

## **Recovery of inhibitory control prefrontal cortex function in inpatients with heroin use disorder: a 15-week longitudinal fMRI study**

Ahmet O. Ceceli, Ph.D. <sup>1</sup>, Yuefeng Huang, Ph.D. <sup>1</sup>, Pierre-Olivier Gaudreault, Ph.D. <sup>1</sup>, Natalie E. McClain, B.A. <sup>1</sup>, Sarah G. King, B.A. <sup>2</sup>, Greg Kronberg, Ph.D. <sup>1</sup>, Amelia Brackett, M.A. <sup>1</sup>, Gabriela N. Hoberman, B.A. <sup>1</sup>, John H. Gray, B.E. <sup>1</sup>, Eric L. Garland, Ph.D. <sup>3,4</sup>, Nelly Alia-Klein, Ph.D. <sup>1,2</sup>, Rita Z. Goldstein, Ph.D. <sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, 1 Gustave L. Levy Place, Box 1230, New York, NY 10029

<sup>2</sup> Department of Neuroscience, Friedman Brain Institute, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, 1 Gustave L. Levy Place, Box 1065, New York, NY 10029

<sup>3</sup> Center on Mindfulness and Integrative Health Intervention Development (C-MIIND), University of Utah, 395 S. 1500 East, Salt Lake City, UT 84108, USA

<sup>4</sup> College of Social Work, University of Utah, Goodwill Humanitarian Building, 395 S.1500 East, Salt Lake City, UT 84108, USA

Corresponding author:

Rita Z. Goldstein

Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

Gustave L. Levy Place, Box 1230

New York, NY 10029

[rita.goldstein@mssm.edu](mailto:rita.goldstein@mssm.edu)

(212) 659-8886

Word count: 3,663

## **Key points**

**Question:** Does inhibitory control brain function, a common impairment in drug addiction, recover with treatment in inpatient individuals with heroin use disorder (iHUD)?

**Findings:** In this longitudinal cohort study, 26 inpatient iHUD and 24 healthy controls (HC) performed a stop-signal task during functional MRI twice, separated by an average of 15 weeks. In the iHUD, we found lower anterior and dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (comprising the cognitive control network) signaling at baseline, which increased after 15 weeks of treatment, as associated with behavioral improvements.

**Meaning:** As the opioid epidemic continues, our results indicate potential therapeutic targets to enhance neural function underlying self-control in heroin addiction.

## Abstract

**Importance:** Heroin addiction and related mortality impose a devastating toll on society, with little known about the neurobiology of this disease or its treatment. Poor inhibitory control is a common manifestation of prefrontal cortex (PFC) impairments in addiction, and its potential recovery following treatment is largely unknown in heroin (or any drug) addiction.

**Objective:** To study inhibitory control brain activity in iHUD and HC, before and after 15 weeks of inpatient treatment in the former.

**Design:** A longitudinal cohort study (11/2020-03/2022) where iHUD and HC underwent baseline and follow-up fMRI scans. Average follow-up duration: 15 weeks.

**Setting:** The iHUD and HC were recruited from treatment facilities and surrounding neighborhoods, respectively.

**Participants:** Twenty-six iHUD [40.6±10.1 years; 7 (29.2%) women] and 24 age-/sex-matched HC [41.1±9.9 years; 9 (37.5%) women].

**Intervention:** Following the baseline scan, inpatient iHUD continued to participate in a medically-assisted program for an average of 15 weeks (abstinence increased from an initial 183±236 days by 65±82 days). The HC were scanned at similar time intervals.

**Main Outcomes and Measures:** Behavioral performance as measured by the stop-signal response time (SSRT), target detection sensitivity ( $d'$ , proportion of hits in go vs. false-alarms in stop trials), and brain activity (blood-oxygen level dependent signal differences) during successful vs. failed stops in the stop signal task.

**Results:** As we previously reported, at time 1 and as compared to HC, iHUD exhibited similar SSRT but impaired  $d'$  [ $t(38.7)=2.37, p=.023$ ], and lower anterior and dorsolateral PFC (aPFC, dlPFC) activity ( $p<.001$ ). Importantly, at time 2, there were significant gains in aPFC and dlPFC activity in the iHUD (group\*session interaction,  $p=.002$ ); the former significantly correlated with increases in  $d'$  specifically in iHUD ( $p=.012$ ).

**Conclusions and Relevance:** Compared to HC, the aPFC and dlPFC impairments in the iHUD at time 1 were normalized at time 2, which was associated with individual differences in improvements in target detection sensitivity. For the first time in any drug addiction, these results indicate a treatment-mediated inhibitory control brain activity recovery. These neurobehavioral results highlight the aPFC and dlPFC as targets for intervention with a potential to enhance self-control recovery in heroin addiction.

## Introduction

The opioid epidemic continues to exert its devastating toll with over 100,000 overdose-related deaths in 2021 alone <sup>1</sup>, rendering paramount the need for effective treatments. However, the neurobehavioral mechanisms underlying recovery of symptoms associated with opioid (e.g., heroin) addiction remain unclear. Given its putative contribution to drug use and relapse in drug addiction, deficient inhibitory control may be an important symptomatic target <sup>2,3</sup>. This core symptom of drug addiction is associated with downregulation of prefrontal cortex (PFC) regions (see <sup>4-6</sup> for reviews) comprising the cognitive control network, including the inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), supplementary motor area, and dorsolateral PFC (dlPFC) <sup>7</sup>. Recently, using the hallmark measure of inhibitory control, the stop-signal task (SST), we reported lower inhibitory control performance (as indicated in  $d'$ , or target detection sensitivity) and anterior PFC (aPFC) and dlPFC activity in 41 abstinent individuals with heroin use disorder (iHUD) as compared to 24 demographically-matched healthy controls (HC) <sup>8</sup>. While this cross-sectional neuroimaging study implicated the PFC in inhibitory control deficits in heroin addiction, exploring whether treatment/abstinence normalizes these neurobehavioral impairments requires longitudinal (within-subject) efforts.

Although an intuitive notion, the empirical evidence for the potential recovery of inhibitory control-related neural function in drug addiction is scarce. A recent review reported very few longitudinal fMRI studies of inhibitory control-related processes in individuals with substance use disorders <sup>9</sup>. In a series of three clinical trials, 44 individuals with cocaine use disorder performed the color-word Stroop fMRI task at two time points, separated by 8 or 12 weeks of cognitive behavioral and/or pharmacological intervention. There were no significant changes in cognitive control network engagement at follow-up compared to baseline <sup>10</sup> (see <sup>11-13</sup> for the

smaller individual preliminary trials). Using the addiction Stroop fMRI task (a drug-word modification of the classic color-word Stroop task; reviewed in <sup>14</sup>) at two time points, separated by six months of abstinence, we showed increased BOLD signal in the dopaminergic midbrain in 15 individuals with cocaine use disorder. This increase in midbrain activity correlated with lower simulated drug seeking, indicative of enhanced self-control (or lower drug-biased salience attribution) in a drug context <sup>15</sup>. Specifically in heroin addiction, a single study examined longitudinal changes in brain activity during a Go/No-Go task. Twenty-one methadone-maintained iHUD (abstinent for at least 3 months) had increased right IFG function after a year of treatment <sup>16</sup>, suggesting that PFC activity may serve as a sensitive marker of recovery in treatment. This study did not include a HC group and hence the potential confounds of time (and task repetition) were not accounted.

To summarize, only a handful of fMRI longitudinal studies targeted inhibitory control-related recovery with time (as a function of abstinence and/or treatment) in individuals with substance use disorder, and a lower proportion included a HC group. Further, unlike the SST, which estimates the ability to stop after an already initiated response—a defining component of inhibitory control <sup>17</sup>, these studies used Stroop and Go/No-Go tasks, the former estimating attentional interference <sup>18</sup> and the latter capturing response selection <sup>19</sup>. To the best of our knowledge, the potential recovery of inhibitory control brain function in heroin (or any drug) addiction remains untested. Therefore, we employed a well-validated SST during fMRI in a longitudinal design to inspect the potential time-dependent recovery of the impaired neural processes underlying inhibitory control in inpatient iHUD as compared to demographically-matched HC. We hypothesized, in iHUD, 1) impaired inhibitory control behavioral performance and PFC activity at baseline compared to HC, 2) significant recovery of PFC activity after 15

weeks of treatment, and 3) PFC inhibitory control recovery from baseline to follow-up to be associated with improvements in behavioral performance.

## **Materials and Methods**

### Participants

Twenty-six iHUD (mean age=40.6±10.1 years; 7 women) were recruited from a medication-assisted inpatient rehabilitation facility and 24 age- and sex-matched HC (mean age=41.1±9.9 years; 9 women) were recruited from the surrounding community for matching purposes through advertisements and word of mouth. See Table 1 for sample descriptive statistics and the supplement for exclusion criteria. Twenty-five iHUD and 22 HC in the current study were part of the previous study sample in our recent cross-sectional report that included 41 iHUD and 24 HC<sup>8</sup>. The Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai's institutional review board approved study procedures, and all participants provided written informed consent.

[Table 1]

### Diagnostic and Clinical Procedures

All iHUD were inpatients in a facility where they attended courses/treatments including relapse prevention, Seeking Safety therapy (a present-focused counseling model to help people attain safety from trauma and/or substance abuse), and anger management. A comprehensive clinical diagnostic and substance use interview was conducted at baseline, consisting of the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview 7<sup>th</sup> edition<sup>20</sup> and the Addiction Severity Index 5<sup>th</sup> edition<sup>21</sup>. Drug dependence severity, craving, and withdrawal symptoms were assessed using the Severity of Dependence Scale<sup>22</sup>, the Heroin Craving Questionnaire [a modified version of the Cocaine Craving Questionnaire<sup>23</sup>] and the Subjective Opiate Withdrawal Scale<sup>24</sup>, respectively.

Nicotine dependence severity was measured using the Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence<sup>25</sup>. All iHUD met DSM-5 criteria for opioid use disorder (with heroin as the primary drug of choice/reason for treatment). Substance use-related psychiatric comorbidities commonly observed in individuals with drug addiction (27, 28) were either in partial or sustained remission at baseline with no current comorbidities found in the HC (see supplement). All iHUD were abstinent (for an average of 183 days during their first study session) and under medication-assisted treatment (confirmed via toxicology on both sessions and dosage in mg collected via self-report at baseline). Beck's Depression and Anxiety Inventories, cue-induced drug craving (via self-reported ratings to picture stimuli from an in-house drug cue reactivity task<sup>26</sup>) and number of days since last heroin use were collected at both sessions. Table 1 details heroin route of administration, nicotine/alcohol/cannabis use, urine toxicology, and medication dose, in addition to demographics, neuropsychological and additional drug use measures.

Following baseline assessments including MRI (see below), iHUD were randomly assigned to one of two types of group therapy (i.e., Mindfulness Oriented Recovery Enhancement or support group) consisting of weekly two-hour sessions led by trained therapists. Data from participants in both treatment groups were combined for the present analyses to assess the general treatment effect. Therapy-specific results of the clinical trial associated with this study (NCT04112186) will be reported separately (see supplement for therapy group details).

### Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Participants underwent two MRI scans (baseline and follow-up) separated by an average of  $106.0 \pm 34.3$  (range=62-185) days in iHUD and  $93.7 \pm 50.6$  (range=56-281) days in HC, with no significant group differences in days between scans [ $t(40)=1.00$ ,  $p=.321$ ]. Scanning was



conducted on a Siemens 3T Skyra (Siemens Healthcare, Erlangen, Germany), using a 32-channel head coil (see supplement for scanning and preprocessing parameters).

## Experimental Paradigm

### *The Stop-Signal Task*

In agreement with the latest guidelines in estimating inhibitory control<sup>27</sup>, we administered the recently revised SST, *STOP-IT*<sup>28</sup>, modified for the fMRI context and presented via jsPsych<sup>29</sup> as recently reported<sup>8</sup>. Participants made index or middle finger button presses using an MR-compatible response glove that corresponded to the left or right white arrows (or the opposite in left-handed participants), respectively, as quickly and accurately as possible. In 25% of these go trials, the white arrow (the go signal) changed to red (the stop-signal) after a variable delay (the stop-signal delay, or SSD), to which participants were instructed to stop their response. The SSD was set to an initial duration of 200 ms and tracked the participant's stopping ability, increasing by 50 ms after successful stops (making the next stop trial more difficult), and decreasing by 50 ms after failed stops (making the next trial easier). The task was administered over two fMRI runs, separated by a brief interval (10 s) when we displayed interim average response time (RT) in ms, proportion of missed go trials, and proportion of correct stops to enhance task compliance.

### Behavioral Data Analyses

We followed well-established parameters in line with the horse-race model of inhibitory control<sup>30</sup> to estimate stop-signal RT (SSRT; lower values indicate quicker performance), using the package *ANALYZE-IT* via the integration method (see<sup>27</sup> for details). We further inspected  $d'$ , derived from a Z-transformation of hit (proportion of correct responses to go trials) and false

alarm (proportion of responses following a stop-signal) rates, with higher  $d'$  values reflecting higher sensitivity in detecting targets over non-targets.

Given our prior cross-sectional report of SST impairment in iHUD<sup>8</sup>, and our current *a priori* interest in treatment-related effects, here we focused on performance differences between sessions, with cross-sectional baseline and follow-up behavioral results reported for completeness. We used linear mixed models [group (iHUD, HC) and session (baseline, follow-up) as fixed factors, subject as random factors] to inspect group differences in SSRT and  $d'$  change ( $\Delta$ ), corrected for familywise error for these two measures of interest ( $\alpha=.05/2=.025$ ). We further tested for contributions to SSRT and  $d'$ , as well as their  $\Delta$  between sessions, of potentially explanatory demographic and neuropsychological measures that differed between groups and/or sessions. Within iHUD, we similarly examined the potential relationships between SSRT/ $d'$  and baseline heroin use-related Table 1 measures including methadone dosage (used by most iHUD), as well as commonly used drugs (alcohol, nicotine, marijuana) that indicated group differences (see supplement).

### BOLD-fMRI Data Analyses

*Go Success*, *Go Fail*, *Stop Success*, and *Stop Fail* events were sampled from the onsets of the corresponding trials' go signals (the white arrow, 1.5 s). These regressors were convolved with a double-gamma hemodynamic response function to be included in a general linear model (GLM) along with their temporal derivatives using FSL's FEAT (version 5.98; Woolrich et al., 2001). Inter-trial intervals contributed to the task baseline<sup>32</sup>. We used Go Fail events and fMRIPrep confound timeseries (see *MRI data preprocessing* in the supplement) as nuisance regressors. The hallmark inhibitory control contrast, Stop Success>Stop Fail, represented inhibitory control brain activity in each of the two runs.

First-level contrast estimates were entered into fixed effects models to yield subject-level statistical maps at baseline and follow-up. We first identified clusters of significant impairment in iHUD vs. HC at baseline via FSL FLAME 1&2 (FMRIB Local Analysis of Mixed Effects) with cluster-based thresholding ( $Z > 3.1$ , corrected to  $p < .05$ ; identical methods as reported in <sup>8</sup>). This first step was conducted to inspect the effects we previously reported, this time in a smaller sample (the subjects who were scanned twice). Next, we inputted baseline and follow-up subject-level maps into a repeated-measures ANOVA with group (between-subjects) and session (within subjects) as fixed factors, using FSL's non-parametric permutation testing tool, *randomise*, with threshold-free cluster enhancement (5000 permutations)—a more appropriate tool for estimating longitudinal effects compared to FLAME (<https://fsl.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl/fslwiki/GLM>). Here we restricted the search for recovery effects via small volume correction to the clusters reflecting the baseline impairments in iHUD as compared to HC. Post-hoc t-tests inspected directionality of significant effects.

In similar repeated-measures ANOVAs, we examined  $\Delta$ SSRT and  $\Delta d'$  as covariates to detect whether increases in behavioral performance is correlated with increases in inhibitory control brain activity, corrected for familywise error ( $\alpha = .05/2 = .025$ ). We further inspected the potential influence of select demographic and neuropsychological measures that showed group and/or session differences. Within iHUD, we inspected baseline heroin use-related measures and commonly used drugs that showed group differences on the time-dependent change in BOLD (see supplement). We also report cross-sectional correlational analyses in the supplement for completeness (e.g., baseline behavioral measures as correlated with baseline brain activity) but refer readers to our previous larger N study that included this sample <sup>8</sup> for their discussion. Across all analyses, values that were three standard deviations  $\pm$  the mean were identified as

outliers and the affected tests are reported with and without their inclusion. Correlational analyses including these outliers were supplemented with robust regression for completeness.

## Results

### Participants

The groups were comparable in age, sex, race, nonverbal IQ, handedness, years of regular alcohol use, and years of alcohol use to intoxication (all  $p>.201$ ). Significant differences were noted in years of education, verbal IQ (HC>iHUD), depression symptoms, anxiety symptoms, nicotine dependence, and years of regular cannabis use (iHUD>HC); all  $p<.002$ , see Table 1. Among the Table 1 variables collected at both time points, there were no significant differences between sessions in either group for depression (iHUD  $p=.398$ , HC  $p=.767$ ) or anxiety symptoms (iHUD  $p=.520$ , HC  $p=.470$ ). Within iHUD, cue-induced drug craving decreased at follow-up (follow-up minus baseline rating=  $-0.34\pm 0.65$ , range=  $-2.06-0.72$ ,  $p=.016$ ). All but four iHUD remained abstinent between the two time points; on average, abstinence increased at follow-up by  $65\pm 82$  days (3 missing). Cue-induced drug craving and abstinence length (at each session or their  $\Delta$ ) did not significantly contribute to the results below, as detailed in the supplement (which also includes the null effects of heroin use-related measures including self-reported methadone dosage at baseline).

### Behavioral Results

Despite the main effect of group for Go accuracy [HC>iHUD  $F(1,96)=11.33$ ,  $p=.001$ ; no session main effect:  $F(1,96)=0.04$ ,  $p=.832$ , or group\*session interaction:  $F(1,96)=0.13$ ,  $p=.719$ ] and Go RT [iHUD>HC  $F(1,96)=4.63$ ,  $p=.034$ ; no session main effect:  $F(1,96)=0.32$ ,  $p=.570$ , or group\*session interaction:  $F(1,96)<0.01$ ,  $p=.989$ ], all participants met the recommended

performance thresholds (i.e., mean go accuracy  $\geq 60\%$ , mean stop accuracy  $\geq 25\%$  and  $\leq 75\%$ , and SSRT  $> 0$ )<sup>27</sup>. There were no main effects or interactions in Stop accuracy or SSD (all  $ps > .253$ ). See Table 2 for cross-sectional analyses where, as previously reported in a larger sample<sup>8</sup>, iHUD exhibited significantly lower  $d'$  than HC at baseline. Indeed a significant main effect of group was evident in  $d'$  [HC>iHUD  $F(1,96)=4.61, p=.034$ ], with no main effect of session [ $F(1,96)=0.02, p=.887$ ] or group\*session interaction [ $F(1,96)=0.71, p=.402$ ]. The SSRT yielded no significant main effects of group [ $F(1,96)=2.37, p=.127$ ], session [ $F(1,96)<0.01, p=.953$ ], or group\*session interaction [ $F(1,96)=1.49, p=.225$ ]. These results were not affected by education, verbal IQ, depression and anxiety, nicotine dependence, years of regular cannabis use, baseline heroin use-related measures, changes in cue-induced drug craving, or days of abstinence between sessions (see the supplement for details).

[Table 2]

### BOLD-fMRI Results

#### *Cross-sectional analyses of baseline and follow-up fMRI-BOLD activity*

At baseline, the whole-brain analysis of inhibitory control (Stop Success>Stop Fail) across all participants revealed significant engagement in the classical cognitive control-related nodes including the bilateral aPFC, right dlPFC, ventromedial PFC/orbitofrontal cortex, among others. When inspected between groups, iHUD displayed significantly lower Stop Success>Stop Fail signaling compared to HC in the right aPFC and right dlPFC among other regions (see eFigure 1, Supplement). No region showed significantly higher activity in iHUD compared to HC (see eTable 1 in the Supplement for details on all clusters).

At follow-up, the whole-brain analyses of inhibitory control across all participants revealed activations in the bilateral precentral gyrus among others (see eTable 2 in the Supplement for details on all clusters). No significant group differences in inhibitory control brain activity emerged at follow-up.

#### *Increase of task-related brain hypoactivity following treatment*

The repeated-measures ANOVA with group and session as fixed factors revealed a main effect of group in the right dlPFC and aPFC among others (see Table 3), driven by iHUD hypoactivations during inhibitory control. We found no main effect of session, but a significant group\*session interaction in the right aPFC and other regions that previously indicated hypoactivity at baseline inhibitory control in the iHUD vs. HC. Post-hoc tests interrogating the direction of effects revealed a significant increase from baseline to follow-up in the right aPFC, dlPFC, among others in the iHUD (Table 3, Figure 1). The single outlier dlPFC BOLD data point in the iHUD did not affect results (the mixed model group \* session interaction remained significant at  $p < .001$ ).  $\Delta$ SSRT did not correlate with increases in inhibitory control brain activity across all participants or in either group. Increases in  $d'$  were associated with increases in right aPFC activity following treatment in iHUD (Table 3, Figure 2), and when tested across all participants, but not within the HC. One  $\Delta d'$  data point in the iHUD was identified as an outlier, and its exclusion reduced this correlation to a trend level when accounting for the two behavioral measures ( $R^2=0.17$ ,  $p=.038$ ,  $\alpha=.025$ ). Nevertheless, a robust regression including the outliers supported the significant effect when assuming a normal t-distribution ( $t=4.04$ ,  $\beta=0.0004$ , standard error=0.0001,  $p<.001$ ). None of the BOLD results (baseline or change from baseline to follow-up) were significantly affected by education, verbal IQ, depression or anxiety symptoms, nicotine dependence, years of regular cannabis use, baseline heroin use-related measures,

changes in cue-induced drug craving, or days of abstinence between sessions (see supplement for details).

[Figure 1]

[Figure 2]

## Discussion

For the first time in heroin (or any drug) addiction, results revealed inhibitory control brain activity enhancement after an average of 15 weeks of inpatient treatment. At baseline, compared to HC, these iHUD showed worse target detection sensitivity (yet comparable stopping speed) and lower aPFC and dlPFC activity during inhibitory control on the SST. Despite comparable performance, these PFC decrements were no longer detectible at follow-up. Importantly, these gains in inhibitory control PFC signaling were most evident in the iHUD who showed improvements in target detection sensitivity, suggesting that this BOLD signal increase may indicate a neural recovery that is related to improvement in task-relevant cognitive control processes.

This suggestion for a functional recovery of the cognitive control network (e.g., aPFC, dlPFC) during SST performance in medication-assisted inpatients with HUD extends previous longitudinal reports of general functional PFC normalizations (e.g., in cue-reactivity, decision-making, and during rest) with treatment and/or abstinence in drug addiction (see <sup>9</sup> for a review). To our knowledge, there is only one other longitudinal report in iHUD that approximated inhibitory control: after a year of methadone treatment, inpatient iHUD exhibited IFG signal increase during response selection in a Go/No-Go task <sup>16</sup>. These results are consistent with a cross-sectional report where the IFG signal was higher with long vs. short-term abstinence in

cocaine addiction (in the absence of Go/No-Go performance differences)<sup>33</sup>. A longitudinal study of 14 medication-assisted iHUD (abstinent for three months) found decreased aPFC resting-state functional connectivity<sup>34</sup>—a task-negative state that is thought to be anti-correlated with task-positive brain activity<sup>35</sup>. In our study, despite comparable performance between sessions as consistent with prior research<sup>11,13,15,16,36</sup>, individual differences in target detection sensitivity improvements (a behavioral measure of inhibitory control) were associated with aPFC signal increases in the iHUD compared to the HC. This neurobehavioral pattern reported here for the first time suggests a pattern of recovery that is detectable even after a short-term treatment in continuously abstinent iHUD. Given the aPFC's role in managing task rules/goals<sup>37-39</sup>, and the dlPFC's top-down modulation of executive control<sup>40,41</sup> (see<sup>42,43</sup> for its neuromodulation improving performance in drug addiction), our results underscore the importance of individual differences in behavioral improvements as a marker of neural recovery that may inform treatment success in heroin addiction.

Several mechanisms may underlie the potential recovery of PFC function during inhibitory control in iHUD. For instance, structural reorganization of the PFC, noted to be essential for drug addiction recovery<sup>44</sup>, may be related to inhibitory control functional changes. Specifically, the dlPFC BOLD signal increase is consistent with increases in gray matter volume in this region, reported with abstinence of approximately a month in alcohol<sup>45,46</sup> and six months in cocaine use disorders (in the aPFC)<sup>47</sup>. Another candidate mechanism may be neuroendocrinological changes over the course of treatment. Neuropeptide Y, commonly associated with homeostatic and regulatory functions (e.g., food intake, sleep)<sup>48,49</sup>, is dysregulated in neuropsychiatric conditions including substance use disorders (e.g., alcohol)<sup>50</sup>. In heroin addiction, the lower neuropeptide Y levels in iHUD at acute withdrawal (3 days) approach the level of HC after a month of



abstinence. Preclinical evidence suggests that a low dose administration of a selective neuropeptide Y antagonist accompanies quicker SSRT and enhanced dorsal frontal cortex-evoked striatal inhibition, potentially underlying the executive control improvements<sup>51</sup>, which remains to be further tested to inform chronic heroin use and cessation. Together, increased PFC activity may be indicative of time-dependent reorganization of cognitive control processes in iHUD; more targeted and translational approaches are needed to precisely identify the neurobiological mechanisms of addiction treatment efficacy.

Our results should be interpreted in light of several limitations. First, inferences about sex- and treatment-seeking status-related contributions warrant a larger sample size with more women and a non-treatment seeking group. Relatedly, our study does not allow for the decoupling between participation in the medication-assisted treatment (in addition to the randomized group therapy) and length of abstinence (and the associated reduction in cue-induced drug craving). Such an effort may require including iHUD who are not abstinent and/or not in treatment; although note lack of significant effects on our results of both abstinence length and craving. While available baseline methadone dosage data yielded no significant correlations with outcomes of interest, we cannot rule out the potential contributions of dosage changes over the course of treatment, or type of medication (e.g., methadone vs. buprenorphine). Finally, while the variables showing group differences (years of education, verbal IQ, depression, anxiety, nicotine dependence, and years of regular cannabis use) did not correlate with outcomes of interest and thus do not explain the current results, samples more closely matched in demographics and smoking status are needed to further evaluate their potential contributions to results.

To the extent of our knowledge, this study is the first to provide empirical evidence for a time-dependent inhibitory control PFC recovery in drug addiction. Our results align with abstinence-

mediated changes to a related cognitive function, response selection, previously reported in iHUD<sup>16</sup> whereby stable behavioral performance and enhanced neural activity were observed with at least three months' follow-up compared to baseline. Including a HC group, we can rule out extraneous factors' contributions to these results (e.g., general time and practice effects). Importantly, we identified individual differences in target detection sensitivity time-dependent changes as pertinent to the parallel neural changes, suggesting that within-subject behavioral improvements may be sensitive measures of inhibitory control PFC functional recovery. Overall, our findings suggest that aPFC and dlPFC functions could be amenable to targeted interventions (e.g., modulation of PFC activity and PFC-mediated processes through behavioral therapy, pharmacotherapy, or brain stimulation) to promote self-control, core to drug addiction symptomology, en route to recovery in iHUD.

## References

1. Center for Disease Control. Drug Overdose Deaths in the U.S. Top 100,000 Annually. Published November 17, 2021. Accessed June 2, 2022. [https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/nchs\\_press\\_releases/2021/20211117.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/nchs_press_releases/2021/20211117.htm)
2. Goldstein RZ, Volkow ND. Drug addiction and its underlying neurobiological basis: neuroimaging evidence for the involvement of the frontal cortex. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2002;159(10):1642-1652. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.159.10.1642
3. Goldstein RZ, Volkow ND. Dysfunction of the prefrontal cortex in addiction: neuroimaging findings and clinical implications. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2011;12(11):652-669. doi:10.1038/nrn3119
4. Luijten M, Machielsen MWJ, Veltman DJ, Hester R, de Haan L, Franken IHA. Systematic review of ERP and fMRI studies investigating inhibitory control and error processing in people with substance dependence and behavioural addictions. *Journal of Psychiatry & Neuroscience*. 2014;39(3):149-169. doi:10.1503/jpn.130052
5. Zilverstand A, Parvaz MA, Goldstein RZ. Neuroimaging cognitive reappraisal in clinical populations to define neural targets for enhancing emotion regulation. A systematic review. *Neuroimage*. 2017;151:105-116. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.06.009
6. Ceceli AO, Bradberry CW, Goldstein RZ. The neurobiology of drug addiction: cross-species insights into the dysfunction and recovery of the prefrontal cortex. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. Published online August 18, 2021. doi:10.1038/s41386-021-01153-9
7. Cole MW, Schneider W. The cognitive control network: Integrated cortical regions with dissociable functions. *NeuroImage*. 2007;37(1):343-360. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.03.071
8. Ceceli AO, King S, McClain N, Alia-Klein N, Goldstein RZ. The neural signature of impaired inhibitory control in individuals with heroin use disorder. *J Neurosci*. Published online November 17, 2022. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1237-22.2022
9. Parvaz MA, Rabin RA, Adams F, Goldstein RZ. Structural and functional brain recovery in individuals with substance use disorders during abstinence: A review of longitudinal neuroimaging studies. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2022;232:109319. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2022.109319
10. Morie KP, DeVito EE, Potenza MN, Worhunsky PD. Longitudinal changes in network engagement during cognitive control in cocaine use disorder. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2021;229:109151. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2021.109151
11. DeVito EE, Kober H, Carroll KM, Potenza MN. fMRI Stroop and behavioral treatment for cocaine-dependence: Preliminary findings in methadone-maintained individuals. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2019;89:10-14. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.09.005

12. DeVito EE, Worhunsky PD, Carroll KM, Rounsaville BJ, Kober H, Potenza MN. A preliminary study of the neural effects of behavioral therapy for substance use disorders. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2012;122(3):228-235. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.10.002
13. DeVito EE, Dong G, Kober H, Xu J, Carroll KM, Potenza MN. Functional neural changes following behavioral therapies and disulfiram for cocaine dependence. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2017;31(5):534-547. doi:10.1037/adb0000298
14. Smith DG, Ersche KD. Using a drug-word Stroop task to differentiate recreational from dependent drug use. *CNS Spectr*. 2014;19(3):247-255. doi:10.1017/S1092852914000133
15. Moeller SJ, Tomasi D, Woicik PA, et al. Enhanced midbrain response at 6-month follow-up in cocaine addiction, association with reduced drug-related choice. *Addiction Biology*. 2012;17(6):1013-1025. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-1600.2012.00440.x
16. Ye JJ, Li W, Zhang DS, et al. Longitudinal behavioral and fMRI-based assessment of inhibitory control in heroin addicts on methadone maintenance treatment. *Experimental and Therapeutic Medicine*. 2018;16(4):3202-3210. doi:10.3892/etm.2018.6571
17. Aron AR. The Neural Basis of Inhibition in Cognitive Control. *Neuroscientist*. 2007;13(3):214-228. doi:10.1177/1073858407299288
18. Ersche KD, Bullmore ET, Craig KJ, et al. Influence of Compulsivity of Drug Abuse on Dopaminergic Modulation of Attentional Bias in Stimulant Dependence. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2010;67(6):632-644. doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2010.60
19. Raud L, Westerhausen R, Dooley N, Huster RJ. Differences in unity: The go/no-go and stop signal tasks rely on different mechanisms. *NeuroImage*. 2020;210:116582. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.116582
20. Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, et al. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N.I.): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 1998;59 Suppl 20:22-33;quiz 34-57.
21. McLellan AT, Kushner H, Metzger D, et al. The Fifth Edition of the Addiction Severity Index. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 1992;9(3):199-213.
22. Gossop M, Griffiths P, Powis B, Strang J. Severity of dependence and route of administration of heroin, cocaine and amphetamines. *Br J Addict*. 1992;87(11):1527-1536. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.1992.tb02660.x
23. Tiffany ST, Singleton E, Haertzen CA, Henningfield JE. The development of a cocaine craving questionnaire. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 1993;34(1):19-28. doi:10.1016/0376-8716(93)90042-o
24. Handelsman L, Cochrane KJ, Aronson MJ, Ness R, Rubinstein KJ, Kanof PD. Two new rating scales for opiate withdrawal. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse*. 1987;13(3):293-308. doi:10.3109/00952998709001515

25. Heatherton TF, Kozlowski LT, Frecker RC, Fagerström KO. The Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence: a revision of the Fagerström Tolerance Questionnaire. *Br J Addict.* 1991;86(9):1119-1127. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.1991.tb01879.x
26. Huang Y, Ceceli AO, Kronberg G, et al. Cortico-striatal engagement during cue-reactivity, reappraisal, and savoring of drug and non-drug stimuli predicts craving in heroin addiction. Published online May 29, 2022:2022.05.27.22275628. doi:10.1101/2022.05.27.22275628
27. Verbruggen F, Aron AR, Band GP, et al. A consensus guide to capturing the ability to inhibit actions and impulsive behaviors in the stop-signal task. Frank MJ, Badre D, Egner T, Swick D, eds. *eLife.* 2019;8:e46323. doi:10.7554/eLife.46323
28. Verbruggen F, Logan GD, Stevens MA. STOP-IT: Windows executable software for the stop-signal paradigm. *Behavior Research Methods.* 2008;40(2):479-483. doi:10.3758/BRM.40.2.479
29. de Leeuw JR. jsPsych: A JavaScript library for creating behavioral experiments in a Web browser. *Behav Res.* 2015;47(1):1-12. doi:10.3758/s13428-014-0458-y
30. Logan G, Cowan W. On the ability to inhibit thought and action: A theory of an act of control. *Psychological Review.* 1984;91(3):295-327.
31. Woolrich MW, Ripley BD, Brady M, Smith SM. Temporal Autocorrelation in Univariate Linear Modeling of fMRI Data. *NeuroImage.* 2001;14(6):1370-1386. doi:10.1006/nimg.2001.0931
32. Aron AR, Poldrack RA. Cortical and Subcortical Contributions to Stop Signal Response Inhibition: Role of the Subthalamic Nucleus. *J Neurosci.* 2006;26(9):2424-2433. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4682-05.2006
33. Connolly CG, Foxe JJ, Nierenberg J, Shpaner M, Garavan H. The neurobiology of cognitive control in successful cocaine abstinence. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2012;121(1-2):45-53. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.08.007
34. Ma N, Liu Y, Li N, et al. Addiction Related Alteration in Resting-state Brain Connectivity. *Neuroimage.* 2010;49(1):738-744. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.08.037
35. Li M, Dahmani L, Wang D, et al. Co-activation patterns across multiple tasks reveal robust anti-correlated functional networks. *Neuroimage.* 2021;227:117680. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117680
36. Dawkins L, Powell JH, Pickering A, Powell J, West R. Patterns of change in withdrawal symptoms, desire to smoke, reward motivation and response inhibition across 3 months of smoking abstinence. *Addiction.* 2009;104(5):850-858. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2009.02522.x

37. Sakai K, Passingham RE. Prefrontal set activity predicts rule-specific neural processing during subsequent cognitive performance. *J Neurosci*. 2006;26(4):1211-1218. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3887-05.2006
38. Koechlin E, Basso G, Pietrini P, Panzer S, Grafman J. The role of the anterior prefrontal cortex in human cognition. *Nature*. 1999;399(6732):148-151. doi:10.1038/20178
39. Cai W, Leung HC. Rule-Guided Executive Control of Response Inhibition: Functional Topography of the Inferior Frontal Cortex. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(6):e20840. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0020840
40. Egner T, Hirsch J. Cognitive control mechanisms resolve conflict through cortical amplification of task-relevant information. *Nat Neurosci*. 2005;8(12):1784-1790. doi:10.1038/nn1594
41. Gbadeyan O, McMahon K, Steinhauser M, Meinzer M. Stimulation of Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex Enhances Adaptive Cognitive Control: A High-Definition Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Study. *J Neurosci*. 2016;36(50):12530-12536. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2450-16.2016
42. Del Felice A, Bellamoli E, Formaggio E, et al. Neurophysiological, psychological and behavioural correlates of rTMS treatment in alcohol dependence. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2016;158:147-153. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.11.018
43. Alizadehgoradel J, Nejati V, Sadeghi Movahed F, et al. Repeated stimulation of the dorsolateral-prefrontal cortex improves executive dysfunctions and craving in drug addiction: A randomized, double-blind, parallel-group study. *Brain Stimulation*. 2020;13(3):582-593. doi:10.1016/j.brs.2019.12.028
44. Garavan H, Weierstall K. The neurobiology of reward and cognitive control systems and their role in incentivizing health behavior. *Preventive Medicine*. 2012;55:S17-S23. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2012.05.018
45. Zou X, Durazzo TC, Meyerhoff DJ. Regional Brain Volume Changes in Alcohol-Dependent Individuals During Short-Term and Long-Term Abstinence. *Alcohol: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2018;42(6):1062-1072. doi:10.1111/acer.13757
46. Durazzo TC, Meyerhoff DJ. Changes of frontal cortical subregion volumes in alcohol dependent individuals during early abstinence: associations with treatment outcome. *Brain Imaging and Behavior*. 2020;14(5):1588-1599. doi:10.1007/s11682-019-00089-5
47. Parvaz MA, Moeller SJ, d'Oleire Uquillas F, et al. Prefrontal gray matter volume recovery in treatment-seeking cocaine-addicted individuals: a longitudinal study. *Addict Biol*. 2017;22(5):1391-1401. doi:10.1111/adb.12403
48. Bi S, Kim YJ, Zheng F. Dorsomedial hypothalamic NPY and energy balance control. *Neuropeptides*. 2012;46(6):309-314. doi:10.1016/j.npep.2012.09.002

49. Singh C, Rihel J, Prober DA. Neuropeptide Y regulates sleep by modulating noradrenergic signaling. *Curr Biol*. 2017;27(24):3796-3811.e5. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2017.11.018
50. Eaton K, Sallee FR, Sah R. Relevance of Neuropeptide Y (NPY) in Psychiatry. *Current Topics in Medicinal Chemistry*. 7(17):1645-1659.
51. Bari A, Dec A, Lee AW, et al. Enhanced inhibitory control by neuropeptide Y Y5 receptor blockade in rats. *Psychopharmacology*. 2015;232(5):959-973. doi:10.1007/s00213-014-3730-z

## **Acknowledgments**

### Author Contributions

The corresponding author, Rita Z. Goldstein, had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

*Concept and design:* Ahmet O. Ceceli, Nelly Alia-Klein, Rita Z. Goldstein

*Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data:* Ahmet O. Ceceli, Yuefeng Huang, Pierre-Olivier Gaudreault, Natalie E. McClain, Sarah G. King, Greg Kronberg, Amelia Brackett, Gabriela N. Hoberman, John H. Gray, Eric L. Garland, Nelly Alia-Klein, Rita Z. Goldstein

*Drafting of the manuscript:* Ahmet O. Ceceli, Rita Z. Goldstein

*Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content:* Ahmet O. Ceceli, Yuefeng Huang, Pierre-Olivier Gaudreault, Eric L. Garland, Rita Z. Goldstein

*Statistical analysis:* Ahmet O. Ceceli, Natalie E. McClain, Sarah G. King, Rita Z. Goldstein

*Administrative, technical, or material support:* Ahmet O. Ceceli, Yuefeng Huang, Pierre-Olivier Gaudreault, Natalie E. McClain, Sarah G. King, Greg Kronberg, Amelia Brackett, Gabriela N. Hoberman, John H. Gray, Eric L. Garland, Nelly Alia-Klein, Rita Z. Goldstein

*Supervision:* Nelly Alia-Klein, Rita Z. Goldstein

### Conflict of Interest Disclosures

None reported.

### Funding/Support

This work was supported by T32DA053558 to AOC, R01DA048094 to ELG, and R01AT010627 to RZG.

### Role of the Funder/Sponsor

The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.



## Tables

Table 1. Sample profile.

	HC (n=24)	iHUD (n=26)	sig. test <sup>a</sup>
Age	41.1 (10.8)	40.6 (9.1)	$t(45.2)=0.14, p=.889$
Sex (Female/Male/Other)	9/15/0	7/18/1	Fisher's Exact $p=.547$
Race (Black/White/Other/Unreported)	6/13/4/1	2/16/4/4	$\chi^2(2,45)=2.29, p=.318$
Education (years) <sup>b</sup>	16.6 (3.0)	12.5 (1.9)	$t(38.9)=5.71, p<.001^*$
Verbal IQ	111 (7.5)	94.5 (12.0)	$t(42.6)=5.79, p<.001^*$
Nonverbal IQ	11.9 (3.2)	10.8 (2.5)	$t(43.8)=1.30, p=.201$
Handedness (left/right)	6/18	4/22	$\chi^2(1,50)=0.24, p=.620$
Beck Depression Inventory-II <sup>e</sup>	3.0 (4.6)	12.5 (11.2)	$t(33.6)=3.96, p<.001^*$
Beck Anxiety Inventory <sup>c,e</sup>	2.2 (4.2)	8.4 (8.2)	$t(35.8)=3.37, p<.002^*$
Smoking status (current/past/never)	1/2/21	25/1/0	Fisher's Exact $p<.001^*$
Fagerström Test for Nicotine Dependence	0.04 (0.2)	3.42 (1.7)	$t(25.7)=9.79, p<.001^*$
Regular marijuana use (years)	0.9 (1.8)	8.4 (8.4)	$t(27.4)=4.46, p<.001^*$
Regular alcohol use (years)	10.9 (13.4)	7.9 (9.4)	$t(34.7)=0.87, p=.387$
Alcohol use to intoxication (years)	5.2 (11.5)	6.4 (8.3)	$t(41.8)=0.43, p=.667$
Lifetime heroin use (years)	--	12.0 (7.8)	--
Days since last heroin use <sup>e</sup>	--	183 (236)	--
Heroin craving questionnaire <sup>d</sup>	--	39.6 (13.3)	--
Subjective Opiate Withdrawal scale	--	3.0 (3.2)	--
Severity of Dependence scale	--	10.0 (3.7)	--
Heroin use (days) in past 30 days	--	0.5 (1.4)	--
Urine toxicology (Methadone/Suboxone)	--	22/4	--
Heroin administration (IV/nasal/oral/smoking)	--	15/8/1/2	--
Self-reported methadone dosage (milligrams)	--	105.9 (61.7)	--

Values in parentheses denote standard deviation. HC: healthy controls; iHUD: individuals with heroin use disorder.

<sup>a</sup> Significant group differences (corrected for familywise error,  $\alpha=.05/13=.005$ ; smoking status excluded from correction given the almost parallel distribution matching group identity) are flagged with an asterisk.

<sup>b</sup> One missing education data point in iHUD.

<sup>c</sup> One missing Beck's Anxiety Inventory score in iHUD.

<sup>d</sup> One missing Heroin Craving Questionnaire score.

<sup>e</sup> Variable was collected at both time points.

Table 2. Behavioral performance.

	Baseline			Follow-up			Group*Session
	HC	iHUD	sig. test <sup>a</sup>	HC	iHUD	sig. test <sup>a</sup>	sig. test
Stop accuracy	0.48 (0.04)	0.47 (0.06)	$t(43.7)=0.68$ , $p=.497$	0.47 (0.03)	0.49 (0.08)	$t(33.9)=0.96$ , $p=.343$	$F(1,96)=1.32$ , $p=.253$
Go accuracy <sup>b</sup>	0.98 (0.02)	0.96 (0.05)	$t(34.6)=1.95$ , $p=.060$	0.98 (0.03)	0.95 (0.03)	$t(46.6)=3.10$ , $p=.003^*$	$F(1,96)=0.13$ , $p=.719$
SSRT	280 (38.2)	284 (59.9)	$t(42.8)=0.25$ , $p=.806$	266 (43.3)	296 (69.0)	$t(42.5)=1.86$ , $p=.069$	$F(1,96)=1.49$ , $p=.225$
SSD	272 (87.7)	304 (142)	$t(42.2)=0.96$ , $p=.343$	296 (104)	312 (156)	$t(43.8)=0.44$ , $p=.660$	$F(1,96)=0.09$ , $p=.764$
Go RT	574 (78.1)	625 (125)	$t(42.3)=1.74$ , $p=.089$	588 (86.8)	639 (162)	$t(38.9)=1.42$ , $p=.164$	$F(1,96)<0.01$ , $p=.989$
$d'$	0.62 (0.04)	0.58 (0.08)	$t(38.7)=2.37$ , $p=.023^*$	0.61 (0.05)	0.59 (0.10)	$t(37.93)=0.87$ , $p=.387$	$F(1,96)=0.71$ , $p=.402$

HC: healthy controls; iHUD: individuals with heroin use disorder; SSRT: stop-signal response time; SSD: stop-signal delay.

<sup>a</sup> Significant group differences (corrected for familywise error in two primary outcomes of interest: SSRT and  $d'$ ,  $\alpha=.05/2=.025$ ) are flagged with an asterisk.

<sup>b</sup> Go accuracy was calculated as go responses divided by the total of correct and incorrect go responses.

Table 3. Task-related fMRI-BOLD recovery.

	Region (Brodmann's Area, BA)	Voxels	<i>p</i>	MNI <sup>a</sup>		
				<i>x</i> <sup>b</sup>	<i>y</i>	<i>z</i>
Group main effect	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	17	.014	26	64	20
	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	4	.039	26	60	-2
	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	6	.041	26	54	2
	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	46	.015	40	52	6
	Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex (BA 9)	48	.001	44	22	34
	Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex (BA 6)	5	.047	42	18	26
	Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex (BA 8)	82	.001	26	14	52
	Superior Frontal Gyrus (BA 6)	8	.009	18	12	56
	Postcentral Gyrus (BA 1)	9	.031	46	-22	46
	Postcentral Gyrus (BA 1)	4	.041	48	-36	62
	Temporal Occipital Fusiform Cortex (BA 37)	12	.010	24	-50	-20
	Temporal Occipital Fusiform Cortex (BA 37)	6	.041	-24	-50	-18
Session main effect	No significant clusters					
Group x Session F-test	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	1	.047	30	60	2
	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	11	.023	26	50	6
	Postcentral Gyrus (BA 4)	15	.013	-32	-32	64
	Temporal Occipital Fusiform Cortex (BA 37)	16	.009	-24	-56	-14
Group x Session (iHUD>HC)	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	4	.025	30	60	2
	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	22	.015	26	50	6

	Region (Brodmann's Area, BA)	Voxels	<i>p</i>	MNI <sup>a</sup>		
				<i>x</i> <sup>b</sup>	<i>y</i>	<i>z</i>
	Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex (BA 44)	6	.028	50	18	34
	Superior Frontal Gyrus (BA 6)	1	.047	22	16	62
	Postcentral Gyrus (BA 1)	19	.011	-32	-32	64
	Supramarginal Gyrus (BA 40)	5	.037	48	-38	46
	Temporal Occipital Fusiform Cortex (BA 37)	27	.008	-24	-56	-14
Group x Session (HC>iHUD)	No significant clusters					
$\Delta$ SSRT (all participants)	No significant clusters					
$\Delta$ SSRT (iHUD)	No significant clusters					
$\Delta$ SSRT (HC)	No significant clusters					
$\Delta d'$ (all participants)	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	67	.002	38	56	4
$\Delta d'$ (iHUD)	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	7	.012	36	60	4
	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	19	.014	26	58	4
	Anterior Prefrontal Cortex (BA 10)	1	.042	26	52	10
$\Delta d'$ (HC)	No significant clusters					

Data are resampled to isotropic voxel size of 2 mm.

<sup>a</sup> Coordinates are in the MNI-152 space.

<sup>b</sup> Negative x-coordinate values indicate left hemisphere.


## Figure legends

**Figure 1. Inhibitory control brain activity increases from baseline to follow-up in individuals with heroin use disorder compared to healthy controls.** Right anterior prefrontal cortex (aPFC; left plot) and right dorsolateral PFC (dlPFC; right plot) activity during successful versus failed stops showed significant increases from baseline to follow-up in individuals with heroin use disorder (iHUD) compared to healthy controls (HC). The clusters are identified by the post-hoc interrogation of the significant group (iHUD, HC) \* session (baseline, follow-up) interaction (iHUD>HC, follow-up>baseline). Bar plots indicate parameter estimates from the voxel with the lowest p-value in each cluster. Swarm plots indicate individual data points. Error bars denote standard error of the mean. For visualization purposes, figure excludes single outlier data point in the iHUD that did not affect results (group \* session interaction in mixed model remained significant at  $p<.001$ ); see eFigure 2 in the Supplement for its inclusion. Coordinates are in the MNI-152 space.

**Figure 2. Individual differences in target detection sensitivity and inhibitory control brain activity increases.** A significant relationship was evident between improvements in target detection sensitivity ( $\Delta d'$ ) and increases in right anterior prefrontal cortex (aPFC) activity during successful compared to failed stops in individuals with heroin use disorder (iHUD). One  $\Delta d'$  data point in the iHUD was identified as an outlier, and its exclusion reduced this correlation to a trend level when accounting for two behavioral measures (including SSRT,  $R^2=0.17$ ,  $p=.038$ ,  $\alpha=.025$ ). Nevertheless, a robust regression including the outliers supported the significant effect when assuming a normal t-distribution ( $t=4.04$ ,  $\beta=0.0004$ , standard error=0.0001,  $p<.001$ ). Coordinates are in the MNI-152 space. HC: healthy controls, ses: session.

## Figures

**Figure 1. Inhibitory control brain activity increases from baseline to follow-up in individuals with heroin use disorder compared to healthy controls.**



**Figure 2. Individual differences in target detection sensitivity and inhibitory control brain activity increases.**

