

ADVANCES IN BEHAVIORAL PHARMACOLOGY

Volume 1

Edited by

TRAVIS THOMPSON AND P. B. DEWS



ACADEMIC PRESS, INC.

A Subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers

Advances in Behavioral Pharmacology

VOLUME 1

Contributors to This Volume

James B. Appel

Robert L. Balster

P. B. Dews

Linda A. Dykstra

D. E. McMillan

Richard A. Meisch

Roy Pickens

Charles R. Schuster

Travis Thompson

Galen R. Wenger

Advances in Behavioral Pharmacology

VOLUME 1

Edited by

TRAVIS THOMPSON

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

and

PETER B. DEWS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY
HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS



ACADEMIC PRESS New York San Francisco London 1977

A Subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers

COPYRIGHT © 1977, BY ACADEMIC PRESS, INC.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

NO PART OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE REPRODUCED OR
TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC
OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPY, RECORDING, OR ANY
INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT
PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM THE PUBLISHER.

ACADEMIC PRESS, INC.

111 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003

United Kingdom Edition published by
ACADEMIC PRESS, INC. (LONDON) LTD.
24/28 Oval Road, London NW1

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 74-10187

ISBN 0-12-004701-2

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Contents

List of Contributors	vii
Preface	ix

Behavioral Pharmacology of the Tetrahydrocannabinols

D. E. McMILLAN

I. Introduction	2
II. Difficulties in Studying the Behavioral Effects of Cannabis Preparations	2
III. Scope of the Present Review	6
IV. Effects of Tetrahydrocannabinols on Grossly Observable Behavior	8
V. Effects of Tetrahydrocannabinols on Schedule-Controlled Behavior	14
VI. Special Problems Concerning the Behavioral Effects of Tetrahydrocannabinols	26
VII. Concluding Statements	29
References	30

Ethanol Self-Administration: Infrahuman Studies

RICHARD A. MEISCH

I. Introduction	36
II. Techniques Used in the Study of Ethanol Self-Administration	36
III. Establishment of Ethanol Intake	38
IV. Factors Affecting Ethanol Intake	42
V. Elimination of Ethanol Drinking	67
VI. Discussion	69
VII. Conclusions	70
References	71

The Discriminative Stimulus Properties of Drugs

CHARLES R. SCHUSTER and ROBERT L. BALSTER

I. Introduction	86
II. Special Problems with Drugs as Stimuli	89
III. Drug Stimulus Control in the Absence of Discrimination Training	90
IV. Drugs as Discriminative Stimuli	95
V. Effectiveness of Drugs as Discriminative Stimuli	99
VI. Generalization	105

VII. Discriminability	113
VIII. Mechanisms of Drug Stimulus Control	117
IX. Drug Stimulus Control in Man	127
X. Nondrug Interoceptive Stimuli	129
XI. Implications of Drug Stimulus Control	131
References	134

Drugs, Discrimination, and Signal Detection Theory

JAMES B. APPEL and LINDA A. DYKSTRA

I. Introduction	140
II. Methods Used to Investigate Drug Effects on Discrimination	141
III. Signal Detection Theory	146
IV. Drug Effects	149
References	162

Rate-Dependency of the Behavioral Effects of Amphetamine

P. B. DEWS and GALEN R. WENGER

I. Introduction	167
II. General Statements on Rate-Dependency	169
III. Rate of Responding as a Dependent and Independent Variable	172
IV. Problems of Quantitation	173
V. Amphetamines in Rats	176
VI. Amphetamine in Squirrel Monkeys	198
VII. Amphetamine in Pigeons	206
VIII. Amphetamine in Mice	214
IX. General Comments on Points Which May Not Conform to Trend	217
X. Significance and Limitations of Analysis	220
XI. Conclusions	221
References	222
Note Added in Proof	227

Behavioral Pharmacology: A Brief History

ROY PICKENS

I. Introduction	230
II. Early Years	230
III. 1800–1940	232
IV. 1940–1955	233
V. 1955–Present	236
VI. Concepts Related to the Behavioral Actions of Drugs	245
VII. Current Developments	253
References	254

Current Status of Behavioral Pharmacology

TRAVIS THOMPSON

New Directions	262
References	263

SUBJECT INDEX	265
---------------	-----

List of Contributors

Numbers in parentheses indicate the pages on which the authors' contributions begin.

- JAMES B. APPEL (139), Department of Psychology, Behavioral Pharmacology Laboratory, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina
- ROBERT L. BALSTER (85), Department of Pharmacology, Medical College of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia
- P. B. DEWS (167), Laboratory of Psychobiology, Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts
- LINDA A. DYKSTRA (139), Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
- D. E. McMILLAN (1), Department of Pharmacology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
- RICHARD A. MEISCH (35), Psychiatry Research Unit, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
- ROY PICKENS (229), Psychiatry Research Unit, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
- CHARLES R. SCHUSTER (85), Departments of Psychiatry and Pharmacology, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
- TRAVIS THOMPSON (259), Department of Psychiatry, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
- GALEN R. WENGER (167), Laboratory of Psychobiology, Department of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

Behavioral pharmacology has grown from its modest beginnings in the 1950s to a substantial scientific enterprise. Numerous journals report the results of individual investigations, and volumes appear from time to time dealing with one or another aspect of behavioral pharmacology. There remains the chasm separating the individual research report from the integrated volume dealing with a single aspect of behavioral pharmacology. The field has reached such a point in its development that efforts to synthesize knowledge in subdomains of a behavioral pharmacology are in order. It was with this need in mind that the *Advances in Behavioral Pharmacology* series was created.

This series will provide synthetic and analytic review of significant areas of behavioral pharmacology, prepared by those most competent and knowledgeable in the respective fields.

As the term suggests, behavioral pharmacology is concerned with behavioral actions of drugs. Neurochemical and neurophysiological actions of drugs generally fall outside the domain intended to be included in this series. As the fields of behavioral pharmacology and neuropharmacology develop, from time to time papers bridging the two domains will be included in the *Advances* series. Actions of drugs on mental or emotional states generally fall outside the domain as well. Thus, while the series will include papers dealing with human behavioral pharmacology, the analysis will be limited to *behavioral* actions of drugs, and so will generally not include investigations at other levels of analysis. Reviews will be concerned with behavioral mechanisms of drug action. They will represent in-depth analyses, rather than summarizing research literature. Papers in the *Advances* are selective and critical in their treatment and deal with topics in depth as opposed to providing broad and superficial reviews.

The Editors are keenly aware of the relative youth of behavioral pharmacology. Thus, in the present volume, papers have been included providing both an historical background and a brief review of the current (and anticipated future) of the discipline. The reviews of the behavioral pharmacology of specific classes of compounds, as well as specific mechanisms of action included in this volume, are intended to be prototypic of the contents of subsequent volumes.

The Editors are deeply indebted to the authors of Volume I, both for their carefully and thoughtfully prepared manuscripts and for their indulgence in the delays in completing this volume. Finally, the editors wish to thank the staff of Academic Press for their confidence in support of this exciting new enterprise.

Travis Thompson

Peter B. Dews

Behavioral Pharmacology
of the Tetrahydrocannabinols

D. E. McMILLAN
*University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina*

I. Introduction	2
II. Difficulties in Studying the Behavioral Effects of Cannabis Preparations	2
A. Purity of Preparations Derived from <i>Cannabis sativa</i>	2
B. Solubility Problems	3
C. Delayed Onset of Action	4
D. Duration of Action	4
E. Tolerance	4
F. Stability of THC's	5
G. Obtaining Samples of THC's	5
H. Chemical Numbering Systems	5
I. Summary of Problems Facing Investigators Working with THC's	6
III. Scope of the Present Review	6
IV. Effects of Tetrahydrocannabinols on Grossly Observable Behavior	8
A. Abnormal Posture and Movement	8
B. Effects of THC's on Motor Activity	9
C. Hyperreactivity to Sensory Stimuli	10
D. Effects in Animal Tests for Analgesic Activity	10
E. Effects of THC's on Food Intake	11
F. Aggression and Dominance	11
G. "Hallucinatory Behavior"	13
H. Miscellaneous Overt Behavior	13
I. Summary of Effects of THC's on Gross Behavior	13
V. Effects of Tetrahydrocannabinols on Schedule-Controlled Behavior	14
A. Background	14
B. Effects of THC's on Simple Schedules of Positive Reinforcement and on Components of Multiple Schedules of Positive Reinforcement	14

C. Multiple Schedules of Positive Reinforcement—Differential Sensitivity of Schedule Components to THC Effects	18
D. Mixed Schedules of Positive Reinforcement	19
E. Effects of THC's on Negative Reinforcement Schedules	20
F. Effects of THC's on Complex Behavior	23
VI. Special Problems Concerning the Behavioral Effects of Tetrahydrocannabinols	26
A. Tolerance	26
B. Physical Dependence	27
C. Active THC Metabolites	28
D. Structure—Activity Relationships among THC's	28
VII. Concluding Statements	29
References	30

I. INTRODUCTION

For thousands of years man has used various preparations of the *Cannabis* plant (*Cannabis sativa*) to produce effects on the central nervous system. Yet, there are few well-controlled studies on the behavioral pharmacology of cannabis preparations appearing in the literature before the early 1960s. Although there are several reasons for the lack of scientific study of the pharmacological effects of cannabis preparations, among the most important reasons were that the active ingredients in the plant were not identified, so that their concentration varied from one preparation to another, and that objective methods for the study of drugs affecting the central nervous system were only beginning to be developed, particularly with respect to the objective measurement of behavior. The establishment of 1- Δ^9 -*trans*-tetrahydrocannabinol (Δ^9 -THC) as the major behaviorally active constituent of marijuana and its total synthesis (Gaoni & Mechoulam, 1964; Isbell, Gorodetzky, Jasinski, Claussen, Spulak, & Korte, 1967; Mechoulam & Gaoni, 1965), the discovery and total synthesis of a second active constituent (Fahrenholtz, Lurie, & Dierstead, 1966; Petrzilka & Sikemeier, 1967; Taylor, Lenard, & Shvo, 1966), 1- Δ^8 -*trans*-tetrahydrocannabinol (Δ^8 -THC), and the application of operant conditioning techniques to the study of drug effects (Dews, 1955; Ferster & Skinner, 1958), mark the beginning of intensive investigation of the behavioral pharmacology of cannabis constituents.

II. DIFFICULTIES IN STUDYING THE BEHAVIORAL EFFECTS OF CANNABIS PREPARATIONS

A. Purity of Preparations Derived from *Cannabis sativa*

Marijuana refers to a preparation from the leaves, stems, flowers, and seeds of the plant *Cannabis sativa*. Marijuana is usually used by burning the dry plant parts in a cigarette and inhaling the smoke. Marijuana often contains less than

1% of the active tetrahydrocannabinols (THCs), although some preparations may contain as much as 7% THCs (Doorenbos, Fetterman, Quimby & Turner, 1971). Hashish, which is the dried resin from the flowering tops of the plant, may contain much higher concentrations of THCs. The concentration of THCs in the plant parts is variable, generally decreasing in the order of resin, flowers, and leaves with very little in the stems, roots and seeds. Thus, the concentration of THCs in a particular plant preparation varies not only with the genetic make-up of the plant, but also with the relative amount of each of the plant parts in the preparation. Until these facts became known, it was difficult to estimate dosages used in the early behavioral studies on marijuana. Since the orderly relationship existing between the dose of the drug and the magnitude of its effects is fundamental to quantitative pharmacological study, it is not too surprising that little progress was made until synthetic THCs became available to scientific investigators.

B. Solubility Problems

Neither Δ^9 -THC nor Δ^8 -THC is water soluble, making it necessary to administer these THCs in suspensions or in special solvents. Some of these vehicles have pharmacological effects of their own. For example, both Δ^8 - and Δ^9 -THC are quite soluble in ethyl alcohol; in fact it is sometimes recommended that stock solutions of THCs be kept in alcohol to prevent decomposition (Pars & Razdan, 1971). However, because ethyl alcohol affects behavior and because ethanol is exceedingly irritating to tissue on parenteral injection (Goodman & Gilman, 1970), the usefulness of this vehicle is limited.

THCs are also soluble in dimethyl sulfoxide (Bergel, 1965). This vehicle has been used successfully in a number of studies on the behavioral effects of THCs, especially when the desired concentrations are too high to make the use of suspensions practical (McMillan, Ford, Frankenheim, Harris, & Harris, 1972). Disadvantages of dimethyl sulfoxide as a solvent for THCs include the unpleasant odor it imparts to laboratory animals injected with it and the ease with which it crosses tissue barriers, such as the skin, thereby endangering laboratory personnel (David, 1972).

Various suspending agents have also been used successfully as THC vehicles. Some investigators have suggested the use of aqueous suspensions of Tween[®] 80 (Waller, 1971). In our laboratories we have found Triton X-100[®] to be an excellent suspending agent, which does not produce behavioral effects after intramuscular injections in pigeons (McMillan *et al.*, 1972) at concentrations as high as 20% (by volume in aqueous solution). Care should be taken to shake these suspensions immediately before use. If the suspension is shaken by hand for a few seconds and then placed in a sonicator for several minutes before injection, a homogeneous suspension can be obtained. Recently Dewey, Jenkins, O'Rourke, and Harris (1972b) have utilized an albumin suspension as a THC