A self-adjusting, progressive shock magnitude procedure to investigate resistance to punishment: characterization in male and female rats

Stevenson Desmercieres[1], Virginie Lardeux[1], Jean-Emmanuel Longueville[1], Myriam Hanna[1], Leigh V. Panlilio[2], Nathalie Thiriet[1], Marcello Solinas[1]

[1] Université de Poitiers, INSERM, U-1084, Laboratoire des Neurosciences Expérimentales et Cliniques, Poitiers, France

[2]Real-world Assessment, Prediction, and Treatment Unit, Translational Addiction Medicine Branch, Intramural Research Program, National Institute on Drug Abuse, Baltimore, MD, USA

Corresponding author:

Dr Marcello Solinas
Laboratory of Experimental and Clinical Neurosciences
INSERM U-1084, University of Poitiers
1, rue Georges Bonnet, TSA 51106
86073 Poitiers Cedex 9, France
Tel : 00 33 549366343
E-mail: marcello.solinas@univ-poitiers.fr

ABSTRACT

Indifference to harmful consequences is one of the main characteristics of compulsive behaviors and addiction. Animal models that provide a rapid and effective measure of resistance to punishment could be critical for the investigation of mechanisms underlying these maladaptive behaviors. Here, analogous to the progressive ratio (PR) procedure widely used to evaluate appetitive motivation as the response requirement is increased, we developed a self-adjusting, progressive shock magnitude (PSM) procedure. The PSM provides, within a single session, a break point that quantifies the propensity to work for a reward in spite of receiving electric footshock that progressively increases in duration. In both male and female rats, the PSM break point was sensitive to 1) the hunger drive; and 2) changes in the qualitative, but not quantitative, incentive value of the reward. In systematic comparisons between PSM and PR procedures in the same rats, we found that both measures are sensitive to manipulations of motivational states, but they are not correlated, suggesting that they measure overlapping but distinct processes. Importantly, the PSM procedure represents a refinement in the 3Rs principles of animal research because animals can control the magnitude of shock that they are willing to tolerate. This self-adjusting PSM procedure may represent a useful tool to investigate mechanisms underlying maladaptive behavior that persists in certain individuals despite harmful consequences.

Addictive and compulsive disorders are characterized by the urge to execute behaviors even when they cause pain, suffering, or health problems [1]. In rodents, compulsive behaviors are often mimicked by resistance to punishment in the context of food or drug-taking behavior. The most commonly used punishment procedures use a fixed magnitude of foot-shock which allows identifying animals that are sensitive or insensitive to shock [2–7]. However, using a fixed level of shock imposes a dichotomy based on an arbitrary threshold; it labels each animal as either sensitive or resistant, without taking into account the fact that sensitivity is a continuous variable. That is, every individual has some level of shock where it will switch from responding to not responding, and this threshold may vary between individuals and over time within the same individual. A more nuanced measure of individual resistance to punishment can be obtained with procedures where the magnitude of foot shock is increased over several sessions [8–10] or in blocks within a single session [11,12] until animals decrease and eventually stop responding. However, even in these procedures the levels of shock are imposed by the experimenter in a fixed (increasing) order and animals have little control of the magnitude of shock that they are willing to accept to obtain rewards. Experimenter-imposed procedures involve the risk of delivering shocks that are substantially higher than what that the individual would be willing to tolerate, which can lead to persistent inhibition of reward seeking [10]. Procedures that adjust the level of shock to individual behavior may allow a more precise measure of resistance to punishment and be more in accordance with ethical standards because punishment is titrated within a range close to the individual's threshold, only exceeding it infrequently and by a small amount.

Progressive ratio (PR) schedules [13] are considered the gold-standard for the investigation of incentive motivation and the strength of rewards. In PR schedules, the number of responses required to obtain a reward increases at each step until the animal stops responding, and the final step, or break point, is considered a direct measure of individual motivation. One

of the advantages of PR schedules is that break points can be obtained within a single session. PR schedules for food rewards are sensitive to the motivation of the individual in terms of hunger drive [13,14] and the incentive value of the reward [13]. To incorporate the advantages of PR procedures, we designed a self-adjusting progressive shock magnitude (PSM) procedure in which the magnitude of shock is adjusted within a single session according to the animal's behavior. In this procedure each animal can titrate its own “acceptable” level of punishment to obtain food rewards.

The magnitude of shock can be manipulated by changing the intensity (current) or by changing the duration of a footshock [15] which determines the electrical charge delivered. Changing the intensity of a shock remotely within a session is tricky and requires specialized equipment. In contrast, changing the duration of footshock can be easily and precisely implemented with conventional shockers by simply altering a parameter in the software program used to control the operant procedure. Thus, in our procedure, the magnitude of shock was determined by using a fixed shock current (0.3 milliamperes, mA) and manipulating the shock duration (from 0 to 0.71 sec), leading to electrical charges ranging from 0 to 0.213 milliCoulomb (mC).

Both resistance to punishment and PR motivation can be viewed as measures of the costs that an individual is willing to accept to obtain a reward. Interestingly, Hodos developed his PR procedure to quantify motivation in order to overcome some technical problems that had led to excessive variability in the results obtained in older progressive shock procedure [13]. However, the relationship between PR procedures and resistance to punishment measures is not straightforward. Indeed, several studies have found that resistance to punishment and PR responding do not always correlate [3,5,12], suggesting that the willingness to exert an effort or the willingness to tolerate a negative outcome to obtain a reward represent two somewhat different aspects of motivation. To gain insights into these aspects of motivation, we

systematically compared the effects of manipulations of motivation on the PSM and PR procedures. We tested whether the punishment break point is sensitive to manipulations of motivational states such as hunger, reward size and reward quality, and we evaluated the effects of these manipulation on progressive ratio responding.

Material and methods

Sprague-Dawley rats (48 males and 24 females) aged 8-9 weeks (Janvier Labs, France) were used in this study because rats' behavioral repertoire makes them a species of choice for the investigation of addiction-related processes [16]. The experiments were performed in 3 separate cohorts of animals: 1) 24 males to establish the procedure; 2) 24 males to replicate and assess reliability of the procedure and 3) 24 females to assess whether the results depend on sex. Data from the cohorts of male animals did not differ and were combined for analysis and presentation here. Rats were housed in pairs with two wooden sticks for enrichment, in IVC cages (Techniplast, Sealsafe Plus GR900), in a temperature- and humidity-controlled room kept under reversed light-dark cycle conditions (12 hours light-dark cycle, lights off at 7 AM). All experiments were conducted during the dark phase and in accordance with European Union directives (2010/63/EU) for the care of laboratory animals and approved by the local ethics committees (COMETHEA).

Food restriction

Starting after a 5-day habituation period and continuing until the end of the experiment, food was restricted to limit weight gain and to motivate operant behavior. Food (approximatively 20 g/day for male and 15mg/day for females) was given 1 hour after the end of the daily experimental session. Unlimited access to water was provided for the entire duration of experiment.

General experimental designs

In this experiment, we aimed to validate the progressive shock magnitude (PSM) procedure by 1) investigating the effects of motivational manipulations such as hunger drive (food restriction or satiation), reward size (1 vs 2 pellets of sucrose) and reward quality (sucrose vs chocolate) on punished responding; and 2) directly comparing the effects of these manipulations in our PSM procedure versus a conventional PR procedure. Tests sessions were

separated by a minimum of one training session, and each type of test occurred once a week. Sessions were performed 5 days a week and a typical week had the following schedule: Monday: training; Tuesday: PR test; Wednesday: training; Thursday: training and Friday: PSM test. After nine initial operant training sessions, we tested resistance to punishment in 2 PSM sessions and appetitive motivation in 2 PR sessions to establish baseline behavior. Subsequently, in both PSM and PR, we investigated the effects of 1) hunger drive (restriction and satiation); 2) quantitative increases in the value of reward (2 pellets vs 1 pellet) and 4) qualitative changes in the value of reward (sucrose vs chocolate pellets).

For 23h prior to the deprivation and satiation tests, respectively, animals were completely food deprived or had food ad libitum as done previously [14]. To study changes in incentive value of reward, we trained animals with the new condition (2 pellets/reward or 1 chocolate pellet) for 2 days before PSM and PR tests.

24-72h after the last operant sessions, we measured anxiety-related behaviors in an open-field and sensitivity to pain in a hotplate procedure.

Food Reinforcement Apparatus and training procedure

Experimental chambers (MedAssociates, www.medassociates.com) were enclosed individually in sound-attenuation chests. Each experimental chamber had a recessed food tray, and two levers in the right wall. The floor was constituted by bars that were connected to shockers that could deliver footshock, with electric current set to 0.3 mA. Each chamber was equipped with a food-pellet dispenser, which could deliver 45 mg food pellets (Sucrose reward tablets, 5TUT, Test Diet, USA) to the food tray. Experimental events were controlled by computers using MedAssociates interface and Med-PC IV software; Med-PC code used to conduct the procedures is available upon request. A diode light was present on each lever. One lever was assigned to be the active lever and the corresponding light was used as a conditioned stimulus for food reinforcement. A third diode light was installed on the opposite wall, and its

flashing was used as a discriminative stimulus to indicate that food reinforcement would be associated with a foot-shock.

The general training schedule involved 45-minute sessions of a fixed-ratio 1 (FR1) schedule of food reinforcement in which one lever press was required to obtain a 45-mg sucrose pellet. Rats initially learned to respond for food during nine sessions under this schedule. During these sessions, food availability was signaled by turning off the house-light, indicating that a single response on the active lever would immediately result in the delivery of one food pellet, accompanied by flashing of the diode light above the lever for 2 s. Subsequently, the house light was turned on for an additional 18-s time-out period, during which responding had no programmed consequences. Following the time out, a new trial started and the next response on the right lever was again reinforced. Responses on the inactive lever were recorded but never reinforced.

Self-adjusting progressive shock magnitude procedure

In the self-adjusting procedure, active lever presses resulted in immediate delivery of food rewards and foot-shocks of different magnitudes. The self-adjusting procedure consisted of steps in which the shock duration was increased each time the animal obtained 2 separate rewards at a given duration. The duration of the first step was 0 sec (no shock), the second step was a low duration of 0.05 sec and subsequent shocks increased at each step for 20 steps. Thus, the step sequence of durations was: 0, 0.05, 0.06, 0.07, 0.08, 0.09, 0.10, 0.12, 0.13, 0.15, 0.18, 0.20, 0.23, 0.27, 0.31, 0.35, 0.41, 0.47, 0.54, 0.62, 0.71 sec. If animals reached the final step, the duration of the shock was not further increased, and all subsequent shock were set at 0.71 sec. If rats did not emit any response for 5 min, shock duration was reset to 0 sec and the shock progression was reinitialized. Thus, animals could at any moment avoid higher magnitude of shock by limiting the frequency of food reinforcement until shock duration returned to 0 sec, which was signaled by the absence of the blinking light. This feature suppressed but did not

completely extinguish operant responding, allowing a rapid return to baseline responding in the following training session. The magnitude of the shock was measured by the electrical charge in millicoulombs (mC) that an animal would tolerate to obtain food pellets and was calculated by multiplying the fixed current of the shock (0.3 mA) by the duration in sec. The break point was calculated by the cumulated magnitude of the shock received during the session. We chose this parameter for the main analysis because it incorporates both the willingness to receive a given charge unit and the willingness to restart responding after an eventual punishment-induced pause. However, it should be noted that similar results were obtained when the maximal magnitude of shock obtained was used (data not shown).

Table 1 summarizes the data obtained in the PSM procedure in terms of responses, duration of shock and total electrical charge received during a session.

Progressive-ratio schedule

Under the progressive-ratio schedule of food reinforcement, the number of responses required to obtain a food pellet increased with each successive food pellet. The steps of the exponential progression were the same as those previously developed by Roberts and colleagues [17] adapted for food reinforcement [14], based on the equation: response ratio = $(5e^{(0.2 \times \text{reinforcer number})}) - 5$, rounded to the nearest integer. Thus, the values of the steps were 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 15, 20, 25, 32, 40, 50, 62, 77, 95, 118, 145, 178, 219, 268, 328, 402, 492, 603, and 737. Sessions under the progressive-ratio schedule lasted until 10 min passed without completing a step, which, under basal conditions, occurred within 1 h.

Anxiety-related behaviors: Open Field

The open-field apparatus (Viewpoint, Lyon, France) consisted of a rectangular arena (50cm wide * 50cm long * 40cm high) of white plexiglass. After a 30-min habituation to the experiment room, rats were placed for 30 min in the arena. Their positions were recorded

automatically and in real time by a camera and video tracking software (Viewpoint, Lyon, France). The software defined a virtual square (25cm * 25cm) delimiting the center zone and the border zone. Anxiety was measured as the percentage (%) of time spent in the border (time in the border/time in the border + time in the center * 100) so that more time spent in the border (thigmotaxis) indicated a higher level of anxiety.

Pain sensitivity: Hot plate test

The hot-plate (Ugo Basile, model-DS 37) was maintained at 48 °C [18]. After a habituation of 10 minutes, animals were placed into a glass cylinder of 25 cm diameter on the heated surface and 47 cm walls. The latency before escape or jumping, was recorded. Experiments were stopped after a cut-off of 120s to prevent unnecessary pain or tissue damage.

Data and Statistical Analysis

Med-PC data obtained was analyzed using a custom-made, freely available software written in Python, Med_to_csv (https://github.com/hedjour/med_to_csv) that uses raw data files to create complete tables for further analysis in GraphPad Prism. Data were checked for normality distribute on using the Shapiro–Wilk test. PSM data using electrical charge did not show normal distribution and therefore, they were normalized using natural logarithm transformation. For baseline measures of PSM and progressive-ratio break points, we used two-way ANOVA for repeated measures (Factors: sex and procedure) to compare the behavior of male and female rats followed by Sidak's post hoc test. Given that baseline behavior significantly differed between males and females, for subsequent behaviors, we separately compared male and female animals using one-way ANOVA for repeated measures (factor: hunger state) followed by Dunnett's post hoc test or Student's paired T-test for reward size and quality. Differences were considered significant when $p < 0.05$.

RESULTS

PSM and PR break points

The last 3 training sessions were used to determine a baseline (BL). The number of active responses (and food rewards obtained) was ~ 121 for male (Fig. A, left) and ~ 98 for female rats (Fig. 1, right). In the PSM session, the number of pellets decreased to about ~ 46 in males and ~ 40 in females, a 62 % and 59 % reduction compared to the BL responding. The PSM break point as measured by the electrical charge sustained was 1.97 ± 0.20 mC in males and 1.69 ± 0.41 mC in females (Table 1). Individual event records (supplementary information, fig. S1) clearly show that rats titrated their punishment and different rats reached different PSM break points. Indeed, a few animals kept responding for food even when the shock magnitude was maximal, whereas most animals responded until the magnitude of shock reached a level where responding stopped for at least 5 minutes, leading to a reset of the shock duration to 0. Then, most animals started responding again reaching levels that were similar to the initial maximal level suggesting that they found a shock magnitude that was "worth" receiving to obtain their rewards. For PR sessions, the number of steps completed was ~ 14 in males and ~ 11 in females and the number of active responses was ~ 428 in males and ~ 276 females. Statistical analysis on the number of responses revealed a significant effect of schedule ($F(1.027, 71.91) = 219$, $p < 0.0001$), of sex ($F(1,70) = 26.10$, $p < 0.0001$) and a significant schedule * Sex interaction ($F(2,140) = 19.41$, $p < 0.0001$). Post-hoc multiple comparison indicated that males and females differed in baseline and PR responding but not in PSM responding. Because baseline behavior was different in males and females, which can confound the interpretation of results, we decided not to compare them directly in subsequent tests.

Frequency distribution of PSM break points was normally distributed when expressed as natural logarithm of the electrical charge sustained for both males and females with a median value of

0.56 (95% CI: 0.12-0.77) and -0.03 (95% CI: -0.037-0.47), respectively (Fig. 2 A,B). Frequency distribution of PR break points was a conventional Gaussian for males with a median value of 431 (95% CI: 360-549) and a slightly positively skewed Gaussian for females with a median value of 243 (95% CI: 148-339) (Fig. 2 C,D). PSM responding (electrical charge sustained) was not correlated with PR responding (number of responses) in either male or female rats (Fig. 2E,F) suggesting that these tasks measure somewhat different motivational and cognitive processes.

Effect of hunger drive on PSM and PR behaviors

To characterize the PSM behavior, we investigated whether it is sensitive to hunger, and we compared these effects to those of these manipulations on PR. In male rats, hunger induced by food deprivation produced an increase in the PSM break point of 25% in pellets obtained (from ~ 45 to ~ 58 pellets) and of 95% in electrical charged received (from 1.97 to 3.84 mC) compared to normal food restriction condition (Fig. 3A,C; Table 1). In contrast, satiation induced by ad libitum pre-session feeding produced a decrease in the PSM break point of 64 % as measured by number of pellets obtained (from ~ 45 to ~ 20 pellets) and of 78 % as measured by the electrical charge received (from 1.97 to 0.43 mC) compared to normal food restriction condition (Fig. 3A,C; Table 1). Similarly, in female rats, hunger induced by food deprivation produced an increase in the PSM break point of 50% in pellets obtained (from ~ 40 to ~ 60 pellets) and of 250 % in electrical charged received (from 1.69 to 4.92 mC) (Fig. 3B,D; Table 1) and food satiation produced a decrease of 56% in the number of pellets obtained (from 40 to 18 pellets) and of 75% in the electrical charge (from 1.69 to 0.41 mC) compared to normal food restriction condition (Fig. 3B,D; Table 1). Individual event records (supplementary information, fig. S2) clearly show that, when hungry, rats were willing to receive higher magnitude of shock than under BL conditions whereas, when sated, they all stop responding at low shock magnitudes.

Consistent with previous reports [13,14], PR responding was also sensitive to manipulations of hunger. In males, hunger increased PR responding from ~ 469 to ~ 688 responses/session (+47%) and satiation decreased it to ~ 128 responses/session (-73%) (Fig.5A). In females, hunger increased PR responding from ~ 277 to ~ 423 responses/session (+53%) and satiation decreased it to ~ 64 responses/session (-77%) (Fig. 5B).

Therefore, both punishment in PSM and efforts in PR are sensitive to hunger drive in both males and females.

Effect of reward size on PSM and PR behaviors

We then investigated whether PSM break points would be sensitive to changes in the reward size. For this, we increased the number of sucrose pellets delivered at each trial to 2 pellets/delivery. Since incentive value needs to be learned, we trained rats for 2 days in this new condition. This manipulation decreased baseline responding because 2 pellets probably induced more rapid satiation. The decrease in baseline was from ~ 119 to ~ 104 active responses (and reward deliveries) in males (13%) and from ~ 98 to ~ 67 active responses (and reward deliveries) in females (-32%) (data not shown). Compared to this new baseline PSM induced a decrease in both males (from ~ 104 to ~ 50 rewards, -50%) and females (from ~ 67 to ~ 32, -52%) (Table 1). PSM break point with 2 pellets did not differ from that with 1 pellet in males (Fig. 5A, Table 1) but it was significantly decreased in females (Fig. 5B, Table 1). PR break point was significantly higher for 2 pellets than for 1 pellet in males (from ~ 468 to ~ 734 active responses, +56%) (Fig. 6A) but was similar in females (~ 276 vs ~ 277) (Fig. 6B).

Effect of reward quality on PSM and PR behaviors

We then investigated whether PSM break points would be sensitive to changes in the organoleptic quality of the reward. For this, we allowed rats to self-administer chocolate-

flavored pellets. Again, rats were first trained for 2 days in this new condition. This manipulation slightly increased baseline responding in both males and females, from ~ 119 to ~ 128 active responses (+7%) in males and from ~ 98 to ~ 111 active responses (+13%) in females compared to sucrose pellets (data not shown). Compared to this new baseline PSM induced a decrease in both males (from ~ 128 to ~ 65 rewards, -49%) and females (from ~ 111 to ~ 55, - 50.5%) (data not shown). More importantly, compared to sucrose pellets, the shock break point with chocolate pellets was higher in both males (active responses from ~ 47 to ~ 65, electrical charge from ~ 3.95 to ~ 4.75, Fig. 7A; Table 1) and in females (active responses from ~ 40 to ~ 55, electrical charge from ~ 2.27 to ~ 3.23, Fig. 7B; Table 1). PR break point was significantly higher for chocolate than for sucrose pellets in both males (from ~ 468 to ~ 650 active responses, +39%) and females (~ 276 vs ~535, +94%) (Fig. 8A,B).

Anxiety and pain sensitivity

At the end of the operant sessions, we measured anxiety in an open field and pain sensitivity in a hot plate test in order to verify whether these factors could have influenced resistance to punishment. We found that neither anxiety (% time spent in the border) nor pain (latency to escape) was correlated to PSM break points in both males (anxiety R^2= 0.019 p = 0.34; pain R^2= 0.003, p = 0.70) and females (anxiety R^2= 0.048, p = 0.30; pain R^2= 0.036, p = 0.37) (data not shown).

Discussion

In this study, we developed and characterized a self-adjusting progressive shock magnitude (PSM) procedure to investigate resistance to punishment in which the magnitude of the punishment was determined by the behavior of the individual animal. Thus, each animal could titrate the amount of shock that it was willing to receive to obtain a food pellet. We show that, in both male and female rats, the PSM break point is sensitive to manipulations of motivation such as hunger drive and incentive value of the reward. Importantly, interindividual differences in resistance to punishment do not appear to depend on pain sensitivity or anxiety because these measures were not correlated with the PSM break point. Interestingly, although PSM and PR break points were both sensitive to manipulations of motivation, they were not intercorrelated, confirming that these behaviors represent some overlapping but distinct constructs and are likely to depend on different brain circuits.

In our procedure, shock magnitude was adjusted for each individual animal in each session, increasing and decreasing depending on the rat's behavior (increasing in steps while responding was persistent and resetting to 0 when responding ceased for 5 minutes). Most rats took advantage of this feature and resumed food seeking behavior 2 or 3 times in a session (supplementary information, fig. S1). Thus, rats could titrate the levels of shock that they were willing to receive by stopping before they reached a level that was aversive enough to persistently suppress their behavior [10]. Importantly, our procedure could be considered a form of refinement in the 3Rs principles of animal research because animals can control the magnitude of punishment that they are willing to tolerate. Therefore, the PSM appears particularly fit to stricter ethical standards of animal research that are required by our societies.

Shock sessions were repeated but infrequent and sparse. Indeed, we wanted punishment to be rare and unpredictable, similarly to what may happen in humans when negative consequences of drug use or excessive food consumption are rarely (intermittently) experienced

after immediate consumption of the reward. In addition, this avoided the cumulative effects of punishment [6,10] which can occur when shock sessions are repeated in consecutive sessions. Instead, with sparse shock sessions we were able to rapidly reestablish baseline operant behavior and have several test/retest conditions. Measures of resistance to punishment were highly correlated for the whole experiment indicating that resistance to punishment is a stable trait (supplementary information, fig. S3). Therefore, our PSM procedure should allow investigating changes in resistance to punishment longitudinally over long periods of time and in response to behavioral and neurobiological manipulations.

Previous research has shown that rats (and pigeons) will titrate the magnitude of a constant or pulsing shock to a specific level when the shock magnitude is contingent on the rate of food-reinforced responding [19,20]; this level was stable within individuals but differed across individuals. More recent studies investigating footshock punishment found bimodal population distributions with procedures using a fixed shock magnitude [4,6,7,21] and continuous Gaussian distribution of responding with procedures using increasing levels of punishment with food [12], cocaine [12] and alcohol [6] as reinforcers. The distribution in our self-adjusting PSM procedure was a positively skewed Gaussian when the electrical charge was plotted (data not shown) but it was a normal Gaussian when the magnitude was expressed as the natural logarithm of the electrical charge. This is consistent with Stevens' power law that states that sensation magnitude and stimulus intensity are described by a power function [22] and with previous studies investigating the consequences of different shock magnitudes [15]. This suggests that when animals can self-titrate the level of punishment, individual levels of shock resistance are log-normally distributed whereas bimodal distribution of shock resistance may at least in part result from imposing a fixed magnitude that artificially divide the population in two groups of resistant or sensitive individuals.

Hunger drive is a potent motivation of food seeking and taking behavior because of the intrinsic evolutionary value of 1) working to obtain food when energy stocks are low and 2) avoiding excessive risk or unnecessary exertion when energy stocks are already sufficient. In this study, both PSM and PR break points were very sensitive to hunger manipulation, and rats dramatically increased their break point when hungry and decreased it when sated. This is consistent with previous findings in rats with PR [13,14] and with punishment [23,24]. Incentive value of food is also an important motivator of food seeking and taking. In different versions of choice experiments, rats rapidly learn to perform actions that lead to the delivery of higher quantity of reward and this preference can be used to investigate the effects of manipulations of delay, risks, etc [25,26], and higher concentrations of a liquid reward maintain higher break points in the PR [13,27]. In our procedure, manipulations where reward size was increased produced inconsistent results. For PSM, no effect was found in males but a decrease in break point was found in females whereas for PR, an increase was found in males and no effect was found in females. These results are likely to be highly influenced by satiation effects associated with doubling the reward size; these effects were stronger in females compared to males because of metabolic needs and were stronger in the PSM compared to PR because in this procedure rats obtain higher number of rewards in the PSM (10-20 deliveries/session in the PR and 30-50 for PSM). For example, it has been shown that PR responding becomes independent from concentration of liquid rewards when rats are water deprived [27]. Therefore, we cannot interpret these results purely in terms of incentive value. In contrast to reward size, manipulations of reward quality (giving chocolate pellets instead of sucrose) led to clear increases in both PSM and PR break points in males and females. Thus, both PSM and PR areé sensitive to changes in incentive value of the reward if satiation levels are maintained at a constant level.

Differences in sensitivity to punishment may be explained by various behavioral mechanisms such as differences in reward/motivation processes, sensitivity to the aversive stimulus, encoding the relation between response and the punishment or the inability to control behavior [21]. In an elegant study using a conditioned punishment task that distinguished between different aspects of punishment insensitivity, Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al. (2019) found that insensitivity to punishment is not related to reward/motivation or Pavlovian fear. The authors argue that individual differences in resistance to punishment is related to deficits in encoding the contingency between behavior and the delivery of shock and not to differences in behavioral inhibition because punishment-resistant rats showed normal suppression of behavior by Pavlovian fear. Our results are consistent with the lack of relationship between resistance to punishment and reward/motivation because punishment and motivation breakpoints were completely uncorrelated. These results are also in agreement with previous papers that directly investigated both measures for drugs such as cocaine [3,12] or food rewards [12]. It is possible that motivation in progressive ratio schedules is mostly dependent on reward neurotransmitters such as dopamine [28–31], endoopioids and endocannabinoids [14] whereas resistance to punishment is mostly dependent on brain serotonin levels [32,33]; it is also possible that the balance between these two systems [34] and/or the involvement of other neurotransmitters such as glutamate and GABA [35] participate in determining individual differences. Importantly, similar to Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al (2019), sensitivity to aversion does not seem to be responsible for differences in punishment because pain sensitivity in the hot-plate test did not differ between resistant and sensitive rats.

Differences exist between males and females in the incidence and prevalence of psychiatric disorders and namely drug addiction and eating disorders [36–38] and have also been reported in animal models [39,40]. Previous studies investigating sex differences in the motivation for food have reported no difference in PR responding [41] or slightly higher

responding in males compared to females [42] that could be explained by differences in baseline responding and body weight. On the other hand, sex differences have been reported in punished-guided actions with females being more sensitive than males when punishment was probabilistic and less sensitive when it was certain [43]. In this study, we found differences in baseline behaviors, with males having higher food intake and PR responding, consistent with males having higher body weight, vigor, and metabolic needs. Because of these differences, which could confound the interpretation of the results, we avoided direct comparison between males and females and instead we analyzed their behavior separately. Importantly, we found that manipulations of hunger and incentive value of food produced similar effects on PSM and PR in males and females.

Although our PSM procedure appears to have several strengths, it may have some limitations compared to other procedures. For example, several punishment procedures use probabilistic punishment schedules in which only a percentage (often 50%) of responses are punished [3,5,6,24]. This has the advantage of modeling the fact that punishment in humans is uncertain and, in addition, it avoids animals to completely stop responding in punishment sessions. In our procedure, adding a probability factor would have reduced the number of times a rat could experience a given magnitude of shock or it would have required more trials at a given magnitude before changing it, which would have undoubtedly complicated the procedure and the interpretation of the results. Another issue that is addressed directly by other procedures but not ours, is the distinction between seeking and taking [3,5,24]. With food reinforcement, after pressing the taking lever, rats have to perform a further action to consume the pellet, therefore, it could be argued that pressing the lever in our procedure is reward seeking whereas eating the pellet is reward taking. It could be interesting to investigate whether similar or different results would be obtained in the PSM procedure if a seeking lever were added, and punishment occurred on this lever well before having access to the food. In general, whereas

the parameters (values of shock, progression, number of repetitions, etc) we chose for our PSM procedure provided a sensitive measure of resistance to punishment of responding for food reward, it remains to be investigated whether other parameters would provide more sensitive measures of resistance to punishment of responding for food reward or for other natural, pharmacological or artificial rewards.

In conclusion, we developed and characterized a novel operant self-adjusting procedure to investigate resistance to punishment in rats. This procedure provides in a single session an individual value, the PSM break point, that reflects the willingness of the animal to seek and take a reward despite negative consequences, a characteristic of compulsive behaviors and addiction. The PSM is sensitive to manipulations of motivation for the reward and allows repeated testing. Importantly, although PR break points were similarly affected by manipulation of motivation, PSM and PR did not correlate at the individual level suggesting that they represent overlapping but distinct behavioral and neurobiological processes. The PSM procedure may be a useful, more efficient tool to investigate neurobiological mechanisms of punishment and it could also be easily adapted to the investigation of compulsive seeking in drug addiction processes.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Effects of introducing progressive shock magnitude (PSM) or progressive ratio (PR) schedules on food-maintained behavior. Number of active responses during baseline (BL), progressive shock magnitude (PSM) and progressive ratio (PR) sessions in male and female rats. Data are expressed as mean ± SEM of correct responses (Males n = 48; Females = 24). Baseline (BL) was calculated on the last three training sessions in training FR1 before the first shock session. The values for PSM and PR represent the average of 2 separate sessions. Two-way ANOVA for repeated measures followed by Sidak's post hoc: ***, $P < 0.001$ PSM and PR vs BL; ###, $P < 0.001$ males vs females.

Figure 2: Population distribution for PSM and PR procedures and their correlation. Frequency distribution for behavioral outputs during baseline sessions in the PSM (A, B) and PR (C, D) procedures and their correlation (E, F) in male (left panels: A, C, E) and female rats (right panels: B, D, F). Dotted curves in E and F indicates 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 3: Effects of modulation of hunger drive on resistance to punishment in the PSM procedure. Resistance to punishment during a PSM session with normal level of food restriction (baseline, PSM BL), after 24h food deprivation (PSM Hungry) or after 24h of access to food ad libitum (PSM Sated) in male (left panels: A, C) and female rats (right panels: B, D) measured number of active responses (A, B) or total electrical charge sustained (C, D). Data are expressed as mean ± SEM (Males n = 48; Females = 24). One-way ANOVA for repeated measures followed by post hoc Dunnett's test: ***, $P < 0.001$ compared to Sh BL.

Figure 4: Effects of modulation of hunger drive on motivation in the PR procedure.

Number of active responses during a PR session with normal level of food restriction (baseline, PR BL), after 24h food deprivation (PR Hungry) or after 24h of access to food ad libitum (PR Sated) in male (A) and female rats (B). Data are expressed as mean ± SEM (Males n = 48; Females = 24). One-way ANOVA for repeated measures followed by post hoc Dunnett's test: ***, P < 0.001 compared to PR BL.

Figure 5: Effects of modulation of reward size on resistance to punishment in the PSM procedure. Resistance to punishment during a PSM session with one pellet/delivery (baseline, PSM BL) or two pellets/delivery (PSM 2 Pellets) in male (left panels: A, C) and female rats (right panels: B, D) measured number of active responses (A, B) or total electrical charge sustained (C, D). Data are expressed as mean ± SEM (Males n = 48; Females = 24). Two-tail paired Student T-Test: * and **, P < 0.05 and P < 0.01 compared to Sh BL.

Figure 6: Effects of modulation of reward size on motivation in the PR procedure. Number of active responses during a PR session with one pellet/delivery (baseline, PR BL) or two pellets/delivery (PR 2 Pellets) in male (A) and female rats (B). Data are expressed as mean ± SEM (Males n = 48; Females = 24). Two-tail paired Student T-Test: ***, P < 0.001 compared to PR BL.

Figure 7: Effects of modulation of reward quality on resistance to punishment in the PSM procedure. Resistance to punishment during a PSM session with delivery of one sucrose (baseline, PSM BL) or one chocolate (PSM Chocolate) in male (left panels: A, C) and female rats (right panels: B, D) measured number of active responses (A, B) or total electrical charge sustained (C, D). Data are expressed as mean ± SEM (Males n = 48; Females = 24). Two-tail paired Student T-Test: ***, P < 0.001 compared to Sh BL.

Figure 8: Effects of modulation of reward quality on motivation in the PR procedure. Number of active responses during a PR session with delivery of one sucrose (baseline, Sh BL) or one chocolate (Sh Chocolate) in male (A) and female rats (B). Data are expressed as mean ± SEM (Males n = 48; Females = 24). Two-tail paired Student T-Test: **, $P < 0.01$ compared to PR BL.

Funding and Disclosure

This work was supported by the Centre National pour la Recherche Scientifique, the Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale, the Université de Poitiers, the Nouvelle Aquitaine CPER 2015-2020 / FEDER 2014-2020 program "Habisan" and the Nouvelle Aquitaine grant AAPR2020A-2019-8357510 (PI : M. Solinas) and the IRESP grant « IRESP-19-ADDICTIONS-20 » (PI : M. Solinas). The contibution of LVP was supported by the Intramural Research Program of the NIH, National Institute on Drug Abuse. The authors declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgements

We thank Youna Vandaele and Pauline Belujon for helpful comments on a previous version of the manuscript. This study has benefited from the facilities and expertise of PREBIOS platform (Université de Poitiers).

Author contributions

SD, NT and MS: Conception and design, Analysis and interpretation of data, Drafting or revising the article; VL, Acquisition and analysis of data, revising the article; JEL and MH, Analysis, preparation of the figures and revising the article; LVP, Conception and programming of the procedure, interpretation of data, revising the article

References

1. Figee M, Pattij T, Willuhn I, Luigjes J, van den Brink W, Goudriaan A, et al. Compulsivity in obsessive–compulsive disorder and addictions. European Neuropsychopharmacology. 2016;26:856–868.
2. Deroche-Gamonet V, Belin D, Piazza PV. Evidence for addiction-like behavior in the rat. Science. 2004;305:1014–1017.
3. Pelloux Y, Everitt BJ, Dickinson A. Compulsive drug seeking by rats under punishment: effects of drug taking history. Psychopharmacology (Berl). 2007;194:127–137.
4. Belin D, Berson N, Balado E, Piazza PV, Deroche-Gamonet V. High-Novelty-Preference Rats are Predisposed to Compulsive Cocaine Self-administration. Neuropsychopharmacol. 2011;36:569–579.
5. Pascoli V, Terrier J, Hiver A, Lüscher C. Sufficiency of Mesolimbic Dopamine Neuron Stimulation for the Progression to Addiction. Neuron. 2015;88:1054–1066.
6. Marchant NJ, Campbell EJ, Kaganovsky K. Punishment of alcohol-reinforced responding in alcohol preferring P rats reveals a bimodal population: Implications for models of compulsive drug seeking. Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry. 2018;87:68–77.
7. Domi E, Xu L, Toivainen S, Nordeman A, Gobbo F, Venniro M, et al. A neural substrate of compulsive alcohol use. Sci Adv. 2021;7:eabg9045.
8. Panlilio LV, Thorndike EB, Schindler CW. Reinstatement of punishment-suppressed opioid self-administration in rats: an alternative model of relapse to drug abuse. Psychopharmacology. 2003;168:229–235.
9. Krasnova IN, Marchant NJ, Ladenheim B, McCoy MT, Panlilio LV, Bossert JM, et al. Incubation of Methamphetamine and Palatable Food Craving after Punishment-Induced Abstinence. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2014;39:2008–2016.
10. Durand A, Girardeau P, Freese L, Ahmed SH. Increased responsiveness to punishment of cocaine self-administration after experience with high punishment. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2021. 24 August 2021. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-021-01159-3.
11. Bentzley BS, Jhou TC, Aston-Jones G. Economic demand predicts addiction-like behavior and therapeutic efficacy of oxytocin in the rat. PNAS. 2014;111:11822–11827.
12. Datta U, Martini M, Sun W. Different functional domains measured by cocaine self-administration under the progressive-ratio and punishment schedules in male Wistar rats. Psychopharmacology. 2018;235:897–907.
13. Hodos W. Progressive ratio as a measure of reward strength. Science. 1961;134:943–944.
14. Solinas M, Goldberg SR. Motivational effects of cannabinoids and opioids on food reinforcement depend on simultaneous activation of cannabinoid and opioid systems. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2005;30:2035–2045.
15. Leander JD. Shock intensity and duration interactions on free-operant avoidance behavior. Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior. 1973;19:481–490.
16. Parker CC, Chen H, Flagel SB, Geurts AM, Richards JB, Robinson TE, et al. Rats are the smart choice: Rationale for a renewed focus on rats in behavioral genetics. Neuropharmacology. 2014;76:250–258.
17. Richardson NR, Roberts DC. Progressive ratio schedules in drug self-administration studies in rats: a method to evaluate reinforcing efficacy. J Neurosci Methods. 1996;66:1–11.

18. Deuis JR, Dvorakova LS, Vetter I. Methods Used to Evaluate Pain Behaviors in Rodents. Frontiers in Molecular Neuroscience. 2017;10.
19. Rachlin H, Loveland D. Titration of punishment. Psychonomic Science. 1971;22:39–40.
20. Rachlin H. Response control with titration of punishment. J Exp Anal Behav. 1972;17:147–157.
21. Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel P, Ma C, Bradfield LA, Killcross S, McNally GP. Punishment insensitivity emerges from impaired contingency detection, not aversion insensitivity or reward dominance. Elife. 2019;8.
22. Stevens SS. On the psychophysical law. Psychol Rev. 1957;64:153–181.
23. Storms LH. Effects of punishment as a function of strain of rat and duration of shock. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology. 1963;56:1022–1026.
24. Jacobs DS, Moghaddam B. Prefrontal Cortex Representation of Learning of Punishment Probability During Reward-Motivated Actions. J Neurosci. 2020;40:5063–5077.
25. Evenden JL, Ryan CN. The pharmacology of impulsive behaviour in rats: the effects of drugs on response choice with varying delays of reinforcement. Psychopharmacology (Berl). 1996;128:161–170.
26. Floresco SB, St Onge JR, Ghods-Sharifi S, Winstanley CA. Cortico-limbic-striatal circuits subserving different forms of cost-benefit decision making. Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci. 2008;8:375–389.
27. Reilly S. Reinforcement Value of Gustatory Stimuli Determined by Progressive Ratio Performance. Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior. 1999;63:301–311.
28. Cagniard B, Balsam PD, Brunner D, Zhuang X. Mice with Chronically Elevated Dopamine Exhibit Enhanced Motivation, but not Learning, for a Food Reward. Neuropsychopharmacol. 2006;31:1362–1370.
29. Kravitz AV, Tye LD, Kreitzer AC. Distinct roles for direct and indirect pathway striatal neurons in reinforcement. Nat Neurosci. 2012;15:816–818.
30. Randall PA, Pardo M, Nunes EJ, Cruz LL, Vemuri VK, Makriyannis A, et al. Dopaminergic Modulation of Effort-Related Choice Behavior as Assessed by a Progressive Ratio Chow Feeding Choice Task: Pharmacological Studies and the Role of Individual Differences. PLOS ONE. 2012;7:e47934.
31. Ko D, Wanat MJ. Phasic Dopamine Transmission Reflects Initiation Vigor and Exerted Effort in an Action- and Region-Specific Manner. J Neurosci. 2016;36:2202–2211.
32. Pelloux Y, Dilleen R, Economidou D, Theobald D, Everitt BJ. Reduced Forebrain Serotonin Transmission is Causally Involved in the Development of Compulsive Cocaine Seeking in Rats. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2012;37:2505–2514.
33. Cohen JY, Amoroso MW, Uchida N. Serotonergic neurons signal reward and punishment on multiple timescales. ELife. 2015;4:e06346.
34. Palminteri S, Pessiglione M. Opponent Brain Systems for Reward and Punishment Learning. Decision Neuroscience, Elsevier; 2017. p. 291–303.
35. Stephenson-Jones M, Bravo-Rivera C, Ahrens S, Furlan A, Xiao X, Fernandes-Henriques C, et al. Opposing Contributions of GABAergic and Glutamatergic Ventral Pallidal Neurons to Motivational Behaviors. Neuron. 2020;105:921-933.e5.
36. Earls F. Sex differences in psychiatric disorders: origins and developmental influences. Psychiatr Dev. 1987;5:1–23.
37. O'Brien MS, Anthony JC. Risk of becoming cocaine dependent: epidemiological estimates for the United States, 2000-2001. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2005;30:1006–1018.
38. Solmi M, Radua J, Olivola M, Croce E, Soardo L, Salazar de Pablo G, et al. Age at onset of mental disorders worldwide: large-scale meta-analysis of 192 epidemiological studies. Mol Psychiatry. 2021. 2 June 2021. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-021-01161-7.

39. Asarian L, Geary N. Sex differences in the physiology of eating. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2013;305:R1215-1267.
40. Becker JB, Koob GF. Sex Differences in Animal Models: Focus on Addiction. Pharmacol Rev. 2016;68:242–263.
41. van Hest A, van Haaren F, van de Poll NE. The behavior of male and female Wistar rats pressing a lever for food is not affected by sex differences in food motivation. Behavioural Brain Research. 1988;27:215–221.
42. Datta U, Martini M, Sun WL. Sex Differences in the Motivational Contrast between Sucrose and Cocaine in Rats. 2017:6.
43. Chowdhury TG, Wallin-Miller KG, Rear AA, Park J, Diaz V, Simon NW, et al. Sex differences in reward- and punishment-guided actions. Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci. 2019;19:1404–1417.

TABLE 1

	# Active Responses		**Total Shock Duration (Sec)**		**Total Electrical Charge (mC)**	
	Males	***Females***	***Males***	***Females***	***Males***	***Females***
BL	120.80 ± 1.46	97.94±4.024	-	-	-	-
PSM BL*	45.87±2.94	40.50±3.08	8.60±0.83	5.638±1.375	1.97±0.20	1.69±0.41
PSM Hungry	57.83±2.48	59.75±5.88	12.79±1.55	16.41±4.37	3.84±0.46	4.92±1.31
PSM Sated	25.33±1.78	17.79±2.478	1.45±0.23	1.38±0.33	0.43±0.07	0.41±0.10
PSM 2 Pellets	50.13±2.04	32.17±2.38	8.01±0.80	3.46±0.95	2.40±0.24	1.04±0.28
PSM Chocolate	65.35±2.968	55.08±3.80	15.83±1.947	10.77±2.85	4.74±0.58	3.23±0.86

Mean ± SEM
* PSM BL was established several times during the experiments. For clarity, here we provide values of the first measure.

FIGURES

Fig. 1



Fig. 2


A)
Males PSM BL
% Frequency
Shock[Ln(Electrical Charge)]
B)
Females PSM BL
% Frequency
Shock[Ln(Electrical Charge)]
C)
Males PR BL
% Frequency
Active Responses
D)
Females PR BL
% Frequency
Active Responses
E)
r2 = 0.01
Active Responses
Shock[Ln(Electrical Charge)]
F)
r2 = 0.005
Active Responses
Shock[Ln(Electrical Charge)]

Fig. 3


A)
Males
Active Responses
150
100
50
0
***
***
PSM BL
PSM Hungry
PSM Sated
B)
Females
Active Responses
150
100
50
0
***
***
PSM BL
PSM Hungry
PSM Sated
C)
Males
Shock[Ln(Electrical Charge)]
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
***
***
PSM BL
PSM Hungry
PSM Sated
D)
Females
Shock[Ln(Electrical Charge)]
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
***
***
PSM BL
PSM Hungry
PSM Sated

Fig. 4


A)
Males
B)
Females
Active Responses
2000
1500
1000
500
0
***
PR BL
PR Hungry
PR Sated

Fig. 5


A)
Males
Active Responses
100
80
60
40
20
0
PSM BL
PSM 2 Pellets
B)
Females
Active Responses
**
PSM BL
PSM 2 Pellets
C)
Males
Shock[Ln(Electrical Charge)]
4
2
0
-2
-4
PSM BL
PSM 2 Pellets
D)
Females
Shock[Ln(Electrical Charge)]
*
PSM BL
PSM 2 Pellets

Fig. 6


A)
Males
***
2000
1500
1000
500
0
Active Responses
PR BL
PR 2 Pellets
B)
Females
2000
1500
1000
500
0
Active Responses
PR BL
PR 2 Pellets

Fig. 7


A)
Males
Active Responses
150
100
50
0
***
PSM BL
PSM Chocolate
B)
Females
Active Responses
150
100
50
0
***
PSM BL
PSM Chocolate
C)
Males
Ln(Electrical Charge)
4
2
0
-2
-4
**
PSM BL
PSM Chocolate
D)
Females
Ln(Electrical Charge)
4
2
0
-2
-4
***
PSM BL
PSM Chocolate

Fig. 8


A)
Males
Active Responses
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
**
PR BL
PR Chocolate
B)
Females
Active Responses
2500
2000
1500
1000
500
0
**
PR BL
PR Chocolate