Prazosin during threat discrimination boosts memory of the safe stimulus

Philipp Homan,1 Qi Lin,1 James W. Murrough,1,2 Laili Soleimani,1 Dominik R. Bach,3 Roger L. Clem,2 and Daniela Schiller1,2

1Department of Psychiatry and Friedman Brain Institute, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, New York 10029, USA; 2Department of Neuroscience and Friedman Brain Institute, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, New York 10029, USA; 3Department of Psychiatry, Psychotherapy, and Psychosomatics, University of Zurich, 8032 Zurich, Switzerland

The α1 adrenergic receptor antagonist prazosin has shown promise in the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms, but its mechanisms are not well understood. Here we administered prazosin or placebo prior to threat conditioning (day 1) and tested subsequent extinction (day 2) and reextinction (day 3) in healthy human participants. Prazosin did not affect threat conditioning but augmented stimulus discrimination during extinction and reextinction, via lower responding to the safe stimulus. These results suggest that prazosin during threat acquisition may have influenced encoding or consolidation of safety processing in particular, subsequently leading to enhanced discrimination between the safe and threatening stimuli.

[P supplemental material is available for this article.]

Pavlovian threat conditioning is a prominent model for understanding the significance of threat discrimination (i.e., the distinction of threatening and safe stimuli) learning and memory in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). This model assumes that a conditioned stimulus (CS+), a formerly neutral stimulus such as a shape or a sound) is associated with an unconditioned stimulus (US, the aversive event) during threat learning, enabling the CS+ itself to become an unsafe cue and trigger a defensive response, while the control stimulus (CS−, a safe cue) may acquire inhibitory properties as it had never been paired with the US. Threat conditioning studies in PTSD generally found increased responses to the CS− but no consistent effect on the discrimination of threat (Dufts et al. 2015). The effect of threat learning can be quantified by the amount of discrimination between the unsafe and the safe cue during threat conditioning, and subsequent presentations of the CS+ without the US induce extinction learning.

The α1 adrenergic receptor antagonist prazosin has shown promise in the treatment of PTSD. Prazosin attenuates noradrenergic effects at central postsynaptic α1 adrenergic receptor after peripheral administration (Menkes et al. 1981) and has been shown to reduce PTSD symptoms including nightmares, poor sleep quality, hyperarousal, and impaired global function (Raskind et al. 2000, 2002, 2003, 2007, 2013; Taylor et al. 2008; Germain et al. 2012; Ahmadpanah et al. 2014; George et al. 2016) which may involve abnormally heightened activity of the noradrenergic central nervous system (Southwick et al. 1993; Raskind et al. 2016).

Previous threat conditioning studies in humans have shown that learned threat memory resisted extinction training following noradrenergic stimulation by yohimbine before threat acquisition, while the initial learning of threat was unaffected (Soeter and Kindt 2011, 2012). Yohimbine is an α2-adrenergic antagonist that stimulates central noradrenergic activity by blocking the α2-adrenergic autoreceptor, and its physiological effects typically include an increase in systolic and diastolic blood pressure. Prazosin, on the other hand, has antihypertensive effects by blocking α1-adrenergic receptors. Although the central actions of α1-adrenergic receptors with respect to threat learning are not fully understood, the opposite physiological effects of yohimbine and prazosin suggest that prazosin may have opposite effects on extinction learning compared with yohimbine.

Specifically, threat discrimination learned under prazosin, and thus under attenuated noradrenergic effects on α1-adrenergic receptors, may reverse the extinction effect of yohimbine: compared with placebo, threat discrimination should be unaffected during acquisition but easier to subsequently extinguish, i.e., higher responses to CS+ compared with CS− during acquisition in both the prazosin and placebo group, but a faster decay of the CS+ response during extinction and reextinction in the prazosin group compared with the placebo group, without affecting the CS−. Contrary to this prediction, however, studies in rodents found that α1 adrenergic receptor antagonists enhanced threat acquisition and impaired threat extinction (Cain et al. 2006; Bernardi and Lattal 2010; Do-Monte et al. 2010; Lazzaro et al. 2010), raising the concerning possibility that prazosin might in fact work against extinction-based treatments (Do-Monte et al. 2010; Maren 2011). Notably, additional noradrenergic effects on β and α2 adrenergic receptors may have also contributed to these memory processes (Do-Monte et al. 2010).

To clarify the effects of prazosin on threat acquisition and extinction in healthy humans, we used a randomized double-blind between–within-subjects experimental design over three consecutive days, conducted in the same context (Fig. 1): Threat learning on day 1, threat extinction on day 2, and reextinction test on
and third fingers of the nondominant hand. SCR signal was amplified and recorded with a MP150 BIOPAC Systems skin conductance module connected to a PC. Data were continuously recorded at a rate of 200 samples per second. Shocks were delivered using a Grass Medical Instruments SD9 stimulator and stimulating bar electrodes attached to the participant’s nondominant wrist. Shock intensity was calibrated up to a maximum of 60 V to reach a level described by participants as “uncomfortable, but not painful.”

The outcome measure was the psychophysiological arousal response to the CSs, indexed by the estimated anticipatory sudomotor nerve activity (aSNA) amplitude (Bach et al. 2010). Estimates of aSNA indicate the anticipation of an aversive event within the time window of stimulus presentation. These were calculated by inverting a forward model that describes how (hidden) SNA translates into an (observable) SCR using a variational Bayes approximation. A unit increase in aSNA corresponds to an increase in SCR of 1 µS. This method uses summary statistics across all available trials (i.e., average aSNA per condition and stimulus) to demonstrate successful experimental manipulations such as threat conditioning, and has shown to be more sensitive compared with a conventional SCR base-to-peak analysis (Bach 2014; Bach et al. 2010; Staib et al. 2015).

We used linear mixed models with restricted maximum likelihood estimation for all analyses, due to their well-established advantages over conventional analysis of variance (e.g., Gueorguieva and Krystal 2004). Mixed models efficiently allow for a full analysis of the data even in the presence of missing data (allowing us to include the participant that did not complete day 3). We used the estimates of aSNA as outcome measure and the R software (R Core Team 2016) and the packages lme4 (Bates 2005; Baayen et al. 2008; Bates et al. 2015) and lsmeans (Lenth 2016) for all analyses. A log-transformation was applied on the aSNA estimates to correct skewness compared with a conventional model.

A log-transformation was applied on the aSNA estimates to correct skewness compared with a conventional model.
reextinction) × stimulus (CS+ vs. CS−) and found that the three-way interaction was significant ($\chi^2(2) = 7.26, P = 0.03$; Fig. 1) and driven by enhanced stimulus discrimination (CS+ vs. CS−) in the prazosin group compared with placebo during extinction and reextinction but not acquisition (Fig. 2). Specifically, both groups showed successful acquisition, indicated by stronger response to the CS+ compared with the CS− and effect sizes between medium and large (placebo: $t(18) = 2.9, P = 0.0097$; Cohen’s $d = 0.66$; prazosin: $t(18) = 4.1, P = 0.0007$; Cohen’s $d = 0.94$). However, in the placebo group, the stimulus discrimination was not significant during extinction ($t(18) = 1.55, P = 0.14$) and reextinction ($t(18) = 1.3, P = 0.21$) whereas for the prazosin group, aSNA for CS+ was significantly higher compared with CS− during extinction ($t(18) = 5.04, P = 0.0001$) and reextinction ($t(18) = 4.76, P = 0.0002$; Fig. 2), confirming the three-way interaction. These results indicate that threat acquisition was successful with no group differences, but stimulus discrimination differed between the groups during extinction and reextinction, with augmented discrimination in the prazosin compared with the placebo group. Notably, these results were consistent with the results obtained by using the conventional manually scored base-to-peak SCR data (see Supplemental Results).

Next, we asked whether changes in response to one stimulus in particular drove the discrimination, i.e., we tested for differences between the placebo and the prazosin group in aSNA responses to CS+ as well as for aSNA responses to CS− (Fig. 1). We found that responses to the CS− were significantly lower in the prazosin group compared with placebo group during late extinction and throughout reextinction (see Supplemental Results).

Thus, prazosin effects during threat memory formation may change the fate of memory: threat discrimination learned under prazosin would be harder to extinguish over time. Consistent with the rodent data (i.e., potentiating threat memory), and in contrast to the expected effects of α-1 adrenergic receptor blockade in humans (i.e., reducing threat memory), we found that the prazosin group compared with placebo showed enhanced threat discrimination memory during extinction and reextinction, driven by lower responding to the safe stimuli, with no effects during acquisition.

How can prazosin interfere with extinction? Potentially, prazosin acts upon the encoding of the memory, affecting both inhibitory and excitatory plasticity, which is later recruited for extinction (Clem and Schiller 2016). Some clues may arise from evaluating the effects of prazosin on threat learning and extinction, especially since α-1 adrenergic receptors are abundant in the lateral nucleus of the amygdala (LA), a key region of synaptic plasticity in threat learning and extinction (LeDoux 2000). The LA receives inputs from the locus coeruleus that contain noradrenaline and exhibit tonic and phasic firing in response to aversive stimuli (Tully and Bolshakov 2010). However, the role of noradrenaline in the modulation of threat learning is less clear. On the one hand, it has been shown that noradrenaline may suppress feed-forward inhibition of threat conditioning thalamic pathway, thereby enhancing learning-related plasticity (Tully et al. 2007; Ehrlich et al. 2009). On the other hand, α-1 adrenergic receptors in the LA may inhibit descending output from the central nucleus of the amygdala to brain regions controlling arousal and defensive responses (Braga et al. 2004; Pape and Pare 2010). As prazosin has a short half-life of only 3 h, the results cannot be explained by direct action of prazosin during extinction or reextinction, suggesting that α-1 receptor blockade may alter the long-term consequences of newly acquired threat associations. In addition, state-dependent learning effects instead of a drug effect of prazosin appears to be an

### Table 1. Demographics, behavioral, and physiological measurements by group

| Characteristic                  | Placebo (N = 19) | Prazosin (N = 19) |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Age, mean (SD), yr              | 27.2 (5.6)       | 26.3 (4.9)        |
| Gender (m/f)                    | 7/12             | 9/10              |
| Adverse events                  | 1                | 2                 |
| Drop-outs                       | 1                | 1                 |
| Heart rate baseline, mean (SD), beats/min | 73.4 (10.3)*     | 77.8 (11.4)*      |
| Systolic BP baseline, mean (SD), mmHg | 110.6 (8.4)*     | 112.2 (7.6)*      |
| Diastolic BP baseline, mean (SD), mmHg | 66.4 (7.7)*      | 67.7 (6.6)*       |
| Heart rate 90 min, mean (SD), beats/min | 64.4 (9.9)       | 72.4 (11.2)*      |
| Systolic BP 90 min, mean (SD), mmHg | 107.2 (10.5)     | 103.9 (11.6)*     |
| Diastolic BP 90 min, mean (SD), mmHg | 67.8 (11.0)      | 67.2 (8.4)*       |
| Shock intensity, mean (SD), V    | 4.2 (1.4)        | 4.2 (1.0)*        |
| Response to the shock, mean (SD), SNA | 2.04 (0.81)      | 2.01 (1.0)        |
| Response to the shock, mean (SD), mS | 0.98 (0.11)      | 0.90 (0.23)       |
| STAI-T total score, mean (SD)   | 32.7 (9.2)*      | 32.7 (9.1)        |

Two male participants were excluded before the experiment due to presumable side effects to the study drug: One male participant reported dizziness and nausea 30 min after ingestion of the placebo pill; another male participant developed a syncope for 5 sec 1 min after taking the first capsule (1 mg) of prazosin. One female participant experienced syncope ∼ 5 h after drug ingestion that lasted 3 min, but was willing to complete the study. Additional monitored side effects included blood pressure drops in two males and nosebleed in one female. The groups did not differ in the physiological response to the drug, there were no significant differences in trait anxiety or shock intensity levels, and the groups did not significantly differ in their physiological responses to the shocks during threat learning. Absence of physiological changes after the prazosin doses we used in this study is in line with previous studies (for review, see George et al. 2016). There was no significant influence of heart rate, blood pressure, trait anxiety, and shock intensity (all $P > 0.16$) when included as covariates in our model, and our primary finding, the three-way interaction, remained significant whenever an additional covariate was included. It is therefore unlikely that the physiological or psychological baseline measures influenced threat processing.

(+) Blood pressure; (STAI-T) trait anxiety subscale of the Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory; (CS) conditioned stimulus; (SNA) sudomotor nerve activity; (μs) microSiemens.

*Due to one missing value, the measure was calculated only for $N = 18$ participants.
the net result is abnormally persistent threat discrimination. Nevertheless, to fully disentangle these competing interpretations, future studies should examine administration of prazosin prior to extinction, when the CS+ undergoes safety learning, and examine whether this would diminish or augment subsequent stimulus discrimination. Consistent with the latter possibility, rodent studies found impairments in extinction learning when prazosin was administered prior to extinction training (Do-Monte et al. 2010) and between repeated extinction sessions (Bernardi and Lattal 2010), indicating it does not enhance but rather counteracts safety learning.

The findings of this study may have clinical relevance as prazosin is often prescribed for the treatment of PTSD symptoms (Taylor et al. 2008; Raskind et al. 2000, 2002, 2003, 2007, 2013; Germain et al. 2012; Ahmadpanah et al. 2014; George et al. 2016), and prolonged exposure therapy is currently the most effective behavioral therapy in PTSD (McLean and Foa 2011). If prazosin is combined with or followed by extinction-based treatments, it might influence reexperienced or new memories in the course of therapy. In addition, as extinction was only indirectly affected in this study through memory encoding or consolidation, the clinical implications may be more relevant for individuals who are taking α-1 blockers when they are traumatized (or who receive them immediately after the trauma) or for individuals with innately reduced α-1 signaling in defensive brain circuits.
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