Published in final edited form as:

J Clin Toxicol. 2012 July 13; 2012(Suppl 7): 003–. doi:10.4172/2161-0495.S7-003.

Cocaine, Appetitive Memory and Neural Connectivity

Suchismita Ray*

Center of Alcohol Studies, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 607 Allison Road,
Piscataway, New Jersey, USA

Abstract

This review examines existing cognitive experimental and brain imaging research related to cocaine addiction. In section 1, previous studies that have examined cognitive processes, such as implicit and explicit memory processes in cocaine users are reported. Next, in section 2, brain imaging studies are reported that have used chronic users of cocaine as study participants. In section 3, several conclusions are drawn. They are: (a) in cognitive experimental literature, no study has examined both implicit and explicit memory processes involving cocaine related visual information in the same cocaine user, (b) neural mechanisms underlying implicit and explicit memory processes for cocaine-related visual cues have not been directly investigated in cocaine users in the imaging literature, and (c) none of the previous imaging studies has examined connectivity between the memory system and craving system in the brain of chronic users of cocaine. Finally, future directions in the field of cocaine addiction are suggested.

Keywords

Appetitive memory; Neural connectivity; Cocaine addiction

Introduction

According to the 2007 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, approximately 35.9 million Americans aged 12 and older had tried cocaine at least once in their lifetimes, representing 14.5% of this population. Among students surveyed as part of the 2008 Monitoring the Future study, 3.0% of eighth graders, 4.5% of tenth graders, and 7.2% of twelfth graders reported lifetime use of cocaine. Approximately 8.5% of college students and 14.7% of young adults (aged 19–28) reported lifetime use of cocaine (NIDA, 2007). Of an estimated 113 million emergency department (ED) visits in the U.S. during 2006, the Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN) estimates 548,608 were cocaine related. Despite this widespread and continuing use of cocaine in youth and young adults, much remains unknown about the neurocognitive mechanisms that support initiation and persistence of chronic cocaine use in humans. Better understanding of these mechanisms is essential both

Copyright: © 2012 Ray S.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

*Corresponding author: Suchismita Ray, Center of Alcohol Studies, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 607 Allison Road, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854, USA, Tel: 732-445-4261; Fax: 732-445-3500; shmita@rci.rutgers.edu.

for identifying those at risk for cocaine use and for intervention development in persistent cocaine users. Motivated by this fact, I have included three sections in this review. First, I examine previous studies that have investigated cognitive processes, for example, implicit and explicit memory processes in cocaine abusers and cocaine-dependent individuals (section I). Next, I report brain imaging studies related to cocaine addiction (section II), and finally I draw conclusions from previous cognitive and imaging studies and recommend future directions (section III).

Implicit and explicit memory processes and cocaine addiction

A long-standing cognitive research tradition has distinguished between automatic and non-automatic modes of information processing [1–8]. The automatic (i.e., implicit) mode involves faster, less effortful processing with less reliance on attention, intention, and strategy. It may occur without conscious awareness and may be difficult to control or inhibit once initiated. Implicit memory processes appear to play a crucial role in the control of attention and contingency-guided decision-making. On the other hand, the controlled and non-automatic (i.e., explicit) mode involves slower, more effortful processing such as rehearsal and elaboration and is dependent on strategy and attentional resources. Controlled information processes are initiated intentionally and are influenced by encoding strategies or depth of encoding [9]. Because explicit memory processes are supported by attentional and other cognitive resources that are limited in capacity, they are vulnerable to a variety of alterations in physiological, neurological, and psychological state [10,11]. Although prominent cognitive and neuroadaptive theories of addiction point to the heuristic value of the automatic/non-automatic information processing distinction for understanding the development of problem drug use behaviors [12–14], literature is however limited on systematic studies of specific types of automatic and effortful memory processes in chronic users of cocaine.

Lambert et al. [15,16] demonstrated that implicitly learned contingencies between cue and target stimuli, of which participants were unaware, guided attention-orienting responses. Their results support the idea that attention orienting to drugs and drug-related stimuli can operate outside of voluntary control via implicit memory processes. Bargh's model [17] suggests that the environment can directly activate a goal (for example, 'want to feel high') that guides cognitive and behavioral processes without the need for conscious decision making, and without the person's conscious intent or awareness of the operation of the goal [18]. The role of associative learning and implicit memory systems in contributing to transitions from regular drug use to addiction [12] and to the function of craving [19] is well supported, yet little attention has been directed to the role of implicit memory as an explanatory mechanism for early transitions in use, such as experimental use to occasional use, and occasional use to regular and/or escalating use. Exceptions are the earlier work by Stacy et al. [20,21], Szalay et al. [22–24], and Hill and Paynter [25], who examined motivational processes using verbal methods of assessing memory activation. Stacy [20], for example, showed that memory associations to ambiguous cues (e.g., 'pitcher') were significantly related to college students' use of alcohol and marijuana use. Furthermore, Szalay et al. [22–24] research showed that college cocaine users associate cocaine words with positive experiences and feelings, and are more familiar with cocaine names than

college student nonusers. Hill and Paynter [25] used an implicit semantic priming paradigm that included appetitive cues and suggested that this paradigm may have value as a clinical tool for the detection of psychoactive substance dependence and assessment of change. Semantic priming is defined as recognition facilitation of semantically related stimuli. Hill and Paynter [25] found that lexical decision (LD; the time to decide whether a string of letters was a word or a non-word) time was faster for the alcohol-related words [e.g., 'alcohol' (study word)–'relaxation' (test word)] than unrelated words ['alcohol' (study word)–'navigation' (test word)]. This suggests stronger memory association for alcohol-related concepts in semantic memory network than between concepts that are not alcohol related.

In the opiate addiction literature, only one study has examined contextual priming in opiate-dependent individuals and their family members and found that dependent individuals responded faster to opiate-related words following withdrawal-related sentences, as compared to neutral words that followed neutral sentences [26]. In the cocaine addiction literature, there is one study that has examined implicit and explicit cocaine-related cognitions in cocaine-dependent poly-substance abusers and controls [27]; implicit associations were assessed using an implicit association test (IAT) and explicit cognitions were assessed with a questionnaire using the same words as the IAT. Results showed that cocaine patients, compared to controls, associated cocaine more strongly with arousal as measured in the IAT, and scored lower on sedation expectancies and higher on arousal expectancies as measured in the explicit test. In addition to the Wiers et al. and Szalay et al. [22–24,27] studies that have examined cocaine related memory association in cocaine users, there has been one previous study that has examined attentional bias for cocaine-related words in cocaine abusers [28] and another study that has examined visual neutral word priming in abstinent cocaine and cocaine/alcohol dependent volunteers [29]. In Franken et al. [28] study, cocaine abusers participated in a reaction time (RT) experiment that was intended to measure the ability of subjects to shift their attention away from the cocaine related words. Results showed attentional bias for cocaine cues in patients who scored higher on obsessive thoughts about cocaine use in the week before the experiment. According to Jasiukaitis and Fein [29] both semantically and perceptually mediated visual neutral word priming are based on implicit cognitive processes that are resilient to the sequelae of cocaine dependence. In contrast to enhanced cocaine-related implicit memory processing in cocaine users [22–24,27], explicit memory involving neutral stimuli is usually impaired in chronic heavy users of alcohol and other drugs [29–31]. Cocaine dependent individuals, as well as abstinent MDMA ('Ecstasy') users, show impaired explicit memory processes such as free recall that utilizes neutral stimuli [29,32]. From the above review, it is evident that none of the existing studies involving cocaine has examined both implicit and explicit memory processes for cocaine related visual information within the same cocaine abuser or cocaine dependent individual.

Drug use behaviors in chronic users are frequently triggered by viewing drug related visual cues in the environment. Investigating the integrated operation of implicit and explicit memory processes involving drug related visual information within the same individual has important implications for developing prevention and intervention techniques tailored specifically for that individual. Many drug abuse prevention interventions involve

techniques such as drug refusal skill training, learning the negative consequences of drug use, and other controlled and attention-demanding components that rely heavily on explicit memory [33].

Brain imaging studies related to cocaine addiction

The neural correlates of implicit and explicit memory processes have been well studied in healthy non-substance abusing individuals. Using implicit repetition priming and semantic priming paradigms and functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI), the role of Left Dorsal Prefrontal Cortex (LDPC), Extrastriate Visual Cortex (EVC), and Posterior Temporal Cortex (PTC) has been demonstrated in implicit processing of neutral picture and word stimuli [34–42]. Priming is characterized by decreased brain activation (“response suppression”) in LDPC, EVC, and PTC for repeated compared to novel items (repetition priming) or for related compared to unrelated items (semantic priming). On the other hand, using explicit episodic and recognition memory tasks and fMRI, involvement of amygdala in explicit processing of emotional picture and word stimuli and involvement of hippocampus in explicit processing of neutral picture and word stimuli has been demonstrated [43–47]. Explicit episodic and recognition memory is characterized by increased activation in amygdala and hippocampus for correct recognition of the studied items compared to the novel items.

Neural mechanisms underlying implicit and explicit memory processes for appetitive cues have not been directly investigated in cocaine dependent individuals in the fMRI and PET literature. Yet, independent lines of research suggest that it would be valuable to do so. For example, cocaine-related cues and active cocaine infusion cause activation in brain areas linked to craving. Typically in a cue exposure paradigm, individuals maintaining abstinence from drug/alcohol use are brain scanned during exposure to addiction-related word or picture stimuli or related thoughts. Using cocaine-related verbal and picture cues, activation of insula, Orbito Frontal Cortex (OFC), amygdala, hippocampus and Anterior Cingulate (AC) areas was found during cocaine-cue induced craving [48–58]. These same brain areas have shown activation in response to alcohol, heroin, and nicotine-related cues in individuals dependent on these substances [59–68]. Cocaine-challenge studies showed that acute cocaine administration activated mesolimbic and mesocortical dopaminergic projection regions in addition to activation in anterior prefrontal cortex and orbitofrontal cortex [69–71]. These studies concluded that dopaminergic pathways and hierarchical brain networks may participate in mediating cocaine reward processes, associative learning, memory and motivation. Thus, drug and alcohol cue exposure is believed to trigger memories related to their use [28,49,51,65,72,73], apparently due to activation in hippocampus and amygdala during cue exposure. A separate line of research in healthy non-substance abusing individuals has linked activation in the hippocampus to explicit memory [44–47] and activation in the amygdala to both explicit emotional [43,44] and implicit emotional memory [74].

Taken together, the above imaging literature suggests a role of LDPC, EVC, and PTC in implicit processing of neutral stimuli, and involvement of amygdala and hippocampus in explicit processing of emotional and neutral stimuli, and also the role of insula, OFC,

amygdala, hippocampus and AC areas in cue induced brain activation in cocaine and other substance use disordered individuals. In addition to examining localized brain Regions of Interest (ROIs), there has been an increasing focus of neuroscientists on understanding how one brain area influences another, that is, on the 'effective connectivity' [75] or 'functional connectivity' (according to this view, functional connectivity between two brain areas is the correlation or covariance between their time-dependent activity) [75] during a cognitive task or at rest in healthy normal and clinical and neurotypical individuals [76–94]. Functional connectivity provides a quantitative description of inter-relatedness of information processing in different regions of brain, pertaining to a certain cognitive task or in a resting state. In that sense, functional connectivity provides information about information flows in the brain and influences produced by different areas of the brain on each other during particular cognitive tasks. This typically provides correlative information but can be used to obtain hints about the causal links (from such correlations) that exist between different cognitive processes in the brain in subjects' performing certain tasks. The modeling of effective connectivity not only provides an *in vivo* examination of brain function that complements the more invasive techniques used in animal research, but also has proved to be a useful tool for understanding brain function in both clinical and neurotypical populations. This modeling has been instrumental in developing clinical interventions. This approach expands the utility of neuroimaging data not only to identify isolated brain ROIs that are especially active during cognition, perception and action, but also the causal relations among activity in these regions [74,95–99]. The inter-connectivity of different regions in the brain is a well established concept in clinical and neurotypical literature.

However, this issue of brain interconnectivity is relatively novel in the addiction literature. Only one recent fMRI study has examined brain functional connectivity during a finger tapping task in MDMA abusers [100] whereas in another fMRI study brain effective connectivity was examined while the healthy subjects were under the influence of pure compounds of cannabis sativa. Furthermore, only one previous PET study of opiate craving [61] and only one previous resting state fMRI study involving opioid dependent patients [101] have investigated this important issue of brain interconnectivity. A few MRI studies that have examined functional connectivity in heroin abusers or heroin dependent individuals have primarily concentrated on the resting state [102–110] and functional or effective connectivity during any cognitive task yet needs to be explored. Similarly, the brain interconnectivity literature on cocaine addiction is very limited: only one study has examined the effect of acute cocaine administration on functional connectivity in human primary visual and motor cortex [111], a few studies have examined functional connectivity during the resting state [58,112–115] and a few studies have examined functional connectivity while participants performed a cognitive task [116–119].

Conclusions and Future Directions

Review of the previous cognitive experimental literature involving cocaine addiction reveals that only a limited number of studies have examined cocaine-related implicit and explicit memory processing [23–27] in cocaine users, despite the fact that neurobiological models of addiction argue that memory processes, and especially implicit memory processes play a crucial role in escalation and persistence of drug abuse [12–14]. However, there is no study

that examined both implicit and explicit memory processes involving cocaine related visual information in the same cocaine abuser or cocaine dependent individual. Future research is needed to examine this. Understanding that an individual's explicit memory processes involving drug related visual information are impaired whereas the implicit memory processes involving the same information are spared will help develop prevention and intervention tools that will utilize that person's intact implicit memory system. The implicit memory processes have not been the focus in the field, although it has been suggested that changing automatic associative effects could be fundamental adjunct to interventions [120].

Future work on the role of implicit memory in drug-taking behavior would be informed by studies on cognitive processes in the alcohol literature. In line with Goldman [121], it can be suggested that an implicit spread of activation between addiction related stimuli and their respective addiction expectancy concepts in the semantic memory network (a permanent associative network in which knowledge is stored) contributes to drug taking behavior. Goldman [121] has argued that alcohol expectancy concepts (images, memories of sensor motor and affective experiences, specific behavior patterns, and verbal representations of these concepts) are nodes in the semantic memory network and activation of particular nodes occurs in a predictable fashion once the individual encounters stimuli that match previously encoded material relevant to drinking. These activation patterns in turn influence the onset and pattern of drinking by activating affective systems in the brain [12]. It has been shown in the cognitive experimental literature that implicit memory processes are affected by divided attention [122] wherein one retains a high memory load during the memory processing. Future cognitive experimental research in the field of cocaine addiction should explore how attentional demands and memory loads might be harnessed or controlled for cocaine use prevention and intervention. That is, it may be possible to use attentional manipulations during exposure to a cocaine visual cue to restrict the implicit spreading of activation between, for example, cocaine related concepts in the semantic memory network.

In the fMRI and PET literature, neural mechanisms underlying implicit and explicit memory processes for cocaine cues have not been directly investigated either in high-risk for cocaine abuse/dependent or in cocaine dependent individuals despite an independent line of research has suggested that it would be valuable to do so. Furthermore, none of the previous imaging studies has examined connectivity between the memory system and craving system in the brain despite the fact that it has been argued that these two systems play a crucial role in maintenance of drug use behavior [12,19,123]. Future research should integrate the results of the neural substrate of memory in non-clinical samples with research examining the neural mechanisms of craving in substance use disordered groups by using fMRI to directly examine neural mechanisms that underlie implicit and explicit memory processing of cocaine-related visual cues in youthful samples who vary in cocaine exposure from none, to occasional, to persistent. Research should focus on brain ROIs that have shown to be involved in implicit memory processing (LDPC, EVC, PTC) and explicit memory processing (amygdala, hippocampus) in non-clinical samples, and brain ROIs that have shown to be involved during cocaine as well as other cue exposure in cocaine and other substance use disordered individuals (insula, OFC, amygdala, hippocampus, AC). Activation in LDPC, EVC, and PTC ROIs should be examined while participants' process cocaine related visual information during an implicit memory task whereas activation in

amygdala and hippocampus ROIs should be examined while they process cocaine related visual information during an explicit memory task. Also, during both memory tasks, activation of craving related brain areas (insula, OFC, AC) should be examined. In addition to examining the localized brain ROIs, it is necessary to further examine the connectivity between craving related and implicit (or explicit) memory related brain areas while participants process cocaine related visual cues during implicit (or explicit) memory task by using multiple advanced state-of-the art causal modeling approaches [75,124–126]. The research findings will elucidate our understanding of how brain functioning may differ in persons who vary in extent and consequences of cocaine exposure, that is, individuals who have limited experience with cocaine versus individuals who are chronic cocaine users. More specifically, in the high-risk group, the connectivity from the memory system to the craving system is not expected to be as strong as in the cocaine dependent individuals as strength of connectivity is a function of repeated exposure over time. Individuals with no previous experience with cocaine would not show any connectivity between these systems. Thus, the proposed research has practical implications in terms of its ability to assess an individual's level of cocaine experience by examining that individual's connectivity map which reveals the individual's strength of connectivity between the memories and craving systems. Such knowledge will be useful in identifying individual specific treatments or drug targets.

Furthermore, an examination of the connectivity map between the memory and craving systems during the course of treatment may help clinicians identify individuals who may relapse. The novel medication development strategies for long-term smoked cocaine use [e.g., dopamine receptor agonist (modafinil), dopamine receptor antagonist (ecopipam)] should be examined on cocaine dependent individuals to see whether their subjective craving ratings change and whether the connectivity between the memory and craving systems is diminished as a result of medication. At a cognitive level, this will refer to a restriction on implicit spreading of activation between cocaine related concepts in the semantic memory network. Finally, knowledge gained from this research on neurocognitive mechanisms in cocaine addiction will be instrumental in developing therapies that will modulate the functions of craving related brain areas in cocaine dependent individuals.

In addition to the proposed above mentioned cognitive experimental and fMRI research, advances in structural integrity/connectivity obtained by utilizing both Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI) and Voxel Based Morphometry (VBM) imaging techniques [127,128] can enhance our understanding of brain dysfunction in cocaine dependent individuals. As these evolving methods mature, a better understanding of structural and functional connectivity and their interplay will further enhance the field.

The results from future research will lay the groundwork for more articulated neurocognitive models of craving and impulse control in cocaine users, and potentially suggest ways that implicit memory processes may be harnessed to interrupt craving states. The knowledge gained from this future research will have implications for developing individually-tailored and effective cocaine use prevention and intervention techniques. These techniques could potentially include cognitive restructuring within the implicit memory system, neuro

feedback [129–132], developing therapies to modulate the functions of craving related brain areas, and medication development.

Acknowledgments

This review was supported by a National Institute on Drug Abuse grant (NIDA: K01 DA029047) to the author.

References

1. Broadbent DE. The hidden preattentive processes. *Am Psychol.* 1977; 32:109–118. [PubMed: 835877]
2. Ellmore TM, Stouffer K, Nadel L. Divergence of explicit and implicit processing speed during associative memory retrieval. *Brain Res.* 2008; 1229:155–166. [PubMed: 18655778]
3. Hasher L, Zacks RT. Automatic and effortful processes in memory. *J Exp Psychol Gen.* 1979; 108:356–388.
4. Logan, GD. Automaticity and cognitive control. In: Uleman, JS.; Bargh, JA., editors. *Unintended thought.* Guilford Press; New York: 1989. p. 52-74.
5. Luethi M, Meier B, Sandi C. Stress effects on working memory, explicit memory, and implicit memory for neutral and emotional stimuli in healthy men. *Front Behav Neurosci.* 2008; 2:5. [PubMed: 19169362]
6. Magno E, Allan K. Self-reference during explicit memory retrieval: An event-related potential analysis. *Psychol Sci.* 2007; 18:672–677. [PubMed: 17680935]
7. Posner, MI. *Chronometric explorations of the mind.* Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum; 1978.
8. Velmans M. Is human informational processing conscious? *Behav Brain Sci.* 1991; 14:651–726.
9. Craik FIM, Tulving E. Depth of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory. *J Exp Psychol Gen.* 1975; 104:268–294.
10. Hasher L, Zacks RT. Automatic processing of fundamental information: The case of frequency of occurrence. *Am Psychol.* 1984; 39:1372–1388. [PubMed: 6395744]
11. Schneider, W.; Dumais, ST.; Shiffrin, RM. Automatic and control processing and attention. In: Parasuraman, R.; Davies, DR., editors. *Varieties of Attention.* Academic Press; 1984. p. 1-27.
12. Robinson TE, Berridge KC. The neural basis of craving: An incentive-sensitization theory of addiction. *Brain Res Brain Res Rev.* 1993; 18:247–291. [PubMed: 8401595]
13. Rooke SE, Hine DW, Thorsteinsson EB. Implicit cognition and substance use: a meta-analysis. *Addict Behav.* 2008; 33:1314–1328. [PubMed: 18640788]
14. Tiffany ST. A cognitive model of drug urges and drug-use behavior: Role of automatic and nonautomatic processes. *Psychol Rev.* 1990; 97:147–168. [PubMed: 2186423]
15. Lambert A, Naikar N, McLachlan K, Aitken V. A new component of visual orienting: Implicit effects of peripheral information and subthreshold cues on covert attention. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform.* 1999; 25:321–340.
16. Lambert AJ, Sumich AL. Spatial orienting controlled without awareness: A semantically based implicit learning effect. *Q J Exp Psychol A.* 1996; 49:490–518. [PubMed: 8685393]
17. Bargh, JA. Auto-Motives: Preconscious Determinants of Social Interaction. In: Higgins, ET.; Sorrentino, RM., editors. *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior.* Vol. 2. Guilford Press; New York: 1990. p. 93-130.
18. Bargh, JA.; Barndollar, K. Automaticity in action: The unconscious as repository of chronic goals and motives. In: Gollwitzer, PM.; Bargh, JA., editors. *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior.* Guilford Press; New York: 1996. p. 457-481.
19. Tiffany, ST. The role of cognitive factors in reactivity to drug cues. In: Drummond, DC.; Tiffany, ST.; Glautier, S.; Remington, B., editors. *Addictive behaviour: Cue exposure theory and practice.* Oxford: John Wiley & Sons; 1995. p. 137-165.
20. Stacy AW. Memory association and ambiguous cues in models of alcohol and marijuana use. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol.* 1995; 3:183–194.

21. Stacy AW, Ames SL, Sussman S, Dent CW. Implicit cognition in adolescent drug use. *Psychol Addict Behav.* 1996; 10:190–203.
22. Szalay LB, Bovasso G, Vilov S, Williams RE. Assessing treatment effects through changes in perceptions and cognitive organization. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse.* 1992; 18:407–428. [PubMed: 1449123]
23. Szalay LB, Carroll JF, Tims F. Rediscovering free associations for use in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy.* 1993a; 30:344–356.
24. Szalay LB, Inn A, Strohl JB, Wilson LC. Perceived harm, age, and drug use: Perceptual and motivational dispositions affecting drug use. *J Drug Educ.* 1993b; 23:333–356. [PubMed: 8145112]
25. Hill AB, Paynter S. Alcohol dependence and semantic priming of alcohol-related words. *Pers Individ Dif.* 1992; 13:745–750.
26. Weinstein, CE.; Husman, J.; Dierking, DR. Self-Regulation Interventions with a Focus on Learning Strategies. In: Boekaerts, M.; Pintrich, PR.; Zeidner, M., editors. *the Handbook of Self-Regulation.* Academic Press; 2000. p. 727-747.
27. Wiers RW, Bartholow BD, van den Wildenberg E, Thush C, Engels RC, et al. Automatic and controlled processes and the development of addictive behaviors in adolescents: A review and a model. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav.* 2007; 86:263–283. [PubMed: 17116324]
28. Franken, IHA.; Zijlstra, C.; Booij, J.; van den Brink, W. Imaging the addicted brain: Reward, craving, and cognitive processes. In: Wiers, R.; Stacy, A., editors. *Handbook of implicit cognition and addiction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc; 2006. p. 185-193.
29. Jasiukaitis P, Fein G. Intact visual word priming in cocaine dependent subjects with and without cognitive deficit. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry.* 1999; 23:1019–1036. [PubMed: 10621947]
30. Bates, ME.; Convit, A. Neuropsychology and neuroimaging of alcohol and illicit drug abuse. In: Calev, A., editor. *Assessment of neuropsychological functions in psychiatric disorders.* Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1999. p. 373-445.
31. Smith ME, Oscar-Berman M. Resource-limited information processing in alcoholism. *J Stud Alcohol.* 1992; 53:514–518. [PubMed: 1405646]
32. Zakzanis KK, Young DA, Campbell Z. Prospective memory impairment in abstinent MDMA (“Ecstasy”) users. *Cogn Neuropsychiatry.* 2003; 8:141–153. [PubMed: 16571556]
33. Donaldson SI, Sussman S, MacKinnon DP, Severson HH, Glynn T, et al. Drug abuse prevention programming: Do we know what content works? *Am Behav Sci.* 1996; 39:868–883.
34. Buckner RL, Goodman J, Burock M, Rotte M, Koutstaal W, et al. Functional-anatomical correlates of object priming in humans revealed by rapid presentation event-related fMRI. *Neuron.* 1998; 20:285–296. [PubMed: 9491989]
35. Chee MW, Sriram N, Soon CS, Lee KM. Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and the implicit association of concepts and attributes. *Neuroreport.* 2000; 11:135–140. [PubMed: 10683845]
36. Copland DA, de Zubicaray GI, McMahon K, Wilson SJ, Eastburn M, et al. Brain activity during automatic semantic priming revealed by event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Neuroimage.* 2003; 20:302–310. [PubMed: 14527590]
37. Demb JB, Desmond JE, Wagner AD, Vaidya CJ, Glover GH, et al. Semantic encoding and retrieval in the left inferior prefrontal cortex: a functional MRI study of task difficulty and process specificity. *J Neurosci.* 1995; 15:5870–5878. [PubMed: 7666172]
38. Gabrieli JDE, Desmond JE, Demb JB, Wagner AD, Stone MV, et al. Functional magnetic resonance imaging of semantic memory processed in the frontal lobes. *Psychol Sci.* 1996; 7:278–283.
39. Matsumoto A, Iidaka T, Haneda K, Okada T, Sadato N. Linking semantic priming effect in functional MRI and event-related potentials. *NeuroImage.* 2005; 24:624–634. [PubMed: 15652298]
40. Schacter DL, Buckner RL. On the relations among priming, conscious recollection, and intentional retrieval: Evidence from neuroimaging research. *Neurobiol Learn Mem.* 1998; 70:284–303. [PubMed: 9753603]

41. Wagner, AD.; Bunge, SA.; Badre, D. Cognitive control, semantic memory, and priming: Contribution from prefrontal cortex. In: Gazzaniga, MS., editor. *The cognitive neurosciences*. 3. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2004. p. 709-725.
42. Wagner AD, Desmond JE, Demb JB, Glover GH, Gabrieli JDE. Semantic repetition priming for verbal and pictorial knowledge: A functional MRI study of left inferior prefrontal cortex. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 1997; 9:714–726. [PubMed: 23964594]
43. Hamann SB, Ely TD, Grafton ST, Kilts CD. Amygdala activity related to enhanced memory for pleasant and aversive stimuli. *Nat Neurosci*. 1999; 2:289–293. [PubMed: 10195224]
44. Phelps EA. Human emotion and memory: Interactions of the amygdala and hippocampal complex. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 2004; 14:198–202. [PubMed: 15082325]
45. Preston AR, Gabrieli JD. Dissociation between explicit memory and configural memory in the human medial temporal lobe. *Cereb Cortex*. 2008; 18:2192–2207. [PubMed: 18234685]
46. Preston AR, Shrager Y, Dudukovic NM, Gabrieli JD. Hippocampal contribution to the novel use of relational information in declarative memory. *Hippocampus*. 2004; 14:148–152. [PubMed: 15098720]
47. Rolls ET. Memory systems in the brain. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2000; 51:599–630. [PubMed: 10751982]
48. Bonson KR, Grant SJ, Contoreggi CS, Links JM, Metcalfe J, et al. Neural systems and cue-induced cocaine craving. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2002; 26:376–386. [PubMed: 11850152]
49. Childress AR, Mozley PD, McElgin W, Fitzgerald J, Reivich M, et al. Limbic activation during cue-induced cocaine craving. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1999; 156:11–18. [PubMed: 9892292]
50. Garavan H, Pankiewicz J, Bloom A, Cho JK, Sperry L, et al. Cue-induced cocaine craving: Neuroanatomical specificity for drug users and drug stimuli. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2000; 157:1789–1798. [PubMed: 11058476]
51. Grant S, London ED, Newlin DB, Villemagne VL, Liu X, et al. Activation of memory circuits during cue-elicited cocaine craving. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 1996; 93:12040–12045. [PubMed: 8876259]
52. Kilts CD, Schweitzer JB, Quinn CK, Gross RE, Faber TL, et al. Neural activity related to drug craving in cocaine addiction. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2001; 58:334–341. [PubMed: 11296093]
53. Maas LC, Lukas SE, Kaufman MJ, Weiss RD, Daniels SL, et al. Functional magnetic resonance imaging of human brain activation during cue-induced cocaine craving. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1998; 155:124–126. [PubMed: 9433350]
54. Volkow ND, Fowler JS, Wang GJ, Telang F, Logan J, et al. Cognitive control of drug craving inhibits brain reward regions in cocaine abusers. *Neuroimage*. 2010; 49:2536–2543. [PubMed: 19913102]
55. Volkow ND, Wang GJ, Tomasi D, Telang F, Fowler JS, et al. Methylphenidate attenuates limbic brain inhibition after cocaine-cues exposure in cocaine abusers. *PLoS One*. 2010; 5:e11509. [PubMed: 20634975]
56. Wang GJ, Volkow ND, Fowler JS, Cervany P, Hitzemann RJ, et al. Regional brain metabolic activation during craving elicited by recall of previous drug experiences. *Life Sci*. 1999; 64:775–784. [PubMed: 10075110]
57. Wexler BE, Gottschalk CH, Fulbright RK, Prohovnik I, Lacadie CM, et al. Functional magnetic resonance imaging of cocaine craving. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2001; 158:86–95. [PubMed: 11136638]
58. Wilcox CE, Teshiba TM, Merideth F, Ling J, Mayer AR. Enhanced cue reactivity and fronto-striatal functional connectivity in cocaine use disorders. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2011; 115:137–144. [PubMed: 21466926]
59. Brody AL, Mandelkern MA, Lee G, Smith E, Sadeghi M, et al. Attenuation of cue-induced cigarette craving and anterior cingulate cortex activation in bupropion-treated smokers: A preliminary study. *Psychiatry Res*. 2004; 130:269–281. [PubMed: 15135160]
60. Brody AL, Mandelkern MA, London ED, Childress AR, Lee GS, et al. Brain metabolic changes during cigarette craving. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2002; 59:1162–1172. [PubMed: 12470133]
61. Dalglish MR, Weinstein A, Malizia AL, Wilson S, Melichar JK, et al. Functional connectivity analysis of the neural circuits of opiate craving: “more” rather than “different”? *Neuroimage*. 2003; 20:1964–1970. [PubMed: 14683702]

62. George MS, Anton RF, Bloomer C, Teneback C, Drobles DJ, et al. Activation of prefrontal cortex and anterior thalamus in alcoholic subjects on exposure to alcohol-specific cues. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2001; 58:345–352. [PubMed: 11296095]
63. Myrick H, Anton RF, Li X, Henderson S, Drobles D, et al. Differential brain activity in alcoholics and social drinkers to alcohol cues: Relationship to craving. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2004; 29:393–402. [PubMed: 14679386]
64. Schneider F, Habel U, Wagner M, Franke P, Salloum JB, et al. Subcortical correlates of craving in recently abstinent alcoholic patients. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2001; 158:1075–1083. [PubMed: 11431229]
65. Sinha R, Li CS. Imaging Stress- and cue-induced drug and alcohol craving: association with relapse and clinical implications. *Drug Alcohol Rev*. 2007; 26:25–31. [PubMed: 17364833]
66. Tapert SF, Brown GG, Baratta MV, Brown SA. fMRI bold response to alcohol stimuli in alcohol dependent young women. *Addict Behav*. 2004; 29:33–50. [PubMed: 14667419]
67. Tapert SF, Cheung EH, Brown GG, Frank LR, Paulus MP, et al. Neural response to alcohol stimuli in adolescents with alcohol use disorder. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2003; 60:727–735. [PubMed: 12860777]
68. Wrase J, Grüsser SM, Klein S, Diener C, Hermann D, et al. Development of alcohol-associated cues and cue-induced brain activation in alcoholics. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2002; 17:287–291. [PubMed: 12381499]
69. Breiter HC, Gollub RL, Weisskoff RM, Kennedy DN, Makris N, et al. Acute effects of cocaine on human brain activity and emotion. *Neuron*. 1997; 19:591–611. [PubMed: 9331351]
70. Kufahl PR, Li Z, Risinger RC, Rainey CJ, Wu G, et al. Neural responses to acute cocaine administration in the human brain detected by fMRI. *Neuroimage*. 2005; 28:904–914. [PubMed: 16061398]
71. Lukas, SE.; Renshaw, PF. Cocaine effects on brain function. In: Higgins, ST.; Katz, JL., editors. *Cocaine abuse: Behavior, pharmacology, and clinical applications*. San Diego: Academic Press; 1998. p. 265–287.
72. Uhl, GR. *Addiction reviews 2008*. Blackwell Publishing; Malden: 2008.
73. Volkow ND, Fowler JS, Wang GJ, Goldstein RZ. Role of dopamine, the frontal cortex and memory circuits in drug addiction: Insights from imaging studies. *Neurobiol Learn Mem*. 2002; 78:610–624. [PubMed: 12559839]
74. Aggleton, JP., editor. *The Amygdala: Neurobiological Aspects of Emotion, Memory, and Mental Dysfunction*. New York: Wiley-Liss; 1992.
75. Friston KJ. Functional and effective connectivity in neuroimaging: A synthesis. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 1994; 2:56–78.
76. Anand A, Li Y, Wang Y, Gardner K, Lowe MJ. Reciprocal effects of antidepressant treatment on activity and connectivity of the mood regulating circuit: an fMRI study. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2007; 19:274–282. [PubMed: 17827412]
77. Anand A, Li Y, Wang Y, Wu J, Gao S, et al. Activity and Connectivity of Brain Mood Regulating Circuit in Depression: A Functional Magnetic Resonance Study. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2005; 57:1079–1088. [PubMed: 15866546]
78. Babiloni C, Bares M, Vecchio F, Brazdil M, Jurak P, et al. Synchronization of gamma oscillations increases functional connectivity of human hippocampus and inferior middle temporal cortex during repetitive visuomotor events. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2004; 19:3088–3098. [PubMed: 15182317]
79. Banks SJ, Eddy KT, Angstadt M, Nathan PJ, Phan KL. Amygdala-frontal connectivity during emotion regulation. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2007; 2:303–312. [PubMed: 18985136]
80. Bluhm R, Williamson P, Lanius R, Théberge J, Densmore M, et al. Resting state default-mode network connectivity in early depression using a seed region-of-interest analysis: Decreased connectivity with caudate nucleus. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2009; 63:754–761. [PubMed: 20021629]
81. Burton H, Dixit S, Litkowski P, Wingert JR. Functional connectivity for somatosensory and motor cortex in spastic diplegia. *Somatosens Mot Res*. 2009; 26:90–104. [PubMed: 20047510]
82. Camara E, Rodriguez-Fornells A, Münte TF. Functional connectivity of reward processing in the brain. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2008; 2:19. [PubMed: 19242558]

83. Chen S, Wu X, Lui S, Wu Q, Yao Z, et al. Resting-state fMRI study of treatment-naïve temporal lobe epilepsy patients with depressive symptoms. *Neuroimage*. 2012; 60:299–304. [PubMed: 22178816]
84. Faymonville ME, Roediger L, Del Fiore G, Delguedre C, Phillips C, et al. Increased cerebral functional connectivity underlying the antinociceptive effects of hypnosis. *Brain Res Cogn Brain Res*. 2003; 17:255–262. [PubMed: 12880897]
85. Fitzgerald KD, Stern ER, Angstadt M, Nicholson-Muth KC, Maynor MR, et al. Altered function and connectivity of the medial frontal cortex in pediatric obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2010; 68:1039–1047. [PubMed: 20947065]
86. Jech R, Urgosik D, Tintera J, Nebuzelský A, Krásenský J, et al. Functional magnetic resonance imaging during deep brain stimulation: A pilot study in four patients with Parkinson's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2001; 16:1126–1132. [PubMed: 11748747]
87. Liao W, Qiu C, Gentili C, Walter M, Pan Z, et al. Altered effective connectivity network of the amygdala in social anxiety disorder: A resting-state fMRI study. *PLoS One*. 2010; 5:e15238. [PubMed: 21203551]
88. Mechelli A, Penny WD, Price CJ, Gitelman DR, Friston KJ. Effective connectivity and intersubject variability: Using a multisubject network to test differences and commonalities. *NeuroImage*. 2002; 17:1459–1469. [PubMed: 12414285]
89. Motzkin JC, Newman JP, Kiehl KA, Koenigs M. Reduced prefrontal connectivity in psychopathy. *J Neurosci*. 2011; 31:17348–17357. [PubMed: 22131397]
90. Pugh KR, Mencl WE, Shaywitz BA, Shaywitz SE, Fulbright RK, et al. The angular gyrus in developmental dyslexia: task-specific differences in functional connectivity within posterior cortex. *Psychol Sci*. 2000; 1:51–56. [PubMed: 11228843]
91. Rabinak CA, Angstadt M, Welsh RC, Kenndy AE, Lyubkin M, et al. Altered amygdala resting-state functional connectivity in post-traumatic stress disorder. *Front Psychiatry*. 2011; 2:62. [PubMed: 22102841]
92. Ruiz S, Lee S, Soekadar SR, Caria A, Veit R, et al. Acquired self-control of insula cortex modulates emotion recognition and brain network connectivity in schizophrenia. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2011; 24:131–137.
93. Wang L, Zang Y, He Y, Liang M, Zhang X, et al. Changes in hippocampal connectivity in the early stages of Alzheimer's disease: Evidence from resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage*. 2006; 31:496–504. [PubMed: 16473024]
94. Zeng LL, Shen H, Liu L, Wang L, Li B, et al. Identifying major depression using whole-brain functional connectivity: a multivariate pattern analysis. *Brain*. 2012; 135:1498–1507. [PubMed: 22418737]
95. Friston KJ, Harrison L, Penny W. Dynamic causal modeling. *Neuroimage*. 2003; 19:1273–1302. [PubMed: 12948688]
96. Goebel R, Roebroeck A, Kim DS, Formisano E. Investigating direct cortical interactions in time-resolved fMRI data using vector autoregressive modeling and granger causality mapping. *Magn Reson Imaging*. 2003; 21:1251–1261. [PubMed: 14725933]
97. Honey GD, Fu CH, Kim J, Brammer MJ, Croudace TJ, et al. Effects of verbal working memory load on corticocortical connectivity modeled by path analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging data. *NeuroImage*. 2002; 17:573–582. [PubMed: 12377135]
98. Krause BJ, Horwitz B, Taylor JG, Schmidt D, Mottaghy FM, et al. Network analysis in episodic encoding and retrieval of word-pair associates: a PET study. *Eur J Neurosci*. 1999; 11:3293–3301. [PubMed: 10510193]
99. McIntosh AR, Grady CL, Ungerleider LG, Haxby JV, Rapoport SI, et al. Network analysis of cortical visual pathways mapped with PET. *J Neurosci*. 1994; 14:655–666. [PubMed: 8301356]
100. Salomon RM, Karageorgiou J, Dietrich MS, McLellan JY, Charboneau EJ, et al. MDMA (Ecstasy) association with impaired fMRI BOLD thalamic coherence and functional connectivity. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2012; 120:41–47. [PubMed: 21807471]
101. Upadhyay J, Maleki N, Potter J, Elman I, Rudrauf D, et al. Alterations in brain structure and functional connectivity in prescription opioid-dependent patients. *Brain*. 2010; 133:2098–2114. [PubMed: 20558415]

102. Liu J, Liang J, Qin W, Tian J, Yuan K, et al. Dysfunctional connectivity patterns in chronic heroin users: an fMRI study. *Neurosci Lett*. 2009; 460:72–77. [PubMed: 19450664]
103. Liu J, Qin W, Yuan K, Li J, Wang W, et al. Interaction between dysfunctional connectivity at rest and heroin cues-induced brain responses in male abstinent heroin-dependent individuals. *PLoS One*. 2011; 6:e23098. [PubMed: 22028765]
104. Ma N, Liu Y, Fu XM, Li N, Wang CX, et al. Abnormal brain default-mode network functional connectivity in drug addicts. *PLoS One*. 2011; 6:e16560. [PubMed: 21298074]
105. Ma N, Liu Y, Li N, Wang CX, Zhang H, et al. Addiction related alteration in resting-state brain connectivity. *Neuroimage*. 2010; 49:738–744. [PubMed: 19703568]
106. Wang W, Wang YR, Qin W, Yuan K, Tian J, et al. Changes in functional connectivity of ventral anterior cingulate cortex in heroin abusers. *Chin Med J*. 2010; 123:1582–1588. [PubMed: 20819516]
107. Xie C, Li SJ, Shao Y, Fu L, Goveas J, et al. Identification of hyperactive intrinsic amygdala network connectivity associated with impulsivity in abstinent heroin addicts. *Behav Brain Res*. 2011; 216:639–646. [PubMed: 20851718]
108. Yuan K, Qin W, Dong M, Liu J, Liu P, et al. Combining spatial and temporal information to explore resting-state networks changes in abstinent heroin-dependent individuals. *Neurosci Lett*. 2010; 475:20–24. [PubMed: 20302912]
109. Yuan K, Qin W, Dong M, Liu J, Sun J, et al. Gray matter deficits and resting-state abnormalities in abstinent heroin-dependent individuals. *Neurosci Lett*. 2010; 482:101–105. [PubMed: 20621162]
110. Yuan K, Qin W, Liu J, Guo Q, Dong M, et al. Altered small-world brain functional networks and duration of heroin use in male abstinent heroin-dependent individuals. *Neurosci Lett*. 2010; 477:37–42. [PubMed: 20417253]
111. Li SJ, Biswal B, Li Z, Risinger R, Rainey C, et al. Cocaine administration decreases functional connectivity in human primary visual and motor cortex as detected by functional MRI. *Magn Reson Med*. 2000; 43:45–51. [PubMed: 10642730]
112. Camchong J, MacDonald AW 3rd, Nelson B, Bell C, Mueller BA, et al. Frontal hyperconnectivity related to discounting and reversal learning in cocaine subjects. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2011; 69:1117–1123. [PubMed: 21371689]
113. Gu H, Salmeron BJ, Ross TJ, Geng X, Zhan W, et al. Mesocorticolimbic circuits are impaired in chronic cocaine users as demonstrated by resting-state functional connectivity. *Neuroimage*. 2010; 53:593–601. [PubMed: 20603217]
114. Kelly C, Zuo XN, Gotimer K, Cox CL, Lynch L, Brock D, et al. Reduced interhemispheric resting state functional connectivity in cocaine addiction. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2011; 69:684–692. [PubMed: 21251646]
115. Meunier D, Ersche KD, Craig KJ, Fornito A, Merlo-Pich E, Fineberg NA, et al. Brain functional connectivity in stimulant drug dependence and obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Neuroimage*. 2012; 59:1461–1468. [PubMed: 21871569]
116. Bednarski SR, Zhang S, Hong KI, Sinha R, Rounsaville BJ, et al. Deficits in default mode network activity preceding error in cocaine dependent individuals. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2011; 119:e51–e57. [PubMed: 21703783]
117. Hanlon CA, Wesley MJ, Stapleton JR, Laurienti PJ, Porrino LJ. The association between frontal-striatal connectivity and sensorimotor control in cocaine users. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2011; 115:240–243. [PubMed: 21193273]
118. Narayanan A, White CA, Saklayen SS, Abduljalil A, Schmalbrock P, Pepper TH, et al. Functional connectivity during language processing in acute cocaine withdrawal: A pilot study. *Neurocase*. 2011 Epublication.
119. Tomasi D, Volkow ND, Wang R, Carrillo JH, Maloney T, et al. Disrupted functional connectivity with dopaminergic midbrain in cocaine abusers. *PLoS One*. 2010; 5:e10815. [PubMed: 20520835]
120. Ames, SL.; Franken, IHA.; Coronges, K. Implicit cognition and drugs of abuse. In: Wiers, RW.; Stacy, AW., editors. *Handbook of implicit cognition and addiction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc; 2006. p. 363-375.

121. Goldman MS. Risk for substance abuse: Memory as a common etiological pathway. *Psychological Science*. 1999; 10:196–198.
122. Mulligan NW. Attention and implicit memory: The effects of varying attentional load on conceptual priming. *Mem Cognit*. 1997; 25:11–17.
123. Tiffany ST, Carter BL. Is craving the source of compulsive drug use. *J Psychopharmacol*. 1998; 12:23–30. [PubMed: 9584965]
124. Biswal BB, Mennes M, Zuo XN, Gohel S, Kelly C, et al. Toward discovery science of human brain function. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2010; 107:4734–4739. [PubMed: 20176931]
125. Ramsey JD, Hanson SJ, Hanson C, Halchenko YO, Poldrack RA. Six problems for causal inference from fMRI. *Neuroimage*. 2010; 49:1545–1558. [PubMed: 19747552]
126. Zheng X, Rajapakse JC. Learning functional structure from fMR images. *Neuroimage*. 2006; 31:1601–1613. [PubMed: 16540348]
127. Basser PJ, Jones DK. Diffusion-tensor MRI: theory, experimental design and data analysis-a technical review. *NMR Biomed*. 2002; 15:456–467. [PubMed: 12489095]
128. Koch MA, Norris DG, Hund-Georgiadis M. An investigation of functional and anatomical connectivity using magnetic resonance imaging. *Neuroimage*. 2002; 16:241–250. [PubMed: 11969331]
129. Burkett VS, Cummins JM, Dickson RM, Skolnick MH. Effects of neurotherapy on attention and impulsivity in crack cocaine addiction: A controlled, single-blind study. *Journal of Neurotherapy*. 2004; 8:119–120.
130. Chiew M, Laconte SM, Graham SJ. Investigation of fMRI neurofeedback of differential primary motor cortex activity using kinesthetic motor imagery. *Neuroimage*. 2012; 61:21–31. [PubMed: 22401758]
131. Peniston, EG.; Kulkosky, PJ. Neurofeedback in the treatment of addictive disorders. In: Evans, JR.; Andrew, A., editors. *Introduction to quantitative EEG and neuro feedback*. San Diego: Academic Press; 1999. p. 157-179.
132. Sokhadze TM, Stewart CM, Hollifield M. Integrating cognitive neuroscience research and cognitive behavioral treatment with neurofeedback therapy in drug addiction comorbid with posttraumatic stress disorder: A conceptual review. *Journal of Neurotherapy*. 2007; 11:13–44.