Methamphetamine (MA) use, MA dependence, and MA-induced psychosis are associated with increasing aberrations in the compensatory immunoregulatory system and interleukin-1α and CCL5 levels.
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Abstract

Comprehensive immunological profiles have not been studied in relation to methamphetamine (MA) use, MA dependency, or MA-induced psychosis (MAP). Using the BioPlex Pro Human Cytokine 48-Plex panel, this study measured M1 macrophage, T helper (Th)-1, Th-2, growth factor, and chemokine profiles, as well as the immune inflammatory response system (IRS) and compensatory immunoregulatory system (CIRS) in peripheral blood samples from patients with MA use (n=51), MA dependence (n=47), and MAP (n=43) in comparison with healthy controls (n=43). We discovered that persistent MA use had a robust dose-dependent suppressive impact on all immunological profiles, suggesting extensive immunosuppression. The most reliable biomarker profile of MA use is the combination of substantial CIRS suppression and a rise in selected pro-inflammatory cytokines, namely CCL27 (CTACK), CCL11 (eotaxin), and interleukin (IL)-1α. In addition, MA dependency is related with a more severe immunosuppression, as demonstrated by lower stem cell factor and higher IL-10 levels. MAP is related with a significant decrease in all immunological profiles, particularly CIRS, and an increase in CCL5 (RANTES), IL-1α, and IL-12p70 signaling. In conclusion, long-term MA use and dependency severely undermine immune homeostasis. This results in widespread immunosuppression, which may increase the likelihood of infectious and immune illness or exacerbate disorders such as hepatitis and AIDS. Elevated levels of CCL5, CCL11, CCL27, IL-1α, and/or IL-12p70 may be associated with severe peripheral (atherosclerosis, cutaneous inflammation, immune aberrations, hypospermatogenesis) and central (neuroinflammation, neurotoxic, neurodegenerative, depression, anxiety and psychosis) side effects. Our message: “cease using MA, or better yet, never begin using MA”. 
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1. Introduction

Methamphetamine (MA), a psychostimulant, is the second most frequently used illegal substance worldwide (Paulus and Stewart, 2020; Stoneberg et al., 2018). Between 2009 and 2018, the number of persons who used MA increased from 210 million to 265 million worldwide (UNODC, 2022). With at least 169 tonnes of MA seizures in 2020, seizures in East and Southeast Asia continued to rise (UNODC, 2021). Between 2016 and 2020, 72% of amphetamine-type stimulant seizures included MA, followed by 17% amphetamine and 4% ecstasy (UNODC, 2022). In Southeast Asia, particularly Thailand, the most popular drug has been MA speed tablets combining both MA and caffeine (Kalayasiri, 2016). In recent years, crystal meth (ice), a crystalline and pure version of MA, has gained popularity and has been introduced as a chemsex substance, including among those who inject drugs (Giorgetti et al., 2017; Werb et al., 2009).

An increase in dopamine, norepinephrine, and serotonin turnover causes the stimulant effects of MA on the central nervous system (Cruickshank and Dyer, 2009). In addition, the use of MA causes significant neurological and physical consequences, such as sleep disturbances, aggressive behavior, anxiety, sadness, depression, and psychosis, including delusions and hallucinations (Paulus and Stewart, 2020; Zeng et al., 2018). MA-induced psychosis (MAP) is characterized by persecuting delusions, hallucinations, and conceptual disorganization (Al-Hakeim et al., 2022; Chiang et al., 2019; Voce et al., 2019). Around 3–23% of frequent users in a population sample of MA abusers reported MAP or psychotic symptoms (McKetin et al., 2006). Around 40% of persons with MA dependency in a hospital-based research group may have psychotic symptoms, such as paranoia, throughout their lifetime use of MA (Kalayasiri et al., 2014). MAP occurs over the course of MA use, including acute intoxication and chronic use (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Typically, MAP may be present for a brief period, a few days to one month after the
cessation of MA use; nevertheless, 38.8% of patients have a continuous course of psychosis, suggesting an association between MAP and primary psychotic disorders, such as schizophrenia (Kittirattanapaiboon et al., 2010).

A number of studies demonstrated that MA use may disrupt immunological homeostasis and suppress immune functions (Shi et al., 2022), including suppressing the production of T helper (Th)-1 cytokines (Yu et al., 2002), T-cell proliferation (Potula et al., 2018), and the number of lymphocytes and immune cells (Harms et al., 2012; In et al., 2005). Nitrostyrene, an amphetamine derivative, decreases interleukin (IL)-12 and IL-6 concentrations (Carter et al., 2002). Earlier research showed that MAP is associated with symptoms of immunological activation and inflammation, as well as neuroinflammation, as evidenced by elevated IL-6 and IL-8 (Yang et al., 2020), as well as elevated oxidative stress and decreased antioxidant defenses (Al-Hakeim et al., 2022). MA may affect antigen-presenting cells (APCs) in the brain, leading to an increase in pro-inflammatory cytokines such as IL-1β, IL-6, IL-8, interferons (IFN), and tumor necrosis factor (TNF)-α (Prakash et al., 2017).

MAP is often used and investigated as a model of schizophrenia because the overlapping symptoms and biomarker characteristics, such as elevated dopamine turnover (Ikeda et al., 2013). There is now evidence that schizophrenia, and particularly its more severe phenotype deficit schizophrenia, is a neuro-immune and neuro-oxidative disorder (Maes et al., 1994; Maes et al., 2022b; Roomruangwong et al., 2020), with elevated levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines such as IL-1β, IL-6, IL-12p70, and TNF-α (Monji et al., 2009; Song et al., 2009), activation of macrophage M1, Th-1, Th-2, Th-17, and T regulatory (Treg) phenotypes, as well as activation of the immune-inflammatory response system (IRS) and the compensatory immune-regulatory systems (CIRS), which tend to downregulate the IRS and prevent hyperinflammation (Roomruangwong et al., 2020). However, no research has studied
the comprehensive immunological profiles of MA use, MA dependence, and MAP, including M1, Th-1, Th-2, Th-17, IRS, CIRS, chemokine, and growth factor profiles, to determine whether these conditions are characterized by immune activation or suppression. Hence, we explored peripheral blood immune profiles in MA use, MA dependence, and MAP as compared with healthy controls to examine whether these conditions are accompanied by immune activation or immunosuppression, and which immune profiles and cytokines are specifically involved in the three conditions.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

This research recruited 173 participants, 43 healthy controls and 141 Thai MA users from the Princess Mother National Institute on Drug Abuse Treatment (PMNIDAT), Thailand, including those with no MA dependency (n = 51), MA dependence (n = 47), and MAP (n = 43). A verbal notice was made at King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital to recruit healthy controls (HC) (n = 32) who had never taken MA in their lives and did not have any drug dependency except for a tobacco use disorder. By age and gender, the controls were matched with the MA group. All participants were between the ages of 18 and 65. Participants with severe neuropsychiatric disorders, such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, psycho-organic disorders, and schizo-affective disorder, as well as subjects with (auto)immune disorders, such as psoriasis, inflammatory-bowel disease, rheumatoid arthritis, and lupus erythematosus, were excluded from the study. We also omitted women who were pregnant or nursing. The data collection was between March - August 2022 and was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Faculty of Medicine of Chulalongkorn University and the PMNIDAT (No. 28/2565).
2.2. Clinical assessment

Using the Thai version of the Semi-Structured Assessment of Drug Dependency and Alcoholism (SSADDA), demographics, drug use data including tobacco, alcohol, cannabis, and MA, and diagnoses were acquired (Kalayasiri et al., 2014; Malison et al., 2011). Based on the Fourth Version of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV), the SSADDA is a thorough interview to identify drug dependency and associated mental illnesses (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Utilizing the SSADDA, patients meeting 6-7 criteria on the DSM-IV MA dependent scale were recruited for the MA dependence group, whereas those with 0-1 criteria were recruited for the no MA dependence group. Persons having a history of psychotic symptoms while taking MA, including hallucinations and/or delusions, were selected for the MAP group if they answered "yes" to any of the Psychotic Section of the SSADDA questions. Using the latter, we also determined the length of heavy MA use (in months), the daily quantity of MA (in milligrams; mg), and the forms of MA, such as crystal meth, speed pills, or both. We also evaluated lifetime and present alcohol and illicit substance use. We estimated the maximum number of alcoholic drinks per day; one standard alcoholic drink is equivalent to 10 grammes of pure alcohol. The interviewers were two psychologists with more than five years of training and experience doing SSADDA interviews. Before finishing the interview data, all interviews were cross-checked by several interviewers.

2.3 Measurement of cytokines

Early in the morning (between 8:00 and 9:00 a.m.), 5 ml of venous blood was drawn from each participant using a disposable syringe. Blood was stored at -80 °C until thawed for biomarker assays. The samples were placed at room temperature for 1 hour, then aliquots 25 µl. whole blood were diluted 1:4 (sample: diluent) after that the standard dilutions were
prepared. The concentrations of 48 cytokines, chemokines and growth factors were measured using Bio-Plex Multiplex Immunoassays (Bio-Rad Laboratories Inc., USA). 50 µl of the diluted samples were combined with 50 µl of the microparticle cocktail (containing cytokines/chemokines per well of a 96-well plate) and incubated for 1 h at room temperature while shaking at 850 rpm. The plates were rinsed three times, then 50 µl of diluted Streptavidin-PE was added to each well, and it was incubated for 10 minutes at room temperature. 125 µl of assay buffer was added, and the wells were shaken for 30 seconds at room temperature (850 rpm) prior to being read with the Bio-Plex® 200 System (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.). In the present study, we employed the concentrations of the different analytes in the data analyses. Concentrations that were not detectable (i.e., the lower limit out of range values) were censored and we imputed these censored data with the sensitivity values of each assay. Cytokines/chemokines/growth factors with concentration levels that were >45% out of range were excluded from the analysis concerning the solitary analytes. Nevertheless, we also computed different immune profiles (see Introduction), including M1, Th-1, Th-2, IRS and CIRS profiles and all analytes (even those with <45% detectable concentrations) may be used toward that end (Maes et al., 2022b; Thisayakorn et al., 2022), except those with <7% detectable concentrations (GM-CSF, IL-2, IL-3, IL-5, IL-15, and β-NGF). The reason is that even a smaller number of measurable concentrations (>more than 12) may contribute to the immune profiles. Electronic Supplementary File (ESF), Table 1 lists all cytokine/chemokines/growth factors measured here, as well as their names, gene IDs and % measurable analytes (>lower limit of out of range concentration). ESF, Table 2 shows how we constructed M1, Th-1, Th-2, IRS and CIRS immune profiles, based on our previous publications (Maes and Carvalho, 2018; Maes et al., 2022b; Thisayakorn et al., 2022). Unfortunately, we were unable to construct the Th-17 profile because its major players IL-6 and IL-17 were not measurable in many blood samples. We also computed the ratio z
transformation of IL-12p70 – z IL-12p40, because IL-12 signaling via IL-12p70 may be inhibited via IL-12p40 (Zagozdzon and Lasek, 2016).

2.4 Statistical analysis

Using Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients, correlations between variables were analyzed. The analysis of contingency tables was used to compare variables depending on their categories (Chi-square tests). Analysis of variance was employed to examine the differences in continuous variables across 4 study groups (HC, MA use, MA dependence, and MAP). Univariate generalized linear models taking into account the impacts of gender, age, BMI, current tobacco and alcohol use disorder, we examined the associations among these groups and cytokines and immune profiles. At a significance level of p 0.05, pairwise comparisons of group means were conducted to detect differences between the four study groups. Binary logistic regression analysis was performed to delineate the most important predictors of MAP versus MA without MAP (MA-MAP), and MA dependence versus MA use. Using the overfit criterion as entry and/or removal criterion (maximum effects number set at 5) we performed forward stepwise automatic linear modelling analyses (allowing for the confounders) and consequently, examined the model using a manual regression analyses. We checked the residual distributions of the final model, the variance inflation factor and tolerance in order to identify any collinearity or multicollinearity concerns, and heteroskedasticity using the White and modified Breusch-Pagan homoscedasticity tests. We calculated the partial regression analysis of immune data on clinical data, model statistics (F, df, and p values, total variance explained, which was used as effect size), and the standardized β coefficients, t statistics (with exact p-value) for each predictor. The significance threshold of all statistical analyses was calculated using two-tailed tests with a value of 0.05. Where needed, the cytokines/chemokines/growth factors were
introduced in the statistical analyses after transformations, including log10, fractional rank-based normal transformations, and Winsorization. We used principal component analysis (PCA) as a feature reduction method and the first PC was considered to be adequate when the variance explained (VE) in the data was > 50%, and all variables have a loading > 0.66, the factoriability of the correlation matrix using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy, the Bartlett’s sphericity and the anti-image correlation matrix were accurate. All of the aforementioned statistical studies were conducted using IBM, SPSS windows version 28. An a priori sample size calculation was conducted using G*Power 3.1.9.4; for an analysis of covariance with 5 covariates, effect size of 0.27, alpha=0.05 (two tailed), power=0.8, and 4 groups the sample size should be at least 154.

3. Results

Demographics and clinical data in the four study groups

Table 1 shows the sociodemographic and clinical data of the 4 study groups. There were no significant differences in the sex ratio among groups, although there were some differences in age, BMI and marital status between the groups. MAP patients showed a significantly higher amount of daily MA use (in mg), alcohol drinks per day, and severity of alcohol use than patients without MAP. The severity of MA dependence and the DSM-IV number of dependence criteria were significantly higher in MA dependence and MAP than in those with MA use. There were significant differences in lifetime, but not current, tobacco and cannabis use among the four study groups.

immune profiles in MA use and dependence and MAP

Table 2 shows the immune profiles of the four study groups. Using PCA, we were able to extract one PC from M1, Th-1, Th-2, IRS, CIRS, chemokine and growth factor
profiles (VE=84.7%, all loadings > 0.878, KMO=0.896, bartlett’s test: $\chi^2=1652.808$, df=21, p<0.001), labeled PC_immune. All of the cytokine profiles including PC_immune, were significantly different between the study groups (p < 0.001). The MAP group had the lowest M1, Th-1, Th-2, IRS, CIRS, chemokine, growth factor, and PC_immune scores but higher IL1270 - IL2040 scores as compared with the three other groups. In addition, MA dependence and/or MA use had lower z-scores of M1, Th-1, Th-2, IRS, CIRS, chemokine, growth factor, and PC_immune scores than healthy controls. The PC_immune score was lower in MAP than in all other subjects. The IL1270 - IL2040 scores were higher in patients than controls. A post-hoc analysis to compute the achieved power for the least significant comparison in Table 2 (IRS/CIRS), showed that the achieved power (at $\alpha=0.05$, 4 groups, 5 covariates, n=174) was 0.987. The achieved power for all other comparisons was 1.0. ESF, Figures S1-S36 show the levels of the measurable cytokines/chemokines/growth factors in controls, MA-use, MA dependence, and MAP.

**Intercorrelation matrix**

Table 3 shows the associations between MA use and dependence features and the immune profiles. The MA dose was significantly and negatively correlated with the M1, Th-1, Th-2, IRS, CIRS, chemokine, growth factor, and PC_immune profiles, and positively with IL1270 - IL2040 and the IRS/CIRS ratio. The duration of MA use showed an inverse association with the growth factor profile. The severity of MA dependence was significantly associated with M1, Th-1, Th-2, IRS, CIRS, chemokine, growth factor, and PC_immune profiles, and a positive correlation with IL1270 - IL2040 and the IRS/CIRS ratio.

*Prediction of the general immune profile by MA and other clinical features*
Table 4 shows two different regression models predicting PC_immune. The first model was performed using MA features only and shows that 26.8% of the variance in PC_immune is explained by the regression on the number of dependency criteria and in addition by MA dose (both inversely). Figure 1 shows the partial regression of PC_immune on MA dose. Regression #2 was performed with MA, alcohol and cannabis features as explanatory variables and shows that 40.1% of the variance in PC_immune is explained by the combined effects of alcohol dependence (positively) and an ordinal variable based on the 4 groups (negatively).

Regression analyses with MAP and MA dependence as outcomes

Table 5 shows the results of logistic binary regression analyses with MAP, MA dependence and MA use as dependent variables. Binary logistic regression #1 shows that MAP (reference group = MA patients without MAP) is predicted by lowered CIRS, and increased MA dose, number of DSM-IV MA dependence criteria and alcohol dependence ($\chi^2$=60.69, df=2, p<0.001, correctly classified or CC: 82.5%, Nagelkerke=0.492). Regression #2 shows that MAP was strongly predicted by Th-1 and CIRS profiles (inversely) and by CCL5 and IL-1α (positively) ($\chi^2$=96.41, df=4, p<0.001, correctly classified or CC: 87.3%, Nagelkerke=0.698). Regression #3 shows an alternative prediction of MAP with CIRS (inversely) and IL12 70 - IL20 40 and IL-1α (positively) as explanatory variables ($\chi^2$=103.4, df=3, p<0.001, correctly classified or CC: 86.7%, Nagelkerke=0.667). Regression #4 examined the prediction of MAP versus all other patients and controls and found that the same variables as shown in regression #2 predicted MAP ($\chi^2$=116.812, df=4, p<0.001, correctly classified or CC: 89.8%, Nagelkerke=0.726). Regression #5 shows that IRS/CIRS was the single best predictor of MAP (versus MA patients without MAP) (positive correlation). Binary logistic regression #6 examines the prediction of MA dependence (MA
use as reference group) and shows that MA dependence was best predicted by SCF (inversely) and IL-10 (positively) ($\chi^2=107.362$, df=2, p<0.001, correctly classified or CC: 94.1%, Nagelkerke=0.888). The last regression (#7) shows that the best discrimination of MA patients versus healthy controls was obtained using CIRS (inversely) and CTACK+CCL11+IL-1α (positively) as predictors ($\chi^2=92.793$, df=2, p<0.001, correctly classified or CC: 93.1%, Nagelkerke=0.672).

Discussion

Immune profiles in MA use and dependence

The first major finding is that chronic MA use reduces considerably the first factor extracted from all immunological profiles (M1, Th-1, Th-2, IRS, CIRS, chemokine, and growth factors), indicating widespread immunosuppression. These findings expand upon those of recent papers demonstrating the many immunosuppressive effects of MA. MA at pharmacological doses exerts immunosuppressive effects on antigen-presenting cells, including macrophages and dendritic cells, reduces T cell proliferative activity, and inhibits receptor-mediated phagocytosis of antibody particles and MHC class II antigen presentation by T cells (Potula et al., 2018; Tallóczy et al., 2008). In addition, MA treatment of splenocytes has a substantial influence on antigen-induced proliferation and macrophage phagocytosis (Martinez et al., 2009). Two weeks of MA treatment inhibits lymphoproliferative responses to lipopolysaccharide (LPS) and concanavalin A in mice (In et al., 2005). In rodent models, injection of MA reduces the amount of T lymphocytes in the spleen, including CD4 and CD8 cells, and the number of macrophages, dendritic cells, and natural killer cells, with the latter exhibiting diminished reactivity (Harms et al., 2012). Furthermore, treatment of MA lowers the production of Th-1 cytokines, including IFN-γ, and IL-2, but had no effect on the production of IL-6 and IL-4 (Yu et al., 2002).
Importantly, immunosuppression in users of MA is strongly associated with increasing doses of MA (but not with duration of heaviest MA use) and with the severity of MA dependence. This indicates that MA has a strong dose-dependent suppressant effect on IRS and CIRS products. Overall, our data on M1 and Th-1 profiles are consistent with animal studies showing decreased M1 and Th-1 activity following MA exposure. Despite this, our findings indicate that chronic MA use additionally suppresses Th-2 and CIRS profiles, as well as the chemokine and growth factor subnetworks. This is important, as the latter subnetwork is intimately connected with the cytokine-chemokine network (Maes et al., 2022a). In addition, we discovered that prolonged MA use lowers the levels of several cytokines/chemokines/growth factors, such as FGF, GRO, IL-1β, sIL-1RA, sIL-2R, IL-4, IL-8, IL-12p40, IL-13, IL-18, LIF, CCL7 (MCP3), CSF, MIF, CXCL9 (MIG, SCF, and TRAIL.

Obviously, such a general decrease of immune processes may be accompanied by dysfunctions in host immunity, as observed in MA users, resulting in greater susceptibility to acquire new infections and a worsening of infectious diseases, including hepatitis and AIDS (Salamanca et al., 2015).

Factors explaining MA-induced immunosuppression

Several variables may account for the significant immunosuppression generated by persistent MA use. First, MA may interfere with the cell cycle machinery, hence preventing T cell proliferation and a proper adaptive immune response (Potula et al., 2018). MA may reduce T cell cycle gene expression, including cyclin E, CDK2, and E2F, resulting in a prolonged G1/S phase transition (Potula et al., 2018). Second, injection of MA causes apoptosis in macrophages and T cells (Aslanyan et al., 2017; Potula et al., 2010). Third, MA-stimulated catecholamine turnover may suppress the production of IL-6, TNF-α, and sIL-1RA, therefore influencing the IRS and CIRS (Maes et al., 2000). Fourth, exposure to MA, a
weak base, may interfere with the pH maintenance of the more acidic organelles, which
govern protein breakdown and surface receptor expression (Martinez et al., 2009; Tallóczy et
al., 2008). The effects of MA on the pH gradient may impair acidic organelles inside immune
cells, MHC class II antigen processing, antigen presentation by dendritic cells to T cells, and
ultimately the immunological response (Martinez et al., 2009; Tallóczy et al., 2008). Fifth,
MA exposure may induce T cell mRNA expression of the trace amine-associated receptor 1
(TAAR1) (Sriram et al., 2016), which is involved in rheostasis, homeostasis, and cAMP
signaling and interacts with monoamine turnover (Dodd et al., 2021; Maes et al., 2005). This
indicates that MA-induced TAAR1 expression may downregulate Th-1-like cytokines such as
IL-2 (Sriram et al., 2016).

Signs of immune activation in MA use and dependence

Our second major observation is that persistent MA use is also associated with
indicators of immunological activation. Various analytes were significantly elevated, such as
CCL27 (CTACK) in MA users, and IL-1α, IL-12p70, and CCL5 (RANTES) in subjects with
MA dependence. In addition, not all analytes were lowered in MA users, including CCL11
(eotaxin), IL-9, IL-16, CXCL10 (IP10), CCL3 (MIP1α), CCL4 (MIP1β), TNF-α and TNF-β
(in both MA use and dependence), and G-CSF, HGF, CCL2 (MCP1), PDGF-BB, CXCL12
(SDF-1α), IL-9, and IL-10 (in MA dependence). These findings expand the findings of prior
investigations. For example, treatment of MA to microglia markedly elevates IL-12p70
(Vargas et al., 2020), and MA exposure substantially increases IL-12 levels in the kidney and
liver (but not spleen) of mice (Peerzada et al., 2013). Moreover, MA induces T cell
proliferation in the brain via upregulating IL-15 in astrocytes (Bortell et al., 2017). Macaques
afflicted with Simian Immunodeficiency Virus may produce more CCL5 if they are treated
with MA (Najera et al., 2016). MA exposure elevates TNF-α levels in selected mouse brain
areas, which are partially mediated by redox processes (Flora et al., 2002). Another research paper showed that MA exposure may considerably boost TNF-α production even in the presence of Th-1 suppression (Yu et al., 2002).

Considering that MA users have a generally suppressed immune system, the significant or relative increase in some cytokines/growth factors may be relevant. This is further supported by a higher IRS/CIRS ratio in MA users compared to healthy controls. Hence, despite the overall immunosuppression, there is a relative rise in pro-inflammatory cytokines/chemokines, as well as growth factors (G-CSF, PDGF-BB, and CXCL12 or SDF-1α) that may fuel the synthesis of these cytokines/chemokines. In fact, a combination of a decreased CIRS profile and an increase in pro-inflammatory cytokines/chemokines (CCL27 + CCL11 + IL-1α) is the best biomarker profile of MA use. It is noteworthy to note that CD4+ cells, which are inhibited during MA use, also exhibit indicators of activation, such as increased expression of CD150 and CD226 (Harms et al., 2012).

All in all, not only the generalized immunosuppression but also signs of immune activation are important to understand the pathophysiology of MA use. For example, CCL27 (CTACK or cutaneous T cell-attracting chemokine) is a cutaneous chemokine that attracts lymphocyte-associated antigen (CLA)+ memory cells, which are implicated in cutaneous inflammatory lesions (Morales et al., 1999). As such, increased CCL27 may perhaps play a role in MA-associated skin damage, including itching (due to meth mites), lesions, excoriations, and ulcers (Banyan Treatment Centers, 2021). IL-1α, IL-12p70, and CCL5 are pro-inflammatory cytokines/chemokines that may contribute to the inflammatory pathways and the accompanying brain dysfunctions (Salamanca et al., 2015) as well as peripheral inflammation-linked disorders, including cardiovascular diseases, which frequently occur in MA users (Al-Hakeim et al., 2022). CCL11 levels may be associated with greater anxiety, depression, and cognitive deficits among MA users (Huckans et al., 2015).
Moreover, the transition from moderate MA use to severe MA dependency (greater dosage and longer duration of MA use) is characterized by decreased SCF (stem cell factor) and increased IL-10 levels. SCF is a cytokine that plays a major role in hematopoiesis and spermatogenesis; consequently, decreased SCF may contribute to the decreased lymphoproliferative responses to MA (see discussion above) and the decreased sperm count, motility, and morphology in MA users (Allaeian Jahromi et al., 2022). In response to MA exposure, IL-10 levels are elevated in the plasma of both mice and humans (Loftis et al., 2011; Peerzada et al., 2013). Such a non-protective immunological response to IL-10 may restrict T cell proliferation even further.

The immune profile of MAP

The third major finding of the study is that MAP is characterized by a) extremely reduced levels of M1, Th-1, Th-2, IRS, chemokine, and growth factor profiles, but especially the CIRS profile; b) an increase in a few selected cytokines/chemokines with systemic effects, including CCL5 and IL-1α, and IL-12p70 signaling; and c) an increased IRS/CIRS ratio. Alternatively stated, MA users with severe immunosuppression and increased levels of some pro-inflammatory cytokines are at risk for developing MAP. In addition, MAP is linked with increased MA use and severity of MA dependence, both of which are connected with rising immunosuppression and immune activation markers (e.g. IL-12 signaling).

IL-1α produced from peripheral blood may cross the BBB and get access to cortical brain cells (Banks et al., 1991). The production of IL-1α is mediated by elevated levels of damage-associated molecular patterns, necrosis, and necroptotic stimuli during sterile inflammation (Banks et al., 1993; Brough and Denes, 2015). Moreover, MA exposure may enhance the production of HMGB1, a significant DAMP, that contributes to neuroinflammation (Frank et al., 2016) and may promote necrosis/necroptosis via
dopaminergic, oxidative stress, and AGE-RAGE pathways (Al-Hakeim et al., 2023; Davidson et al., 2001). Additionally, peripheral and central IL-1α elevations play a significant role in CNS inflammation, therefore contributing to acute and chronic brain diseases (Brough and Denes, 2015) Interestingly, IL-1α may generate CCL5, another cytokine related with MAP (Brough and Denes, 2015). As the levels of IL-1RA (which regulates IL-1-signaling; (Maes et al., 2012)) are significantly reduced in MAP, the effects of IL-1α and CCL5 may become more prominent. CCL5 (RANTES) is a chemokine that may cross the BBB and reach the brain parenchyma, and CCL5 and its receptor are expressed in glia, whilst microglia and astrocytes are capable of producing CCL5 (Bajetto et al., 2002; Dorf et al., 2000; Guo et al., 1998; Quaranta et al., 2023). Elevated CCL5 expression in the central nervous system is associated with increased neuroinflammation, cortical synaptic excitability, and hyperalgesia, and is implicated in neuroinflammatory and neurodegenerative disease (Bajetto et al., 2002; Benamar et al., 2008; Mori et al., 2016). In addition, enhanced IL-12 signaling contributes to neuroinflammation and neurodegeneration (Schneeberger et al., 2021; Turka et al., 1995; Vom Berg et al., 2012), and IL-12 (Turka et al., 1995) is, as CCL27, implicated in inflammatory skin lesions.

Despite the fact that it is now well-established that schizophrenia is an immunological condition and that first-episode schizophrenia and deficit schizophrenia are associated with IRS and CIRS activation (Maes, 2022; Maes et al., 1994; Noto et al., 2019), there are relatively few reports on the cytokine network in MAP. Yang et al. (2020) found that IL-6 and IL-8 were elevated in MAP patients and that sIL-2R was negatively correlated with positive symptoms (Yang et al., 2020). Psychosis in amphetamine-dependent women during early cessation is associated by increases in IL-10, TNF-α, and IL-5 (the latter cytokine was not measurable in our research) (Kuo et al., 2018). MAP is also accompanied by neuroinflammatory aberrations in the AAC-thalamus circuits (Burger et al., 2023).
Conclusions

Figure 2 summarizes our findings. Prolonged MA use disrupts immunological homeostasis, resulting in widespread immunosuppression (including elevated IL-10 levels and decreased SCF levels) and activation of specific cytokines/chemokines/growth factors (including CCL27, IL-1α, and CCL11). The increasing severity of MA dependence is accompanied with increased suppression of IRS and CIRS profiles and increases in IL-1α-CCL5 signaling and the IRS/CIRS ratio, which together appear to determine the onset of MAP. The findings show that despite the widespread immunosuppression, increased IL-1α-CCL5 signaling and IL-12p70 may contribute to MAP.
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Table 1. Demographic and clinical data in healthy controls (HCs), patients with methamphetamine (MA)-use, MA-dependence, and MA-induced psychosis (MAP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>HC A n=32</th>
<th>MA use B n=51</th>
<th>MA dependence C n=47</th>
<th>MAP D n=43</th>
<th>F/X^2 df p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/male</td>
<td>16/16</td>
<td>25/26</td>
<td>23/24</td>
<td>18/25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>31.8 (10.7)</td>
<td>33.6 (6.8) C</td>
<td>29.0 (8.1) B</td>
<td>31.0 (7.3)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (S/M/D)</td>
<td>25/7/0</td>
<td>40/8/3</td>
<td>36/4/7</td>
<td>27/2/14</td>
<td>FFHET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body mass index (kilogram/metre^2)</td>
<td>26.2 (5.8)</td>
<td>21.5 (3.8)</td>
<td>22.4 (4.4)</td>
<td>25.1(4.9)</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MA use variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of heaviest use (months)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8 (30.3) C</td>
<td>84.9 (87.9) B,D</td>
<td>25.7 (47.1) C</td>
<td>21.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily amount of heaviest use (milligrams)</td>
<td></td>
<td>106.3 (113.9) C,D</td>
<td>324.3 (343.7) B,D</td>
<td>906.9 (908.0) B,L</td>
<td>26.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM-IV criteria number^a</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3 (0.5) A,L,J</td>
<td>6.7 (0.7) A,B</td>
<td>6.9 (0.4) A,H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA dependence severity (z score)</td>
<td>-0.986 (0.0) C,D</td>
<td>-0.801 (0.270) C,D</td>
<td>0.770 (0.688) A,B</td>
<td>0.825 (0.780) A,H</td>
<td>KWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaviest MA use (N/Cr/SP/Both)</td>
<td>32/0/0/0</td>
<td>0/22/29/0</td>
<td>0/12/30/5</td>
<td>0/20/13/10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol use variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum alcohol drinks per day^b</td>
<td>5.8 (6.7) B,C,D</td>
<td>9.3 (13.6) A,J</td>
<td>13.7 (12.2) A,J</td>
<td>21.3 (24.9) A,B,L</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of alcohol use (z scores)</td>
<td>-0.336 (0.778) C</td>
<td>-0.243 (0.875) C</td>
<td>-0.007 (0.929) C</td>
<td>0.546 (1.1541) A,B,L</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime alcohol dependence (Y/N)</td>
<td>0/31</td>
<td>2/46</td>
<td>8/379</td>
<td>21/21</td>
<td>40.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current alcohol drinking (Y/N)</td>
<td>2/29</td>
<td>2/46</td>
<td>1/44</td>
<td>0/43</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tobacco use variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime tobacco use (Y/N)</td>
<td>8/24</td>
<td>43/8</td>
<td>43/4</td>
<td>41/1</td>
<td>69.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current tobacco smoking (Y/N)</td>
<td>8/24</td>
<td>15/36</td>
<td>12/35</td>
<td>4/39</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cannabis use variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime cannabis use (Y/N)</td>
<td>7/25</td>
<td>18/33</td>
<td>36/11</td>
<td>32/11</td>
<td>37.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current cannabis use (Y/N)</td>
<td>0/32</td>
<td>0/51</td>
<td>2/45</td>
<td>0/43</td>
<td>FFHET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data are shown as mean (SD), analyzed using analysis of variance (F) or Kruskal Wallis test (KWT); or as ratios, analyzed using χ² tests or Fisher–Freeman–Halton exact test (FFHET); ^A,B,C,D^: protected post-hoc comparisons among group means, S/M/D = single/married/divorced, N/Cr/SP/Both = none / crystal MA / speed pills / both; Y/N = yes/no; ^a^ Diagnostic and Statistical Manual on Mental Disorders (DSM-IV) symptom count or number of criteria for methamphetamine dependence; ^b^ alcohol standard drink or unit (1 drink = 10 gram of pure alcohol)
Table 2. Measurements of immune profiles in healthy controls (HCs), patients with MA-use, MA-dependence, and MA-induced psychosis (MAP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z scores</th>
<th>HC A n=32</th>
<th>MA use B n=51</th>
<th>MA dependence C n=47</th>
<th>MAP D n=43</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>0.776 (0.146) B,C,D</td>
<td>0.236 (0.117) A D</td>
<td>0.113 (0.118) A,D</td>
<td>-0.971 (0.125) A,B,C</td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th-1</td>
<td>0.912 (0.139) B,C,D</td>
<td>0.081 (0.111) A D</td>
<td>0.251 (0.112) A,D</td>
<td>-1.048 (0.118) A,B,C</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL-12/IL-12</td>
<td>-0.740 (0.155) B,C,D</td>
<td>-0.307 (0.124) A,C,D</td>
<td>0.173 (0.125) A,B,D</td>
<td>-0.711 (0.132) A,B,C</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th-2</td>
<td>0.919 (0.144) B,C,D</td>
<td>0.149 (0.115) A,D</td>
<td>0.119 (0.116) A,D</td>
<td>-0.985 (0.123) A,B,C</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>0.609 (0.159) B,D</td>
<td>0.136 (0.127) A,D</td>
<td>0.211 (0.128) D</td>
<td>-0.836 (0.135) A,B,C</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRS</td>
<td>1.010 (0.135) B,C,D</td>
<td>0.085 (0.108) A,D</td>
<td>0.181 (0.109) A,D</td>
<td>-1.042 (0.115) A,B,C</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS/CIRS</td>
<td>-0.693 (0.175) B,C,D</td>
<td>0.088 (0.140) A</td>
<td>0.053 (0.141) A</td>
<td>0.356 (0.149) A</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemokines</td>
<td>0.760 (0.141) B,C,D</td>
<td>0.373 (0.113) A,C,D</td>
<td>0.014 (0.114) A,D</td>
<td>-1.015 (0.120) A,B,C</td>
<td>37.51</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth factors</td>
<td>0.805 (0.144) C,D</td>
<td>0.448 (0.115) A,C,D</td>
<td>-0.166 (0.116) A,B,D</td>
<td>-0.957 (0.122) A,B,C</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC_immune</td>
<td>0.863 (0.140) B,C,D</td>
<td>0.202 (0.112) A,D</td>
<td>0.151 (0.113) A,D</td>
<td>-1.042 (0.119) A,B,C</td>
<td>40.69</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All results of univariate GLM analyses; shown are the estimated marginal mean (SE) values (in z scores) after covarying for body mass index, sex, age, current smoking, and current alcohol use (all df=3/164). A,B,C,D: protected post-hoc comparisons among group means. M1: macrophage M1; Th: T helper, IL: interleukin; IRS: immune-inflammatory responses system; CIRS: compensatory immune-regulatory system; PC_immune: first principal component extracted from the immune profiles.
Table 3. Intercorrelation matrix between methamphetamine (MA) use and dependence features and immune profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>MA amount of use (^a)</th>
<th>MA duration of use (^b)</th>
<th>MA dependence severity (^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>-0.338 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>-0.083 (0.274)</td>
<td>-0.438 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th-1</td>
<td>-0.396 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>-0.044 (0.560)</td>
<td>-0.402 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL12(<em>{70}) - IL12(</em>{40})</td>
<td>0.321 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>0.138 (0.070)</td>
<td>0.475 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th-2</td>
<td>-0.376 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>-0.062 (0.419)</td>
<td>-0.430 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>-0.280 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>-0.046 (0.548)</td>
<td>-0.321 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRS</td>
<td>-0.378 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>-0.089 (0.243)</td>
<td>-0.436 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS / CIRS</td>
<td>0.169 (0.026)</td>
<td>0.074 (0.330)</td>
<td>0.199 (0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemokines</td>
<td>-0.368 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>-0.102 (0.182)</td>
<td>-0.508 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth factors</td>
<td>-0.382 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>-0.175 (0.021)</td>
<td>-0.557 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC_immune</td>
<td>-0.381 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>-0.074 (0.331)</td>
<td>-0.449 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shown are Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficients (with exact p value, all: n=174)

\(^a\) Daily amount of heaviest use of MA; \(^b\) Duration of heaviest use of MA; \(^c\) z unit-weighted composite score based on daily amount of heaviest use of MA, duration of heaviest use of MA and the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual on Mental Disorders (DSM-IV) number of criteria for MA dependence

M1: macrophage M1; Th: T helper, IL: interleukin; IRS: immune-inflammatory responses system; CIRS: compensatory immune-regulatory system; PC_immune: first principal component extracted from the immune profiles.
Table 4. Results of multiple regression analysis with the immune profile (PC_immune) as dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Explanatory variables</th>
<th>Parameter estimates with statistics</th>
<th>Model statistics and effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1. PC_immune</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of criteria $^a$</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA dose $^b$</td>
<td>-0.366</td>
<td>-3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. PC_immune</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HC / MAU / MAD / MAP</td>
<td>-0.743</td>
<td>-10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol dependence</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC_immune: first principal component extracted from macrophage M1; Th-1 (T-helper), Th-2, immune-inflammatory responses system; compensatory immune-regulatory system, growth factors, and chemokines; MA = methamphetamine; $^a$ Diagnostic and Statistical Manual on Mental Disorders (DSM-IV) number of criteria for MA dependence; $^b$ Daily amount of heaviest use of MA; $^c$ Duration of heaviest use of MA; MA HC/use/dep/MIP: ordinal variable with HC: healthy control = 0, MAU: MA use = 1, MAD: MA dependence =2; and MAP: MA-induced psychosis =3.
Table 5. Results of logistic binary regression analysis with methamphetamine (MA)-induced psychosis (MAP), MA dependence, or MA use as dependent variables and immune profiles or single cytokines as explanatory variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>‡Explanatory variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Wald_{df}</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1. MAP versus MA-MAP</td>
<td>CIRS</td>
<td>-2.611</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02; 0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA dose</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.07; 3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSM-IV MA criteria</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>1.348</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>1.18; 2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol dependence</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.06; 1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. MAP vs MA-MAP</td>
<td>Th-1</td>
<td>-2.904</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01; 0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIRS</td>
<td>-2.100</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02; 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCL5</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.39; 8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IL-1α</td>
<td>1.869</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2.00; 20.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3. MAP vs MA-MAP</td>
<td>IL-12_{20},IL12_{40}</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.01; 2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIRS</td>
<td>-3.330</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.01; 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IL-1α</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>2.10; 16.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4. MAP vs MA-MAP</td>
<td>+ healthy controls</td>
<td>CIRS</td>
<td>-2.127</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>&lt;0.034</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02; 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Th-1</td>
<td>-2.901</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.008; 0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCL5</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.41; 8.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IL-1α</td>
<td>1.887</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>2.05; 21.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5. MAP vs MA-MAP</td>
<td>IRS/CIRS</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.05; 2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6. MA dependence vs MA use</td>
<td>SCF</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01; 0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IL-10</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>2388</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>5998</td>
<td>5568; 64620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7. MA vs Healthy controls</td>
<td>CIRS</td>
<td>-4.121</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>3.66; 58.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCL27+CCL11+IL-1α</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>3.66; 58.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP versus MA-MAP: MAP versus MA use+MA dependence; M1: macrophage M1; Th: T helper, IL: interleukin; IRS: immune-inflammatory responses system; CIRS: compensatory immune-regulatory system; PC_immune: first principal component extracted from the immune profiles; SCF: stem cell factor; CCL27 or CTACK: cutaneous T-cell attracting chemokine
Figure 1. Partial regression of a generalized index of immune function (PC_immune) on the amount of methamphetamine
Figure 2. Summary of the findings of the current study.

HC: healthy controls; MA: methamphetamine; MAP: MA-induced psychosis
IRS: immune-inflammatory responses system; CIRS: compensatory immunoregulatory system;
IL: interleukin; Th: T helper; SCF: stem cell factor