Published in final edited form as:

Neuroimage. 2017 May 01; 151: 14–23. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.12.076.

Orbitofrontal cortex connectivity as a mechanism of adolescent behavior change

Sarah W. Feldstein Ewing^{a,*}, Tammy Chung^b, Justin D. Caouette^a, Arielle Ketcherside^c, Karen A. Hudson^a, and Francesca M. Filbey^c

^aOregon Health & Science University, Department of Psychiatry, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Rd., M/C DC7P, Portland, OR 97239

^bUniversity of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Departments of Psychiatry and Psychology, 3811 O'Hara St., Pittsburgh, PA 15213

^cCenter for BrainHealth, School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, The University of Texas at Dallas, 2200 West Mockingbird Lane, Dallas, TX 75235, USA

Abstract

An increasing number of studies have implicated network functional connectivity with addiction. Yet, none have examined functional connectivity as a potential mechanism of adolescent behavior change. We examined the underlying neural mechanisms of a promising treatment for adolescents, motivational interviewing (MI). We began by employing psychophysiological interaction (PPI) to evaluate network response in a sample of adolescent cannabis users ($N = 30$). Next, we examined correlations between network connectivity and clinical metrics of treatment outcome. PPI analyses seeded on the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) showed significant increases in functional connectivity across the inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), precentral gyrus, anterior and posterior cingulate gyrus, supplementary motor area (SMA), superior frontal gyrus, pallidus, caudate, and parahippocampal gyrus. Further, greater functional connectivity between the OFC and anterior cingulate/medial frontal gyrus was associated with less behavior change (e.g., greater post-treatment cannabis problems). These data support the role of the OFC network as a mechanism of adolescent addiction treatment response.

Keywords

orbitofrontal cortex; cannabis; alcohol; psychophysiological interaction; conjunction analysis; treatment

*Corresponding author: Sarah W. Feldstein Ewing, PhD, Professor, Oregon Health & Science University, Department of Psychiatry, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Rd., M/C DC7P, Portland, OR, 97239, USA.

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.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors have no competing financial or other conflicts of interest relating to the data included in the manuscript.

Introduction

Cannabis and alcohol are two of the most widely abused substances among adolescents. Though it remains to be seen whether newly instantiated changes in United States (U.S.) cannabis legislation will cause rates of adolescent misuse to escalate ¹, rates of daily cannabis use have steadily been on the rise for youth ². By the start of high school, 26% of U.S. youth have used cannabis, a proportion that increases to 50% by graduation ². Similarly, most adolescents experiment with alcohol during the high school years, with 51% reporting drinking alcohol at least one time by the time they start high school, a percent that rises to 73% by senior year ². These levels of use are consequential, as cannabis and alcohol use are a key contributor to accidents and injuries, the number one source of morbidity and mortality for this age group ³. Notably, most adolescents see little connection between their substance use and substance-related problems ⁴⁻⁶.

Motivational interviewing is an addiction treatment focused on catalyzing and enhancing an individual's intrinsic motivation and movement toward behavior change⁷; this is one reason why it represents a particularly good fit with non-treatment seeking youth ⁸⁻¹⁰. MI is one of the strongest evidence-based treatments for adolescent cannabis and alcohol use (SAMHSA; <http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/>), and clinically, it is well received by adolescents ^{11,12}. A single session of MI generates observable behavior change, with weighted effect sizes approaching $d = 0.8$ ($M d = 0.17$), and the strongest effect sizes observed within 6 months post-treatment ($d = 0.32$) ¹³.

Contrasting with other types of adolescent addiction treatment ¹⁴, ambivalence is one of the central tenets of the clinical framework of MI ¹⁵. Ambivalence represents a client's experience of simultaneously wanting to make a change while also being reticent to do so. Concretely, within MI, ambivalence is operationalized as client expressions in favor of changing (change talk; CT), which most often co-occur with client expressions in favor of maintaining a target behavior (sustain talk; ST) ⁷ [e.g., "I know I shouldn't drink (CT), but it is so fun!" (ST)]. In practice, therapists must navigate the key challenge of MI: helping clients "resolve" their ambivalence in the direction of behavior change ¹⁶. Therapists can measure their degree of success in this effort by observing clients' in-session increase expressions of "change talk" and in-session decreased expressions of "sustain talk" ⁷.

Yet, much of the knowledge base on MI was generated from samples of treatment-seeking adults who were actively trying to quit drinking (e.g., COMBINE; MATCH; UKATT) ¹⁷⁻¹⁹. In contrast, most youth in addiction treatment are non-treatment-seeking (e.g., "opportunistic" clients ^{20,21}), who arrive at the clinician's office because treatment is either an integrated component of their other medical ^{11,20} or service system care ^{22,23}, or because an adult brought them²⁴. Meta-analytic data on MI with adolescents [(Cohen's $d = 0.17$, 95% CI [.09, .25], $n = 21$) ¹³; (Hedge's $g = .16$; 95% CI [.05, .27], $n = 8$) ²⁵; (Hedge's $g = 0.28$; 95% CI [0.242, 0.323], $n = 37$)] ²⁶ support that youth *still* show positive behavior change after receiving MI, despite limited interest in receiving addiction treatment.

One avenue to understand how adolescents respond to this intervention is to examine the mechanisms of treatment response ¹⁴. Defined by Morgenstern (p. 860; ²⁷), mechanisms

represent “processes occurring within the client” that facilitate or interfere with an individual’s movement toward successful behavior change during treatment. Unfortunately, at this time, examinations of behavioral factors (only) have languished. In addition, numerous studies have tried to isolate behavioral drivers of individual change, but have failed to identify reliable factors upon which to “match” individuals to effective treatment ²⁸.

To strengthen the examination of potential treatment mechanisms, investigators are increasingly integrating basic biological approaches into this field of inquiry ^{29,30}, including MRI ³¹. Compellingly, work within our lab has generated support for this translational approach ³². For example, among our adolescent samples, we have found greater BOLD response for client speech in favor of reducing substance use (change talk) relative to client speech in favor of continuing to use (sustain talk) ³³. Our lab and others’ have found support for several regions in successful behavior change, including the precuneus, middle and superior frontal gyrus, inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), insula, and posterior cingulate/cingulate gyrus ^{33–35}. While recent reviews have highlighted the extensive network of neural systems that respond to drug cues ³⁶, it is not known how functional networks, or communication between these neural regions, may drive successful treatment response ³².

These are important clinical questions, and highly informative in terms of the less-than-intuitive translation of “bench-to-bedside”, the use of neuroscience data to guide real-world clinical practice ³⁷. Learning how networks within the adolescent brain process clinical elements, and evaluating the predictive validity of those neural network processes is integral in guiding clinicians’ selection of which approaches to use in clinical settings.

Given that prior investigations of adolescent addiction treatment response have primarily focused on regional activation, we sought to expand our investigation to examine functional organization of these systems. Specifically, by generating an empirically-derived seed region, we identified the locus and nature of network cohesion as a relevant mechanism of change in adolescent treatment response. We sought to query the functional connectivity, or temporal correlation, of BOLD response with other relevant regions within the brain during the in-session proxy for adolescent movement on the key clinical construct of ambivalence: client change talk. To determine the association between network connectivity and adolescent treatment response, we evaluated the correlation between network connectivity and adolescent post-treatment behavior change. Finally, to determine the degree of generalizability of these networks across other types of adolescent substance abuse, we employed conjunction analysis with a de novo sample of adolescent alcohol abusers. Our aims were thus three-fold: (1) Employ psychophysiological interaction (PPI) analyses to evaluate network response in a large sample of adolescent cannabis users, (2) utilize correlations to evaluate the link between network connectivity and treatment response within this sample, and (3) conduct an exploratory conjunction analysis to assess congruence of these networks across different substances of abuse.

Materials and Methods

1.1 Participants

For this evaluation, 45 unique adolescent substance users (ages 14–19; $n = 30$ in the cannabis sample, and $n = 15$ in the alcohol sample) were recruited through community and/or high-risk (justice) centers in the Southwestern United States^{33,38}. For sample demographics, see Table 1. All adolescents agreed to participate in a translational study aimed at reducing adolescent health risk behavior. Written consent was obtained from participants ages >18 . For youth $<age 18$, adolescents provided written assent and parent/guardian informed consent was obtained via telephone following youth assent. All consent conversations were audio-recorded and logged. Study procedures were conducted with institutional review board approval and with a federal Certificate of Confidentiality.

Inclusion criteria required that youth be current users of alcohol and/or cannabis (defined as > 7 past-month cannabis use episodes for the cannabis sample; > 3 past-month binge-drinking episodes for the alcohol sample), and meet requisite MRI safety criteria³⁹. Youth were excluded if they reported serious medical conditions (e.g., loss of consciousness >5 minutes in the last 6 months, history of brain disease or brain illness), current psychosis, and/or serious psychopathology (as measured by current prescription medications for these disorders).

2.1 Procedure

Adolescents completed a psychosocial assessment, two MI sessions focused on reducing the target substance of abuse (cannabis or alcohol, respectively), an MRI scan that included an fMRI paradigm to assess the neural correlates of client language, and a behavioral follow-up at one month post-treatment. All youth completed the baseline behavioral assessment and the first MI session during their first appointment. One week later, youth completed an MRI scan, immediately followed by their second MI session. One month after the scan session, youth completed their final behavioral follow-up.

All youth completed measures of demographics, substance use, and an MRI scan. In terms of accuracy, recent adolescent studies support the reliability and validity of adolescent self-report in assessing substance use behavior^{40,41}. Adolescents also completed the Timeline Followback (TLFB;⁴²), an interviewer-administered measure that utilizes a calendar format to assess adolescents' quantity and frequency of substance use during the past month. From this measure, we derived past month totals for overall number of cannabis and alcohol use days at each assessment point. For the first sample (cannabis using youth), we employed a clinical metric of treatment response, a 58-item measure evaluating past-month cannabis-related problems (e.g., "Have you had a persistent chest infection or cough?", "Have you driven while stoned?"; CPQ-A;⁴³).

The MI treatment followed a manualized approach⁴⁴. A master's level therapist administered all treatment sessions. The first author, via random audio-recorded session review during weekly supervision, monitored treatment integrity and fidelity. Across both sessions, therapists relied on MI-consistent approaches, including use of complex reflections, open-ended questions, affirmations, accurate empathy, support of youths' self-

efficacy, and efforts to reduce youth resistance. All sessions were audio-recorded to gather requisite statements for the neuroimaging paradigm and to maintain treatment integrity and fidelity.

2.3 fMRI data acquisition

Participants were instructed to abstain from all substance use for a minimum of 24 hours prior to the MRI scan, which was verified by self-report prior to the scan session. Youth were screened for indicators of acute intoxication; no individuals were non-compliant, and no youth needed to be rescheduled. Once comfortable with the MRI procedures, youth were placed into the scanner for a high-resolution structural scan. This scan provided image registration and normalization. We utilized the standard audio volume setting for all participants, which was monitored by our MR technicians. As verified in our post-scan questionnaire, no youth reported difficulties hearing the audio statements within the fMRI paradigm.

MRI images were collected using a 3T Siemens Trio whole body scanner equipped with Sonata gradient subsystem (40 mT/m amplitude, 200 μ s rise time, 100% duty cycle) with a 12-channel coil combined with body coil transmission to achieve greater sensitivity in cortical areas. A high resolution whole brain anatomical MRI scan was also collected with a T1-weighted multi-echo Magnetization Prepared Rapid Gradient Echo or MPRAGE (MEMPR) sequence with the following parameters: TR/TE/TI = 2300/2.74/900 ms, flip angle = 8°, 192 sagittal slices, FOV = 256×256 mm, slab thickness = 176 mm, matrix = 256×256×176, voxel size = 1×1×1 mm, number of echos = 4, pixel bandwidth = 650 Hz. Whole brain fMRI scans were collected using a gradient echo, echoplanar (EPI) sequence with ramp sampling correction using the inter-commissural line (AC-PC) as a reference (TR: 2.0 s, TE: 27ms, α : 70°, matrix size: 64×64, 32 slices, voxel size: 3×3×4 mm for the cannabis study; TR: 2.0 s, TE: 27 ms, flip angle= 75°, matrix size: 64 × 64, 33 slices, voxel size: 3.75 × 3.27 × 4.55 mm for the alcohol study) ventral to the surface of the OFC. A tilting acquisition previously described in Filbey et al.³⁹ was applied to increase the signal-to-noise ratio in the OFC.

Our task (Figure 1) was designed to assess the impact of in-session client statements on brain response. Throughout the past decade, this task has demonstrated the ability to extract relevant regional brain activation during client language across three different age groups (adolescents, young adults, and adults) and across two different substances of abuse (alcohol and cannabis)^{33, 38, 45, 46}. For this task, we extracted 5 client “change talk” statements (CT; “I need to cut back my use”) and 5 client “sustain talk” statements (ST; “I like using - it’s fun!”) from participants’ therapy sessions.

Each type of client statement (change talk; sustain talk) was presented in 4 counterbalanced runs consisting of 10 × 65 second trials (TR 2s/volume; 1 run = 10 trials × 65 seconds/30 TRs per trial = 325 TRs/10 minutes). Across the 4 counterbalanced runs, the subjects were presented with each of the 10 CT and 10 ST trials twice for a total of 40 trials (20 CT and 20 ST). During the presentation of the CT and ST statements, participants were instructed to silently read their visually presented words and listen to their audio-recorded voice. For a single run, each trial started with their 6 second audio clip (recorded from the participant’s

therapy session) with a simultaneous visual presentation (seeing the written words) of their CT or ST statement. Statement presentations were then followed by a 4–20 second washout period with a fixation cross on the screen during which no audio was presented. The task was presented using a front projection to a mirror system mounted on the head coil. Stimulus presentations were delivered using E-Prime (cannabis study) and Presentation (alcohol study). The timing of the stimulus presentation was synchronized with trigger pulses from the scanner to ensure precise temporal integration of stimulus presentation and fMRI data acquisition.

Given our interest on the expression of client language as a potential marker of in-session behavior change, all analyses herein focused on the comparison of client language condition relative to baseline. This facilitated a way for us to elucidate how the *brain* responds to this widely accepted mechanism of change in the behavioral treatment literature⁴⁷. The baseline included the washout/fixation period.

2.4 fMRI Data Preprocessing and First-level Analyses

All analyses were performed offline using SPM8 (Wellcome Department of Imaging Neuroscience, London, UK). Before starting statistical analysis, the first six volumes of each EPI run were discarded to allow the MR signal to reach steady state. Pre-processing of these volumes started with motion correction using SPM's realignment module⁴⁸. This was followed by slice timing correction, which corrected for temporal differences in acquisition time of the BOLD signal across slices within each volume. The functional data were then normalized⁴⁹ into the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) standard space using the template provided in SPM. The resultant time series was then smoothed using a 6 mm (FWHM) Gaussian kernel. Also, for each dataset, the anatomical MPRAGE scan was co-registered to the BOLD first dynamic, normalized to MNI space, skull stripped and segmented to yield WM and CSF segments. The average BOLD time series within these segments were extracted using in-house Matlab scripts.

To determine the potential neural mechanisms of client in-session language, we modeled BOLD activation during client language (change talk and sustain talk) in the GLM analysis. All regressors were convolved with a canonical HRF included in SPM8. Ancillary non-target conditions of interest to this study (e.g., cue types and urge rating in the cannabis study, therapist language in the alcohol study) were modeled as nuisance regressors. The mean WM and CSF signal were also included as regressors of no interest in the model. Notably, these conditions did not contribute to baseline activation, and the resultant model fit was optimal.

2.5 fMRI Data Functional Connectivity Analysis

To determine functional connectivity, we performed whole brain psychophysiological interaction (PPI) analyses using the gPPI toolbox⁵⁰ for SPM8. This approach shows how functional connectivity between brain regions is altered as a result of experimental or psychological context, such as following the receipt of psychotherapy or elements of psychotherapy (e.g., client language)⁵¹. In order to maximize potential applicability across both types of in-session client language, we wanted to ensure that we selected a seed region

that would be relevant not just for change talk, but also for sustain talk. Thus, to identify a seed region that was (a) significantly activated for both groups and both conditions of interest, and (b) within the same anatomic region across all subjects, we performed a conjunction analysis over the effects of interest (both client language conditions: change talk vs. baseline; sustain talk vs. baseline; FDR corrected $p < 0.05$)⁵² and in the pooled sample of user groups (cannabis users with alcohol users). This approach generated a common region of activation within the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) for all subjects across conditions; this functional mask for the OFC was then used as the seed region for all PPI analyses (see Supplementary Figures 4, 5, and 6).

For each subject, the first eigenvariate of fMRI signal was extracted from within the OFC seed, temporally filtered, and corrected for non-neuronal components of the design (such as session-specific mean). This time series was deconvolved by the canonical HRF to estimate the time series for the neural activity (the physiological vector). The psychological vector was obtained by encoding the onset and duration of the client language blocks. The physiological and psychological vectors were multiplied to obtain the corresponding PPI vector. Similar psychological and PPI vectors were also obtained for other conditions in the study to improve model fit. The averaged WM and CSF signals were also included in the model. The single subject PPI GLM thus comprised the PPI vectors, the corresponding psychological vectors, and physiological vector, each of which was convolved by the canonical HRF prior to GLM analysis.

2.6 Group-level analyses: Correlation between network connectivity strength and treatment response

To assess whether functional connectivity during change talk events differed as a function of post-treatment behavior change, we examined the associations between PPI estimates and treatment response in our adolescent cannabis-using sample ($n = 30$). Specifically, we correlated the change talk vs. baseline contrast map against the post-treatment measure of cannabis problems. Analysis was restricted within a mask consisting of cortical and subcortical grey matter. In line with other neurodevelopmental and addiction connectivity studies^{53,54}, we corrected for multiple comparisons via SPM's voxel-wise False Discovery Rate (FDR) correction for multiple comparisons at $p < 0.05$ ⁵⁵ and utilized an extent threshold (k) of at least 50 voxels for all analyses. The anatomical localization for all regions of activation was found using the xjview software (<http://www.alivelearn.net/xjview>). For visualization and display of significant activation, the z-maps were overlaid on the MNI template provided within SPM.

All results were examined with the addition of framewise displacement (FD) as a covariate. Mean FD values were very low for both samples ($M = 0.21$ for each sample), as subjects with substantive head movement had already been omitted from analyses prior to the calculation of FD for each subject. In all cases, results with FD as a covariate did not differ from results without the inclusion this covariate. Thus, we retain original results and tables/figures without the inclusion of FD.

2.7 Exploratory conjunction analysis

To test the potentially cross-substance congruence of this network response across different adolescent substances of abuse³⁴, we performed a conjunction analysis to see whether a *de novo* sample of youth with alcohol abuse showed the same activation in the PPI network as the sample of cannabis users. To evaluate the overlap in neural regions of activation, we utilized the same OFC seed region for both groups, and compared PPI maps from this cluster for both groups (see Supplement Figure 6). The conjunction analysis included a total of 45 subjects (30 adolescent cannabis users, 15 adolescent alcohol users).

Due to original study questions, both the cannabis study and the alcohol study included several variables that were not the focus of the current study and were subsequently modeled as nuisance regressors (e.g., cannabis study = cannabis cues, rating period; alcohol study = therapist statements). PPI analyses in the alcohol study paralleled the cannabis study in explicitly modeling change talk (vs. baseline) and sustain talk (vs. baseline) seeded on the functional mask within OFC and regressing out all other vectors.

The single subject PPI GLM now comprised the PPI vectors, the corresponding psychological vectors and physiological vector, each of which was convolved by the canonical HRF prior to GLM analysis. Here as well, all results were similar with the inclusion of FD values as covariates. We also included time derivatives of the HRF in the model to account for any variations in response across subjects. Motion parameters along with averaged WM and CSF signals were also included in the model as regressors of no interest to improve model fit. This approach is in line with recommendations by Power et al.⁵⁶ that caution against decoupling covariates that may be related to the anticipated variables of interest. This is an especially important consideration in young, clinical populations where motion tends to be high.

The connectivity maps from both groups of cannabis and alcohol users were entered into a random effects ANOVA model to look at the degree of conjunction⁵², or overlapping regions of consistent connectivity increases or decreases, with the OFC for both substance abuse populations. As described above, analyses were restricted within a mask consisting of cortical and subcortical grey matter. Significant activations were identified within the mask using SPM's voxel-based FDR corrected $p < 0.05$, $k > 50$ voxels.

Results

3.1 Treatment Response

As observed in Table 1, both groups of adolescents reported heavy use at baseline, as supported by their weekly cannabis use and/or binge drinking. Across both studies, we had excellent retention at 1-month follow-up (97.67% for cannabis sample; 82% for alcohol sample). Consistent with similar studies that have highlighted the challenges in retaining substance using youth⁵⁷, missing youth were unreachable despite repeated staff efforts. Importantly, adolescents in both samples evidenced clinically-significant behavior change for their target substance of abuse from baseline to follow-up, as measured by statistically significant reductions in frequency of use (substance use days for only the target substance of abuse) and a halving of substance-related problems (p 's $< .001$; see Table 1). Notably, the

non-target substances of abuse did not show clinically or statistically significant change from pre-to-post treatment in these studies (e.g., alcohol use did not decrease in the cannabis study; cannabis use did not decrease in the alcohol study), indicating the specificity of the treatment effects to the target substance.

3.2 Functional connectivity and treatment mechanisms: PPI results

In line with recent neurodevelopmental studies in the field of adolescent cannabis use and connectivity^{58–60}, all adolescents in this sample had movement within standard neurodevelopmental limits (<2 mm translation and <2 degrees rotation). Additionally, motion parameters were included as nuisance regressors in the GLM for both activation and PPI analysis. The averaged WM and CSF signal were included as nuisance regressors in the GLM.

For this analysis, we examined OFC network connectivity as a mechanism of behavior change. When examining functional connectivity during change talk vs. baseline, we observed significant increases in functional connectivity between the OFC seed and areas including the IFG, precentral gyrus, anterior and posterior cingulate gyrus, SMA, superior frontal gyrus, pallidus, caudate, and parahippocampal gyrus. We also observed significant decreases in functional connectivity between the OFC seed and several areas including the precuneus, superior/middle frontal gyrus, parahippocampal gyrus, thalamus, inferior parietal lobule, cingulate gyrus. All analyses were FDR corrected $p < 0.05$, $k > 50$. (Table 2a and 2b; Figure 2).

3.3 Functional connectivity and treatment response

To examine how functional connectivity may serve as a mechanism of adolescent behavior change, we examined the correlation between OFC connectivity and post-treatment cannabis problems. We found a significant positive correlation, such that greater connectivity between the OFC and anterior cingulate/medial frontal gyrus was associated with more post-treatment cannabis problems (FDR corrected $p < 0.05$, $k > 50$). There were no negative correlations, or correlations with the regions of decreased connectivity (Table 2c; Figure 3).

3.4 Exploratory conjunction analysis between adolescent cannabis and alcohol users

We also explored how congruent these networks were across youth receiving treatment targeting two different substances of abuse: cannabis vs. alcohol. Networks of functional connectivity were specific to the target substance of abuse discussed during the treatment sessions (cannabis for the cannabis sample; alcohol for the alcohol sample). For substance-specific conversations about changing the target substance of abuse (e.g., change talk), we observed no areas of overlapping connectivity increases or decreases at the chosen threshold (FDR corrected $p < 0.05$; $k > 50$).

3.5 Post hoc examination of the sustain talk condition

Post hoc analyses of the sustain talk condition are detailed in the Supplement. We examined the contrast between change talk and sustain talk for the PPI analysis; no significant regions emerged at our pre-determined level of statistical correction. However, within the conjunction analysis, we did observe significant overlap in functional connectivity between

the adolescent cannabis and alcohol using samples during the sustain talk condition (OFC seed with IFG, SMA, superior frontal gyrus, middle temporal gyrus; see Supplement, Table 4).

Discussion

While studies are increasingly using PPI to evaluate functional connectivity in the brain and its correspondence to addiction^{61–63}, this represents the first published study, to our knowledge, to examine functional connectivity as a mechanism of change in adolescent addiction treatment. Based on foundational behavioral and neuroimaging work, which has identified the importance of client language in adolescents' MI treatment response^{33,64}, we took a three-step approach to identify the extent and location of network connectivity during a key aspect of treatment response (client language in favor of change; change talk), the link between that connectivity and adolescent behavior change, and an exploratory look at the generalizability of those networks across two different adolescent substances of abuse (cannabis and alcohol).

The OFC is a highly relevant region, both within addiction, and across the broader field of psychopathology. For example, recent studies reflect that the OFC may underlie neural sensitivity to cannabis cues⁶⁵ and place individuals at greater risk for a more protracted trajectory of use, particularly when youth begin using at an earlier age⁶⁶. Further, OFC dysregulation appears to be a signature feature across anxiety, OCD, and anorexia nervosa^{67–69}, subsequently indicating its relevance as a marker of neural health, and potentially, a region that may be disrupted during the transition into emergent or more long-standing psychiatric conditions.

In this study, during client statements in favor of change (change talk), we found increased neural cohesion between the OFC seed and a number of regions including the IFG, precentral gyrus, anterior and posterior cingulate gyrus, SMA, superior frontal gyrus, pallidus, caudate, parahippocampal gyrus. We also observed several areas of decreased functional connectivity between the OFC seed and a number of areas, including the precuneus, superior/middle frontal gyrus, parahippocampal gyrus, thalamus, inferior parietal lobule, and cingulate gyrus. We believe that these findings are of high clinical relevance, as they take a substantial step beyond regional activation studies, to support the existence of a cohesive network of neural communication during client language in favor of change. Compellingly, this study offers the first study to actually accrue empirical support for networks that our team had previously hypothesized might be relevant in treatment response in 2011³². More specifically, we proposed that the OFC might co-activate with the IFG, in what we had titled the “executive control network”, to clinically facilitate an individual's movement toward behavior change. In this capacity, we believed that this OFC-based network might underlie an individual's capacity to continue to actually *implement* ideas generated during the treatment session to *real-world* reduction in use.

Interestingly, while sustain talk was not the original focus of this investigation, we also examined areas of regional connectivity for this comparison condition (see Supplement). Here we found that sustain talk was associated with a large area of increased connectivity

between the OFC with regions including the IFG, SMA, superior frontal gyrus, posterior cingulate, pallidus, and caudate. As with change talk, connectivity during sustain talk was also showed a large area of decreased connectivity between the OFC seed and regions including the precuneus, caudate, middle/superior frontal gyrus, thalamus, insula, and SMA. Most simply, these data reflect the substantive OFC network communication during adolescents' processing of both types of clinical, in-session language. Interestingly, when contrasted directly, we found a parallel level of response across both types of client response; in other words, network connectivity was not greater for one type of client statement relative to the other (CT vs. ST). We posit that, for adolescents, comparable, and similarly powered, neural network systems are activated during language in favor of changing, along with language in favor of staying the same. Notably, these two types of client language that have been associated with very different behavioral response within the adult treatment literature; more specifically, client change talk has been associated with positive treatment response (lower substance use post-treatment), whereas client sustain talk has been associated with much poorer treatment outcomes (greater substance use post-treatment) ^{70,71}. We believe that future work must continue to disentangle the nature of neural response during both types of client language in order to understand the strength and pattern of brain response in adolescent addiction treatment, with a particular eye to how network response and post-treatment change may be unique within this developmental period, as compared with other age groups who are more often examined in treatment contexts (e.g., treatment-seeking adults) ³⁷.

In terms of treatment response, OFC connectivity with the anterior cingulate/medial frontal gyrus - during change talk (only) - was significantly correlated with adolescents' behavior change in this study. These results reflect that greater OFC connectivity may be a flag, or indicator, of *more* post-treatment cannabis problems. This is interesting, as it maps onto larger scale studies of cannabis use, where greater OFC connectivity, specifically, has been a distinguishing marker of a much greater risk profile, in terms of protracted use and associated problems ⁶⁶. Further, these data are also in line with a recent meta-analysis in the field of depression, which supported the impact of psychotherapy on similar neural circuits ⁷². Moreover, OFC network systems may not only be responsive to therapy, but potentially modifiable through therapy directly, and/or potentially through an adjunctive venue to enhance brain response to psychotherapy (e.g., neurostimulation) ⁷³. For instance, others have found that not only is ACC response particularly responsive to social reward, with neurofeedback, it can be refined and modulated ⁷⁴.

Interestingly, while we observed a relationship between network connectivity and treatment response for change talk, our supplementary analyses did **not** reflect the same relationship for client language in favor of staying the same (sustain talk). In other words, while the functional connectivity maps for change talk and sustain talk looked similar in terms of strength, direction, and location, *only one* type of client language was significantly associated with post-treatment behavior change: change talk. Clinically – this is a very interesting finding, and one that is highly informative in terms of guiding in-session clinician efforts. In other words, even though these types of language (sustain talk and change talk) may be processed in the adolescent brain similarly, they are highly different in terms of

clinical predictive validity; only change talk was associated with reductions in substance use³⁷. This is a real-world tangible difference that is relevant for clinicians, as it continues to indicate the importance of eliciting and bolstering client statements in favor of change during in-session clinical exchanges³³; these exchanges may be predictive of true, real-world, behavior change.

One additional element that is compelling to consider in this equation is the dyadic and social role of the therapeutic exchange. Emerging studies have suggested that functional coupling between ACC and frontal cortex corresponds with less efficient inhibitory processing⁷⁵. This is relevant because the anterior cingulate has been implicated in social processing, including for cannabis users⁷⁶. Further, the connection between frontal and cingulate cortical regions has also been involved in children's neural processing of feedback from their parents⁷⁷; similar substrates are likely to be involved in clinical, dyadic exchanges with a therapist.

Our final exploratory examination was on the degree of neural overlap with a small, de novo sample of adolescent alcohol users. Importantly, while this comparison was limited by a small sample size, we did not observe any regions of overlapping connectivity for client language about change (change talk). In contrast, in our supplemental exploration, we did observe areas of conjunction during client language about continuing their substance use (sustain talk) across the IFG, SMA, and superior frontal gyrus. While interpretation of these findings must be made with caution due to the very small sample size, these data serve as preliminary indication that within the adolescent brain, processes underlying or driving addiction (such as reasons for using) may be more common across substances of abuse, than potential reasons for changing. In contrast, it is possible that cognition and related connectivity around processing whether/how/why to change substance use, may be substance specific. We will continue to examine these relationships in larger, more fully powered samples to get more definitive answers regarding these thought-provoking possibilities.

In terms of clinical relevance, the next question is how these data may translate to the treatment context. Based on advances in the field of translational "bench-to-bedside" science^{29,31,78}, there are two different avenues through which these data could inform direct care. One is by evaluating the strength of the role of the OFC network as a predictor of treatment response. Emerging studies with adults and adolescents suggest that brain markers may represent more sensitive and powerful metrics of clinical symptoms and behavior change^{31,79}. A second role for the use of neural metrics is to continue to examine different facets of behavior change²⁹. This is still very much at the cutting edge, with an increasing number of studies examining how to integrate neural parameters into clinical trials. However, it is our position that this approach is scientifically savvy; if we can continue to identify which neural mechanisms underlie positive behavior change, we can then take steps to strengthen those treatment elements in our clinical approaches⁸⁰.

Limitations and Conclusions

While there are notable strengths to the current study, including the novel use of in-session client language to better understand brain networks during the psychotherapeutic exchange and their relation to behavior change, the following limitations warrant consideration. First, and most importantly, while advances are being made in this direction, it is still not possible to conduct behavioral interventions in the MRI; an *in vivo*, temporal evaluation of these relationships represents an important next step in understanding these data. Second, the binge drinking sample was a pilot study with a small sample size; we are currently conducting a larger study which will allow us to better parse out auditory and narrative components of the task for added specificity of findings. Replication of the conjunction analysis with this larger sample will help strengthen study findings, and allow for additional exploration into potential age and gender differences in neural networks and treatment response. Third, in line with standard protocols in adolescent addiction treatment studies⁸¹, there was no healthy control group in this study; this is because the sample needed to have adequate levels of substance abuse in order to be able to potentially detect behavior change in post-treatment substance use patterns. In other words, it would not be possible for participants to show behavior change (e.g., reduction in potential substance use) if they began as a non-user. Fourth, while client change talk was the focus of this investigation, we included the results for the sustain talk condition in the supplemental analyses; compellingly, these data support that the relationship between OFC network response for client language and treatment outcomes was specific to change talk only. No relationship was observed between sustain talk and client treatment outcomes. However, future work will examine in greater depth the relationship between change talk vs. sustain talk, in order to disentangle the relationship between treatment elements, neural network response, and treatment outcomes for adolescents. Fifth, we acknowledge that head movement in the scanner during fMRI data acquisition can cause artifacts. Although task-based fMRI data is less systematically affected by very low amplitude head movements, we utilized several strategies to minimize head movement during data collection (e.g., mock scanner motion training, foam padding) as well as approaches to assess data quality and account for motion during processing and analysis (regressing motion estimates and other nuisance regressors). Further, tests of motion correlates did not indicate greater motion during change talk relative to sustain talk; together, our observed effects in the presence of sub-millimeter motion suggests that these significant findings are robust. Finally, we suggest understanding networks of neural response is useful in that it offers a creative and innovative approach to accelerate discovery of critical neural mechanisms. In other words, it is important to consider that one of the critical contributions of this manuscript is that it sets the foundation for those who want to pursue this type of translational research. This is a multi-step approach, which we hope will culminate in generating practical, clinical data to inform and drive behavioral strategies to facilitate positive behavior change for adolescents.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by 1R01AA023658-01 (PI: Feldstein Ewing). The funder had no involvement in any aspect of the study.

References

1. CDC. 2014:1–172.
2. CDC. (ed Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). 2016; 65
3. Heron, M. National Center for Health Statistics). Vol. 62. Hyattsville, MD: 2013.
4. Khan MR, Cleland CM, Scheidell JD, Berger AT. Gender and racial/ethnic differences in patterns of adolescent alcohol use and associations with adolescent and adult illicit drug use. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse*. 2014; 40:213–224. [PubMed: 24766088]
5. Thompson K, Stockwell T, Leadbeater B, Homel J. Association among different measures of alcohol use across adolescence and emerging adulthood. *Addiction*. 2014; 109:894–903. [PubMed: 24467265]
6. Roditis ML, Halpern-Felsher B. Adolescents' Perceptions of Risks and Benefits of Conventional Cigarettes, E-cigarettes, and Marijuana: A Qualitative Analysis. *J Adolesc Health*. 2015
7. Miller, WR., Rollnick, S. *Motivational Interviewing: Helping People Change*. 3rd. Guilford Press; 2013.
8. Peterson PL, Baer JS, Wells EA, Ginzler JA, Garrett SB. Short-term effects of a brief motivational intervention to reduce alcohol and drug risk among homeless adolescents. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2006; 20:254–264. [PubMed: 16938063]
9. McCambridge J, Slym RL, Strang J. Randomized controlled trial of motivational interviewing compared with drug information and advice for early intervention among young cannabis users. *Addiction*. 2008; 103:1809–1818. [PubMed: 18778385]
10. D'Amico EJ, Miles JNV, Stern SA, Meredith LS. Brief motivational interviewing for teens at risk of substance use consequences: A randomized pilot study in a primary care clinic. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 2008; 35:53–61. [PubMed: 18037603]
11. Stern SA, Meredith LS, Gholson J, Gore P, D'Amico EJ. Project CHAT: A brief motivational substance abuse intervention for teens in primary care. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 2007; 32:153–165. [PubMed: 17306724]
12. D'Amico EJ, Osilla KC, Hunter SB. Developing a group motivational interviewing intervention for first-time adolescent offenders at-risk for an alcohol or drug use disorder. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*. 2010; 28:417–436. [PubMed: 21113392]
13. Jensen CD, et al. Effectiveness of motivational interviewing interventions for adolescent substance use behavior change: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2011; 79:433–440. [PubMed: 21728400]
14. Black JJ, Chung T. Mechanisms of change in adolescent substance use treatment: How does treatment work? *Substance Abuse*. 2014; 35:344–351. [PubMed: 24901750]
15. Feldstein Ewing SW, Gaume J, Apodaca TR. Ambivalence: Prerequisite for success in motivational interviewing with adolescents? *Addiction*. 2016
16. Miller WR, Rose GS. Toward a theory of motivational interviewing. *American Psychologist*. 2009; 64:527–537. [PubMed: 19739882]
17. Anton RF, et al. Combined pharmacotherapies and behavioral interventions for alcohol dependence, the COMBINE Study: A randomized control trial. *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2006; 295:2003–2017. [PubMed: 16670409]
18. Project Match Research Group. Matching alcoholism treatments to client heterogeneity: Project MATCH Posttreatment drinking outcomes. *Journal of studies on alcohol*. 1997; 58:7–29. [PubMed: 8979210]
19. UKATT Research Team. Effectiveness of treatment for alcohol problems: Findings of the randomised UK alcohol treatment trial (UKATT). *BMJ*. 2005; 331:541. [PubMed: 16150764]

20. Spirito A, et al. Individual and family motivational interventions for alcohol-positive adolescents treated in an emergency department: results of a randomized clinical trial. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.* 2011; 165:269–274. [PubMed: 21383276]
21. D'Amico EJ, et al. Group motivational interviewing for adolescents: Change talk and alcohol and marijuana outcomes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.* 2015; 83:68–80. [PubMed: 25365779]
22. Stein LA, et al. Motivational interviewing to reduce substance-related consequences: Effects for incarcerated adolescents with depressed mood. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* Epub ahead of print. 2011
23. Walker DD, et al. Randomized controlled trial of motivational enhancement therapy with nontreatment-seeking adolescent cannabis users: A further test of the teen marijuana check-up. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors.* 2011
24. Feldstein Ewing, SW., Walters, S., Baer, JS. *Motivational Interviewing in Groups.* Ingersoll, CC., Wagner, KS., editors. Guilford press; 2013. p. 387-406.
25. Cushing CC, Jensen CD, Miller MB, Leffingwell TR. Meta-Analysis of Motivational Interviewing for Adolescent Health Behavior: Efficacy Beyond Substance Use. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.* 2014
26. Gayes LA, Steele RG. A meta-analysis of motivational interviewing interventions for pediatric health behavior change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.* 2014; 82:521–535. [PubMed: 24547922]
27. Morgenstern J, et al. Motivational interviewing: a pilot test of active ingredients and mechanisms of change. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors.* 2012; 26
28. ProjectMatchResearchGroup. Matching alcoholism treatments to client heterogeneity: treatment main effects matching effects on drinking during treatment. Project MATCH Research Group. *J Stud Alcohol.* 1998; 59:631–639. [PubMed: 9811084]
29. Naqvi NH, Morgenstern J. Cognitive neuroscience approaches to understanding behavior change in alcohol use disorder treatments. *Alcohol Res.* 2015; 37:29–38. [PubMed: 26259087]
30. Berkman ET, Falk EB. Beyond Brain Mapping: Using Neural Measures to Predict Real-World Outcomes. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci.* 2013; 22:45–50. [PubMed: 24478540]
31. Gabrieli JDE, Ghosh SS, Whitfield-Gabrieli S. Prediction as a humanitarian and pragmatic contribution from human cognitive neuroscience. *Neuron.* 2015; 85:11–26. [PubMed: 25569345]
32. Feldstein Ewing SW, Filbey FM, Hendershot CS, McEachern AD, Hutchison KE. A proposed model of the neurobiological mechanisms underlying psychosocial alcohol interventions: The example of motivational interviewing and functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs.* 2011; 72:903–916. [PubMed: 22051204]
33. Feldstein Ewing SW, et al. Integrating brain and behavior: Evaluating adolescents' response to a cannabis intervention. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors.* 2013; 27:510–525. [PubMed: 22925010]
34. Feldstein Ewing SW, et al. The impact of therapists' words on the adolescent brain: In the context of addiction treatment. *Behavioural Brain Research.* 2015
35. Falk EB, Berkman ET, Whalen D, Lieberman MD. Neural activity during health messaging predicts reductions in smoking above and beyond self-report. *Health Psychology.* 2011; 30:177–185. [PubMed: 21261410]
36. Jasinska AJ, Stein EA, Kaiser J, Naumer MJ, Yalachkov Y. Factors modulating neural reactivity to drug cues in addiction: a survey of human neuroimaging studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2014; 38:1–16. [PubMed: 24211373]
37. Feldstein Ewing SW, Tapert SF, Molina BS. Uniting adolescent neuroimaging and treatment research: Recommendations in pursuit of improved integration. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2016; 62:109–114. [PubMed: 26748378]
38. Feldstein Ewing SW, et al. The impact of therapists' words on the adolescent brain: In the context of addiction treatment. *Behav Brain Res.* 2016; 15:359–369.
39. Filbey FM, et al. Exposure to the taste of alcohol elicits activation of the mesocorticolimbic neurocircuitry. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2008; 33:1391–1401. [PubMed: 17653109]

40. Clark DB, Winters KC. Measuring risks and outcomes in substance use disorders prevention research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2002; 70:1207–1223. [PubMed: 12472298]
41. Marlatt GA, et al. Screening and brief intervention for high-risk college student drinkers: Results from a 2-year follow-up assessment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1998; 66:604–615. [PubMed: 9735576]
42. Sobell, LC., Sobell, MB. Measuring alcohol consumption. Litten, RZ., Allen, JP., editors. Humana Press; 1992. p. 73-98.
43. Martin G, Copeland J, Gilmour S, Gates P, Swift W. The Adolescent Cannabis Problems Questionnaire (CPQ-A): Psychometric properties. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2006; 31:2238–2248. [PubMed: 16626880]
44. Feldstein Ewing SW, Bryan AD, Hutchison KE. The Adolescent Substance Use Check-Up: Intervention Manual. 2008
45. Feldstein Ewing SW, Yezhuvath U, Houck JM, Filbey FM. Brain-based origins of change language: A beginning. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2014; 39:1904–1910. [PubMed: 25150658]
46. Feldstein Ewing SW, Filbey FM, Sabbineni A, Hutchison KE. How psychosocial alcohol interventions work: A preliminary look at what fMRI can tell us. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2011; 35:1–9.
47. Miller WR, Moyers TB. The forest and the trees: Relational and specific factors in addiction treatment. *Addiction*. 2014
48. Friston KJ, et al. Analysis of fMRI time-series revisited. *Neuroimage*. 1995; 2:45–53. [PubMed: 9343589]
49. Ashburner J, Friston KJ. Nonlinear spatial normalization using basis functions. *Human Brain Mapping*. 1999; 7:254–266. [PubMed: 10408769]
50. McLaren DG, Ries ML, Xu G, Johnson SC. A generalized form of context-dependent psychophysiological interactions (gPPI): a comparison to standard approaches. *Neuroimage*. 2012; 61:1277–1286. [PubMed: 22484411]
51. Friston KJ, et al. Psychophysiological and modulatory interactions in neuroimaging. *Neuroimage*. 1997; 6:218–229. [PubMed: 9344826]
52. Nichols T, Brett M, Andersson J, Wager T, Poline JB. Valid conjunction inference with the minimum statistic. *NeuroImage*. 2005; 25:653–660. [PubMed: 15808966]
53. Agcaoglu O, Miller R, Mayer AR, Hugdahl K, Calhoun VD. Lateralization of resting state networks and relationship to age and gender. *NeuroImage*. 2015; 104:310–325. [PubMed: 25241084]
54. Thayer RE, et al. Negative and interactive effects of sex, aging, and alcohol abuse on gray matter morphometry. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2016; 37:2276–2292. [PubMed: 26947584]
55. Genovese CR, Lazar NA, Nichols T. Thresholding of statistical maps in functional neuroimaging using the false discovery rate. *Neuroimage*. 2002; 15:870–878. doi:10.1006/nimg.2001.1037 S1053811901910377 [pii]. [PubMed: 11906227]
56. Power JD, Schlaggar BL, Petersen SE. Recent progress and outstanding issues in motion correction in resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage*. 2015; 105:536–551. [PubMed: 25462692]
57. Montanaro E, Feldstein Ewing SW, Bryan AD. What works? An empirical perspective on how to retain youth in longitudinal HIV and substance risk reduction studies. *Substance Abuse*. 2014
58. Lopez-Larson MP, Rogowska J, Yurgelun-Todd D. Aberrant orbitofrontal connectivity in marijuana smoking adolescents. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*. 2015; 16:54–62. [PubMed: 26296778]
59. Dwyer DB, et al. Large-scale brain network dynamics supporting adolescent cognitive control. *J Neurosci*. 2014; 42:14096–14107.
60. Gee DG, et al. A developmental shift from positive to negative connectivity in human amygdala-prefrontal circuitry. *Neuroscience*. 2013; 249:129–138. [PubMed: 23262241]
61. Claus ED, Blaine SK, Filbey FM, Mayer AR, Hutchison KE. Association between nicotine dependence severity, BOLD response to smoking cues, and functional connectivity. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2013; 38:2363–2372. [PubMed: 23708507]

62. Weiland BJ, et al. Accumbens functional connectivity during reward mediates sensation-seeking and alcohol use in high-risk youth. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2013; 128:130–139. [PubMed: 22958950]
63. Filbey FM, Dunlop J. Differential reward network functional connectivity in cannabis dependent and non-dependent users. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence.* 2014
64. Gaume J, et al. Change talk during motivational intervention with young adult males: strength matters. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment.* 2016; 65:58–65. [PubMed: 26947118]
65. Filbey FM, et al. fMRI study of neural sensitization to hedonic stimuli in long-term, daily cannabis users. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2016
66. Filbey FM, et al. Long-term effects of marijuana use on the brain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2014; 25:16913–16918.
67. Cha J, et al. Abnormal reward circuitry in anorexia nervosa: A longitudinal, multi-modal MRI study. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2016
68. Park J, Wood J, Bondi C, De Arco A, Moghaddam B. Anxiety evokes hypofrontality and disrupts rule-relevant encoding by dorsomedial prefrontal cortex neurons. *J Neurosci.* 2016; 36:3322–3335. [PubMed: 26985040]
69. Yang XY, et al. Regional homogeneity of spontaneous brain activity in adult patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder before and after cognitive behavioural therapy. *J Affect Disord.* 2015; 188:243–251. [PubMed: 26378734]
70. Magill M, et al. The technical hypothesis of motivational interviewing: A meta-analysis of MI's key causal model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.* 2014; 82:973–983. [PubMed: 24841862]
71. Moyers TB, Martin T, Houck JM, Christopher PJ, Tonigan JS. From in-session behaviors to drinking outcomes: A causal chain for motivational interviewing. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.* 2009; 77:1113–1124. [PubMed: 19968387]
72. Boccia M, Piccardi L, Guariglia P. How treatment affects the brain: meta-analysis evidence of neural substrates underpinning drug therapy and psychotherapy in major depression. *Brain Imaging and Behavior.* 2016; 10:619–627. [PubMed: 26164169]
73. Ouellet J, et al. Enhancing decision-making and cognitive impulse control with transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) applied over the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC): A randomized and sham-controlled exploratory study. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2015; 69:27–34. [PubMed: 26343591]
74. Mathiak KA, et al. Social reward improves the voluntary control over localized brain activity in fMRI-based neurofeedback training. *Front Behav Neuroscience.* 2015; 9:136.
75. Spielberg JM, et al. Adolescent development of inhibition as a function of SES and gender: Converging evidence from behavior and fMRI. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2015; 36:3194–3203. [PubMed: 26010995]
76. Gilman JM, T CM, Calderon V, Schuster RM, Evins AE. Altered neural processing to social exclusion in young adult marijuana users. *Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging.* 2016; 1:152–159. [PubMed: 26977454]
77. Lee KH, Siegle GJ, Dahl RE, Hooley JM, Silk JS. Neural responses to maternal criticism in healthy youth. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci.* 2015; 10:902–912. [PubMed: 25338632]
78. Allen NB, Dahl RE. Multi-level models of internalizing disorders and translational developmental science: Seeking etiological insights that can inform early intervention strategies. *J Abnorm Child Psychology.* 2015; 43:875–883.
79. Magnan RE, et al. Evaluating an integrative theoretical framework for HIV sexual risk among juvenile justice involved adolescents. *Journal of AIDS & Clinical Research.* 2013; 4
80. Feldstein Ewing SW, Tapert SF, Molina BSG. Uniting adolescent neuroimaging and treatment research: Recommendations in pursuit of improved integration. (in revision).
81. Dennis ML, et al. The Cannabis Youth Treatment (CYT) study: Main findings from two randomized trials. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment.* 2004; 27:197–213. [PubMed: 15501373]

Highlights

1. Functional connectivity has been associated with addiction.
2. We examined functional connectivity as a mechanism of treatment response.
3. We found network cohesion seeded on the OFC.
4. OFC functional connectivity was associated with behavior change.

Duration	6 s	4-20 s
Event	Client statement (Change Talk or Sustain Talk)	Washout (Fixation cross)
Stimuli	Visual and audio	No audio

Figure 1. Task schematic

FIGURE 2. Main Effects

Regions having increased connectivity strength with OFC seed, during change talk compared to baseline (cannabis users, $n=30$). Activations (FDR corrected $p<0.05$, $k>50$) are displayed on contiguous slices of the EPI template. The color bar indicates t range. Orientation: Right=Right.

FIGURE 3. Positive correlation between OFC network connectivity strength and treatment response

Maximum loci of activation between connectivity during change talk (relative to baseline) and post-treatment behavior change for the adolescent cannabis using sample (FDR corrected $p < 0.05$). (a) Activations have been overlaid onto the single subject template. The color bar indicates t values. Orientation: Right=Right. (b) Scatter plot of parameter estimates for connectivity strength between this ROI and the seed region have also been shown.

TABLE 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participating Samples

Variable	Cannabis sample (n = 30) Mean	Alcohol sample (n = 15) Mean
Gender		
Male (n)	25	7
Female (n)	5	8
Race/Ethnicity		
Hispanic American	16	7
Bi/Multi-racial	4	4
Asian American	0	2
Native American	0	1
African American	1	0
Caucasian	9	1
Age (years)	16.09	16.62
Age at first drink (years)	--	13.86
Age at first cannabis use (years)	12.30	--
Baseline past-month drinking days	1.74	4.07
Follow-up past month drinking days	1.76	0.86
Baseline past-month cannabis days	18.33	6.36
Follow-up past month cannabis days	11.05	5.29

TABLE 2
Functional connectivity and treatment mechanisms: PPI results for change talk

Maximum loci of regions that showed change in connectivity with the OFC (seed region) during change talk (relative to baseline) for the adolescent cannabis using sample. Activations have been thresholded at FDR $p < 0.05$, $k > 50$ voxels. R = right; L = left.

# voxels	Localization	t value	x (mm)	y (mm)	z (mm)
(a) Regions of increased connectivity					
1466	L. Inferior frontal gyrus (Pars orbitalis)	11.58	-44	26	-8
	L. Precentral gyrus	8.41	-42	6	50
2467	L. Middle Temporal Gyrus	10.2	-60	-32	-6
	L. Middle Temporal Gyrus	9.22	-52	-36	-2
1379	L. Supplementary motor area	9.38	-4	16	62
	L. Medial superior frontal gyrus	7.27	-8	34	56
1148	R. Middle Temporal Gyrus	7.66	52	-34	2
	R. Superior temporal gyrus	5.96	62	-24	-2
137	R. Inferior Occipital Gyrus	7.06	26	-98	-4
	R. Calcarine gyrus	5.43	18	-96	-4
798	L. Posterior cingulate gyrus	6.5	-6	-50	28
	R. Posterior cingulate gyrus	4.39	2	-48	26
96	L. Inferior occipital gyrus	6.32	-26	-94	-6
350	R. Medial superior frontal gyrus	6.29	8	62	24
193	L. Pallidum	5.36	-18	4	-4
	L. Caudate	3.75	-8	4	4
418	L. Middle temporal pole	5.1	-46	14	-30
	L. Inferior temporal gyrus	4.78	-44	2	-40
140	L. Middle cingulate gyrus	5.04	-2	-16	40
	L. Anterior cingulate gyrus	2.57	-2	-4	30
134	L. Parahippocampal Gyrus	3.96	-16	-14	-14
202	R. Inferior Frontal Gyrus (Pars triangularis)	3.87	52	24	2
	R. Inferior Frontal Gyrus (Pars triangularis)	3.72	58	28	14
68	R. Caudate	3.83	14	10	8

# voxels	Localization	t value	x (mm)	y (mm)	z (mm)
	R. Pallidum	3.79	18	4	-6
112	L. Rectus	3.55	-6	46	-16
	L. Rectus	3.24	-2	38	-20
(b) Regions of decreased connectivity					
1201	R. Middle frontal gyrus	7.12	34	34	40
	R. Superior frontal gyrus	6.01	24	4	68
2604	R. Middle temporal gyrus	6.98	52	-62	2
	R. Precuneus	6.63	10	-58	62
1429	L. Precuneus	6.89	-8	-60	60
	L. Middle temporal gyrus	6.61	-50	-68	6
1230	L. Lingual gyrus	6.39	-16	-78	-8
	L. Parahippocampal gyrus	5.66	-32	-26	-24
551	R. Supramarginal gyrus	5.91	60	-32	30
	R. Postcentral gyrus	4.39	54	-24	52
939	R. Inferior temporal gyrus	5.77	50	-46	-18
	R. Fusiform gyrus	4.44	38	-30	-18
62	R. Superior occipital gyrus	5.47	16	-100	16
61	L. Superior occipital gyrus	5.39	-18	-100	14
83	R. Thalamus	5.27	14	-26	10
52	L. Thalamus	4.91	-14	-30	12
261	L. Supramarginal gyrus	4.9	-62	-30	40
	L. Inferior parietal lobule	3.39	-52	-36	52
55	L. Middle frontal gyrus	4.69	-22	2	68
	L. Superior frontal gyrus	3.88	-22	4	58
158	R. Olfactory gyrus	4.65	4	14	-10
89	L. Middle cingulate gyrus	4.02	-10	4	40
212	L. Middle frontal gyrus	4	-32	36	40
	L. Middle frontal gyrus	3.79	-30	30	32
101	R. Superior temporal pole	3.81	46	6	-12
(c) Correlations between OFC network connectivity strength and treatment response					
87	L. Anterior cingulate gyrus/Medial frontal	6.26	-2	40	26

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

# voxels	Localization	t value	x (mm)	y (mm)	z (mm)
gyrus					
	L. Medial frontal gyrus	5.46	-2	48	30
50	R. Anterior cingulate gyrus	5.88	4	36	24