Published in final edited form as:

Psychiatry Res. 2014 September 30; 223(3): 218–225. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2014.06.003.

Clarifying the Neural Basis for Incentive Salience of Tobacco Cues in Smokers

Joshua C. Gray¹, Michael T. Amlung², John Acker¹, Lawrence H. Sweet^{1,3}, Courtney L. Brown⁴, and James MacKillop^{1,5,*}

¹ Department of Psychology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30605 USA.

² Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211 USA.

³ Department of Health Psychology, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211 USA.

⁴ Department of Psychiatry and Human Behavior, Brown University, Providence RI 02912

⁵ Department of Behavioral and Social Sciences, Brown University, Providence RI 02912

Abstract

In functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies, smoking cues have been found to elicit increases in brain activity in regions associated with processing rewarding and emotional stimuli. However, most smoking cue studies to date have reported effects relative to neutral control stimuli with no incentive properties, making it unclear whether the observed activation pertains to value in general or the value of cigarettes in particular. The current fMRI study sought to clarify the neural activity reflecting tobacco-specific incentive value versus domain-general incentive value by examining smoking cues, neutral cues, and a third set of cues, monetary cues, which served as an active control condition. Participants were 42 male daily smokers. Compared to neutral cues, significantly greater activation was found in the left ventral striatum in response to tobacco and money cues. Monetary cues also elicited significantly increased activation in the right inferior frontal gyrus and cuneus compared to the other two cue types. Overall, the results suggest that the salience of monetary cues was the highest and, as a result, may have reduced the incentive salience of tobacco cues.

Keywords

Tobacco; Nicotine; Cues; Incentive Salience; Money; fMRI

Cigarette smoking is responsible for the death of approximately 440,000 U.S. citizens each year and 6,000,000 deaths worldwide (NIDA, 2009; World Health Organization, 2011). In

© 2014 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

* Corresponding Author: James MacKillop, PhD, Department of Psychology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, 30602. jmackill@uga.edu Phone: 706-542-3033 Fax: 706-542-327.

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.

addition to its impact on health, tobacco use is responsible for hundreds of billions of dollars of economic burden worldwide every year (World Health Organization, 2011). Among current U.S. adult smokers, approximately two-thirds report that they want to quit smoking, although the majority are unsuccessful (American Society of Addiction Medicine, 2010; CDC, 2011).

One of the major theories of nicotine dependence is that it is a disorder of learning and memory (Franklin et al., 2007; Olausson et al. 2003). From this perspective, environmental cues play an important role and partially elicit substance use behavior through associative (classical) conditioning. Specifically, neutral environmental stimuli (e.g., people, places, things) that precede drug use become associated with the actual drug use and acquire motivational properties. In the context of smokers, drug-related cues (e.g., a cigarette, another smoker, a cup of coffee) become associated with the act of smoking and, over time, the smoking related cues begin to trigger conditioned responses, including subjective craving and psychophysiological arousal (Conklin et al., 2010, 2013; Thewissen et al., 2007). Furthermore, these associated cues putatively become highly salient over time, triggering compulsive drug seeking and taking even if the expectation of pleasure is diminished (Berridge, Robinson, & Aldridge, 2009; Robinson & Berridge, 1993).

Considerable empirical research supports this perspective. Animal and human research has shown that these previously neutral stimuli elicit a number of conditioned drug responses, including physiological indices (Winkler et al., 2011), attentional indices (Robinson & Berridge, 1993), and actual drug seeking and taking behavior (Le Foll & Goldberg, 2006). Following extinction of nicotine-seeking behavior, rats have been shown to reinstate their nicotine-seeking behavior upon presentation of the conditioned stimulus (LeSage et al., 2004). In human cue reactivity studies, nicotine dependent individuals exhibit increases in affect, heart rate, skin conductivity, and subjective craving following the presentation of smoking-related stimuli (e.g., images of cigarettes) (Carter & Tiffany, 1999; Payne et al. 2007; Tiffany et al., 2000; MacKillop et al., 2012). Parallel findings have been found for alcohol and other psychoactive drugs (e.g., MacKillop & Lisman, 2005; MacKillop et al., 2010; Robbins, Ehrman, Childress, & O'Brien, 1999).

Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies have extended smoking cue reactivity research to understand neural responses, finding that smoking-related cues elicit greater blood-oxygenation-level-dependent (BOLD) activation in regions associated with the processing of reward and emotional stimuli (Due et al., 2002; David et al., 2005; McClernon et al, 2005; Franklin et al., 2007, Versace et al., 2011). These studies typically employ a passive-viewing task, in which participants are instructed to observe photographs or videos of smoking cues and neutral cues. Additionally, some of the studies incorporate holding a cigarette and holding a neutral object.

A number of neural profiles have been found to be consistently associated with the presentation of tobacco cues in smokers and hold potential to provide further insight into reward processing and contributors to relapse. Kuhn and Gallinat (2011) reviewed 13 studies of daily smokers exposed to smoking-related versus control cues, and found that the ventral striatum, amygdala, anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), and the temporo-parietal junction are

consistently activated more by smoking cues versus control cues. Although it was not demonstrated to be consistently active in this meta-analysis, the anterior insula is also thought to be important in the experience of appetitive craving and has been associated with the maintenance of tobacco use through cue reactivity and the experience of craving (Englemann et al., 2012; Versace et al., 2011; Naqvi et al., 2007).

The ventral striatum, amygdala, and ACC all potentially play a unique role in the reactivity of drug addicted individuals to associated substance cues. The ventral striatum is associated with motivational behavior including reward reactivity (Parkinson et al., 1999; Chase et al., 2011). The amygdala is associated with emotional and reward processing (Phillips et al., 2003), and greater activation in this region has been associated with intensity of tobacco cue-induced craving (Smolka et al., 2006). Activity in the ACC is also associated with increases in craving (Goldstein & Volkow, 2002; Jentsch & Taylor, 1999), and it is thought to play a role in the exertion of inhibitory control over behavior and in conflict processing and monitoring (Lubman et al., 2004). Brain imaging studies have demonstrated that both nicotine abstinence and the expectations that smoking will take place can modulate the response of the ACC to smoking cues (McBride et al., 2006; McClernon et al., 2005; Wilson et al., 2005). Furthermore, recent research has found the BOLD response to smoking cues in the ACC and amygdala to predict smoking lapse in nicotine dependent individuals seeking to quit smoking (Janes et al., 2010).

Importantly, most cue reactivity fMRI studies to date have used neutral visual control conditions (e.g., office supplies, non-smoking faces), but have not used an active incentive value control. An exception to this is a study by Versace et al. (2011), which examined neural activity elicited by smoking-related cues, pleasant (e.g., erotic and romantic), unpleasant (e.g., mutilation and sad), and neutral cues. They found only the insula to have a greater BOLD response to cigarette cues relative to all other categories, while in all other clusters, erotic stimuli elicited greater magnitude of BOLD responses. Nonetheless, this is the only study to date that has sought to contextualize tobacco-related neural activity within the larger category of reinforcers and punishments.

The goal of the current study was to extend research on tobacco-specific reactivity by examining it in relation to both conventional control cues and also with a novel set of monetary cues. Money is a powerful nonspecific reinforcer and, as such, could serve as excellent control for brain activity associated with incentive value in general. In addition, as sex differences are present for erotic pictures (Lang et al., 1998; Hamann et al., 2004; Sabatinelli et al., 2004), money was considered advantageous because of no known gender differences. Given the motivational significance of cigarette and money cues, we hypothesized that both would elicit greater BOLD activation than neutral cues in the ventral striatum, amygdala, and ACC. In addition, we hypothesized that smoking cues would elicit significantly greater activation than money cues in the ACC and amygdala, based on the known associations of these regions with craving, inhibitory control, and emotional processing. Finally, given the novelty of this cue reactivity paradigm, exploratory analyses were utilized to examine additional activation differences between the cigarette cues, monetary cues, and neutral cues.

Method

Participants

Daily smokers were recruited via flyers, print, and internet advertising. Inclusion criteria for participation in the study were as follows: 1) male; 2) right handed; 3) 18-55 years old; 4) self-reported smoking of ≥ 5 cigarettes a day; 5) baseline expired carbon monoxide (CO) > 5 parts per million (ppm); 6) at least a 10th grade education; and 7) computer use ≥ 4 days a week to ensure adequate familiarity with computerized assessments. Females were not included because gender differences in cue reactivity have been reported in prior research (e.g., Field & Duka, 2004; McClernon, Kozink, & Rose, 2008; Niaura et al., 1998) and the study was not powered to systematically examine sex differences. Exclusionary criteria were as follows: 1) any head injury more severe than a mild traumatic brain injury (TBI) or > 2 mild TBIs; 2) MRI contraindications (e.g. metal implant, claustrophobia); 3) received mental health services within the last six months or prescribed psychotropic medications; 4) actively seeking treatment to reduce tobacco use or having undergone treatment for nicotine dependence in the past 90-days; 5) weekly illicit drug use, other than marijuana; and 6) living with someone who has participated in the study. Forty-four participants were enrolled, with two participants excluded for invalid data (i.e., noncompliant smoking during the session; non-responding during in-scanner assessments, suggesting sleeping). No participants were excluded for excessive in-scanner movement (> 3.5 mm) along the x-, y-, or z-axes, leaving a final sample of 42 (76.2% white, 21.4% African American, 2.4% Asian; median income = $< \$30,000$, IQR = $< \$15,000 - \$44,999$; age $M = 26.6$, $SD = 7.1$; cigarettes per day $M = 15.9$ $SD = 7.5$; Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence [FTND] $M = 3.1$, $SD = 1.9$; fMRI session expired CO $M = 18.9$, $SD = 11.3$; past three months marijuana use, median = monthly or less).

Measures

Subjective motivation for cigarettes and money was assessed immediately before and after the cue reactivity paradigm by asking participants how much they desired each commodity (i.e., money and cigarettes) via a 9-point Likert scale. Level of nicotine dependence was assessed using the FTND (Heatherton et al., 1991). Expired CO was assessed during the screening session and at the start of fMRI session, using a PiCO+ Smokerlyzer (Bedfont Scientific, Ltd; Rochester, UK). Demographic information was also collected (e.g., ethnicity, income, age).

fMRI Protocol

Imaging data were collected at the University of Georgia Bio-Imaging Research Center with a General Electric 16-channel fixed-site Signa HDx 3.0 Tesla MRI scanner. Structural imaging used a high-resolution T1 scan (voxel size 1mm^3 , field of view = 25.6^2 mm, matrix = 256^2 , slice thickness = 1mm). Functional imaging used echo planar imaging (EPI) of T2* scans using a single-shot gradient echo pulse sequence (TR = 2000 ms, TE = 25 ms, field of view = 22.5^2 cm, matrix = 64^2 , voxel size = $3.52 \times 3.52 \times 3.5$ mm, with 40 contiguous 3.5 mm slices collected axially). Three dummy TRs preceded the functional scans to permit the scanner to reach steady-state equilibrium.

fMRI Stimuli

High-resolution image stimuli sets were developed in three categories: tobacco-related (i.e., images of cigarettes), money-related (i.e., images of US dollar bills), and neutral (i.e., images of visually-matched office supplies). Sample stimuli and a schematic of the paradigm are provided in Figure 1. The individual pictures were identified via Internet searches and were selected in matched triplets (one tobacco image, one money image, one neutral image) to have analogous layout and complexity, to minimize difference in shapes perceived, in an extra effort to isolate differences in incentive value. There were 32 images of each category chosen and no images were shown twice. Stimuli were programmed using E-Prime 2.0 software (Psychology Software Tools, Sharpsburg, PA, USA) and presented via MR-compatible stimulus-presentation goggles (Resonance Technology Inc., Los Angeles, USA). Individual cue images were displayed on a black background for 3s each, delivered in blocks of eight images for each image type (24s per block) interspersed with rest blocks of equal length. The full cue reactivity paradigm was comprised of 12 active blocks (four blocks of each cue type) and three rest blocks, totaling 360s. The order of cue and rest blocks was counterbalanced (see Figure 1B), and every block of stimuli had variable complexity of images embedded within it.

Procedure

Following a positive phone-screen interview, prospective participants attended a one-hour in-person screening session. Eligibility for the MRI scan was assessed using an MRI safety and contraindication screening questionnaire. Participants who met the eligibility criteria were invited to participate in the fMRI session and those scheduled were explicitly told to not use drugs or alcohol within 24 hours of their appointment time.

At the imaging session, participants were told to smoke at the start of the session (if they had not already) to standardize nicotine exposure and withdrawal effects. The protocol prior to the fMRI scan lasted approximately two and a half hours and was comprised of an expired CO assessment, questionnaires, and scan orientation. Throughout this period, participants were not permitted to smoke to create a mild deprivation state, a procedure consistent with other studies utilizing an acute tobacco deprivation to increase the likelihood of interest in tobacco cues (McClernon, Hutchison, Rose, & Kozink, 2007; Acker & MacKillop, 2013). This was followed by the fMRI scan that lasted one hour. Participants were compensated \$15 for the in-person screening, \$40 for the fMRI session, and up to \$10 for another task at the fMRI session (unrelated to cue reactivity and not reported here). All procedures were approved by the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board.

Data analysis—Functional imaging data processing and analysis was conducted using Analysis of Functional NeuroImages software (AFNI; Cox, 1996) with follow-up analyses using SPSS 17.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY). Functional datasets were aligned to the T1 anatomical dataset and volume-registered (motion-corrected for head movement). Analysis of motion in the scanner verified that no participants moved excessively (> 3.5 mm; $M = .16$ mm, $SD = .10$ mm) along the x-, y-, or z-axes. Motion-corrected datasets were normalized into Talairach space (Talairach & Tournoux, 1988), and individual volumes from the run were registered to a base volume proximal to acquisition of the anatomical dataset (Saad et

al., 2009). The data were then spatially smoothed using a 3.5 mm full width half maximum (FWHM) Gaussian filter, excluding non-brain voxels. The raw BOLD signal was scaled to percent signal change from the mean signal intensity. For cue reactivity, 3dDeconvolve (Ward, 2002) was applied using three cue-related regressors (neutral, smoking, and money) and six nuisance regressors to account for motion (x, y, z, roll, pitch, yaw). Each regression also accounted for linear, quadratic, and cubic trends.

Both *a priori* and data-driven exploratory functional ROI strategies were used. This was because some aspects of this study overlapped with previous studies using tobacco cue reactivity paradigms, but the novel introduction of monetary cues made the possibility of unique regions of activation likely. For *a priori* ROIs, we generated 4 mm-radius spherical ROIs centered on the Talairach-equivalent coordinates from the Kuhn and Gallinat (2011) meta-analysis on regions differentially active to tobacco cues (e.g., left ACC (Brodmann area 32), left ACC (Brodmann area 32/24), left amygdala, and left and right ventral striatum; coordinates are provided in Table 1). The left temporo-parietal junction specified in the Kuhn and Gallinat (2011) review was at least partially outside of 10 participants' individual anatomical scan, and therefore was not included.

For exploratory analyses, a disjunction (Boolean "OR" logic) mask was generated for each cue (smoking, neutral, or money) in comparison to activity during rest (Amlung et al., 2012; MacKillop et al., 2012; Sweet et al., 2010; Ballard & Knutson, 2009). To correct for type-1 error rate, the average spatial smoothness in the x, y, and z planes was estimated using the residuals from the multiple regression and then inputted to AlphaSim (Ward, 2000) to obtain the minimum cluster extent needed for a family-wise error rate (FWER) of $\alpha < .05$. Incorporating these parameters, a voxelwise one-sample *t*-test was computed to identify clusters of significant activity in any of the three choice categories ($p < .0001$, cluster size 9 voxels, FWER $< \alpha .05$). For the initial mask at $p < .0001$, three ROIs were very large and subsumed multiple discrete regions. In these cases voxelwise *p* values were iteratively decreased to identify functionally discrete regions, which was determined using AFNI proportionate overlap with anatomical regions in Talairach space.

For both *a priori* and exploratory analyses, mean BOLD signal effects for each commodity were extracted from each ROI and imported into SPSS. These mean BOLD percent signal change values were compared using one-way three-level analyses of variance (ANOVAs). Significant effects were followed-up with pairwise *t*-tests to identify specific patterns. The five *a priori* analyses were not further corrected for multiple comparisons. However, for exploratory analyses, multiple comparison correction was implemented by applying a Bonferroni correction to the significance threshold for disjunction mask ANOVAs.

Results

Subjective Ratings

Subjective motivation for tobacco and money are depicted in Figure 2. Subjective desire for a cigarette was moderate according to the 9-point craving scale prior to the cue exposure and significantly higher in the post-cue exposure condition, $t(41) = 2.13$, $p = .04$, $d = .66$. Desire for money was high, did not significantly differ between pre- and post-cue exposure

conditions, $t(41) = 1.46, p = .15, d = .45$, and was statistically unrelated to desire for cigarettes in both pre and post-cue exposure conditions (pre-pre: $p = .90, r = .02$; post-post: $p = .10, r = .26$). The absence of a cue effect and the absence of a relationship between money and cigarette motivation may be related to ceiling effects, as the maximum possible rating was an eight, and the mean reported desire for money pre- and post-cue exposure was $MMI = 7.26, M = 7.12$, with SDs of 1.23 and 1.77, respectively. Notably, the desire for money was significantly greater than for cigarettes at pre- and post-cue exposure conditions (pre: $t(41) = 4.58, p < .001, d = 1.41$; post: $t(41) = 3.11, p < .01, d = .96$).

***a priori* ROI Analyses**

Differences in cue-elicited activation in the *a priori* ROIs are presented in Table 1. Significantly discriminating activation was identified in the left ventral striatum, $F(2, 41) = 5.48, p < .01$. Specifically, activity associated with tobacco and money cues were greater than neutral cues in the left ventral striatum ($p < .01$ for both contrasts; see Figure 3). However, level of BOLD activation did not significantly differ between money and cigarette cues in this region ($p = .85$). The other *a priori* ROIs did not significantly differentiate between any cue types as indicated by the non-significant one-way three-level omnibus ANOVAs ($ps > .17$).

Empirical ROI Analyses

Eighteen clusters of significant activity were identified at $p < .0001$. Three large clusters that subsumed multiple discrete functional regions were further examined. These were: i) bilateral occipital lobe, cuneus, lingual gyrus, parahippocampal gyrus, declive, culmen; ii) right precentral gyrus and postcentral gyrus; and iii) left precentral gyrus, insula, and postcentral gyrus. Using the proposed strategy, these clusters were segregated into seven spatially distinct clusters: left posterior insula, left pre/postcentral gyrus, and left postcentral gyrus at $p < .00005$; bilateral paracentral lobule at $p < .00001$; left thalamus/parahippocampal gyrus at $p < .000005$; and bilateral occipital lobe/cuneus and right thalamus/parahippocampal gyrus at $p < .0000005$.

In total, twenty-two clusters were identified as ROIs using this procedure, five of which significantly discriminated between cue type at the Bonferroni corrected p -value ($p < .001$); the seventeen non-discriminating clusters were not subjected to further analysis but are reported in Supplementary Materials. Regions of interest that significantly discriminated between cue type are indicated in Figure 4 and Table 2, where the results of the pairwise t -tests are also presented. Overall, money cues elicited significantly greater activation than both tobacco cues and neutral cues in regions associated with visual and inhibitory processing, including bilateral cuneus and right inferior frontal gyrus (IFG). Money cues elicited significantly greater activation than tobacco cues in the left IFG. Significantly greater response to neutral cues was found compared to tobacco and money cues in left posterior insula.

Discussion

The goal of the current study was to clarify the neural activity associated with tobacco-related stimuli by incorporating active control stimuli comprising monetary images. The findings revealed one *a priori* ROI and five exploratory ROIs that exhibited differential activation to tobacco, money, and neutral cues. Specifically, *a priori* analyses identified the left ventral striatum as significantly more active to the two reward cues compared to neutral cues. In exploratory analyses, four out of the five discriminating regions were most active in response to monetary cues, suggesting an overall greater salience of monetary cues versus tobacco and neutral cues. Furthermore, tobacco cues demonstrated no significantly greater response in any of the exploratory regions, suggesting that money cues were perceived to be a more salient reward and, in contrast, potentially diminished interest in less desirable rewards. The interpretation of money possessing greater motivational salience than cigarettes is further corroborated by the subjective ratings over the course of the paradigm. Participants in this study reported high motivation for money and comparatively lower motivation for cigarettes. Motivation for money was sustained over time and did not increase, likely due to ceiling effects; in contrast, cigarette craving significantly increased from the start of the paradigm to its conclusion. Overall, the subjective ratings and the exploratory (disjunction mask) analyses (Ballard & Knutson, 2009) suggested that monetary cues possess greater overall motivational significance than tobacco cues in a sample of nicotine dependent smokers.

In terms of the mechanisms in play, the current findings corroborate the notion of the ventral striatum subserving the motivational significance of environmental stimuli (David et al., 2005; Cardinal et al., 2002). Furthermore, the fact that the ventral striatum did not differentiate the type of reward suggests that it is not stimulus specific (e.g., drug only). This finding is consistent with previous literature identifying the ventral striatum as critical for the motivational impact of all classically conditioned stimuli (Cardinal et al., 2002). In the exploratory (disjunction mask) analyses, monetary cues elicited the greatest activation in the cuneus region of the visual cortex, which is further suggestive of generally greatest salience for monetary cues. In addition, left posterior insula activation was found to be greater for neutral cues as compared to smoking and monetary cues. While the anterior insula is the primary region associated with interoceptive processing (Craig et al., 2002; Critchley et al., 2005) and the experience of craving for tobacco (and other drugs of abuse) in response to associated cues (Englemann et al., 2012; Versace et al., 2011), the posterior insula is implicated in processing aversion (Samanesz-Larkin et al., 2008). Thus, it appears left posterior insula activation may have reflected diminished aversion to the reward cues. Notably, this study's finding of less activation to both classes of reward cues in the posterior insula is consistent with previous research that identified reduced activation in the posterior insula to drug imagery as compared to neutral imagery (Kilts et al., 2001).

A second profile of considerable interest was significantly different bilateral activation in the IFG, which was selectively more active in response to money cues relative to both tobacco and neutral cues. The right IFG has been implicated in tasks of behavioral inhibition, such as Go/NoGo (Aron, Robbins, & Poldrack, 2014), as well as in some studies of tobacco (and general drug) cue reactivity (Chase et al., 2011; Due et al., 2002). Reactivity

to tobacco cues in the left IFG has been positively associated with abstinence-induced (24-hours of abstinence) increases in craving (McClernon et al., 2005). In a recent study, right IFG was recruited in response to important cues, regardless of whether response inhibition was subsequently executed (Hampshire, Chamberlain, Monti, Duncan, & Owen, 2010). Based on this, it appears that the IFG plays an important role in attentional allocation to motivationally relevant environmental stimuli and, in this study, monetary cues were the most salient to the participants.

Contrary to our predictions, we did not identify brain regions that were recruited specifically in response to smoking stimuli. Indeed, in no instance did tobacco cues elicit significantly more activation than money cues. One possibility for this finding is that the competing salience of a highly valued alternative reinforcer (i.e., money) may have reduced the salience of tobacco cues. Importantly, the majority of the smokers in the present sample were of relatively low income, thus, the incentive salience of money for these individuals would be expected to be very high. This is also supported by the high subjective desire for money both in absolute terms (~90% of scale maximum) and in comparison to cigarettes. Therefore, diminished reward reactivity to smoking cues may have been due to comparatively lower desirability than the monetary stimuli. This may also explain why these findings differ from typical paradigms where tobacco cues are exclusively contrasted with neutral cues (Engelmann et al., 2012; Kuhn & Gallinat, 2011).

The current study should be evaluated in the context of its strengths and weaknesses. Positive aspects of the study were its sample size, the use of both traditional and active control stimuli, and close matching of stimuli in category triplets. However, the sample was moderate in terms of nicotine dependence and all participants were male, which may limit generalizability to more severely-dependent smokers and females. With regard to this latter point, given previous evidence of gender differences in tobacco cue reactivity (Field & Duka, 2004; McClernon et al., 2008; Niaura et al., 1998), the generalizability of these findings to females is particularly unclear and future studies systematically investigating differences in brain activity between males and females are warranted. In addition, the participants were only mildly deprived of nicotine and it may be that the incentive salience of tobacco cues is most clearly observed under conditions of more substantial deprivation (Engelmann et al., 2012). A related point is that despite controlling the length of nicotine deprivation in participants, we did not systematically track subjective craving or physiological levels of nicotine immediately prior to the scan. Also noteworthy is that the cue reactivity paradigm did not include rest blocks between conditions, which may have been suboptimal for separating differential patterns of activation. Although this concern is mitigated by the use of 3Ddeconvolve to model the hemodynamic response accurately, the number of volumes obtained by stimulus category, and the counterbalancing of conditions to equalize order effects across conditions and optimize differences, it may be possible for even higher resolution perspectives on differential activation with extended interleaved rest periods. Finally, it is worth noting that the participants were all non-treatment-seeking individuals and it may be that unique neural profiles are evident among smokers who actively want to change their behavior (Chase et al., 2011).

In summary, the current study revealed that both cigarette and monetary cues elicit significantly greater activity in the ventral striatum, but monetary cues also elicited activity in a number of other brain regions that suggested greater salience. The commodity effects observed here provide evidence that the presentation of multiple classes of rewarding stimuli may affect neural responses differently than when rewarding stimuli are presented alone. In other words, clarifying differential reactions to tobacco cues inherently requires other stimuli for comparison, but, equally, active control stimuli have their own properties that will be differentially relevant to participants. Although the study was limited in identification of tobacco-specific regions of interest, these findings suggest that monetary cues may have acutely diminished interest in tobacco cues in nicotine deprived smokers, however, future study of this relationship is warranted to definitively ascertain whether this is the case. Although conjecture, the enduring salience of monetary rewards may explain the success of contingency management in the treatment of substance use disorders, including nicotine dependence (Prendergast, Podus, Finney, Greenwell, & Roll, 2006). Indeed, given promising recent findings using neuroimaging to predict smoking cessation response (Janes et al., 2010), it is possible that neural reactivity to monetary cues could predict contingency management intervention outcomes. That is, of course, an empirical question. More broadly, the current study reveals the need for further work characterizing and contextualizing the neural basis for the incentive salience for tobacco and other psychoactive drugs.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This project was partially supported by the National Institutes of Health (P30 DA027827, K23 AA016936, T32 AA013526, and R21 DA031269), the University of Georgia Research Foundation, and the John & Mary Franklin Foundation. The sponsors played no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, interpretation, or manuscript preparation. The authors affirm that they have no conflicts of interest with regard to these findings. The authors are grateful to Research Assistants of the Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology Laboratory at the University of Georgia for their contributions.

References

- Acker J, MacKillop J. Behavioral economic analysis of Cue-elicited Craving for tobacco: a virtual reality study. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2013; 15(8):1409–1416. doi: 10.1093/ntr/nts341. [PubMed: 23322768]
- American Society of Addiction Medicine. Public Policy Statement on Nicotine Dependence and Tobacco. American Society of Addiction Medicine; Chevy Chase (MD): 2010.
- Amlung M, Sweet LH, Acker J, Brown CL, MacKillop J. Dissociable brain signatures of choice conflict and immediate reward preferences in alcohol use disorders. *Addiction Biology*. 2012 doi: 10.1111/adb.12017.
- Aron AR, Robbins TW, Poldrack RA. Inhibition and the right inferior frontal cortex: one decade on. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2014; 18(4):177–185. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2013.12.003. [PubMed: 24440116]
- Aron AR, Robbins TW, Poldrack RA. Inhibition and the right inferior frontal cortex. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2004; 8(4):170–177. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2004.02.010. [PubMed: 15050513]
- Ballard K, Knutson B. Dissociable neural representations of future reward magnitude and delay during temporal discounting. *Neuroimage*. 2009; 45(1):143–150. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.11.004. [PubMed: 19071223]

- Berridge KC, Robinson TE, Aldridge JW. Dissecting components of reward: 'liking', 'wanting', and learning. *Current Opinion in Pharmacology*. 2009; 9(1):65–73. doi: 10.1016/j.coph.2008.12.014. [PubMed: 19162544]
- Cardinal RN, Parkinson JA, Hall J, Everitt BJ. Emotion and motivation: the role of the amygdala, ventral striatum, and prefrontal cortex. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2002; 26(3):321–352. doi: 10.1016/S0149-7634(02)00007-6. [PubMed: 12034134]
- Carter BL, Tiffany ST. Meta-analysis of cue-reactivity in addiction research. *Addiction*. 1999; 94(3):327–340. doi:10.1046/j.1360-0443.1999.9433273.x. [PubMed: 10605857]
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Quitting smoking among adults—United States, 2001–2010. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2011; 60(44):1513–1519. [PubMed: 22071589]
- Chase HW, Eickhoff SB, Laird AR, Hogarth L. The neural basis of drug stimulus processing and craving: an activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2011; 70(8):785–793. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2011.05.025. [PubMed: 21757184]
- Conklin CA, Perkins KA, Robin N, McClernon FJ, Salkeld RP. Bringing the real world into the laboratory: personal smoking and nonsmoking environments. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2010; 111(1):58–63. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2010.03.017. [PubMed: 20510552]
- Conklin CA, Salkeld RP, Perkins KA, Robin N. Do People serve as Cues to smoke?. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2013; 15(12):2081–2087. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntt104. [PubMed: 23873978]
- Cox RW. AFNI: software for analysis and visualization of functional magnetic resonance neuroimages. *Computers and Biomedical Research*. 1996; 29(3):162–173. doi:10.1006/cbmr.1996.0014. [PubMed: 8812068]
- Craig AD. How do you feel? Interoception: the sense of the physiological condition of the body. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2002; 3(8):655–666.
- Critchley HD. Neural mechanisms of autonomic, affective, and cognitive integration. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*. 2005; 493(1):154–166. doi: 10.1002/cne.20749. [PubMed: 16254997]
- David SP, Munafò MR, Johansen-Berg H, Smith SM, Rogers RD, Matthews PM, Walton RT. Ventral striatum/nucleus accumbens activation to smoking-related pictorial cues in smokers and nonsmokers: A functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2005; 58(6):488–494. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2005.04.028. [PubMed: 16023086]
- Due DL, Huettel SA, Hall WG, Rubin DC. Activation in mesolimbic and visuospatial neural circuits elicited by smoking cues: Evidence from functional magnetic resonance imaging. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2002; 159(6):954–960. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.159.6.954. [PubMed: 12042183]
- Engelmann JM, Versace F, Robinson JD, Minnix JA, Lam CY, Cinciripini PM. Neural substrates of smoking cue reactivity: A meta-analysis of fMRI studies. *Neuroimage*. 2012; 60(1):252–262. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.12.024. [PubMed: 22206965]
- Field M, Duka T. Cue reactivity in smokers: the effects of perceived cigarette availability and gender. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior*. 2004; 78(3):647–652. doi: 10.1016/j.pbb.2004.03.026.
- Franklin TR, Wang Z, Wang J, Sciortino N, Harper D, Li Y, Childress A. Limbic activation to cigarette smoking cues independent of nicotine withdrawal: A perfusion fMRI study. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2007; 32(11):2301–2309. doi: 10.1038/sj.npp.1301371. [PubMed: 17375140]
- Goldstein RZ, Volkow ND. Drug addiction and its underlying neurobiological basis: Neuroimaging evidence for the involvement of the frontal cortex. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*. 2002; 159(10):1642–1652. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.159.10.1642. [PubMed: 12359667]
- Hamann S, Herman RA, Nolan CL, Wallen K. Men and women differ in amygdala response to visual sexual stimuli. *Nature Neuroscience*. 2004; 7(4):411–416. doi: 10.1038/nn1208.
- Hampshire A, Chamberlain SR, Monti MM, Duncan J, Owen AM. The role of the right inferior frontal gyrus: inhibition and attentional control. *NeuroImage*. 2010; 50(3):1313–1319. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.12.109. [PubMed: 20056157]
- Heatherton TF, Kozlowski LT, Frecker RC, Fagerström K. The Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence: A revision of the Fagerström Tolerance Questionnaire. *British Journal of Addiction*. 1991; 86(9):1119–1127. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.1991.tb01879.x. [PubMed: 1932883]

- Janes AC, Pizzagalli DA, Richardt S, Frederick BB, Chuzy S, Pachas G, Kaufman MJ. Brain reactivity to smoking cues prior to smoking cessation predicts ability to maintain tobacco abstinence. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2010; 67(8):722–729. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.12.034. [PubMed: 20172508]
- Jentsch J, Taylor JR. Impulsivity resulting from frontostriatal dysfunction in drug abuse: Implications for the control of behavior by reward-related stimuli. *Psychopharmacology*. 1999; 146(4):373–390. doi: 10.1007/PL00005483. [PubMed: 10550488]
- Kilts CD, Schweitzer JB, Quinn CK, Gross RE, Faber TL, Muhammad F, Drexler KP. Neural activity related to drug craving in cocaine addiction. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2001; 58(4):334–341. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.58.4.334. [PubMed: 11296093]
- Kühn S, Gallinat J. Common biology of craving across legal and illegal drugs—A quantitative meta-analysis of cue-reactivity brain response. *European Journal of Neuroscience*. 2011; 33(7):1318–1326. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2010.07590.x. [PubMed: 21261758]
- Lang PJ, Bradley MM, Fitzsimmons JR, Cuthbert BN, Scott JD, Moulder B, Nangia V. Emotional arousal and activation of the visual cortex: An fMRI analysis. *Psychophysiology*. 1998; 35(2):199–210. doi: 10.1017/S0048577298001991. [PubMed: 9529946]
- Le Foll B, Goldberg SR. Nicotine as a typical drug of abuse in experimental animals and humans. *Psychopharmacology*. 2006; 184(3-4):367–381. doi: 10.1007/s00213-005-0155-8. [PubMed: 16205918]
- LeSage MG, Burroughs D, Dufek M, Keyler DE, Pentel PR. Reinstatement of nicotine self-administration in rats by presentation of nicotine-paired stimuli, but not nicotine priming. *Pharmacology, Biochemistry and Behavior*. 2004; 79:507, 513. doi: 10.1016/j.pbb.2004.09.002.
- Lubman DI, Yücel M, Pantelis C. Addiction, a condition of compulsive behaviour? Neuroimaging and neuropsychological evidence of inhibitory dysregulation. *Addiction*. 2004; 99(12):1491–1502. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2004.00808.x. [PubMed: 15585037]
- MacKillop J, Amlung MT, Wier LM, David SP, Ray LA, Bickel WK, Sweet LH. The neuroeconomics of nicotine dependence: A preliminary functional magnetic resonance imaging study of delay discounting of monetary and cigarette rewards in smokers. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*. 2012; 202(1):20–29. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2011.10.003.
- MacKillop J, Lisman SA. Reactivity to alcohol cues: isolating the role of perceived availability. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*. 2005; 13(3):229–237. doi: 10.1037/1064-1297.13.3.229. [PubMed: 16173886]
- MacKillop J, O'Hagen S, Lisman SA, Murphy JG, Ray LA, Tidey JW, Monti PM. Behavioral economic analysis of cue-elicited craving for alcohol. *Addiction*. 2010; 105(9):1599–1607. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2010.03004.x. [PubMed: 20626376]
- McBride D, Barrett SP, Kelly JT, Aw A, Dagher A. Effects of expectancy and abstinence on the neural response to smoking cues in cigarette smokers: an fMRI study. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2006; 31(12):2728–2738. doi: 10.1038/sj.npp.1301075. [PubMed: 16598192]
- McClellon F, Hiott F, Huettel SA, Rose JE. Abstinence-induced changes in self-report craving correlate with event-related fMRI responses to smoking cues. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2005; 30(10):1940–1947. doi: 10.1038/sj.npp.1300780. [PubMed: 15920499]
- McClellon FJ, Hutchison KE, Rose JE, Kozink RV. DRD4 VNTR polymorphism is associated with transient fMRI-BOLD responses to smoking cues. *Psychopharmacology*. 2007; 194(4):433–441. doi: 10.1007/s00213-007-0860-6. [PubMed: 17611740]
- McClellon FJ, Kozink RV, Rose JE. Individual differences in nicotine dependence, withdrawal symptoms, and sex predict transient fMRI-BOLD responses to smoking cues. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2008; 33(9):2148–2157. doi: 10.1038/sj.npp.1301618. [PubMed: 17987060]
- Naqvi NH, Rudrauf D, Damasio H, Bechara A. Damage to the insula disrupts addiction to cigarette smoking. *Science*. 2007; 315(5811):531–534. doi: 10.1126/science.1135926. [PubMed: 17255515]
- National Institute on Drug Abuse. Research Report Series: Tobacco Addiction. National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Drug Abuse; Bethesda (MD): 2009.

- Niaura R, Shadel WG, Abrams DB, Monti PM, Rohsenow DJ, Sirota A. Individual differences in cue reactivity among smokers trying to quit: effects of gender and cue type. *Addictive Behaviors*. 1998; 23(2):209–224. doi: 10.1016/S0306-4603(97)00043-9. [PubMed: 9573425]
- Olausson P, Jentsch JD, Taylor JR. Repeated nicotine exposure enhances reward-related learning in the rat. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2003; 28(7):1265–1272. doi: 10.1038/sj.npp.1300173.
- Parkinson JA, Olmstead MC, Burns LH, Robbins TW, Everitt BJ. Dissociation in effects of lesions of the nucleus accumbens core and shell on appetitive pavlovian approach behavior and the potentiation of conditioned reinforcement and locomotor activity by d-amphetamine. *The Journal of Neuroscience*. 1999; 19(6):2401–2411. [PubMed: 10066290]
- Payne B, McClernon F, Dobbins IG. Automatic affective responses to smoking cues. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*. 2007; 15(4):400–409. doi: 10.1037/1064-1297.15.4.400. [PubMed: 17696687]
- Phillips ML, Drevets WC, Rauch SL, Lane R. Neurobiology of emotion perception I: The neural basis of normal emotion perception. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2003; 54(5):504–514. doi: 10.1016/S0006-3223(03)00168-9. [PubMed: 12946879]
- Prendergast M, Podus D, Finney J, Greenwell L, Roll J. Contingency management for treatment of substance use disorders: A meta-analysis. *Addiction*. 2006; 101(11):1546–1560. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2006.01581.x. [PubMed: 17034434]
- Robbins SJ, Ehrman RN, Childress AR, O'Brien CP. Comparing levels of cocaine cue reactivity in male and female outpatients. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 1999; 53(3):223–230. doi: 10.1016/S0376-8716(98)00135-5. [PubMed: 10080048]
- Robinson TE, Berridge KC. The neural basis of drug craving: An incentive-sensitization theory of addiction. *Brain Research Reviews*. 1993; 18(3):247–291. doi: 10.1016/0165-0173(93)90013-P. [PubMed: 8401595]
- Saad ZS, Glen DR, Chen G, Beauchamp MS, Desai R, Cox RW. A new method for improving functional-to-structural MRI alignment using local Pearson correlation. *Neuroimage*. 2009; 44(3):839–848. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.09.037. [PubMed: 18976717]
- Sabatinelli D, Flaisch T, Bradley MM, Fitzsimmons JR, Lang PJ. Affective picture perception: Gender differences in visual cortex?. *Neuroreport*. 2004; 15(7):1109–1112. doi: 10.1097/00001756-200405190-0000. [PubMed: 15129155]
- Samanez-Larkin GR, Hollon NG, Carstensen LL, Knutson B. Individual differences in insular sensitivity during loss anticipation predict avoidance learning. *Psychological Science*. 2008; 19(4):320–323. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02087.x. [PubMed: 18399882]
- Smolka MN, Bühler M, Klein S, Zimmermann U, Mann K, Heinz A, Braus DF. Severity of nicotine dependence modulates cue-induced brain activity in regions involved in motor preparation and imagery. *Psychopharmacology*. 2006; 184(3-4):577–588. doi: 10.1007/s00213-005-0080-x. [PubMed: 16133128]
- Sweet LH, Mulligan RC, Finnerty CE, Jerskey BA, David SP, Cohen RA, Niaura RS. Effects of nicotine withdrawal on verbal working memory and associated brain response. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*. 2010; 183(1):69–74. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2010.04.014.
- Talairach, J.; Tournoux, P. Co-planar stereotaxic atlas of the human brain: 3-Dimensional proportional system: An approach to cerebral imaging. Theme Medical Publishers; New York: 1988.
- Thewissen R, Havermans RC, Geschwind N, van den Hout M, Jansen A. Pavlovian conditioning of an approach bias in low-dependent smokers. *Psychopharmacology*. 2007; 194(1):33–39. doi: 10.1007/s00213-007-0819-7. [PubMed: 17520241]
- Tiffany ST, Cox LS, Elash CA. Effects of transdermal nicotine patches on abstinence-induced and cue-elicited craving in cigarette smokers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2000; 68(2):233–240. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.68.2.233. [PubMed: 10780123]
- Versace F, Engelmann JM, Jackson EF, Costa VD, Robinson JD, Lam CY, Cinciripini PM. Do brain responses to emotional images and cigarette cues differ? An fMRI study in smokers. *European Journal of Neuroscience*. 2011; 34(12):2054–2063. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-9568.2011.07915.x. [PubMed: 22097928]
- Ward, D. Simultaneous Inference for fMRI Data. Medical College of Wisconsin; Milwaukee, WI: 2000.

- Ward, D. Deconvolution Analysis of fMRI Time Series Data. Medical College of Wisconsin; Milwaukee, WI: 2002.
- Wilson SJ, Sayette MA, Delgado MR, Fiez JA. Instructed smoking expectancy modulates cue-elicited neural activity: a preliminary study. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2005; 7(4):637–645. doi: 10.1080/14622200500185520. [PubMed: 16085533]
- Winkler MH, Weyers P, Mucha RF, Stippekohl B, Stark R, Pauli P. Conditioned cues for smoking elicit preparatory responses in healthy smokers. *Psychopharmacology*. 2011; 213(4):781–789. doi: 10.1007/s00213-010-2033-2. [PubMed: 20953588]
- World Health Organization. WHO report on the global tobacco epidemic, 2011: warning about the dangers of tobacco. World Health Organization Press; Geneva, Switzerland: 2011.

Highlights

- We sought to clarify neural representations of tobacco reward value using fMRI.
- We examined brain activity in response to tobacco, neutral, and monetary stimuli.
- Tobacco and monetary stimuli both elicited activity in a key brain reward region.
- Based on other patterns of activation, monetary cues appeared to be most salient.
- The presence of money cues may overshadow the reward value of drug cues.

Panel A		
Cigarette Stimuli	Money Stimuli	Neutral Stimuli

<i>Single Cigarette</i>	Example Triplet #1 <i>Single Unit of Money</i>	<i>Single Pen</i>

<i>Hand Holding Cigarette</i>	Example Triplet #2 <i>Hand Holding Money</i>	<i>Hand Holding Pen</i>

<i>Hand with Pack of Cigarettes</i>	Example Triplet #3 <i>Hand with Wad of Money</i>	<i>Hand with Pens</i>

B **Figure 1.**

Sample matched stimuli used within the cue reactivity paradigm (Panel A) and schematic of the cue-reactivity paradigm (Panel B). For Panel A, the images are three of the matched triplets used in the paradigm. In total, participants were shown 32 unique images of each cue type. For Panel B, eight images of varying complexity were presented for each category per block (3s each).

Figure 2. Subjective ratings of desire for tobacco and money before and after the cue reactivity run. * = significantly different subjective rating for tobacco between pre- and post-cue exposure ($p < .05$). # = significantly greater subjective rating for money than for tobacco within condition ($p < .05$). The error bars denote standard error.

Figure 3.

Significantly discriminating reward cue reactivity in the left ventral striatum. The *a priori* left ventral striatum is depicted in the adjacent image, which is in radiological conventions (R=L; see Table 1 for coordinates). * = significantly less BOLD signal to neutral cues than tobacco and money cues ($p < .05$). The error bars denote standard error.

Figure 4.

Empirical ROI analyses significantly discriminating by cue type. Corresponding ROIs are depicted sequentially in axial slices and are presented in radiological convention (R=L; coordinates depicted in Table 2). * = denotes statistically significant differences in BOLD signal between the specified cue type and the other two cue types ($p < .05$).

Table 1

Omnibus effects and pairwise contrasts for a priori ROIs by cue type.

Region (side; Brodmann area)	X	Y	Z	<i>F</i> (2,44)	<i>p</i>	Tobacco vs. Money <i>p</i>	Tobacco vs. Neutral <i>p</i>	Money vs. Neutral <i>p</i>
Ventral Striatum (L)	−6	4	−4	5.48	0.006	0.85	0.006	0.008
Ventral Striatum (R)	5	5	−5	1.81	0.17	---	---	---
ACC (L; 32)	−4	41	7	0.20	0.82	---	---	---
ACC (L; 32/24)	−5	30	21	1.07	0.35	---	---	---
Amygdala (L)	−19	−5	−15	1.41	0.25	---	---	---

Note. L = Left; R = Right. ACC = anterior cingulate cortex. All spheres were 4 mm-radius (268 mm³). X, Y, and Z coordinates correspond to Talairach space.

Table 2

Omnibus effects and pairwise contrasts for discriminating empirical regions of interest (ROI) by cue type. Contrasts were only conducted on disjunction mask ROIs that surpassed a Bonferroni-corrected significance threshold of $p < .001$.

Extent mm ³	Region (side)	X	Y	Z	<i>F</i> (2,41)	<i>p</i>	Tobacco vs. Money <i>p</i>	Tobacco vs. Neutral <i>p</i>	Money vs. Neutral <i>p</i>
79276	Cuneus (BL)	3	-73	0	23.79	7.1×10^{-9}	$2.0 \times 10^{-8}_m$	0.02 _n	0.0002 _m
4845	Posterior Insula (L)	-43	-12	16	7.41	0.001	0.24	0.0003 _n	0.02 _n
1544	IFG (L)	-44	8	30	10.39	9.5×10^{-5}	$4.4 \times 10^{-5}_m$	0.003 _n	0.19
3001	IFG (R)	52	30	14	11.31	4.6×10^{-5}	0.0005 _m	0.73	$5.4 \times 10^{-5}_m$
1115	IFG (R)	47	4	30	24.63	4.2×10^{-9}	$2.2 \times 10^{-5}_m$	0.10	$4.5 \times 10^{-8}_m$

Note. IFG = inferior frontal gyrus; L = Left; R = Right; BL = bilateral; X, Y, and Z coordinates correspond to Talairach space. ^m = Monetary cues elicited significantly greater activation; ⁿ = Neutral cues elicited significantly greater activation.