Published in final edited form as:

Drug Alcohol Depend. 2017 October 01; 179: 275–279. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2017.07.017.

Sex differences in guanfacine effects on stress-induced stroop performance in cocaine dependence

Verica Milivojevic¹, Helen C. Fox², Nitya Jayaram-Lindstrom³, Gretchen Hermes^{1,4}, and Rajita Sinha¹

¹The Yale Stress Center, Yale University School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry 2 Church Street South, Suite 209, New Haven, CT 06519, USA

²Stony Brook University, Health Sciences Center, T10-040B, Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA

³Centre for Psychiatry Research, Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet, and Stockholm Health Care Services, Stockholm County Council, Stockholm, Sweden

⁴APT Foundation, One Long Wharf Drive, New Haven, CT 06511, USA

Abstract

Aims—Chronic drug abuse leads to sex-specific changes in drug cue and stress physiologic and neuroendocrine reactivity as well as in neural responses to stress and cue-related challenges and in executive function such as inhibitory control, cognitive flexibility and self control. Importantly, these functions have been associated with high risk of relapse and treatment. Alpha-2 agonism may enhance inhibitory cognitive processes in the face of stress with sex-specific effects, however this has not been previously assessed in cocaine dependence.

Method—Forty inpatient treatment-seeking cocaine dependent individuals (13F/27M) were randomly assigned to receive either placebo or up to 3mgs of Guanfacine. Three laboratory sessions were conducted following 3–4 weeks of abstinence, where patients were exposed to three 10-min personalized guided imagery conditions (stress, drug cue, combined stress/cue), one per day, on consecutive days in a random, counterbalanced order. The Stroop task was administered at baseline and immediately following imagery exposure.

Results—Guanfacine treated women improved their performance on the Stroop task following exposure to all 3 imagery conditions compared with placebo women ($p=.02$). This improvement in cognitive inhibitory performance was not observed in the men.

Correspondence: Verica Milivojevic, Ph.D., The Yale Stress Center, Yale University School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, 2 Church Street South, Suite 209, New Haven, CT06519, USA, verica.milivojevic@yale.edu.

Contributors

RS developed the study. HCF, NJL and VM analyzed and interpreted data under the guidance of RS. GH provided medical oversight. VM drafted the initial manuscript and all authors provided critical reviews and editing. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript for submission.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no financial conflicts of interest in regard to this research.

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.

Conclusions—Enhancing the ability to cognitively regulate in the face of stress, drug cues and combined stress and drug cue reactivity may be key targets for medications development in cocaine dependent women.

Keywords

cocaine dependence; guanfacine; cognitive inhibitory performance; gender; stress

1.0 Introduction

Cocaine dependence is a serious health problem affecting a large number of the world population. Women are steadily increasing their use of cocaine (SAMHSA, 2013), and somewhat alarmingly are more vulnerable than men to the initiation, progression and relapse stages of cocaine dependence (Anker and Carroll, 2010; Quinones-Jenab, 2006). Chronic drug abuse shows differential neuroadaptations in men and women. For example, sex differences have been observed in physiologic and neuroendocrine response to stress and drug cue (Back et al., 2005; Fox and Sinha, 2009) as well as in neural responses regulatory behaviors including inhibitory control, cognitive flexibility and self control (Moeller et al., 2016; Potenza et al., 2012). Notably, these are all measures that have been associated with high risk of relapse and treatment outcomes (Back et al., 2005; Daughters et al., 2009; Fox and Sinha, 2009; Moeller et al., 2016; Sinha et al., 2006; Van Dam et al., 2014).

Furthermore, while executive functions such as response inhibition and self control are critical for successful clinical outcome and relapse prevention (Aharonovich et al., 2006; Aharonovich et al., 2003), these functions are known to be most compromised under stress and cue reactivity states. As such, inhibitory control may represent an important process contributing to the association between stress and treatment outcome (Schwabe et al., 2011; Sinha, 2001). Despite this, no previous research has assessed whether stress- and cue-related arousal compromise response inhibition during early abstinence from cocaine, or whether pharmacologic agents that improve prefrontal executive function, such as Alpha-2 adrenergic agonists like Guanfacine (Arnsten, 2009; Arnsten and Jin, 2012), may rescue these executive functions in cocaine dependence.

Preclinical research has shown that Alpha-2 adrenergic agonists such as Guanfacine reduce central norepinephrine, improve executive functioning during stress (Arnsten, 2009), and decrease stress-induced reinstatement of drug seeking (Mantsch et al., 2010; Vranjkovic et al., 2012). In nicotine dependent individuals, Alpha-2 adrenergic agonists, such as Clonidine, have been shown to improve smoking cessation outcomes and more so in women than men (Glassman et al., 1993). More recently, we have shown that Guanfacine's ability to strengthen prefrontal function in the face of stress, may play an important role in attenuating motivation for drugs. For example, Guanfacine relative to placebo, improved stress-related self control over smoking in the laboratory and also improved brain prefrontal activation to incongruent stimuli in a Stroop task (McKee et al., 2015). We also previously reported that Guanfacine reduced cue-induced cocaine craving and stress-induced arousal in cocaine dependent individuals and simultaneously increased medial and lateral prefrontal activity following stress and drug cue exposure compared with placebo (Fox et al., 2012). Importantly, Guanfacine also displayed sex-specific effects, showing greater efficacy in

reducing stress arousal in cocaine dependent women than men (Fox et al., 2014). However, it is not known whether Guanfacine improves inhibitory control during stress and arousal states in cocaine dependent individuals and whether such improvements show sex differences. Thus, the current study examined this possible effect in cocaine dependent men and women treated with 2–3mg/day of Guanfacine or matching placebo for 3 weeks in a randomized, double blinded manner as reported on previously (Fox et al., 2014). We hypothesized that Guanfacine would improve stress and cue-induced inhibitory control as measured by the Stroop task, and additionally that improvement would be more robust in women relative to men.

2.0 Methods

2.1 Participants

Forty treatment-seeking cocaine dependent individuals (13F/27M) were recruited from the local area using newspaper and on-line advertisements. Current cocaine dependence was determined using the Structured Clinical Interview for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders IV (SCID IV - First et al., 1995) as well as positive urine toxicology screens collected upon entry into inpatient treatment. Exclusion criteria included DSM-IV dependence for any drug other than cocaine, alcohol or nicotine. Participants using prescribed medications for any psychiatric or medical disorders were also excluded, and all individuals underwent stringent medical assessments including electrocardiography and laboratory tests of renal, hepatic, pancreatic, hematopoietic and thyroid function. Results from the parent study on Guanfacine effects on cue reactivity from this sample are previously published (Fox et al., 2014). Written and verbal consent were obtained from all participants and the procedures were approved by the Human Investigation Committee of the Yale University School of Medicine.

2.2 Guanfacine Dosing

Subjects were randomly assigned to either Guanfacine (2mgs or 3mgs) or placebo in a randomized, double blind manner and five days after inpatient admission were initiated on a twelve-day tapered medication schedule, similar to that used in previous human studies (Biederman et al., 2008; Chappell et al., 1995; Handen et al., 2008; Scahill et al., 2001). As such, participants who were randomized to the dose of Guanfacine 2mg started dosing on days 1–3 (0.5mg evening), on days 4–13 (0.5mg morning and 1.0mg evening), and weeks 2 onwards (1.0mg morning and 1.0mg evening). Participants who were randomized to the dose of Guanfacine 3mg started dosing on days 1–2 (0.5mg evening), on days 3–5 (0.5mg morning and 1.0mg evening), on days 6–8 (1.0mg morning and 1.0mg evening), on days 9–11 (1.0mg morning and 1.5mg evening), and on day 12 onwards (1.5mg morning and 1.5mg evening). Placebo was administered exactly as the Guanfacine group dosing, and all pills appeared identical. All laboratory sessions were conducted in week 4, approximately 21 days after admission. Following the laboratory sessions, and on completion of inpatient stay (5 weeks) all participants underwent a standard 5-day taper (Strang et al., 1999). Randomization procedures were conducted by the Connecticut Mental Health Center (CMHC) research pharmacist, experienced in Urn randomization procedures (Stout et al., 1994).

2.3 Laboratory Sessions

Subjects participated in three laboratory sessions conducted at the Clinical Neuroscience Research Unit (CNRU) of the CMHC in week 3–4 of a 4 week inpatient stay. In the laboratory sessions, participants were exposed to 10-minute personalized stress/stress, drug cue/drug cue and stress/drug cue imagery scripts, one imagery condition per day, across three consecutive days in a randomized and counterbalanced order. Imagery script development procedures are based on methods developed by Lang and his colleagues (Lang et al., 1980; Lang et al., 1983; Miller et al., 1987), and further adapted in our previous studies (Sinha et al., 1999; Sinha et al., 2000; Sinha et al., 1992) Sinha and Parsons, 1996). Procedures are presented in previous studies (Bergquist et al., 2010; Sinha, 2009; Sinha et al., 2006; Sinha et al., 2005; Sinha et al., 2003) and also in a published manual (Sinha and Tuit, 2012). The imagery conditions were: i) stress (5 mins)/stress (5 mins) (2 separate stress scripts), ii) cue (5mins)/cue (5mins) (2 separate drug cue scripts), iii) combined stress (5mins)/cue (5mins) (one stress and one drug cue script).

2.4 Cognitive Inhibitory Performance

Cognitive inhibitory performance was measured using the Stroop Color/Word Test (Golden, 1976), which has been used extensively in both clinical and experimental fields to assess the ability to inhibit incongruent competing conflicts. On the initial trial participants are given 45 seconds to read as quickly as possible a list of 100 color words (red, green, blue) randomly arranged and printed in black ink. On the second trial participants have 45 seconds to identify as quickly as possible the color of 100 “XXXX” printed in either red, green or blue ink. The final trial consists of the 100 words presented in the initial trial in the colors presented in the second trial. In all cases, the word (i.e., red) is different from the color it is printed in (i.e., blue. (e.g., “red”). Subjects are given 45 seconds to name the color of the ink as quickly as possible. The number of raw items read for each trial is recorded and converted to standardized T scores. In the current study, participants practiced the Stroop task during intake assessments, and then completed the Stroop at baseline (pre-imagery) and immediately following imagery period on each experimental day.

2.5 Statistical Analyses

Linear Mixed Effect (LME) models (Laird and Ware, 1982) were implemented to analyze the data, both at baseline and following imagery exposure, using SPSS software (version 19). Within-subjects factors of Imagery Condition (stress/stress, cue/cue, combined stress/cue), Time-point (pre- and post- imagery) and Between-subjects factors of Medication Group (Guanfacine Vs Placebo) and Gender (Males Vs Females) were the fixed effects. Subjects represented the random effect. Baseline data were used as covariates in all analyses in order to account for variability across each testing day. T-tests were used to compare the medication groups on demographic and drug use variables. Chi-squares were applied to all categorical variables including gender and racial distribution across groups.

3.0 Results

3.1 Sample Characteristics

The placebo and Guanfacine groups were statistically matched in terms of demographic and drug use variables (see Table 1).

3.2 Stroop Performance

No significant baseline differences were observed for Stroop Word or Color test performance in terms of either Gender or Medication effects. Thus, the baseline data were used as covariates in order to account for variability across each testing day. Following imagery exposure, a significant Gender x Medication Group interaction [$F(1, 22) = 6.6, p < .02$] was observed on the color/word incongruent component of the Stroop test. Guanfacine treated females significantly improved their Stroop performance compared with placebo treated females after exposure to all imagery conditions ($p = .05$), but this effect was not seen in the males (Figure 1). Moreover, a deficit in cognitive performance was displayed in the placebo females compared with the placebo males following all imagery conditions ($p < .04$), suggesting that cocaine dependent women are particularly vulnerable to impairments in cognitive flexibility and inhibition in the face of stress and cue reactivity.

4.0 Discussion

In this study, we found that women who received Guanfacine displayed improved stress- and cue-related cognitive inhibitory performance on the Stroop task compared with women receiving placebo. These effects were specific to Guanfacine treated women and were not observed in the men. Moreover, placebo treated women showed greater deficits in cognitive flexibility than the placebo treated men, suggesting that these observed robust sex differences in Guanfacine effects on cognitive flexibility and inhibitory control in the face of stress and cue-related arousal may be key targets for medications development in cocaine dependent women.

Findings corroborate the fact that cocaine dependent women show greater mood and anxiety symptoms as compared to men (Rounsaville et al., 1991) and sex differences with increased distraction and cognitive inflexibility have also been previously reported in women relative to men with substance use disorders (SUDs) (Moran-Santa Maria et al., 2016; van der Plas et al., 2009; Volkow et al., 2011; Winhusen and Lewis, 2013). Furthermore, cocaine dependent women show greater cocaine-related adaptations in the autonomic catecholaminergic pathways while men show stress and cue-related adaptations in the hypothalamic-pituitary adrenal (HPA) axis (Back et al., 2005; Fox and Sinha, 2009; Moran-Santa Maria et al., 2016). Moreover, chronic drug abuse alters not only these stress pathways but also has significant effects on stress effects on cognitive function related to central norepinephrine effects on the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) (Arnsten and Jin, 2012; Moran-Santa Maria et al., 2016), and its related modulation of the glutamatergic system in the mPFC that is reversed by alpha-2 adrenoceptor agonists such as Guanfacine. Additionally, in our laboratory we found that Guanfacine treatment reversed the cue reactivity and executive function effects with increased activation in specific regions of the

medial and lateral prefrontal cortex in response to stress and drug cue exposure, as well as increasing insula activation during stress imagery exposure compared with placebo (Fox et al., 2012) and during Stroop incongruent trials in smokers (McKee et al., 2015). Together, this previous work supports current findings that cocaine dependent women may be more sensitive to stress and cue-related adaptations in cognitive flexibility and inhibitory control and that Guanfacine improves these functions under stress and cue challenge conditions possibly due to its beneficial effects in improving medial PFC function.

The current study has some limitations. One is that we did not assess the role of menstrual cycle phase in the women in this study. This would be an important addition to the current findings as hormonal changes are known to affect adrenergic (Feltenstein et al., 2011; Sinha et al., 2007) and HPA axis function (Carpenter et al., 2011; Fox et al., 2008). Another limitation is that the study would have benefited from a neutral (non-stress and non-drug cue) imagery condition as this would have allowed us to examine the Stroop effect in an active control condition relative to the combined stress and cue and the stress alone and cue alone.

Despite these limitations, the current findings are novel in demonstrating that women with SUD may be more vulnerable than men to reduced inhibitory control under stress- and cue conditions and that Guanfacine may improve cognitive inhibitory performance in the Stroop task. This is important as the inability to cognitively regulate in the face of stress may have important effects on ability to self control and abstain from drug use during both treatment and post-treatment. This, in turn, may make SUD individuals more susceptible to relapse. As such, enhancing cognitive control processes using adrenergic medications such as Guanfacine may prove efficacious in improving treatment outcome, particularly in women.

Acknowledgments

Role of Funding Source

This work was supported by The Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services as well as the National Institute of Health (NIH) and the NIH Common Fund Grants R01-DA027130 (to Sinha), P50-DA16556 (to Sinha), and PL1-DA024859 (to Sinha), 1K01-DA029040 (to Fox) and 5T32DA007238-24 (to Milivojevic). Trial name of the grant: NCT00585754 <http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00585754?term=%28NCT00585754%29&rank=1>.

We would like to thank the staff at The Clinical Neuroscience Research Unit (CNRU) and The Substance Abuse Center located at The CMHC, as well as the staff at The Yale Stress Center for all their help in completing this study.

References

- Aharonovich E, Hasin DS, Brooks AC, Liu X, Bisaga A, Nunes EV. Cognitive deficits predict low treatment retention in cocaine dependent patients. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2006; 81:313–322. [PubMed: 16171953]
- Aharonovich E, Nunes E, Hasin D. Cognitive impairment, retention and abstinence among cocaine abusers in cognitive-behavioral treatment. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2003; 71:207–211. [PubMed: 12927659]
- Anker JJ, Carroll ME. Sex differences in the effects of allopregnanolone on yohimbine-induced reinstatement of cocaine seeking in rats. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2010; 107:264–267. [PubMed: 20005642]

- Arnsten AF. Stress signalling pathways that impair prefrontal cortex structure and function. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2009; 10:410–422. [PubMed: 19455173]
- Arnsten AF, Jin LE. Guanfacine for the treatment of cognitive disorders: A century of discoveries at Yale. *Yale J Biol Med.* 2012; 85:45–58. [PubMed: 22461743]
- Back SE, Brady KT, Jackson JL, Salstrom S, Zinzow H. Gender differences in stress reactivity among cocaine-dependent individuals. *Psychopharmacology.* 2005; 180:169–176. [PubMed: 15682303]
- Bergquist KL, Fox HC, Sinha R. Self-reports of interoceptive responses during stress and drug cue-related experiences in cocaine- and alcohol-dependent individuals. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol.* 2010; 18:229–237. [PubMed: 20545387]
- Biederman J, Melmed RD, Patel A, McBurnett K, Konow J, Lyne A, Scherer N, Group SPDS. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of guanfacine extended release in children and adolescents with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Pediatrics.* 2008; 121:e73–84. [PubMed: 18166547]
- Carpenter LL, Shattuck TT, Tyrka AR, Geraciotti TD, Price LH. Effect of childhood physical abuse on cortisol stress response. *Psychopharmacology.* 2011; 214:367–375. [PubMed: 20838776]
- Chappell PB, Riddle MA, Scahill L, Lynch KA, Schultz R, Arnsten A, Leckman JF, Cohen DJ. Guanfacine treatment of comorbid attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and Tourette's syndrome: Preliminary clinical experience. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 1995; 34:1140–1146. [PubMed: 7559307]
- Daughters SB, Richards JM, Gorka SM, Sinha R. HPA axis response to psychological stress and treatment retention in residential substance abuse treatment: A prospective study. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2009; 105:202–208. [PubMed: 19713052]
- Feltenstein MW, Henderson AR, See RE. Enhancement of cue-induced reinstatement of cocaine-seeking in rats by yohimbine: Sex differences and the role of the estrous cycle. *Psychopharmacology.* 2011; 216:53–62. [PubMed: 21308466]
- First, M., Spitzer, R., Gibbon, M., Williams, J. Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV. Patient Edition. American Psychiatric Press Inc; Washington DC: 1995.
- Fox HC, Hong KA, Paliwal P, Morgan PT, Sinha R. Altered levels of sex and stress steroid hormones assessed daily over a 28-day cycle in early abstinent cocaine-dependent females. *Psychopharmacology.* 2008; 195:527–536. [PubMed: 17891383]
- Fox HC, Morgan PT, Sinha R. Sex differences in guanfacine effects on drug craving and stress arousal in cocaine-dependent individuals. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2014; 39:1527–1537. [PubMed: 24395021]
- Fox HC, Seo D, Tuit K, Hansen J, Kimmerling A, Morgan PT, Sinha R. Guanfacine effects on stress, drug craving and prefrontal activation in cocaine dependent individuals: preliminary findings. *J Psychopharmacol.* 2012; 26:958–972. [PubMed: 22234929]
- Fox HC, Sinha R. Sex differences in drug-related stress-system changes: Implications for treatment in substance-abusing women. *Harv Rev Psychiatry.* 2009; 17:103–119. [PubMed: 19373619]
- Glassman AH, Covey LS, Dalack GW, Stetner F, Rivelli SK, Fleiss J, Cooper TB. Smoking cessation, clonidine, and vulnerability to nicotine among dependent smokers. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 1993; 54:670–679. [PubMed: 8275622]
- Golden CJ. Identification of brain disorders by the Stroop Color and Word Test. *J Clin Psychol.* 1976; 32:654–658. [PubMed: 956433]
- Handen BL, Sahl R, Hardan AY. Guanfacine in children with autism and/or intellectual disabilities. *J Dev Behav Pediatr.* 2008; 29:303–308. [PubMed: 18552703]
- Laird NM, Ware JH. Random-effects models for longitudinal data. *Biometrics.* 1982; 38:963–974. [PubMed: 7168798]
- Lang PJ, Kozak MJ, Miller GA, Levin DN, McLean A Jr. Emotional imagery: Conceptual structure and pattern of somato-visceral response. *Psychophysiology.* 1980; 17:179–192. [PubMed: 7375619]
- Lang PJ, Levin DN, Miller GA, Kozak MJ. Fear behavior, fear imagery, and the psychophysiology of emotion: the problem of affective response integration. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 1983; 92:276–306. [PubMed: 6619405]

- Mantsch JR, Weyer A, Vranjkovic O, Beyer CE, Baker DA, Caretta H. Involvement of noradrenergic neurotransmission in the stress- but not cocaine-induced reinstatement of extinguished cocaine-induced conditioned place preference in mice: Role for beta-2 adrenergic receptors. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2010; 35:2165–2178. [PubMed: 20613718]
- Marlatt, GA., Gordon, JR. Relapse prevention: Maintenance strategies in the treatment of addictive behaviors. Guilford Press; New York, NY: 1985.
- McKee SA, Potenza MN, Kober H, Sofuoglu M, Arnsten AF, Picciotto MR, Weinberger AH, Ashare R, Sinha R. A translational investigation targeting stress-reactivity and prefrontal cognitive control with guanfacine for smoking cessation. *J Psychopharmacol*. 2015; 29:300–311. [PubMed: 25516371]
- Miller GA, Levin DN, Kozak MJ, Cook EW, McLean A Jr, Lang PJ. Individual differences in imagery and the psychophysiology of emotion. *Cogn Emot*. 1987; 1:367–390.
- Moeller SJ, Bederson L, Alia-Klein N, Goldstein RZ. Neuroscience of inhibition for addiction medicine: From prediction of initiation to prediction of relapse. *Prog Brain Res*. 2016; 223:165–188. [PubMed: 26806776]
- Moran-Santa Maria MM, Baker NL, McRae-Clark AL, Prisciandaro JJ, Brady KT. Effects of yohimbine and drug cues on impulsivity and attention in cocaine-dependent men and women and sex-matched controls. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2016; 162:56–63. [PubMed: 26961964]
- Potenza MN, Hong KI, Lacadie CM, Fulbright RK, Tuit KL, Sinha R. Neural correlates of stress-induced and cue-induced drug craving: influences of sex and cocaine dependence. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2012; 169:406–414. [PubMed: 22294257]
- Quinones-Jenab V. Why are women from Venus and men from Mars when they abuse cocaine? *Brain Res*. 2006; 1126:200–203. [PubMed: 17010952]
- Rounsaville BJ, Anton SF, Carroll K, Budde D, Prusoff BA, Gawin F. Psychiatric diagnoses of treatment-seeking cocaine abusers. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1991; 48:43–51. [PubMed: 1984761]
- SAMHSA. Results from the 2013 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Summary of National Findings. HHS Publication No. (SMA) 14–4863. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; Rockville, MD:
- Scahill L, Chappell PB, Kim YS, Schultz RT, Katsovich L, Shepherd E, Arnsten AF, Cohen DJ, Leckman JF. A placebo-controlled study of guanfacine in the treatment of children with tic disorders and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2001; 158:1067–1074. [PubMed: 11431228]
- Schwabe L, Dickinson A, Wolf OT. Stress, habits, and drug addiction: A psychoneuroendocrinological perspective. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2011; 19:53–63. [PubMed: 21341923]
- Sinha R. How does stress increase risk of drug abuse and relapse? *Psychopharmacology*. 2001; 158:343–359. [PubMed: 11797055]
- Sinha R. Modeling stress and drug craving in the laboratory: Implications for addiction treatment development. *Addict Biol*. 2009; 14:84–98. [PubMed: 18945295]
- Sinha R, Catapano D, O'Malley S. Stress-induced craving and stress response in cocaine dependent individuals. *Psychopharmacology*. 1999; 142:343–351. [PubMed: 10229058]
- Sinha R, Fuse T, Aubin LR, O'Malley SS. Psychological stress, drug-related cues and cocaine craving. *Psychopharmacology*. 2000; 152:140–148. [PubMed: 11057517]
- Sinha R, Garcia M, Paliwal P, Kreek MJ, Rounsaville BJ. Stress-induced cocaine craving and hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal responses are predictive of cocaine relapse outcomes. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2006; 63:324–331. [PubMed: 16520439]
- Sinha R, Kimmerling A, Doebrick C, Kosten TR. Effects of lofexidine on stress-induced and cue-induced opioid craving and opioid abstinence rates: Preliminary findings. *Psychopharmacology*. 2007; 190:569–574. [PubMed: 17136399]
- Sinha R, Lacadie C, Skudlarski P, Fulbright RK, Rounsaville BJ, Kosten TR, Wexler BE. Neural activity associated with stress-induced cocaine craving: A functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *Psychopharmacology*. 2005; 183:171–180. [PubMed: 16163517]
- Sinha R, Lovallo WR, Parsons OA. Cardiovascular differentiation of emotions. *Psychosom Med*. 1992; 54:422–435. [PubMed: 1502284]

- Sinha R, Parsons OA. Multivariate response patterning of fear and anger. *Cogn Emot*. 1996; 10:173–198.
- Sinha R, Talih M, Malison R, Cooney N, Anderson GM, Kreek MJ. Hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis and sympatho-adreno-medullary responses during stress-induced and drug cue-induced cocaine craving states. *Psychopharmacology*. 2003; 170:62–72. [PubMed: 12845411]
- Sinha, R., Tuit, K. Imagery Script development Procedures Manual. Amazon Press; 2012.
- Stout RL, Wirtz PW, Carbonari JP, Del Boca FK. Ensuring balanced distribution of prognostic factors in treatment outcome research. *J Stud Alcohol Suppl*. 1994; 12:70–75. [PubMed: 7723001]
- Strang J, Bearn J, Gossop M. Lofexidine for opiate detoxification: Review of recent randomised and open controlled trials. *Am J Addict*. 1999; 8:337–348. [PubMed: 10598217]
- Van Dam NT, Rando K, Potenza MN, Tuit K, Sinha R. Childhood maltreatment, altered limbic neurobiology, and substance use relapse severity via trauma-specific reductions in limbic gray matter volume. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2014; 71:917–925. [PubMed: 24920451]
- van der Plas EA, Crone EA, van den Wildenberg WP, Tranel D, Bechara A. Executive control deficits in substance-dependent individuals: A comparison of alcohol, cocaine, and methamphetamine and of men and women. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*. 2009; 31:706–719. [PubMed: 19037812]
- Volkow ND, Tomasi D, Wang GJ, Fowler JS, Telang F, Goldstein RZ, Alia-Klein N, Wong C. Reduced metabolism in brain “control networks” following cocaine-cues exposure in female cocaine abusers. *PLoS One*. 2011; 6:e16573. [PubMed: 21373180]
- Vranjkovic O, Hang S, Baker DA, Mantsch JR. beta-adrenergic receptor mediation of stress-induced reinstatement of extinguished cocaine-induced conditioned place preference in mice: roles for beta1 and beta2 adrenergic receptors. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther*. 2012; 342:541–551. [PubMed: 22593095]
- Winhusen T, Lewis D. Sex differences in disinhibition and its relationship to physical abuse in a sample of stimulant-dependent patients. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2013; 129:158–162. [PubMed: 23062872]

Highlights

- Guanfacine improved stress- and cue-related cognitive performance in women.
- These effects were not observed in Guanfacine treated men.
- Placebo treated women vs men showed greater deficits in cognitive flexibility.
- Sex differences exist in Guanfacine effects on cognitive and inhibitory control.

Figure 1.

Stroop color/word performance in cocaine dependent women (female) and men (male) who received Guanfacine or placebo. Guanfacine improved Stroop performance in cocaine dependent females, but not males, after exposure to all imagery conditions. Data are displayed as mean $\pm$ S.E.M. * $p < 0.05$.

Table 1

Demographic and Drug use

	Guanfacine (n=21)		Placebo (n=19)	
	Females, n =7	Males, n =12	Females, n=6	Males, n=15
Race				
-African American	5 (71%)	11 (92%)	6 (100%)	9 (60%)
-Caucasian	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (26.7%)
-Hispanic	2 (28.6%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0)	2 (13.3%)
Age^a	36.9 ± 11.4	40.5 ± 8.4	41.8 ± 5.1	41.2 ± 7.0
Years spent in education^a	11.6 ± 1.8	12.7 ± 2.7	11.8 ± 0.4	11.8 ± 1.7
No. of regular smokers	7 (100%)	11 (92%)	5 (83%)	13 (87%)
Years of cocaine use^a	11.7 ± 8.6	13.3 ± 7.6	18.2 ± 4.4	12.4 ± 7.6
No. of days used in past month^a	24 ± 9.4	16.5 ± 9.9	24.3 ± 8.1	18.7 ± 11.4
Amt of cocaine use in past month^{a,b} - grams	85.5 ± 95.9	16.4 ± 9.9	58.4 ± 57.0	32.7 ± 38.0
Years of alcohol use^a	13.0 ± 9.9	18.6 ± 8.2	19.8 ± 11.1	13.6 ± 10.4
No. of days used in past month^a	16.3 ± 12.6	13.7 ± 9.3	16.0 ± 10.9	13.6 ± 12.3
Amt of alcohol use in past month^a - drinks	181.0 ± 203.3	266.6 ± 331.8	218.2 ± 244.6	287.8 ± 431.5
Lifetime Alcohol Dependence	3 (42.9%)	8 (66.7%)	4 (66.7%)	6 (40%)
Lifetime mood	3 (42.9%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0)	2 (13.3%)
Lifetime anxiety (incl PTSD)	4 (57.1%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	6 (40%)
Lifetime anxiety (without PTSD)	0 (0)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0)	0 (0)

^aData indicate means and standard deviations.

^bmen vs. women p<.05.