration in rats. *Behav Pharmacol*. 1998; 9:195–206. [PubMed: 9832934]
- Shou M, Ferrario CR, Schultz KN, Robinson TE, Kennedy RT. Monitoring dopamine in vivo by microdialysis sampling and on-line CE-laser-induced fluorescence. *Anal Chem*. 2006; 78:6717–6725. [PubMed: 17007489]
- Smith A, Piercey M, Roberts DCS. Effect of (-)-DS 121 and (+)-UH 232 on cocaine self-administration in rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1995; 120:93–98. [PubMed: 7480540]
- Smith RJ, See RE, Aston-Jones G. Orexin/hypocretin signaling at the orexin 1 receptor regulates cue-elicited cocaine-seeking. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2009; 30:493–503. [PubMed: 19656173]
- Sobell MB, Schaefer HH, Mills KC. Differences in baseline drinking behavior between alcoholics and normal drinkers. *Behav Res Ther*. 1972; 10:257–267. [PubMed: 5047682]
- Spear DJ, Katz JL. Cocaine and food as reinforcers: effects of reinforcer magnitude and response requirement under second-order fixed-ratio and progressive-ratio schedules. *J Exp Anal Behav*. 1991; 56:261–275. [PubMed: 1955816]
- Stafford D, LeSage MG, Glowa JR. Progressive-ratio schedules of drug delivery in the analysis of drug self-administration: a review. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 1998; 139:169–184. [PubMed: 9784071]
- Stolerman, IP., editor. *Encyclopedia of Psychopharmacology*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag; 2010.
- Stoops WW, Lile JA, Glaser PE, Hays LR, Rush CR. Intranasal cocaine functions as reinforcer on a progressive ratio schedule in humans. *Eur J Pharmacol*. 2010; 644:101–105. [PubMed: 20638380]
- Stone CP, Barker RG, Tomlin MI. Sexual drive in potent and impotent male rats as measured by the Columbia obstruction apparatus. *J Genet Psychol*. 1935; 47:33–48.
- Stretch R, Gerber GJ, Lane E. Cocaine self-injection behaviour under schedules of delayed reinforcement in monkeys. *Can J Physiol Pharmacol*. 1976; 54:632–638. [PubMed: 824036]
- Stuber GD, Roitman MF, Phillips PE, Carelli RM, Wightman RM. Rapid dopamine signaling in the nucleus accumbens during contingent and noncontingent cocaine administration. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2005a; 30:853–863. [PubMed: 15549053]
- Stuber GD, Wightman RM, Carelli RM. Extinction of cocaine self-administration reveals functionally and temporally distinct dopaminergic signals in the nucleus accumbens. *Neuron*. 2005b; 46:661–669. [PubMed: 15944133]
- Thompson T, Pickens R. Stimulant self-administration by animals: some comparisons with opiate self-administration. *Fed Proc*. 1970; 29:6–12. [PubMed: 4391651]
- Tsibulsky VL, Norman AB. Satiety threshold: a quantitative model of maintained cocaine self-administration. *Brain Res*. 1999; 839:85–93. [PubMed: 10482802]
- Vanderschuren LJ, Everitt BJ. Drug seeking becomes compulsive after prolonged cocaine self-administration. *Science*. 2004; 305:1017–1019. [PubMed: 15310907]
- Vanderschuren LJ, Pierce RC. Sensitization processes in drug addiction. *Curr Top Behav Neurosci*. 2010; 3:179–195. [PubMed: 21161753]
- Vezina P. Sensitization of midbrain dopamine neuron reactivity and the self-administration of psychomotor stimulant drugs. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2004; 27:827–839. [PubMed: 15019432]
- Wakabayashi KT, Weiss MJ, Pickup KN, Robinson TE. Rats markedly escalate their intake and show a persistent susceptibility to reinstatement only when cocaine is injected rapidly. *J Neurosci*. 2010; 30:11346–11355. [PubMed: 20739555]
- Ward SJ, Morgan D, Roberts DCS. Comparison of the reinforcing effects of cocaine and cocaine/heroin combinations under progressive ratio and choice schedules in rats. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2005; 30:286–295. [PubMed: 15578009]
- Wee S, Mandyam CD, Lekic DM, Koob GF. Alpha 1-noradrenergic system role in increased motivation for cocaine intake in rats with prolonged access. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2008; 18:303–311. [PubMed: 17920248]

- Weeks JR. Experimental morphine addiction: method for automatic intravenous injections in unrestrained rats. *Science*. 1962; 138:143–144. [PubMed: 14005543]
- Weeks JR, Collins RJ. Self-administration of morphine in the rat: relative influence of fixed ratio and time-out. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1978; 9:703–704. [PubMed: 733860]
- Weeks JR, Davis JD. Chronic Intravenous Cannulas for Rats. *J Appl Physiol*. 1964; 19:540–541. [PubMed: 14173557]
- Will MJ, Pratt WE, Kelley AE. Pharmacological characterization of high-fat feeding induced by opioid stimulation of the ventral striatum. *Physiol Behav*. 2006; 89:226–234. [PubMed: 16854442]
- Wilson MC, Hitomi M, Schuster CR. Psychomotor stimulant self administration as a function of dosage per injection in the rhesus monkey. *Psychopharmacologia*. 1971; 22:271–281. [PubMed: 4399836]
- Wise, RA. Intravenous drug self-administration: A special case of positive reinforcement. In: Bozarth, MA., editor. *Methods of assessing the reinforcing properties of abused drugs*. Springer-Verlag; New York: 1987. p. 117–141.
- Wise RA, Newton P, Leeb K, Burnette B, Pocock D, Justice JB. Fluctuations in nucleus accumbens dopamine concentration during intravenous cocaine self-administration in rats. *Psychopharmacology*. 1995; 120:10–20. [PubMed: 7480530]
- Wise RA, Yokel RA, Hansson PA, Gerber GJ. Concurrent intracranial self-stimulation and amphetamine self-administration in rats. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1977; 7:459–461. [PubMed: 563601]
- Woodward M, Tunstall-Pedoe H. Self-titration of nicotine: evidence from the Scottish Heart Health Study. *Addiction*. 1993; 88:821–830. [PubMed: 8329973]
- Yokel RA, Pickens R. Drug level of d- and l-amphetamine during intravenous self-administration. *Psychopharmacologia*. 1974; 34:255–264. [PubMed: 4819978]
- Yokel RA, Wise RA. Increased lever pressing for amphetamine after pimozide in rats: implications for a dopamine theory of reward. *Science*. 1975; 187:547–549. [PubMed: 1114313]
- Zernig G, Ahmed SH, Cardinal RN, Morgan D, Acquas E, Foltin RW, Vezina P, Negus SS, Crespo JA, Stöckl P, Grubinger P, Madlung E, Haring C, Kurz M, Saria A. Explaining the escalation of drug use in substance dependence: models and appropriate animal laboratory tests. *Pharmacology*. 2007; 80:65–119. [PubMed: 17570954]
- Zhang M, Balmadrid C, Kelley AE. Nucleus accumbens opioid, GABAergic, and dopaminergic modulation of palatable food motivation: contrasting effects revealed by a progressive ratio study in the rat. *Behav Neurosci*. 2003; 117(2):202–11. [PubMed: 12708516]
- Zimmer BA, Dobrin CV, Roberts DCS. Brain-cocaine concentrations determine the dose self-administered by rats on a novel behaviorally dependent dosing schedule. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2011; 36:2741–2749. [PubMed: 21849981]
- Zimmer BA, Dobrin CV, Roberts DCS. Examination of behavioral strategies regulating cocaine intake in rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2012a
- Zimmer BA, Oleson EB, Roberts DCS. The motivation to self-administer is increased after a history of spiking brain levels of cocaine. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2012b; 37:1901–1910. [PubMed: 22453139]
- Zittel-Lazarini A, Cador M, Ahmed SH. A critical transition in cocaine self-administration: behavioral and neurobiological implications. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2007; 192:337–346. [PubMed: 17318508]

Highlights

Explores the theoretical distinction between appetitive (drug seeking) and consumptive (drug taking) responses

Draws attention to the mechanism that control cocaine intake

Highlights how different patterns of consumption influence subsequent drug seeking.

Figure 1.

Representative within-session threshold data and explanation of behavioral economics measures. (a) A cumulative record from one animal responding in a single within-session threshold procedure is shown. Note that the available unit-injection dose (lower x-axis) decreases across eleven consecutive 10 minute bins. (b) The same animal's data are replotted to show cocaine consumption (mg/10 min bin) as a function of unit price (upper x-axis). Mean cocaine consumption (0.61 mg; gray ellipse) is calculated by averaging intake across bins 2-4. (c) The same animal's data are replotted to show responding (responses/10 min bin) as a function of unit price. The maximal price paid (P_{max} ; 133.9 resp/mg) can be distinguished by assessing the apex of the price response function. Note that P_{max} also corresponds to the final unit price at which cocaine consumption is maintained in 1b (adapted from Oleson et al., 2011).

Figure 2.

Current brain levels of cocaine predict subsequent dose. Data from a representative animal during four 6-hour sessions consisting of alternating 5 min access period to the hold down lever and timeout periods of varying length. A The calculated brain-cocaine concentration during a session with a 10 min (top left, green), 15 min (top right, blue), 20 min (bottom left, red), or 25 min (bottom right, black) timeout period. Dashed lines emphasize how far brain-cocaine levels declined following each timeout period. B The relationship between brain-cocaine concentration and subsequent doses animals self-administered. Data points are from the same sessions illustrated in panel A. Colors represent a 10, 15, 20, or 25 min timeout period (green, blue, red, or black, respectively). Closed circles represent the first dose of a 5-min access period, and open circles represent a dose self-administered within the remainder of the period. From Zimmer et al. 2011.

Figure 3.

A-C Intake and estimated brain levels of cocaine for representative animals tested using three distinct self-administration procedures. Each panel shows the modeled brain levels of cocaine (left axis, black) and cumulative intake (right axis, blue) throughout a session for an individual rat self-administering for cocaine on a ShA (A), LgA (B), or IntA (C) procedure. D Behavioral economic analysis of data obtained from the within-session threshold procedure. The Pmax value was calculated for all animals as the price (responses/mg of cocaine) animals reached before responding dropped off. Bars represent average ($\pm$ SEM) Pmax values for each group. Adapted from Zimmer et al. 2012b.

Figure 4.

Comparison of responding and intake for representative rats self-administering on a 1-lever (left panels) or 2-lever (right panels) PR schedule of reinforcement. A-B Cumulative responses are plotted for representative animals. Each tick mark represents the completion of a ratio. C-D Corresponding intake (mg) self-administered following each ratio completion during the same sessions represented in panels A-B. Note that completion of each ratio on the 1-lever PR schedule resulted in a fixed, unit dose (0.34 mg – panel C), whereas on the 2-lever schedule a separate drug lever provided 5 min access during which no limitations were placed on intake (D). E-F Estimated brain levels are shown for the 1-lever (E) or 2-lever (F) sessions. Inset Correlation between dose and estimated brain levels (EBL) on the data from panel D. Correlation coefficient was -0.92.

Table 1
Comparison of the effects of various treatments on cocaine self-administration

Summary of the effects of various treatments on responding for cocaine under progressive ratio (PR) or fixed ratio (FR) schedules of reinforcement. The primary dependent measure for progressive ratio schedules is break point (BP) and for fixed ratio schedules is rate of responding. The upper section illustrates that the effects of many dopaminergic manipulations on BP are inversely related to their effects on rate of drug intake. The lower section lists reports showing that BP and rate of drug intake are not necessarily related. Some treatments can affect one dependent measure (sometimes dramatically) without affecting the other. Updated from Richardson and Roberts, 1996.

Treatment	PR Break-point	FR1 Rate	Reference
Higher unit doses			Depoortere et al. (1993); Roberts et al. (1989b)
DA (D1) antagonist SCH 23390			Depoortere et al. (1993); Hubner and Moreton (1991)
DA (D2) antagonist Spiperone			Hubner and Moreton (1991)
DA atypical antagonist Clozapine			Loh et al. (1992); Roberts and Vickers (1984)
Haloperidol decanoate			Richardson et al. (1994); Roberts et al. (1989b)
Flupenthixol decanoate			Richardson et al. (1994)
6-OHDA lesions			Koob et al. (1987), Roberts et al. (1977)
Intrastriatal SCH 23390	NC		McGregor and Roberts (1995)
Ibotenic acid lesions			Hubner and Koob (1990)
5,7-DHT lesions		NC	Loh and Roberts (1990); Roberts et al. (1994)
Estrous phase		NC	Roberts et al. (1989a)
Fluoxetine			Carroll et al. (1990); Richardson et al. (1991)
DS 121			Smith et al. (1995)
Tryptophan		or NC	Carroll et al. (1990); McGregor et al. (1993)
Selective breeding for depression		NC	Lin et al. (2012)
Baclofen		or NC	Brebner et al. (2000); Campbell et al. (1999); Roberts et al. (1996); Shoaib et al. (1998)
Orexin antagonist (SB 334867)		NC	Aston-Jones et al. (2009); Borgland et al. (2009); Espana et al. (2010); Smith et al. (2009)

NC = no change.

Table 2
Differential effects on Pmax and Q₀ of various pharmacological pretreatments

Summary of the effects of various treatments on maximal price paid for cocaine (Pmax) and cocaine consumption when response cost is minimal (Q₀) on a within-session threshold procedure.

	Pmax	Q ₀
Haloperidol		
Amphetamine		n.c.
Fluoxetine		
Baclofen		n.c.