

Orexin-1 receptor antagonism decreases ethanol consumption and preference selectively in high-ethanol–preferring Sprague–Dawley rats

David E. Moorman, Gary Aston-Jones*

Department of Neurosciences, Medical University of South Carolina, 173 Ashley Avenue, Suite 403-BSB, MSC 510, Charleston, SC 29425, USA

Received 24 March 2009; received in revised form 8 June 2009; accepted 2 July 2009

Abstract

Work from our laboratory has shown that orexin (ORX; or hypocretin) neurons in the lateral hypothalamus are involved in preference for morphine, cocaine, and food. Other groups have demonstrated a connection between the ORX system and ethanol-related behaviors. Here, we extended those results to investigate, in outbred Sprague–Dawley rats, the relationship between ethanol preference and the ORX system. In Experiment 1, rats were trained to drink 10% ethanol using the intermittent access (IA) technique. In Experiment 2, different groups of rats were trained to drink 10% ethanol using either IA or the sucrose-fade (SF) technique. Following ethanol-drinking acquisition, ethanol preference was assessed using two-bottle-choice tests. The rats were then tested for changes in preference with additional two-bottle-choice tests following administration of the orexin-1 receptor antagonist SB-334867 (SB; 30 mg/kg, intraperitoneally). Differences in ethanol preference were observed across individuals, with a significantly higher ethanol preference observed in rats trained to drink using IA compared with SF. In both Experiments 1 and 2, SB reduced ethanol preference selectively in rats with high ethanol preference. These results demonstrate a strong, causal relationship between the ORX system and ethanol preference in outbred rats. These findings provide additional evidence that the ORX system provides opportunities to develop novel treatments for alcohol abuse. © 2009 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Orexin; Lateral hypothalamus; Alcohol; Reward; Preference

Introduction

The orexins (ORXs, also known as hypocretins) are neuropeptides expressed within a subset of neurons located exclusively within the lateral, perifornical, and dorsomedial hypothalamus (de Lecea and Sutcliffe, 1999; Sakurai et al., 1998). These neurons project widely across the neuraxis and exhibit potent and diverse influences over behaviors, such as feeding, arousal, and sleep/wake regulation (Chemelli et al., 1999; Nishino, 2007; Nishino et al., 2000; Peyron et al., 1998; Sakurai et al., 1998; Sutcliffe and de Lecea, 2002; Willie et al., 2001). In recent years, it has become clear that the ORX system is also critically involved in controlling general reward-associated behaviors, including responses both to natural rewards and to drugs of abuse (Aston-Jones et al., 2009; DiLeone et al., 2003; Georgescu

et al., 2003; Harris and Aston-Jones, 2006; Narita et al., 2006). In particular, work from our laboratory has demonstrated a strong and direct correlation between preference for rewards and activation of ORX neurons of the lateral hypothalamus (LH) (Harris et al., 2005; Harris et al., 2007).

Work from a number of laboratories in the last few years has demonstrated an important relationship between the ORX system and ethanol consumption. Lawrence et al. reported, in an alcohol-preferring (iP) strain of rat, that ethanol consumption upregulated ORX mRNA in the LH, and that the orexin-1 receptor (OX₁R) antagonist SB-334867 (SB) reduced operant responding for ethanol or for cues related to ethanol (Lawrence et al., 2006). Richards et al. also described decreased operant responding for ethanol and decreased yohimbine-induced reinstatement of ethanol seeking following SB pretreatment (Richards et al., 2008). Dayas et al. reported increased Fos activation of ORX neurons following contextual reinstatement to ethanol seeking (Dayas et al., 2008). Similarly, Hamlin et al. found increased Fos activation in ORX neurons during

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1-843-792-6092; fax: +1-843-792-4423.

E-mail address: astong@musc.edu (G. Aston-Jones).

renewal (contextual reinstatement) for alcoholic beer (Hamlin et al., 2009). Finally, Schneider et al. described increased ethanol consumption following ORX infusion into the paraventricular nucleus (PVN) of the hypothalamus or in the LH itself (Schneider et al., 2007).

The goals of the present study were twofold. First, we sought to determine the influence of the ORX system on preference for ethanol, since we have previously shown a direct relationship between ORX neuron activation and preference for other drugs of abuse. Second, we wanted to explore ethanol preference in outbred (Sprague–Dawley) rats because our previous work demonstrated the ORX–preference relationship for other drugs in this strain. Outbred strains are interesting due to their genetic heterogeneity (which may approximate differences in human populations) and due to their inconsistent ethanol drinking, which can be strongly influenced by the method of drinking acquisition (Schneider et al., 2007; Simms et al., 2008). To address the influence of the ORX system on ethanol preference in Sprague–Dawley rats, we used a two-bottle-choice test following training to drink ethanol by either the sucrose-fade or intermittent exposure method, and then tested the influence of OX₁R antagonism on the different levels of preference expressed.

Materials and methods

Subjects

Male Sprague–Dawley rats (initial weight approximately 200–250 g [Experiment 2, $n = 24$] or 300–350 g [Experiment 1, $n = 8$]; Charles River, Wilmington, MA) were single housed or pair housed under a reversed 12-h light/dark cycle (lights off 6 a.m.) and had ad libitum access to food and water. Animals were housed in a temperature- and humidity-controlled animal facility at MUSC (AAA-LAC-accredited). All experiments were approved by the IACUC at MUSC and conducted according to specifications of the NIH as outlined in the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals.

Drug treatments

The OX₁R antagonist SB-334867 (SB: 1-(2-methylbenzoxazol-6-yl)-3-[1,5]naphthyridin-4-yl urea hydrochloride, generously donated by Eli Lilly, Indianapolis, IN) was suspended in 2% DMSO and 10% 2-hydroxypropyl- β -cyclodextrin (Sigma, St. Louis, MO) in sterile water; 30 mg/kg was given in a volume of 4 mL/kg (intraperitoneally) 30 min prior to the test session. Vehicle was delivered at the same volume as the SB solution. Ethanol solutions (10% or 20%, vol/vol) were prepared using 95% ethanol (AAPER, Shelbyville, KY) and filtered water. Sucrose solutions (10% sucrose wt/vol) were prepared using filtered water.

Procedures and statistical analyses

Animals were trained to drink ethanol using one of two methods: sucrose-fade (SF) (Samson, 1986) or intermittent access (IA) (Simms et al., 2008; Wise, 1975). In SF, animals were initially given access to a 10% sucrose solution for 3 h/day. Over the course of 2 weeks, sucrose was faded out and ethanol was faded in in 2% stages. Upon reaching 10% ethanol:0% sucrose, animals received one more week of 10% ethanol exposure. In IA, the rats received either 20% ethanol or water for 24 h on alternating days for 2 weeks. For eight SF rats and all IA rats, the solutions were given in home cages with ad lib access to food and water. Eight other SF rats (which had been pair housed) were separated each day for ethanol exposure. There was no influence of housing on ethanol or water consumption or preference (all P values $> .05$), so the data were combined. After acquisition, all rats were given 1 week of two-bottle-choice tests (10% ethanol and water, 3 h/day) to establish baseline preference. The next day, rats were treated with either SB or vehicle 30 min prior to two-bottle-choice preference testing. Two days later, the opposite treatment was given and animals were tested again. Vehicle and SB injections were counterbalanced across days. Volumes of ethanol and water were measured each day, either at the end of 3 h (in the case of SF and two-bottle-choice testing) or upon bottle switching (IA). In Experiment 1, volumes were measured after 2 h. Measurement times were increased to 3 h in Experiment 2 to allow for greater possible differences in preference across experimental groups. During all testing, “leak test bottles” were mounted in separate cages and the amount of leak was measured. Body weights were measured for calculation of ethanol consumption in g/kg. Preference scores in two-bottle-choice testing were calculated as (vol. ethanol/[vol. ethanol + vol. water]) consumed over the 3-h test session. All statistical comparisons were made using mixed model two-factor analyses of variances (preferrer/non-preferrer vs. days or preferrer/non-preferrer vs. treatment) or else paired or unpaired t -tests for within- or between-group comparisons, respectively.

Results

Experiment 1

In a preliminary study, eight rats were trained to drink 10% ethanol using IA (see Methods). Following ethanol-drinking acquisition, ethanol preference was tested on a daily basis using two-bottle-choice tests (see Methods). The rats were characterized as ethanol preferers or non-preferers based on the last 3 days of preference testing. A median split by preference scores demonstrated a differentiation between ethanol preferers and non-preferers that was reliable and significant with respect to g/kg consumed (Fig. 1A, $F[1, 6] = 12.24$, $P < .05$), preference (Fig. 1B, $F[1, 6] = 14.08$, $P < .01$), or volume of ethanol




Fig. 1. The rats in Experiment 1 ($n = 8$) were sorted into two groups (preferrers and non-preferrers) based on a median split for preference for ethanol vs. water. These groups exhibited a significant difference in ethanol consumption in g/kg (A), ethanol preference (B), and ethanol vs. water consumption (C). In this and all other figures, $*P < .05$, $**P < .01$, $***P < .005$, $****P < .001$, ns = not significant.

($F[1, 6] = 14.71, P < .01$) consumed (Fig. 1C). Accordingly, there was a significant difference between ethanol and water consumed in ethanol-preferring rats (Fig. 1C, $F[1, 6] = 14.61, P < .01$), but not in non-preferring rats (Fig. 1C, $P > .05$). There was no significant difference in volume of water consumed across preferring and non-preferring rats (Fig. 1C). There was also no influence of day on ethanol or water consumption or preference ($P > .05$).

We then tested the OX_1R antagonist SB-334867 (SB; 30 mg/kg, ip) or vehicle given 30 min before two-bottle-choice testing on ethanol preference in these animals. As shown in Fig. 2A, following SB administration preferrers showed significantly decreased ethanol consumption as measured in g/kg as demonstrated by a main effect of




Fig. 2. The administration of orexin-1 receptor antagonist SB-334867 (SB) prior to two-bottle-choice testing in Experiment 1 significantly decreased ethanol consumption in g/kg (A) and volume in preferrers (relative to non-preferrers [C, D]). Preference (B) was also reduced, but not significantly.

treatment (vehicle/SB: $F[1, 6] = 20.73, P < .01$) and an interaction effect of treatment (vehicle/SB \times preferrer/non-preferrer, $F[1, 6] = 7.67, P < .05$), which was selective for ethanol preferrers only ($t[3] = 4.63, P < .05$).

Treatment with SB selectively decreased ethanol volume consumption (Fig. 2C, $F[1, 6] = 20.08$, $P < .005$), and this decrease was selective for ethanol-preferring rats, as demonstrated by a significant interaction effect (vehicle/SB \times preferer/non-preferer, $F[1, 6] = 8.67$, $P < .05$) that was selective for ethanol-preferring rats only ($t[3] = 4.39$, $P < .05$). There was no effect of SB on water consumption as shown in Fig. 2C, D ($P > .05$). There was a tendency for preferers to exhibit a greater decrease in preference following SB administration than non-preferers (Fig. 2B). This difference, however, was not significant, presumably due to the low number of subjects ($n = 8$) and the high variability among animals. To refine these results, we carried out a more thorough study, described in Experiment 2.

Experiment 2

In the second study, 16 rats were trained to drink 10% ethanol using SF, and 8 rats were trained to drink 10% ethanol using IA. A third group of eight rats served as a water control, and were faded from 10% sucrose to water in steps equivalent to SF for ethanol. Following ethanol-drinking acquisition, ethanol preference was characterized using two-bottle-choice testing. Preference was assessed based on the last 5 days of two-bottle-choice testing. As can be seen in Fig. 3B, the rats that acquired ethanol drinking via IA exhibited a significantly greater preference for ethanol than did the rats that acquired ethanol drinking via SF ($F[1, 22] = 42.80$, $P < .001$). This preference was driven by a significantly higher amount of ethanol consumed, both in g/kg (Fig. 3A, $F[1, 22] = 7.21$, $P < .05$) and volume (Fig. 3C, $F[1, 22] = 7.99$, $P < .05$), as well as by a lower volume of water consumed (Fig. 3C, $F[1, 22] = 13.20$, $P < .005$) during the testing period. Differences between water consumption and ethanol consumption within the acquisition technique were also significant (Fig. 3C, IA: $F[1, 14] = 31.72$, $P < .001$; SF: $F[1, 30] = 4.74$, $P < .05$). We also observed a significant effect of two-bottle-choice day ($F[4, 56] = 8.73$, $P < .001$) and ethanol/water versus day interaction ($F[4, 56] = 5.95$, $P < .005$) in IA rats that was specific to significant increases in ethanol drinking across two-bottle-choice days (Fig. 3D, ethanol: $F[4, 28] = 9.00$, $P < .001$, water: $P > .05$) and was not present for SF rats ($P > .05$).

These results confirm previous studies demonstrating that IA produces higher levels of ethanol drinking than SF (Simms et al., 2008; Wise, 1975), and extend these findings to Sprague–Dawley rats. Of note, among the 16 SF rats, only two exhibited high levels of ethanol preference and consumption (preference scores > 0.5 and g/kg ethanol > 1.0). One additional rat with high preference (0.61) exhibited low g/kg ethanol (0.34), suggesting that it consumed little fluid overall. Among the eight IA rats, only one demonstrated a relatively low preference and g/kg ethanol scores (preference = 0.63, g/kg ethanol = 0.25). One other




Fig. 3. In Experiment 2, the rats that underwent intermittent access (IA) training for ethanol drinking (IA, $n = 8$) consumed significantly more ethanol (A, C) and exhibited a greater preference for ethanol over water (B, C) than did the rats that underwent sucrose-fade (SF) training (SF, $n = 16$). The difference in preference was driven by a greater preference for water over ethanol in SF rats and a greater preference for ethanol over water in IA rats. The IA rats also demonstrated a significant increase in ethanol (and not water) drinking over days of two-bottle-choice testing that was not seen in SF rats (D).

rat showed relatively low preference (0.64) but high g/kg ethanol (1.06) scores. This degree of consistency within acquisition method suggests that although individual differences in preference exist (as seen in Experiment 1), the ethanol acquisition method strongly influences the degree of individual preference (e.g., SF produces low and IA produces high ethanol preference).

Following ethanol preference characterization in the two-bottle-choice test, we assessed the influence of OX₁R antagonism in both the SF and IA groups. As in Experiment 1, SB (30 mg/kg, ip) or vehicle was administered 30 min




Fig. 4. The administration of orexin-1 receptor antagonist SB-334867 (SB) in Experiment 2 produced significant reductions in ethanol consumed in g/kg (A) and volume (C, D) as well as significant reductions in ethanol preference

prior to two-bottle-choice testing. The administration of SB produced a significant decrease in ethanol preference (Fig. 4B, $F[1, 22] = 9.15, P < .01$) selectively in IA rats (IA: $t[7] = 7.82, P < .001$; SF: $P > .05$). This decreased preference was exemplified by a drop in g/kg ethanol consumed (Fig. 4A, $F[1, 22] = 21.92, P < .001$). This decrease was more than three times larger in IA rats than SF rats (mean decrease IA/preferrers: 0.95 g/kg, mean decrease SF/non-preferrers: 0.26 g/kg). The effect of SB administration was significant in both cases (SF: $t[15] = 2.14, P = .049$; IA: $t[7] = 3.42, P = .011$), although we also observed an interaction effect (vehicle/SB \times preferer/non-preferer), suggesting a stronger decrease in IA/preferrers than SF/non-preferrers ($F[1, 22] = 7.19, P < .05$). The effect of SB appeared to be most strongly influenced by preference and g/kg of ethanol consumed. Of the two preferers in the SF group, one showed a large decrease in preference and amount of ethanol consumed following SB administration (veh. pref.: 0.87, veh. g/kg: 2.63; SB pref.: 0.33, SB g/kg: 0.79). The second rat displayed abnormally high water consumption ($>$ mean + 2 standard deviation of all tested rats) on vehicle test day that obscured preference measurements, although SB had no effect on ethanol consumption in g/kg in this animal (veh: 0.78; SB: 0.81). The one non-preferer in the IA group showed a minimal effect of SB (veh. pref.: 0.60, veh. g/kg: 0.54; SB pref.: 0.50, SB g/kg: 0.36). Overall, these results support the hypothesis that the effect of OX₁R antagonism on ethanol preference and consumption is strongly related to baseline levels of ethanol preference and consumption. Although training regimen clearly influenced preference, even those animals exhibiting opposite preference from the majority of the population within a training regimen were influenced by SB in a preference-specific manner. This conclusion for preference-dependent effects of SB is also consistent with results of Experiment 1, where high preferers within a group trained on IA showed a greater decrease in preference following SB than low-preferring rats.

The difference in the effect of SB on preference was further characterized by assessing the influence of SB on ethanol and water consumption in the two groups. Although ethanol-drinking levels were statistically different under vehicle conditions (mean ethanol IA vehicle: 8.9 mL/1.67 g/kg; mean ethanol SF vehicle: 4.1 mL/0.77 g/kg), SB administration decreased ethanol drinking in IA/preferrers to a level statistically equivalent to levels of ethanol drinking

(B). Decreases in preference (B) were seen selectively for intermittent access (IA) rats. Decreases in ethanol consumed (A, C, D) were seen in both groups, although the decrease was dramatically greater for IA compared with sucrose-fade (SF) rats (see text). Water consumption was not significantly affected in either group (C, D), indicating a selective effect of SB on ethanol drinking. This finding was confirmed in a separate group of rats with no ethanol experience ($n = 8$), which demonstrated no effect of SB vs. vehicle on water consumption (E).

in SF/non-preferrers under vehicle conditions (mean ethanol IA SB: 3.8 mL/0.72 g/kg, $P > .05$). As previously mentioned, SF/non-preferrers demonstrated a small (although significant) decrease in g/kg ethanol consumed following SB treatment. This can also be seen in volume of ethanol consumed as shown in Fig. 4D (preferrers: $t[7] = 3.31$, $P < .05$, non-preferrers: $t[15] = 2.27$, $P < .05$). Again, however, the SB-related decrease in ethanol consumption in IA rats was more than three times that of SF rats (Fig. 4D, mean decrease preferrers: 5.06 mL, mean decrease non-preferrers: 1.38 mL). This observation was also supported by a significant interaction effect (vehicle/SB \times preferrer/non-preferrer; $F[1, 22] = 7.29$, $P < .05$). Water consumption was unaffected ($P > .05$) in both groups. These results suggest that the inhibitory effects of OX₁R antagonism were selective for ethanol preference/consumption and not for fluid consumption per se. A further demonstration of this specificity can be seen in Fig. 4E in which data are shown from eight control animals that were trained on sucrose fade to water demonstrating almost no change in water consumption following SB versus vehicle administration (mean volume water vehicle: 5.72 mL, mean volume water SB: 5.03 mL, $P > .05$).

Discussion

Work from our laboratory has shown a direct relationship between the activation of ORX neurons and preference for both natural and drug rewards, such that animals with high preference show strong activation in ORX neurons (Harris et al., 2005). Although the relationship between the ORX system and ethanol seeking has been demonstrated in a number of instances (Dayas et al., 2008; Hamlin et al., 2009; Lawrence et al., 2006; Richards et al., 2008; Schneider et al., 2007), it is not known if ORX neurotransmission relates to preference for ethanol. In this study, we addressed the issue of preference using a simple behavioral measure: ethanol preference in a two-bottle-choice test. We determined that Sprague–Dawley rats could be separated into groups of ethanol preferrers and non-preferrers based on either individual differences (as seen in Experiment 1) or the influence of ethanol acquisition method on preference (as seen in Experiment 2). Furthermore, we determined that interference with the ORX system via administration of an OX₁R antagonist decreased ethanol drinking and preference strongly in ethanol preferrers but only weakly in ethanol non-preferrers. Critical to interpretation of these results was the finding that SB administration produced minimal effects on water consumption, both in ethanol-experienced and non-experienced animals. Although some research indicates that the ORX system may influence water drinking (Kunii et al., 1999), other groups have failed to find a reliable influence of ORX on water consumption, while simultaneously showing a potent influence of ORX on ethanol drinking (Schneider et al., 2007). Although we observed an overall decrease in fluid consumption in SB-treated ethanol-drinking

rats, this effect was driven primarily by decreases in ethanol consumption, as evidenced by significant decreases in ethanol volume consumption and no significant decreases in water consumption, a finding that is bolstered by the observation that SB had no influence on water consumption in ethanol-naïve rats (Fig. 4E). These findings rule out alternate explanations of the effects of the OX₁R antagonist, such as reduction in arousal or overall drinking behavior. Our results also support previous research related to the relationship of ORX to ethanol seeking and to preference for other rewards, including other drugs of abuse (Aston-Jones et al., 2009; Harris and Aston-Jones, 2006; Harris et al., 2005).

One basic, but important implication from this investigation is that behavioral heterogeneity in outbred strains for alcohol preference, whether through training or individual differences, is an informative and valuable characteristic of a population. In the instance of the present study, ethanol preference was seen to vary across subjects, due to differences in training (Experiment 2) or across individuals (Experiment 1). In both cases, the effect of OX₁R antagonism on ethanol drinking and preference was dependent on the initial preference of the individual. In many studies using rat models of ethanol consumption, it is preferable to use strains of rats that produce reliable levels of drinking, high or low. However, when addressing issues, such as substance abuse, it is often valuable to have a genetically or experientially heterogeneous population to better model the diversity seen in human drug users.

Our results are well aligned with previous studies investigating the influence of the OX₁R on ethanol seeking and consumption. In the first study of this type, Lawrence et al. demonstrated, in the iP rat strain, that the administration of SB decreased operant responding for ethanol and for ethanol-associated cues, without affecting operant responding for water or water-associated cues (Lawrence et al., 2006). This result was replicated by Richards et al. in Long–Evans rats, who additionally showed decreases in yohimbine-induced reinstatement of ethanol seeking with SB preadministration (Richards et al., 2008). Our study supports these results, while extending them in a number of ways. First, we show that SB blocks ethanol drinking in the absence of an operant response. Although this is a subtle point, it confirms that SB is decreasing ethanol seeking per se, as opposed to inhibiting the ability to perform a learned arbitrary operant response. Second, we show that the influence of SB is dependent on the subject's prior preference for ethanol. In prior reports, no variability in rat ethanol preference was noted, presumably because high levels of preference were established either genetically (in the case of Lawrence et al., 2006) or through training (in the case of Richards et al., 2008) so as to support operant responding for ethanol. Because our tasks required no a priori ethanol preference, we were able to (1) observe striking differences in preference across individuals and (2) use these differences to better characterize the influence of the ORX system on ethanol seeking.

The volumes consumed in our ethanol-preferring rats were high (mean: 1.20 g/kg, with individual values as high as 2.88 g/kg) and significantly greater than those consumed by the non-preferring groups. Indeed, similar to results reported by Simms et al. (Simms et al., 2008), we observed reliable escalation in consumption in IA rats that continued through vehicle testing days (i.e., the average ethanol consumed by IA rats under vehicle in Fig. 4C is more similar to the final data point in Fig. 3D than the average data shown in Fig. 3C). However, it is likely that individual amounts of ethanol consumed infrequently corresponded to blood ethanol levels resembling to that achieved by binge-like drinking (≥ 0.08 g%, NIAAA National Advisory Council, 2004), particularly given that these values were measured after 3 h of drinking. In a number of IA animals, we measured the amount of ethanol consumed in 30 min. Although these values were lower than that measured at 3 h as expected, they were still relatively high (mean = 0.88 g/kg, max = 1.37 g/kg) but still only approached values reported to produce blood ethanol levels at ≥ 0.08 g% in recent studies of Wistar (Ji et al., 2008) and Long–Evans rats (Simms et al., 2008). Establishing high-blood ethanol levels purely through drinking is a common difficulty with rat models of ethanol consumption (although see [Ji et al., 2008]), and is something that we will address in future studies using ethanol dependence induction methods (e.g., inhalation chambers or the use of a “supersac” [3% glucose + 0.125% saccharin] solution) and measurements of blood ethanol levels. Inclusion of these techniques will allow us to better characterize the influence of the ORX system in excessive ethanol consumption and dependence. The present experiments clearly demonstrated a relationship between ethanol preference and the ORX system, and based on these data, we hypothesize that this relationship, or a stronger one, will be present in bingeing and/or dependent animal models.

Mechanistically, how might ORX influence ethanol preference? One option is through modulation of dopamine (DA) neurons of the ventral tegmental area (VTA). It is known that ORX projections to VTA are involved in reward-associated behaviors (Harris et al., 2005; Narita et al., 2006). It is also known that ethanol and ethanol seeking produces activation of DA neurons and/or DA release (Brodie et al., 1990; Gessa et al., 1985; Gonzales et al., 2004; Weiss et al., 1993). In addition to the potentially direct effect of ethanol on DA neurons (Brodie et al., 1999), ethanol could activate ORX neurons which, in turn, excite DAergic neurons (Borgland et al., 2006; Korkotkova et al., 2006; Muschamp et al., 2007). This hypothesis is in line with the work of others showing that cues and contexts related to ethanol self-administration increase Fos activation of ORX neurons (Dayas et al., 2008; Hamlin et al., 2009) and that the OX₁R antagonist SB reduces conditioned ethanol seeking (Lawrence et al., 2006; Richards et al., 2008). Given the widespread distribution of ORX axons across the brain (Peyron et al., 1998), there

are clearly multiple sites at which ORX could influence ethanol preference. As previously mentioned, the effect of ORX in the PVN appears to facilitate ethanol drinking (Schneider et al., 2007) and this pathway also may be important for ethanol preference. Further work will be needed to identify specific circuits involved.

Notably, blocking OX₁R in this study reduced ethanol in high-drinking/preferring animals, but only in very few cases did SB completely abolish ethanol drinking. Instead, SB administration to preferers appeared to decrease the amount of alcohol consumed to a level equivalent to that of non-preferrers. This suggests that a major difference between high- and low-ethanol preferences involves the ORX system. This difference could be genetic, as suggested by individual differences in ethanol preference, or based on experience, as suggested by differences in ethanol preference induced by different training regimens. One hypothesis suggested by these data is that the ORX system is activated in varying degrees in relation to alcohol preference. It is possible that dysregulation or hyperactivation of the ORX system could produce pathological alcohol craving, which may be restrained by dampening such activation. If this mechanism proved to be true, a treatment for alcohol abuse or alcoholism that involves the ORX system could reduce pathological or problematic craving and consumption but leave more modest (and natural) reward-seeking intact (via a normally functioning ORX system). Data from previous work (e.g., Lawrence et al., 2006; Richards et al., 2008) also support this idea. Although the present studies address differences in individuals exhibiting high- versus low-ethanol preference, future studies directly examining excessive ethanol consumption (as described previously) will be needed to understand what role the ORX system specifically has in alcohol dependence and alcoholism.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Howard Becker for helpful comments on this article and Paul Knackstedt for excellent technical support. This work was supported by T32 AA007474, R37-DA06214, R01-DA017289, and NCRR C06 grant RR015455.

References

- Aston-Jones, G., Smith, R. J., Moorman, D. E., and Richardson, K. A. (2009). Role of lateral hypothalamic orexin neurons in reward processing and addiction. *Neuropharmacology* 56(Suppl 1), 112–121.
- Borgland, S. L., Taha, S. A., Sarti, F., Fields, H. L., and Bonci, A. (2006). Orexin A in the VTA is critical for the induction of synaptic plasticity and behavioral sensitization to cocaine. *Neuron* 49, 589–601.
- Brodie, M. S., Pesold, C., and Appel, S. B. (1999). Ethanol directly excites dopaminergic ventral tegmental area reward neurons. *Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res.* 23, 1848–1852.
- Brodie, M. S., Shefner, S. A., and Dunwiddie, T. V. (1990). Ethanol increases the firing rate of dopamine neurons of the rat ventral tegmental area in vitro. *Brain Res.* 508, 65–69.

- Chemelli, R. M., Willie, J. T., Sinton, C. M., Elmquist, J. K., Scammell, T., Lee, C., et al. (1999). Narcolepsy in orexin knockout mice: molecular genetics of sleep regulation. *Cell* 98, 437–451.
- Dayas, C. V., McGranahan, T. M., Martin-Fardon, R., and Weiss, F. (2008). Stimuli linked to ethanol availability activate hypothalamic CART and orexin neurons in a reinstatement model of relapse. *Biol. Psychiatry* 63, 152–157.
- DiLeone, R. J., Georgescu, D., and Nestler, E. J. (2003). Lateral hypothalamic neuropeptides in reward and drug addiction. *Life Sci.* 73, 759–768.
- Georgescu, D., Zachariou, V., Barrot, M., Mieda, M., Willie, J. T., Eisch, A. J., et al. (2003). Involvement of the lateral hypothalamic peptide orexin in morphine dependence and withdrawal. *J. Neurosci.* 23, 3106–3111.
- Gessa, G. L., Muntoni, F., Collu, M., Vargiu, L., and Mereu, G. (1985). Low doses of ethanol activate dopaminergic neurons in the ventral tegmental area. *Brain Res.* 348, 201–203.
- Gonzales, R. A., Job, M. O., and Doyon, W. M. (2004). The role of mesolimbic dopamine in the development and maintenance of ethanol reinforcement. *Pharmacol. Ther.* 103, 121–146.
- Hamlin, A. S., Newby, J., and McNally, G. P. (2007). The neural correlates and role of D1 dopamine receptors in renewal of extinguished alcohol-seeking. *Neuroscience* 146, 525–536.
- Harris, G. C., and Aston-Jones, G. (2006). Arousal and reward: a dichotomy in orexin function. *Trends Neurosci.* 29, 571–577.
- Harris, G. C., Wimmer, M., and Aston-Jones, G. (2005). A role for lateral hypothalamic orexin neurons in reward seeking. *Nature* 437, 556–559.
- Harris, G. C., Wimmer, M., Randall-Thompson, J. F., and Aston-Jones, G. (2007). Lateral hypothalamic orexin neurons are critically involved in learning to associate an environment with morphine reward. *Behav. Brain Res.* 183, 43–51.
- Ji, D., Gilpin, N. W., Richardson, H. N., Rivier, C. L., and Koob, G. F. (2008). Effects of naltrexone, duloxetine, and a corticotropin-releasing factor type 1 receptor antagonist on binge-like alcohol drinking in rats. *Behav. Pharmacol.* 19, 1–12.
- Korotkova, T. M., Brown, R. E., Sergeeva, O. A., Ponomarenko, A. A., and Haas, H. L. (2006). Effects of arousal- and feeding-related neuropeptides on dopaminergic and GABAergic neurons in the ventral tegmental area of the rat. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 23, 2677–2685.
- Kunii, K., Yamanaka, A., Nambu, T., Matsuzaki, I., Goto, K., and Sakurai, T. (1999). Orexins/hypocretins regulate drinking behaviour. *Brain Res.* 842, 256–261.
- Lawrence, A. J., Cowen, M. S., Yang, H. J., Chen, F., and Oldfield, B. (2006). The orexin system regulates alcohol-seeking in rats. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 148, 752–759.
- de Lecea, L., and Sutcliffe, J. G. (1999). The hypocretins/orexins: novel hypothalamic neuropeptides involved in different physiological systems. *Cell Mol. Life Sci.* 56, 473–480.
- Muschamp, J. W., Dominguez, J. M., Sato, S. M., Shen, R. Y., and Hull, E. M. (2007). A role for hypocretin (orexin) in male sexual behavior. *J. Neurosci.* 27, 2837–2845.
- Narita, M., Nagumo, Y., Hashimoto, S., Khotib, J., Miyatake, M., Sakurai, T., et al. (2006). Direct involvement of orexinergic systems in the activation of the mesolimbic dopamine pathway and related behaviors induced by morphine. *J. Neurosci.* 26, 398–405.
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (2004). *NIAAA Council Approves Definition of Binge Drinking*. *NIAAA Newsletter, No 3 (NIH pub no 04-5346)*. Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.
- Nishino, S. (2007). Narcolepsy: pathophysiology and pharmacology. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* 68(Suppl 13), 9–15.
- Nishino, S., Ripley, B., Overeem, S., Lammers, G. J., and Mignot, E. (2000). Hypocretin (orexin) deficiency in human narcolepsy. *Lancet* 355, 39–40.
- Peyron, C., Tighe, D. K., van den Pol, A. N., de Lecea, L., Heller, H. C., Sutcliffe, J. G., et al. (1998). Neurons containing hypocretin (orexin) project to multiple neuronal systems. *J. Neurosci.* 18, 9996–10015.
- Richards, J. K., Simms, J. A., Steensland, P., Taha, S. A., Borgland, S. L., Bonci, A., et al. (2008). Inhibition of orexin-1/hypocretin-1 receptors inhibits yohimbine-induced reinstatement of ethanol and sucrose seeking in Long-Evans rats. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 199, 109–117.
- Sakurai, T., Amemiya, A., Ishii, M., Matsuzaki, I., Chemelli, R. M., Tanaka, H., et al. (1998). Orexins and orexin receptors: a family of hypothalamic neuropeptides and G protein-coupled receptors that regulate feeding behavior. *Cell* 92, 573–585.
- Samson, H. H. (1986). Initiation of ethanol reinforcement using a sucrose-substitution procedure in food- and water-sated rats. *Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res.* 10, 436–442.
- Schneider, E. R., Rada, P., Darby, R. D., Leibowitz, S. F., and Hoebel, B. G. (2007). Orexigenic peptides and alcohol intake: differential effects of orexin, galanin, and ghrelin. *Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res.* 31, 1858–1865.
- Simms, J. A., Steensland, P., Medina, B., Abernathy, K. E., Chandler, L. J., Wise, R., et al. (2008). Intermittent access to 20% ethanol induces high ethanol consumption in Long-Evans and Wistar rats. *Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res.* 32, 1816–1823.
- Sutcliffe, J. G., and de Lecea, L. (2002). The hypocretins: setting the arousal threshold. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 3, 339–349.
- Weiss, F., Lorang, M. T., Bloom, F. E., and Koob, G. F. (1993). Oral alcohol self-administration stimulates dopamine release in the rat nucleus accumbens: genetic and motivational determinants. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 267, 250–258.
- Willie, J. T., Chemelli, R. M., Sinton, C. M., and Yanagisawa, M. (2001). To eat or to sleep? Orexin in the regulation of feeding and wakefulness. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 24, 429–458.
- Wise, R. A. (1975). Maximization of ethanol intake in the rat. *Adv. Exp. Med. Biol.* 59, 279–294.