

1 **Title**

2 **Behavioral effects of multiple-dose oxytocin treatment in autism: A randomized,**
3 **placebo-controlled trial with long-term follow-up**

4

5 **Authors and affiliations**

6 **Sylvie Bernaerts^{a,e}, Bart Boets^{b,e}, Guy Bosmans^c, Jean Steyaert^{d,e}, Kaat Alaerts^{a,e*}**

7 sylvie.bernaerts@kuleuven.be, bart.boets@kuleuven.be, guy.bosmans@kuleuven.be,

8 jean.steyaert@uzleuven.be

9

10 ^aKU Leuven, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Research Group for Neurorehabilitation,
11 Tervuursevest 101 box 1501, 3001 Leuven, Belgium.

12 ^bKU Leuven, Department of Neurosciences, Center for Developmental Psychiatry,
13 Kapucijnenvoer 7 blok h - box 7001, 3000 Leuven, Belgium.

14 ^cKU Leuven, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Parenting and Special
15 Education Research Group, Leopold Vanderkelenstraat 32 box 3765, 3000 Leuven, Belgium.

16 ^dKU Leuven, Department of Neurosciences, Center for Developmental Psychiatry, O&N II
17 Herestraat 49 box 7003, 3000 Leuven

18 ^e Leuven Autism Research consortium, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

19

20 * *Corresponding author.*

21 Kaat Alaerts

22 KU Leuven, Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, Research Group for Neuromotor
23 Rehabilitation, Tervuursevest 101 box 1501, 3001 Leuven, Belgium.

24 E-mail: kaat.alaerts@kuleuven.be

25 Tel.: +32 16 37 64 46, Fax: +32 16 32 91 97

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background**

3 Intranasal administration of the 'prosocial' neuropeptide oxytocin is increasingly explored as a
4 potential treatment for targeting the core characteristics of autism spectrum disorder (ASD).
5 However, long-term follow-up studies, evaluating the possibility of long-lasting retention effects
6 are currently lacking.

7 **Methods**

8 Using a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled, parallel design, this pilot clinical trial
9 explored the possibility of long-lasting behavioral effects of four weeks of intranasal oxytocin
10 treatment (24 International Units once daily in the morning) in 40 adult men with ASD. To do
11 so, self-report and informant-based questionnaires assessing core autism symptoms and
12 characterizations of attachment were administered at baseline, immediately after four weeks
13 of treatment (approximately 24 hours after the last nasal spray administration), and at two
14 follow-up sessions, four weeks and one year post-treatment.

15 **Results**

16 No treatment-specific effects were identified in the primary outcome assessing social
17 symptoms (Social responsiveness scale, self- and informant-rated). In particular, with respect
18 to self-reported social responsiveness, improvements were evident both in the oxytocin and in
19 the placebo group, yielding no significant between-group difference ($p = .37$). Also informant-
20 rated improvements in social responsiveness were not significantly larger in the oxytocin,
21 compared to the placebo group (between-group difference: $p = .19$).

22 Among the secondary outcome measures, treatment-specific improvements were identified in
23 the Repetitive Behavior Scale and State Adult Attachment Measure, indicating reductions in
24 self-reported repetitive behaviours ($p = .04$) and reduced feelings of avoidance towards others
25 ($p = .03$) in the oxytocin group compared to the placebo group, up to one month and even one
26 year post-treatment. Treatment-specific effects were also revealed in screenings of mood

1 states (Profile of Mood States), indicating higher reports of ‘vigor’ (feeling energetic, active,
2 lively) in the oxytocin, compared to the placebo group ($p = .03$).

3 **Conclusions**

4 While no treatment-specific improvements were evident in terms of core social symptoms, the
5 current observations of long-term beneficial effects on repetitive behaviors and feelings of
6 avoidance are promising and suggestive of a therapeutic potential of oxytocin treatment for
7 ASD. However, given the exploratory nature of this pilot study, future studies are warranted to
8 evaluate the long-term effects of OT administration further.

9

10 **Trial Registration**

11 The trial was registered with the European Clinical Trial Registry (Eudract 2014-000586-45)
12 on January 22, 2014 (<https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/ctr-search/trial/2014-000586-45/BE>).

13

14

15 **KEYWORDS**

16 Autism Spectrum Disorder, Oxytocin, Repetitive and restricted behavior, Social
17 responsiveness, Attachment

1 **1. Background**

2 Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) is characterized by lifelong impairments in social and
3 communicative functioning, and the presence of stereotyped behaviors and interests (1). In
4 the past decade, intranasal administration of the neuropeptide oxytocin (OT) has increasingly
5 been explored as a potential pharmacological treatment for targeting the core characteristics
6 of ASD. Endogenous OT is synthesized in the hypothalamus where neurons of the
7 paraventricular nuclei project to various areas of the central nervous system involved in
8 complex (social) behaviors (e.g. amygdala). In typically developing individuals, OT has been
9 linked to interpersonal bonding, parental care, and the ability to establish trust and form social
10 attachments (2,3).

11 With respect to ASD, initial clinical trials have demonstrated that a single dose of OT can
12 induce behavioral enhancements on tasks assessing repetitive behavior (4), affective speech
13 comprehension (emotional intonations) (5), facial emotion recognition (6) and social decision
14 making (cyberball computer game) (7). Multiple-dose trials assessing the effects of OT
15 treatment in adults with ASD have also shown beneficial effects. Anagnostou et al. (8)
16 assessed the safety and efficacy of six weeks of intranasal OT treatment on core autism
17 symptom domains (social cognition/function and repetitive behaviors) in 19 adults with ASD
18 (16 men, 3 women), and showed improved emotion recognition, quality of life and tentative
19 improvements in repetitive behaviors after OT treatment. In another study with 20 adult men
20 with ASD, Watanabe et al. (9) studied the effects of six weeks of intranasal OT administration
21 on core autism characteristics and showed significant improvements in social reciprocity and
22 social functioning (social-judgement task). In a more recent large-scale trial, Yamasue et al.
23 (10) also assessed the effects of six weeks of intranasal OT treatment on core autism symptom
24 domains in 106 adult men with ASD and showed significant improvements in repetitive
25 behaviors.

26 However, a more mixed pattern of results emerged from studies assessing the effects of
27 multiple-dose OT treatment in children with ASD. For example, Dadds et al. (11) assessed

1 behavioral effects of a four-day intranasal OT treatment in 38 boys with ASD (7 to 16 years
2 old) during parent-child interaction training, but found no OT-specific improvements in
3 repetitive behaviors or social responsiveness. Later, also Guastella et al. (12) failed to show
4 beneficial effects after an eight-week OT treatment on core ASD characteristics in slightly older
5 boys (12 to 18 years old). On the other hand, a more recent trial assessing the effects of five
6 weeks of intranasal OT treatment on core ASD characteristics in 31 children with ASD (27
7 boys, 4 girls) was able to demonstrate improved social responsiveness as reported by the
8 parents (13). Similarly, Parker et al. (14) investigated whether a four-week intranasal OT
9 treatment could improve core autism characteristics in 32 children (6-12 years old) with ASD
10 and showed an increase in parent-reported social responsiveness. Taken together, findings of
11 these initial multiple-dose trials provided indications for a more consistent (positive) pattern of
12 results for OT trials with adults with ASD (8–10), compared to trials with children with ASD (11–
13 14).

14 To date, however, potential long-term effects of OT treatment that outlast the period of actual
15 administration have not yet been addressed in adults with ASD. These assessments, however,
16 would be of high relevance since repeated administrations over an extended period might
17 induce long-lasting, experience-dependent adaptations within neural circuits. With respect to
18 ASD, it has been postulated that early-life impairments in social attention/orienting may deprive
19 patients of adequate social learning experiences that normally drive the typical development
20 of social brain networks (15). Considering that OT is hypothesized to increase the saliency of
21 social cues (16) OT therapy might induce an enrichment of social experiences that stimulates
22 long-term adaptations in social behaviors.

23 In this pilot study, we assessed - for the first time - the possibility of long-term retention effects
24 of four weeks of intranasal OT administration on core autism symptom domains (including
25 social responsiveness and restricted and repetitive behaviors), attachment characteristics and
26 general aspects of quality of life in adult men with ASD. While prior multiple-dose trials mainly
27 explored the effects of treatment on these core autism symptom domains, a recent study from

1 our lab (17), showed that two weeks of OT treatment in typically developing young-adult men
2 reduced self-reported feelings of attachment avoidance and increased self-reported feelings
3 of secure attachment toward peers. Against this background and given the growing body of
4 research demonstrating an important role of the oxytocinergic system in interpersonal trust and
5 attachment (18–20), the current study also included an initial assessment of attachment
6 measures to evaluate the long-term effects of OT treatment in adults with ASD. With respect
7 to ASD, Rutgers et al. (21) suggested that most children with ASD (53%) are able to form a
8 secure attachment to caregivers, but that they are significantly less likely to do so compared
9 to typically developing children. In addition, a recent meta-analysis concluded that more severe
10 autism characteristics are associated with less secure attachment in children with ASD (22).

11 The effects of treatment on core autism characteristics and attachment were assessed
12 immediately after the four-week treatment period, and at follow-up sessions, four weeks and
13 one year post-treatment, to assess the possibility of retention effects that outlast the period of
14 actual administration. In line with prior multiple-dose studies (8,9,17), we hypothesized that
15 multiple doses of OT would improve self-report and informant-based ratings of social
16 responsiveness and repetitive behaviors, and ameliorate self-ratings of attachment
17 characteristics and quality of life. A key question was to evaluate whether any beneficial effects
18 of multiple-dose OT treatment would outlast the period of actual administration until one month
19 (four weeks) and/or one year post-treatment.

20

21 **2. Materials and Methods**

22 **2.1. General study design**

23 This two-arm, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled parallel study was performed at
24 the Leuven University Hospital (Leuven, Belgium) to assess multiple-dose effects of intranasal
25 oxytocin (OT) administration on core autism characteristics and experience of attachment in
26 male adults with ASD. A specific aim of this pilot clinical trial was to assess whether any

1 treatment-induced effects would outlast the period of actual administration. To do so, changes-
2 from-baseline (T0) in self-report and informant-based questionnaire scores were assessed
3 immediately after four weeks of OT treatment (T1), and at two follow-up sessions, four weeks
4 (T2) and one year post-treatment (T3) (See **Figure 1**, CONSORT Flow diagram for number of
5 participants randomized and analysed). Written informed consent was obtained from all
6 participants prior to the study. Consent forms and study design were approved by the local
7 Ethics Committee for Biomedical Research at the University of Leuven, KU Leuven (S56327)
8 in accordance to The Code of Ethics of the World Medical Association (Declaration of Helsinki).
9 The trial was registered with the European Clinical Trial Registry (Eudract 2014-000586-45)
10 and the Belgian Federal Agency for Medicines and Health products. Note that the data
11 presented in the current report are part of a larger clinical trial in which neural measures (i.e.
12 task-based and resting-state magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)) were assessed in addition
13 to the presented questionnaire data. These MRI modalities are however not part of the current
14 report and will be reported elsewhere (manuscripts in preparation).

15 **2.2. Participants**

16 Forty high-functioning adult men with a formal diagnosis of ASD were recruited between April
17 2015 and December 2016 from the Autism Expertise Centre at the Leuven University Hospital.
18 The diagnosis was established by a multidisciplinary team (child psychiatrist and/or expert
19 neuropsychiatrist, psychologist, speech/language pathologist and/or physiotherapist) based
20 on the strict criteria of the DSM-IV-TR (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental
21 Disorders(1). Prior to the intervention, the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS or
22 ADOS-2) (23,24) and estimates of intelligence (6-subtest short version of the Wechsler Adult
23 Intelligence Scale-IV Dutch version: Block design, Digit span, Similarities, Vocabulary, Symbol
24 search and Visual puzzles (25) were acquired from all participants (**Table 1**). Inclusion criteria
25 comprised a clinical diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder; gender (male); and age (18-35
26 years old). Exclusion criteria for participation comprised any neurological disorder (e.g., stroke,
27 epilepsy, concussion); demonstrated genetic disorder; or any contraindication for MRI (note

1 that the MRI data analyses are not part of the current report). Current psychoactive medication
2 use and the presence of comorbid psychiatric disorders were screened (**Supplementary**
3 **Table S1**). Forty participants were randomly allocated to either the OT (n=22) or the PL group
4 (n=18) (see **Figure 1**, CONSORT Flow diagram). The initial sample size (n=40) was set to be
5 comparable to three prior studies showing significant effects of multiple-dose OT treatment on
6 similar outcome measures (8,9,17).

7 **2.3. Intervention**

8 Participants were assigned to receive the OT or placebo (PL) treatment based on a computer-
9 generated randomized order. Except for the manager of randomization, all research staff
10 conducting the trial, participants and their parents and/or partners were blinded to treatment
11 allocation. OT (Syntocinon®, Sigma-tau) and PL (saline natrium-chloride solution) were
12 administered in amber 15 ml glass bottles with metered pump (ACA Pharma). Each puff per
13 nostril contained 4 international units (IU) of OT. Participants self-administered a daily dose of
14 24 IU (3 puffs/nostril) over four consecutive weeks (28 doses in total). This dose is in
15 accordance with prior OT administration studies in neurotypical (young) adults (26,27) and
16 adults and adolescents with ASD (6,28,29). At this dosage, no side effects or contraindications
17 of OT have been described (29). All participants received clear instructions about the use of
18 the nasal spray (17,30) and were monitored onsite until approximately two hours after first
19 nasal spray administration. During the course of the treatment, participants were asked to
20 administer the nasal spray in the morning, to keep a daily record of the time point of nasal
21 spray administration, and whether or not they were alone or in company of others the first two
22 hours after administration. Percentage of days at which the spray was administered in the
23 presence of others was not significantly different between treatment groups (OT: 36.8 % (SD
24 29.9); PL: 36.0 % (SD 25.1); $t(37)= .09$; $p= .93$). Participants administered the nasal spray (OT
25 or PL) daily during four consecutive weeks and at the end of each week participants were
26 screened for potential adverse events, side effects (**Supplementary Table S2**) or changes in
27 mood with the Profile of Mood States (POMS) questionnaire (**Table 2** and **Supplementary**

1 **Figure S1**). Finally, at the end of the trial, participants were asked if they thought they had
2 received OT or PL. The majority of participants thought they had received the PL treatment
3 (79.5%). The proportion of participants that believed they had received the OT treatment was
4 not significantly larger in the actual OT group (28.57%), compared to the PL group (11.11%)
5 ($p=.18$). Nonetheless, secondary analyses were performed to explore whether treatment
6 effects were modulated by the participants' own belief about the received treatment
7 (**Supplementary Results**).

8 **2.4. Outcome Measures**

9 The Social Responsiveness Scale (for adults) (SRS-A) total score was used as the primary
10 outcome measure (self-report and informant-based versions). The other behavioral
11 questionnaires were considered secondary: Repetitive Behavior Scale - Revised (RBS-R);
12 State Adult Attachment Measure (SAAM); Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA);
13 Quality of Life questionnaire of the World Health Organization (WHO-QOL) (all self-report).
14 More detailed information on each of the adopted questionnaires is provided in
15 **Supplementary Methods**.

16 In short, the SRS-A (64 items) (31) comprises four subscales examining social communication,
17 social awareness, social motivation and rigidity/repetitiveness, using a four-point Likert-scale.
18 SRS-A raw total scores were adopted.

19 The RBS-R (43 items) (32) examines a heterogeneous set of repetitive behaviors including
20 stereotypic behavior, self-injurious behavior, compulsive behavior, ritualistic behavior,
21 sameness behavior and restricted interests behavior, using a four-point Likert-scale. RBS-R
22 raw total scores were adopted.

23 The SAAM (33) comprises three subscales examining attachment security (e.g., "I feel like I
24 have someone to rely on") (7 items); attachment anxiety (e.g., "I feel a strong need to be
25 unconditionally loved right now") (7 items); and attachment avoidance (e.g., "If someone tried
26 to get close to me, I would try to keep my distance") (7 items) using a seven-point Likert-scale.
27 SAAM raw subscale scores were adopted.

1 The IPPA (34) examines trait attachment to (i) mother (12 items); (ii) father (12 items); (iii)
2 peers (12 items), using a four-point Likert-scale. The IPPA assesses attachment security along
3 three dimensions: degree of mutual trust, quality of communication and extent of anger and
4 alienation. IPPA raw subscale scores were adopted.
5 Finally, the abbreviated version of the WHO-QOL (35) assesses general quality of life related
6 to physical health, psychological health, social relationships, and environment using a five-
7 point Likert scale. WHO-QOL raw total scores were adopted.
8 All questionnaires were assessed at baseline (T0), immediately after four consecutive weeks
9 of nasal spray administration (approximately 24 hours after the last nasal spray administration)
10 (T1), and at follow-up sessions, four weeks (T2) and one year post-treatment (T3). Given that
11 this is an exploratory pilot study evaluating the possibility of long-term retention effects of OT
12 treatment, no primary time point was pre-specified.

13

14 **2.5. Data Analysis**

15 For each questionnaire, baseline differences between groups were assessed using two-
16 sample t-tests. To assess *between-group differences*, pre-to-post difference scores were
17 calculated for each assessment session (T1, T2, T3) and difference scores were subjected to
18 a linear mixed-effects model (one-tailed) with the random factor 'subject', and the fixed factors
19 'treatment' (OT, PL), 'session' (T1, T2, T3) and 'treatment x session' interaction. An intention-
20 to-treat format and last-observations-carried-forward to replace missing data was adopted. For
21 participants with missing baseline data, analysis for that measure was excluded list-wise
22 (**Figure 1** CONSORT Flow diagram). Cohen's d effect sizes of between-group differences
23 (change from baseline_{OT} – change from baseline_{PL}) / pooled standard deviation) are reported in
24 **Table 2**, separately for each outcome measure and assessment session, where 0.2 is
25 indicative of a small effect, 0.5 a medium effect and 0.8 a large effect (36). Additionally, pre-
26 to-post difference scores were subjected to single-sample t-tests to assess within-group
27 changes (compared to baseline) in the OT group and PL group separately (**Table 2**). All

1 statistics were executed with Statistica 8 (StatSoft. Inc. Tulsa, USA). Given that this is an
2 exploratory pilot study evaluating long-term effects of OT treatment, the significance level was
3 set at $p < .05$ for all analyses, without correction for multiple comparisons.

4

5 **3. Results**

6 No significant baseline differences were revealed between participants allocated to the OT or
7 PL group for any of the questionnaires (see **Supplementary Table S3**) or in terms of
8 participant characteristics (see **Table 1**).

9 ***Primary outcome - Social Responsiveness Scale (SRS-A)***

10 *Self-rated SRS-A.* Between-group analyses revealed no significant main effect of treatment
11 ($F(1,76) = .12, p = .37, \eta^2 = .00$), nor a treatment x session interaction effect ($F(2,76) = 1.17, p =$
12 $.16, \eta^2 = .03$), indicating that pre-to-post changes in self-reported social responsiveness were
13 not significantly larger in the OT compared to the PL group (see **Figure 2** and **Table 2** for the
14 effect sizes of between-group differences separately for each session). Within-group analyses
15 showed that SRS-A scores were significantly reduced (compared to baseline) in the OT group
16 at session T1 (immediately after treatment: $p = .033$), T2 (one month post-treatment; $p = .048$)
17 and at trend-level at session T3 (one year post-treatment: $p = .07$). However, a similar reduction
18 (compared to baseline) was evident in the PL group at session T2 ($p = .015$), indicating no
19 specific benefit of OT over the PL treatment (see **Table 2** reporting single-sample t-tests
20 assessing within-group changes from baseline).

21 *Informant-rated SRS-A.* Between-group analyses of the informant-rated SRS-A scores
22 revealed no significant main effect of treatment ($F(1, 60) = .78, p = .19, \eta^2 = .03$), nor a treatment
23 x session interaction effect ($F(2, 60) = .83, p = .22, \eta^2 = .03$), indicating that pre-to-post changes
24 in informant-rated social responsiveness were not significantly larger in the OT compared to
25 the PL group (see **Figure 2** and **Table 2** for the effect sizes of between-group differences
26 separately for each session). Note however that at session T2 (one month post-treatment),

1 informant-rated SRS-A scores were significantly reduced in the OT group (compared to
2 baseline) ($p = .002$), but not in the PL group ($p = .67$) (see **Table 2** reporting single-sample t-
3 tests assessing within-group changes from baseline).

4

5 **Secondary outcome - Repetitive Behavior Scale – Revised (RBS-R)**

6 In terms of repetitive behaviors, between-group analyses identified a significant main effect of
7 treatment ($F(1, 74) = 3.20$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .08$) (but no treatment x session interaction: $F(2, 74) =$
8 1.04 , $p = .18$, $\eta^2 = .03$), indicating that across assessment sessions, pre-to-post improvements
9 in repetitive behaviors were significantly larger in the OT compared to the PL group (see **Figure**
10 **2** and **Table 2** for the effect sizes of between-group differences separately for each session).
11 Within-group analyses confirmed that RBS-R scores were significantly reduced (compared to
12 baseline) in the OT group at session T1 (immediately after treatment: $p = .002$), T2 (one month
13 post-treatment; $p = .002$) and session T3 (one year post-treatment: $p = .02$), but not consistently
14 in the PL group (T1: $p = .15$; T2: $p = .012$; T3: $p = .70$) (see **Table 2** reporting single-sample t-
15 tests assessing within-group changes from baseline).

16

17 **Secondary outcome - State adult attachment measure (SAAM)**

18 *Attachment Avoidance.* In terms of attachment avoidance, between-group analyses identified
19 a significant main effect of treatment ($F(1,76) = 3.70$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .09$) (but no treatment x
20 session interaction: $F(2,76) = .27$, $p = .38$, $\eta^2 = .01$), indicating that across assessment sessions,
21 pre-to-post improvements in attachment avoidance were significantly larger in the OT
22 compared to the PL group (see **Figure 2** and **Table 2** and for the effect sizes of between-group
23 differences separately for each session). Within-group analyses confirmed that attachment
24 avoidance scores were significantly reduced (compared to baseline) in the OT group at session
25 T1 (immediately after treatment: $p = .016$), T2 (one-month post-treatment; $p = .018$) and session
26 T3 (one-year post-treatment: $p = .05$), but not in the PL group (T1: $p = .81$; T2: $p = .73$; T3:
27 $p = 1.00$) (see **Table 2** reporting single-sample t-tests assessing within-group changes from
28 baseline).

1 *Attachment Security*. Between-group analyses identified no main effect of treatment $F(1,76)=$
2 $.88$, $p= .18$, $\eta^2= .02$), nor a treatment x session interaction effect ($F(2,76)= 1.08$, $p= .17$, $\eta^2=$
3 $.03$), indicating no treatment-specific improvement in attachment security across assessment
4 sessions (see **Figure 2** and **Table 2** for the effect sizes of between-group differences
5 separately for each session). Also no significant within-group pre-to-post changes were
6 identified in the OT or PL group separately (see **Table 2**).

7 *Attachment Anxiety*. Between-group analyses identified no main effect of treatment ($F(1,76)=$
8 $.25$, $p= .31$, $\eta^2= .01$), nor a treatment x session interaction effect ($F(2,76)= 1.566$, $p= .10$, $\eta^2=$
9 $.04$), indicating no treatment-specific improvement in attachment anxiety across assessment
10 sessions (see **Figure 2** and **Table 2** and for the effect sizes of between-group differences
11 separately for each session). Also no significant within-group pre-to-post changes were
12 identified in the OT or PL group separately (see **Table 2**).

13

14 **Secondary outcome - Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA)**

15 Between-group analyses showed that pre-to-post changes in self-reported secure attachment
16 towards peers and parents were not significantly larger in the OT compared to the PL group
17 (no main effects of treatment: Peers: $F(1,76)= .20$, $p= .33$, $\eta^2= .01$; Mother: $F(1,74)= .57$, $p=$
18 $.23$, $\eta^2= .02$; Father: $F(1,74)= .78$, $p= .19$, $\eta^2= .02$; nor treatment x session interaction effects:
19 Peers: $F(2,76)= 1.08$, $p= .17$, $\eta^2= .03$; Mother: $F(2,74)= .32$, $p= .36$, $\eta^2= .01$; Father: $F(2,74)=$
20 $.03$, $p= .49$, $\eta^2= .00$) (see **Supplementary Figure S2** and **Table 2** for the effect sizes of
21 between-group differences separately for each session). Also no significant within-group pre-
22 to-post changes were identified in the OT or PL group separately (see **Table 2**).

23

24 **Secondary outcome - World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHO-QOL) – Bref**

25 Between-group analyses showed that pre-to-post changes in self-reported quality of life were
26 not significantly larger in the OT, compared to the PL group (no main effect of treatment:
27 $F(1,74)= .77$, $p= .19$, $\eta^2= .02$, nor a treatment x session interaction effect: $F(2,74)= .96$, $p= .19$,

1 $\eta^2 = .03$) (see **Supplementary Figure S2** and **Table 2** for the effect sizes of between-group
2 differences separately for each session). Also no significant within-group pre-to-post changes
3 were identified in the OT or PL group separately (see **Table 2**).

4

5 ***Screening of changes in mood and side effects***

6 As listed in detail in **Supplementary Table S2**, only minimal, non-treatment specific side
7 effects were reported.

8 In terms of changes in mood as assessed with the Profile of Mood states (POMS), between-
9 group analyses identified a significant main effect of treatment for the mood state ‘vigor’
10 ($F(1,76) = 4.09$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .10$) (but no treatment \times session interaction: $F(2,76) = .04$, $p = .96$,
11 $\eta^2 = .001$), indicating that across assessment sessions, self-reports of ‘vigor’ (feeling
12 ‘energetic’, ‘active’, ‘lively’) were significantly higher in the OT group compared to the PL group
13 (see **Table 2** for the effect sizes of between-group differences separately for each session).
14 While no significant pre-to-post changes were evident within the OT group, the PL group
15 showed a significant reduction (compared to baseline) in self-reported vigor at session T1 ($p =$
16 $.002$) (see **Table 2** reporting single-sample t-tests assessing within-group changes from
17 baseline).

18 No treatment-specific changes were identified for the other mood states (tension, anger,
19 depression, fatigue) (see **Table 2** and **Supplementary Figure S1**), although note that
20 significant reductions (compared to baseline) in feelings of tension and fatigue were reported
21 both in the OT group and in the PL group (see **Table 2** reporting single-sample t-tests
22 assessing within-group changes from baseline).

23

24 ***Associations between ASD characteristics and attachment characteristics***

25 Taken together, treatment-specific effects of a four-week OT treatment were most pronounced
26 in terms of improvements in repetitive behaviors (RBS-R) and perceived attachment avoidance
27 (SAAM). Here, we specifically explored whether and how the quantitative autism
28 characteristics (SRS-A and RBS-R) (assessed at baseline) were associated with the adopted

1 attachment characteristics (SAAM and IPPA). We additionally explored whether individuals
2 with ASD displayed more impairments in attachment, when their baseline behavioral
3 characterizations were compared to those previously obtained from a sample of neurotypical
4 individuals (n=40, mean age = 21.1, S.D. = 2.6) (data adopted from (17)).

5 Higher self-reported SRS-A scores (at baseline) (more impairment in social responsiveness)
6 were significantly associated with lower perceived secure attachment (IPPA) towards peers
7 ($r = -.55$, $p < .001$), mother ($r = -.51$, $p = .001$) and father ($r = -.34$, $p = .034$) and with higher
8 perceived attachment avoidance (SAAM) ($r = .38$, $p = .018$), but not with other reports of
9 attachment characteristics (security: $r = -.26$, $p = .12$; anxiety: $r = .08$, $p = .63$). Further, higher
10 scores on the RBS-R (more frequent and/or severe repetitive and restricted behaviors) were
11 significantly associated with lower perceived secure attachment (IPPA) towards the mother ($r =$
12 $-.56$, $p < .001$), but not the father ($r = -.31$; $p = .056$) or peers ($r = -.22$, $p = .19$). Finally, higher
13 scores on the RBS-R were also significantly associated with higher perceived attachment
14 avoidance ($r = .50$, $p = .002$), but not with other reports of attachment characteristics (security:
15 $r = -.11$, $p = .50$; anxiety: $r = -.02$, $p = .89$).

16 Notably, exploratory analyses also showed that as a group, the individuals with ASD reported
17 significantly higher perceived attachment avoidance ($t(76) = -2.51$, $p = .014$), lower attachment
18 security ($t(76) = 2.48$, $p = .015$), and a trend towards lower perceived secure attachment towards
19 peers (IPPA) ($t(76) = 1.74$, $p = .085$), when compared to a neurotypical sample of adult men (data
20 obtained from (17)) (**Supplementary Table S4**).

21

1 4. Discussion

2 The current trial demonstrated no treatment-specific effects in the primary outcome assessing
3 social symptoms (SRS-A, self- and informant-rated). In particular, with respect to self-reports
4 of social responsiveness, pre-to-post improvements were evident both in the OT (at session
5 T1 and T2) and in the PL group (at session T2), but with no specific benefit of OT over the PL
6 treatment (no significant between-group difference). Correspondingly, in three previous long-
7 term administration trials, improvements in social symptoms (SRS-A: 9, 12) (ADOS subscale
8 assessing social reciprocity: 10) were identified both in participants receiving the OT treatment
9 and in those receiving the placebo treatment, but with no significant difference between the
10 two groups. As suggested by Yatawara et al. (2016), one explanation for these unspecific
11 effects may be the presence of a placebo response which has been shown to occur frequently
12 in paediatric autism pharmacological and dietary placebo-controlled trials (40). In the context
13 of OT trials, increased public attention over the last decade may have influenced the
14 expectations of patients or parents especially with respect to the anticipated effects of OT
15 treatment on social functioning (hence the observed unspecific improvements in self-rated
16 SRS-A scores directly assessing the social domain).

17 Also with respect to the effect of multiple-dose OT treatment on informant-based reports of
18 social responsiveness (SRS-A), no overall treatment-specific improvements were observed
19 (despite the identification of a reduction in informant-rated symptom severity in the OT group,
20 but not in the PL group at session T2) (see **Table 2** reporting within-group changes). In prior
21 studies with young children with ASD, significant treatment-specific improvements in caregiver-
22 rated social responsiveness have been identified immediately after 4 or 5 weeks of OT
23 treatment (13,14). The lack of a treatment-specific effect in our trial versus previous trials in
24 children might relate to the frequency of contact of children versus adult populations with their
25 respective informants (i.e., more frequent, sustained child-informant contact), potentially
26 rendering more subtle improvements in social functioning in the adult population to remain
27 undetected by informants.

1 While no significant treatment-specific effects were identified in social symptoms,
2 exploratory analyses identified long-lasting OT-specific improvements in a secondary outcome
3 assessing attachment characteristics (SAAM), indicating a reduction in feelings of avoidance
4 in the OT, compared to the PL group. While the exact neuromodulatory mechanisms of OT
5 treatment are unknown, OT has been implicated in enhancing the salience of socially-relevant
6 cues, inducing reductions in (social) stress and anxiety, and modulating approach/avoidance
7 motivational tendencies, presumably by impacting on limbic circuits (e.g. amygdala) and the
8 central reward system (e.g. nucleus accumbens). As such, by enhancing social salience and
9 reducing social stress/anxiety, the daily OT administrations over a course of four weeks, may
10 have induced increased feelings of approachability (reduced avoidance) during social
11 interactions. Furthermore, the observation that these beneficial effects of multiple-dose OT
12 treatment on perceived attachment avoidance outlasted the period of actual administration
13 until one month and one year post-treatment, provides support to the notion that repeated
14 administrations over an extended period of time might induce long-lasting adaptations in social
15 brain circuits, presumably in an experience-dependent manner. Indeed, through positive re-
16 enforcement, the recursive experience of the social environment as more 'secure' or
17 'approachable' (during the period of actual OT administrations) can be anticipated to have
18 contributed to the observed long-lasting adaptations in one's motivational tendencies (i.e.
19 increased feelings of social approachability). Considering that attachment avoidance reflects
20 a reluctance to trust others and an emphasis on autonomy, whereas attachment anxiety
21 reflects insecurity about oneself (low trust in oneself) and fear of being rejected (33), our results
22 suggest that the four-week OT treatment predominantly improved a person's reluctance
23 towards closeness or trust in others (i.e., attachment avoidance), but that it could not induce
24 significant long-term alterations in a person's feelings of insecurity about one's own abilities
25 (i.e., attachment anxiety). The notion that OT may thus predominantly influence one's
26 reluctance to engage in closeness or intimacy with others (rather than one's fear of being
27 rejected) may be interpreted within the framework of the recently proposed affiliative-
28 motivation hypothesis (37) suggesting that OT specifically acts by increasing affiliative strivings

1 and that individuals with a decreased tendency to affiliate (e.g. avoidantly attached individuals
2 rather than anxiously attached individuals) may be most likely to benefit from OT treatment.
3 Overall, the observation of a beneficial effect of OT on feelings of approachability is in line with
4 findings from a previous study from our lab (17), in which we demonstrated similar treatment-
5 specific reductions in perceived avoidant attachment (as well as improvements in perceived
6 secure attachment to peers) after a two-week course of OT treatment in neurotypical men. Our
7 findings also extend previous studies showing beneficial effects of a single dose of OT on
8 attachment security (20), development of trust and cooperation (18) and improved communal
9 traits and altered agency (19).

10 In addition to the treatment-specific effect on attachment avoidance, long-lasting
11 treatment-specific improvements were also identified in terms of repetitive behaviors (RBS-R),
12 indicating an overall reduction in repetitive behaviors in the OT group, compared to the PL
13 group. While the exact link between expressions of repetitive behaviors and difficulties in the
14 social domain is unclear, it has been suggested that at least in a subset of individuals with
15 ASD, the experience of the external (social) milieu as ‘unapproachable’ or even ‘threatening’
16 may result in an increased ‘need for sameness’ in order to sustain a level of control over the
17 external surroundings (38,39). The current study provides preliminary evidence that multiple-
18 dose OT treatment may relieve an individual from this increased ‘need for sameness’ and the
19 resulting need for engaging in repetitive and restricted behaviors. Overall, these observed
20 effects on repetitive behaviors are in line with previous trials with adult men with ASD showing
21 beneficial effects of OT on repetitive behaviors after 4 hours of intravenous OT administration
22 (4) and after 6 weeks of daily administrations (8,10). Note however that one six-week trial with
23 adult men with ASD did not show OT-specific improvements on informant-based reports of
24 repetitive behaviors (9). Also, in previous trials with children and adolescents with ASD, no
25 improvements on repetitive behaviors were observed after 4 days or 4, 5, or 8 weeks of daily
26 OT administration (11–14). In this view, it appears that beneficial effects of OT treatment on
27 repetitive behaviors were mostly demonstrated in studies that adopted assessments based on
28 self-reports (current study, (4,8)), whereas no beneficial effects were evident in studies

1 adopting informant-based reports of repetitive behavior (9–14, with the exception of 10).
2 Together, these findings may therefore indicate that self-reports, as opposed to informant-
3 based reports, may be more sensitive for capturing subtle, self-experienced changes in
4 repetitive behaviors.

5 While not included as an explicit outcome measure, screenings of changes in mood
6 states (Profile of Mood States questionnaire (POMS)) showed a treatment-specific effect for
7 the mood state ‘vigor’, indicating higher reports of feelings of vigor (e.g., feeling ‘energetic’,
8 ‘active’, ‘lively’) in the OT group, compared to the PL group. To our knowledge, this is the first
9 study adopting screenings of mood states in an OT trial with ASD patients. In a previous study
10 from our lab (17), the POMS was also adopted to evaluate the effects of a two-week OT
11 treatment in neurotypical men, and while here, no treatment-specific changes in vigor were
12 detected, the POMS revealed OT-specific reductions in feelings of tension and anger. In the
13 current study, reductions in feelings of tension were also reported, but irrespective of received
14 treatment, indicating no specific benefit of OT over the PL treatment. While speculative, the
15 stabilizing effect of OT administration on reports of vigor might be related to the (highly
16 understudied, but in the ASD community heavily discussed) phenomenon of ‘autistic burnout’.
17 Individuals with ASD describe ‘autistic burnout’ as an extreme fatigue and inability to meet the
18 demands of everyday life caused by a continuous attempt to mask and/or deal with their ASD
19 symptoms (i.e. sensory disorders, repetitive behaviors (1)). The overall mitigation of repetitive
20 behavior symptoms and increased feelings of social approachability by the OT treatment may
21 therefore have been accompanied with overall higher reports of feeling ‘energetic’, ‘active’,
22 ‘lively’ in the OT group, compared to the PL group. However, considering the exploratory nature
23 of the identified effects, more research is needed to further elucidate the impact of OT
24 treatment on mood states in ASD.

25 Finally, with respect to the effect of OT on general aspects of quality of life, the current
26 study identified no treatment-specific improvements. To date, evidence on the effects of OT
27 on quality of life is relatively scarce since only two prior studies have addressed this topic.
28 Contrary to our findings, Anagnostou et al. (8) reported an OT-specific improvement in quality

1 of life (socio-emotional section) after a 6-week treatment in adult men with ASD. Watanabe et
2 al. (9) on the other hand, only observed a trend towards improvement in quality of life
3 immediately after a 6-week trial in adult men with ASD. Importantly, recent reviews stated that
4 most individuals with ASD have poor quality of life (note that most studies included children
5 with ASD) (41) or lower quality of life than typically developing adults (42). Note, however, that
6 to date there is no comprehensive ASD-specific quality of life assessment tool validated and
7 consequently, the tools used in the general population (i.e. WHO-QOL) might not be the most
8 adequate to assess quality of life in ASD (and thus changes in quality of life after intervention)
9 (42).

10 In terms of associations between core autism characteristics and attachment
11 characteristics, our study showed that impairments in social responsiveness and more
12 frequent and/or severe repetitive behaviors were associated with a more avoidant attachment
13 style and with less secure attachment towards significant others (especially the mother). Albeit
14 exploratory, we also showed that, as a group, the individuals with ASD scored higher on
15 avoidant attachment and lower on secure attachment, when compared to a sample of
16 neurotypical individuals. Together, these findings provide indications that - at least to some
17 extent - associations are evident between core autism characteristics and attachment
18 characteristics, a notion that is generally supported by a recent meta-analysis showing an
19 association between the severity of autism characteristics and less secure attachment in
20 children with ASD (22), as well as by other studies showing more insecure attachment towards
21 parents or romantic partners in unmarried (43) or married adults with ASD (44), respectively.
22 However, since research on this topic to date is limited, it currently remains speculative
23 whether the reported feelings of insecure attachment are a result of the social difficulties
24 experienced by individuals with ASD, or conversely, whether difficulties in the social domain
25 are – in part or within a subset of individuals with ASD - a result of a decreased tendency or
26 inability to form secure attachments. Nevertheless, elucidating the interaction between autism
27 symptomology and attachment style may be of particular relevance in the context of OT
28 treatment, since – according to the aforementioned affiliative-motivation hypothesis –

1 especially individuals with a decreased tendency to affiliate (i.e., avoidantly attached
2 individuals) have been proposed to benefit the most from receiving OT treatment (37). The
3 current findings of significant ameliorations in attachment avoidance, but no treatment-specific
4 effects on social responsiveness, are in line with this notion and together suggest that
5 attachment characteristics may be more sensitive for evaluating treatment responses, as
6 compared to evaluations based on core autism characteristics alone. Considering the mixed
7 pattern of effects of OT treatment on core autism symptomatology (e.g. SRS-A, RBS-R,
8 ADOS), it seems of great relevance for future multiple-dose clinical trials with individuals with
9 ASD to additionally include more in-depth characterizations of attachment-related constructs
10 both dimensionally and longitudinally (pre-post treatment). In view of the current observations,
11 these explorations are anticipated to be informative for evaluating and predicting treatment
12 responses, and potentially for delineating patient populations that will benefit the most from a
13 course of OT treatment.

14 *Limitations.* Although the current study provides new insights regarding long-lasting effects of
15 multiple-dose OT treatment in ASD and the relation between autism characteristics and
16 attachment characteristics, several limitations need to be considered. First, although our
17 sample size was comparable to that of prior similar clinical trials, studies with larger samples
18 are warranted. Indeed, considering this is an initial pilot study exploring long-term effects of
19 OT treatment (without correction for multiple comparisons), the findings of long-term
20 improvements in repetitive behaviours; attachment avoidance and vigor mood state should be
21 interpreted with caution. Second, in the current study, participants administered the OT nasal
22 spray once a day (in the morning) while the majority of prior multiple-dose OT studies
23 administered two doses/day (one in the morning and one in the afternoon) (8–10, 12-14, but
24 see 11). While elevated levels of OT have been demonstrated up to 7 hours after a single-
25 dose administration (45), future studies are needed to identify at what point in time the effects
26 of intranasal administration of OT fade out and when OT levels return back to baseline. Also
27 potential interactions with diurnal patterns of endogenous OT levels need to be explored to

1 identify the most optimal dosing and timing of intranasal OT administrations. Third, considering
2 the adopted evaluations were predominantly based on self-report questionnaires, the
3 possibility of subjective bias cannot be ruled out. Participants' own beliefs about the received
4 treatment, however, were assessed and inclusion of this factor did not modulate the identified
5 treatment effects. Finally, since only adult men with ASD were included, the current
6 observations of beneficial effects of OT treatment cannot be extended to women or children
7 with ASD.

8 **5. Conclusions**

9 To conclude, while the four-week, once-daily treatment with OT induced no treatment-specific
10 changes in primary outcome measures of social symptoms in ASD; exploratory analyses of
11 secondary outcomes showed long-lasting, medium to large-sized improvements in repetitive
12 behaviors and a reduction in perceived attachment avoidance, that outlasted the period of
13 actual administration until one month and even one-year post-treatment. Overall, the
14 observation that the OT treatment primarily targeted long-term adaptations in repetitive
15 behaviors and perceived attachment characteristics indicates that these constructs are
16 sensitive for capturing OT treatment effects in adult men with ASD. In line with the central role
17 of the human oxytocinergic system in interpersonal bonding, trust and attachment, the current
18 observations may therefore urge future multiple-dose clinical trials to continue to include
19 characterizations of attachment-related constructs when evaluating the potential of OT
20 treatment for ASD. While the exploratory observations of long-term beneficial effects of OT
21 treatment on repetitive behaviors and perceived attachment avoidance are promising, future
22 studies are warranted to further elucidate the long-term impact of OT treatment.

1 **6. List of abbreviations**

2 OT oxytocin

3 ASD autism spectrum disorder

4 DSM Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders

5 ADOS Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule

6 IU international units

7 MRI magnetic resonance imaging

8 PL placebo

9 POMS Profile of Mood States

10 SRS-A Social Responsiveness Scale

11 RBS-R Repetitive Behavior Scale – Revised

12 SAAM State Adult Attachment Measure

13 IPPA Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment

14 WHO-QOL World Health Organization Quality of Life

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 **Declarations**

2

3 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

4 All participants gave informed written consent in accordance with the ethics approval by the
5 local Ethics Committee for Biomedical Research at the University of Leuven, KU Leuven
6 (s56327).

7

8 **Consent for publication**

9 Not applicable.

10

11 **Availability of data and materials**

12 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
13 corresponding author on reasonable request.

14

15 **Competing interests**

16 The authors declare no competing interests.

17

18 **Funding**

19 This research was supported by the Branco Weiss fellowship of the Society in Science - ETH
20 Zurich and by grants from the Flanders Fund for Scientific Research (FWO projects KAN
21 1506716N, KAN 1521313N, G040112 & G079017N). S.B. is supported by a fund of the
22 Marguerite-Marie Delacroix foundation.

23

1 **Authors' contributions**

2 SB acquired, prepared and analysed the data, and drafted and revised the manuscript. KA and
3 JS designed the study and revised the manuscript. KA also analysed the data. GB and BB
4 provided intellectual contribution to the manuscript and revised the manuscript. All authors
5 read and approved the final manuscript.

6

7 **Acknowledgements**

8 We are thankful to all the participating subjects and all the master students who helped with
9 the data collection. We specifically want to acknowledge Claudia Dillen for her help during the
10 start of the clinical trial. We also thank our colleagues of the Leuven Autism Research
11 Consortium.

12

13

14

15

16

17

1 **References**

- 2 1. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental
3 Disorders (DSM-5®) [Internet]. 5th ed. Arlington VA, editor. American Psychiatric
4 Association; 2013 [cited 2016 Feb 4]. 50–59 p. Available from:
5 <https://books.google.com/books?hl=nl&lr=&id=-JivBAAQBAJ&pgis=1>
- 6 2. Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, van IJzendoorn MH. Sniffing around oxytocin: review and
7 meta-analyses of trials in healthy and clinical groups with implications for
8 pharmacotherapy. *Transl Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2013 Jan 21 [cited 2015 Sep 7];3:e258.
9 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/tp.2013.34>
- 10 3. Bartz JA, Zaki J, Bolger N, Ochsner KN. Social effects of oxytocin in humans: context
11 and person matter. *Trends Cogn Sci* [Internet]. 2011;15(7):301–9. Available from:
12 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1364661311000830>
- 13 4. Hollander E, Novotny S, Hanratty M, Yaffe R, DeCaria CM, Aronowitz BR, et al.
14 Oxytocin infusion reduces repetitive behaviors in adults with autistic and Asperger's
15 disorders. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2003;28(1):193–8.
- 16 5. Hollander E, Bartz J, Chaplin W, Phillips A, Sumner J, Soorya L, et al. Oxytocin
17 Increases Retention of Social Cognition in Autism. *Biol Psychiatry* [Internet].
18 2007;61(4):498–503. Available from:
19 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0006322306007293>
- 20 6. Guastella AJ, Einfeld SL, Gray KM, Rinehart NJ, Tonge BJ, Lambert TJ, et al.
21 Intranasal oxytocin improves emotion recognition for youth with autism spectrum
22 disorders. *Biol Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2010 Apr 1 [cited 2015 Dec 16];67(7):692–4.
23 Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006322309011226>
- 24 7. Andari E, Duhamel J-R, Zalla T, Herbrecht E, Leboyer M, Sirigu A. Promoting social
25 behavior with oxytocin in high-functioning autism spectrum disorders. *Proc Natl Acad
26 Sci* [Internet]. 2010;107(9):4389–94. Available from:
27 <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0910249107>
- 28 8. Anagnostou E, Soorya L, Chaplin W, Bartz J, Halpern D, Wasserman S, et al.

- 1 Intranasal oxytocin versus placebo in the treatment of adults with autism spectrum
2 disorders: a randomized controlled trial. *Mol Autism* [Internet]. 2012;3(1):16. Available
3 from:
4 [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3539865&tool=pmcentrez&r](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3539865&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract)
5 endertype=abstract
- 6 9. Watanabe T, Kuroda M, Kuwabara H, Aoki Y, Iwashiro N, Tatsunobu N, et al. Clinical
7 and neural effects of six-week administration of oxytocin on core symptoms of autism.
8 *Brain* [Internet]. 2015 Nov 1 [cited 2016 Jan 6];138(Pt 11):3400–12. Available from:
9 <http://brain.oxfordjournals.org/content/138/11/3400>
- 10 10. Yamasue H, Okada T, Munesue T, Kuroda M, Fujioka T, Uno Y, et al. Effect of
11 intranasal oxytocin on the core social symptoms of autism spectrum disorder: a
12 randomized clinical trial. *Mol Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2018;1. Available from:
13 <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41380-018-0097-2>
- 14 11. Dadds MR, MacDonald E, Cauchi A, Williams K, Levy F, Brennan J. Nasal Oxytocin
15 for Social Deficits in Childhood Autism: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Autism Dev*
16 *Disord* [Internet]. 2014 Mar 26 [cited 2016 Aug 1];44(3):521–31. Available from:
17 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10803-013-1899-3>
- 18 12. Guastella AJ, Gray KM, Rinehart NJ, Alvares G a., Tonge BJ, Hickie IB, et al. The
19 effects of a course of intranasal oxytocin on social behaviors in youth diagnosed with
20 autism spectrum disorders: A randomized controlled trial. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*
21 *Allied Discip*. 2015;4:444–52.
- 22 13. Yatawara CJ, Einfeld SL, Hickie IB, Davenport T a, Guastella a J. The effect of
23 oxytocin nasal spray on social interaction deficits observed in young children with
24 autism: a randomized clinical crossover trial. *Mol Psychiatry* [Internet].
25 2016;(August):1–7. Available from:
26 <http://www.nature.com/are.uab.cat/mp/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/mp2015162a.html%5>
27 Cn<http://www.nature.com/doi/10.1038/mp.2015.162>
- 28 14. Parker KJ, Oztan O, Libove RA, Sumiyoshi RD, Jackson LP, Karhson DS, et al.

- 1 Intranasal oxytocin treatment for social deficits and biomarkers of response in children
2 with autism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci [Internet]*. 2017;114(30):201705521. Available from:
3 <http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.1705521114>
- 4 15. Chevallier C, Kohls G, Troiani V, Brodtkin ES, Schultz RT. The social motivation theory
5 of autism. *Trends Cogn Sci [Internet]*. 2012;16(4):231–8. Available from:
6 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2012.02.007>
- 7 16. Shamay-Tsoory SG, Abu-Akel A. The social salience hypothesis of oxytocin. *Biol*
8 *Psychiatry [Internet]*. 2015 Aug [cited 2015 Aug 7];79(3):194–202. Available from:
9 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006322315006393>
- 10 17. Bernaerts S, Prinsen J, Berra E, Bosmans G, Steyaert J, Alaerts K. Long-term
11 oxytocin administration enhances the experience of attachment.
12 *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2017;78:1–9.
- 13 18. De Dreu CKW. Oxytocin modulates the link between adult attachment and cooperation
14 through reduced betrayal aversion. *Psychoneuroendocrinology [Internet]*. 2012 Jul
15 [cited 2015 Dec 9];37(7):871–80. Available from:
16 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306453011003064>
- 17 19. Bartz J a., Lydon JE, Kolevzon a., Zaki J, Hollander E, Ludwig N, et al. Differential
18 Effects of Oxytocin on Agency and Communion for Anxiously and Avoidantly Attached
19 Individuals. *Psychol Sci [Internet]*. 2015;1–10. Available from:
20 <http://pss.sagepub.com/lookup/doi/10.1177/0956797615580279>
- 21 20. Buchheim A, Heinrichs M, George C, Pokorny D, Koops E, Henningsen P, et al.
22 Oxytocin enhances the experience of attachment security. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*
23 *[Internet]*. 2009;34(9):1417–22. Available from:
24 [http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3138620&tool=pmcentrez&r](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3138620&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract)
25 [endertype=abstract](http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3138620&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract)
- 26 21. Rutgers AH, Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, Van Ijzendoorn MH, Van Berckelaer-Onnes
27 IA. Autism and attachment: a meta-analytic review. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*.
28 2004;45(6):1123–34.

- 1 22. Teague SJ, Gray KM, Tonge BJ, Newman LK. Attachment in children with autism
2 spectrum disorder: A systematic review. *Res Autism Spectr Disord* [Internet].
3 2017;35:35–50. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2016.12.002>
- 4 23. Lord C, Rutter M, Goode S, Heemsbergen J, Jordan H, Mawhood L, et al. Autism
5 diagnostic observation schedule: A standardized observation of communicative and
6 social behavior. *J Autism Dev Disord* [Internet]. 1989 Jun [cited 2018 Jun
7 11];19(2):185–212. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/BF02211841>
- 8 24. Lord C, DiLavore P, Gotham K, Guthrie W, Luyster R, Risi S, et al. Autism diagnostic
9 observation schedule: ADOS-2 [Internet]. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Western Psychological
10 Services; 2012 [cited 2019 Jun 19]. Available from:
11 [https://www.worldcat.org/title/autism-diagnostic-observation-schedule-ados-](https://www.worldcat.org/title/autism-diagnostic-observation-schedule-ados-2/oclc/851410387)
12 [2/oclc/851410387](https://www.worldcat.org/title/autism-diagnostic-observation-schedule-ados-2/oclc/851410387)
- 13 25. Wechsler D, Coalson D, Raiford S. WAIS IV Technical and Interpretive Manual. San
14 Antonio: NCS Pearson; 2008.
- 15 26. Domes G, Heinrichs M, Michel A, Berger C, Herpertz SC. Oxytocin improves “mind-
16 reading” in humans. *Biol Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2007 Mar 15 [cited 2015 Jun
17 1];61(6):731–3. Available from:
18 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006322306009395>
- 19 27. Guastella AJ, Mitchell PB, Dadds MR. Oxytocin increases gaze to the eye region of
20 human faces. *Biol Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2008 Jan 1 [cited 2016 Jan 13];63(1):3–5.
21 Available from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006322307006178>
- 22 28. Gordon I, Vander Wyk BC, Bennett RH, Cordeaux C, Lucas M V., Eilbott JA, et al.
23 Oxytocin enhances brain function in children with autism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* [Internet].
24 2013;110(52):20953–8. Available from:
25 <http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1312857110>
- 26 29. Guastella AJ, MacLeod C. A critical review of the influence of oxytocin nasal spray on
27 social cognition in humans: Evidence and future directions. *Horm Behav* [Internet].
28 2012;61(3):410–8. Available from:

- 1 <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0018506X12000037>
- 2 30. Bernaerts S, Berra E, Wenderoth N, Alaerts K. Influence of oxytocin on emotion
3 recognition from body language: A randomized placebo-controlled trial.
4 *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2016;72.
- 5 31. Constantino JN. *Social Responsiveness Scale-Adult Research Version*. Lon Angeles,
6 CA: Western Psychological Services; 2005.
- 7 32. Lam KSL, Aman MG. The repetitive behavior scale-revised: Independent validation in
8 individuals with autism spectrum disorders. *J Autism Dev Disord*. 2007;37(5):855–66.
- 9 33. Gillath O, Hart J, Nofle EE, Stockdale GD. Development and validation of a state
10 adult attachment measure (SAAM). *J Res Pers [Internet]*. 2009 Jun [cited 2016 Feb
11 15];43(3):362–73. Available from:
12 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0092656608001694>
- 13 34. Armsden GC, Greenberg MT. The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual
14 differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *J Youth
15 Adolesc [Internet]*. 1987;16(5):427–54. Available from:
16 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02202939>
- 17 35. The Whoqol Group. The World Health Organization quality of life assessment
18 (WHOQOL): Development and general psychometric properties. *Soc Sci Med
19 [Internet]*. 1998 Jun 15 [cited 2018 Jun 13];46(12):1569–85. Available from:
20 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277953698000094?via%3Dihub>
- 21 36. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd ed. New Jersey:
22 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
- 23 37. Bartz JA. Oxytocin and the Pharmacological Dissection of Affiliation. *Curr Dir Psychol
24 Sci [Internet]*. 2016;25(2):104–10. Available from:
25 <http://cdp.sagepub.com/lookup/doi/10.1177/0963721415626678>
- 26 38. Rodgers J, Glod M, Connolly B, McConachie H. The Relationship Between Anxiety
27 and Repetitive Behaviours in Autism Spectrum Disorder. *J Autism Dev Disord
28 [Internet]*. 2012 Nov 17 [cited 2018 Jul 25];42(11):2404–9. Available from:

- 1 <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10803-012-1531-y>
- 2 39. Lang M, Krátký J, Shaver JH, Jerotijević D, Xygalatas D. Effects of Anxiety on
3 Spontaneous Ritualized Behavior. *Curr Biol* [Internet]. 2015 Jul 20 [cited 2018 Jul
4 25];25(14):1892–7. Available from:
5 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960982215006521?via%3Dihub>
- 6 40. Masi A, Lampit A, Glozier N, Hickie IB, Guastella AJ. Predictors of placebo response
7 in pharmacological and dietary supplement treatment trials in pediatric autism spectru
8 disorder: A meta-analysis. *Transl Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2015;5(9):e640-9. Available
9 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/tp.2015.143>
- 10 41. Chiang HM, Wineman I. Factors associated with quality of life in individuals with
11 autism spectrum disorders: A review of literature. *Res Autism Spectr Disord* [Internet].
12 2014;8(8):974–86. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2014.05.003>
- 13 42. Ayres M, Parr JR, Rodgers J, Mason D, Avery L, Flynn D. A systematic review of
14 quality of life of adults on the autism spectrum. *Autism*. 2017;
- 15 43. Taylor EL, Target M, Charman T. Attachment in adults with high-functioning autism.
16 *Attach Hum Dev*. 2008;10(2):143–63.
- 17 44. Lau W, Peterson CC. Adults and children with Asperger syndrome: Exploring adult
18 attachment style, marital satisfaction and satisfaction with parenthood. *Res Autism*
19 *Spectr Disord* [Internet]. 2011 Jan 1 [cited 2018 Jun 20];5(1):392–9. Available from:
20 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1750946710000887>
- 21 45. van Ijzendoorn MH, Bhandari R, van der Veen R, Grewen KM, Bakermans-
22 Kranenburg MJ. Elevated Salivary Levels of Oxytocin Persist More than 7 h after
23 Intranasal Administration. *Front Neurosci* [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2019 Mar 20];6:174.
24 Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23233832>
25
26
27

1

Table 1. Participant characteristics

	Oxytocin	Placebo	T-value	p-value
Number of participants	22	18		
Age	25.00 ± 4.86	24.00 ± 5.55	0.62	0.54
IQ				
Total IQ	102.27 ± 12.45	104.61 ± 21.59	-0.43	0.67
VIQ	105.57 ± 9.27	108.72 ± 16.83	-0.74	0.47
PIQ	104.76 ± 18.35	102.39 ± 22.90	0.36	0.72
ADOS(2)				
Total	7.18 ± 4.22	8.06 ± 4.26	-0.65	0.52
Communication	2.05 ± 1.40	2.39 ± 1.54	-0.74	0.46
Social interaction	4.82 ± 3.50	5.67 ± 3.33	-0.78	0.44
Use of psychostimulant medication	6	2		
Comorbidity	8	2		

Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation. IQ = Intelligence Quotient, VIQ = Verbal IQ, PIQ = Performance IQ, ADOS(-2) = Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule(-2). Detailed information on medication use and comorbidities is provided in **Additional file 3a: Table S1**. Note that for one participant of the OT group only total IQ information was available, but not VIQ or PIQ, so that the mean (± standard deviation) information of the VIQ and PIQ of the OT group are based on data from 21 participants.

2

Table 2. Outcome measures and effects of oxytocin treatment. Mean pre-to-post change scores are listed separately for each treatment group (oxytocin, placebo) and assessment session (T1, T2, T3). Cohen's d effect sizes of *between-group* differences are reported separately for each outcome measure and assessment session. T- and p-values correspond to single-sample t-tests assessing *within-group* changes from baseline separately for the oxytocin and placebo group.

Outcome measure	Oxytocin				Placebo				Between-group difference Cohen's d
	N	Mean ± SD	T-value	p	N	Mean ± SD	T-value	p	
Multiple-dose effect (T1)									
<i>Primary outcomes</i>									
SRS-A self-report	22	-5.55 ± 11.40	-2.28	0.033	18	-1.06 ± 10.01	-0.45	0.66	-0.42
SRS-A informant-based	17	0.0 ± 15.86	0.00	1.00	15	-0.87 ± 12.83	-0.26	0.80	0.10
<i>Secondary outcomes</i>									
RBS-R	22	-4.77 ± 6.47	-3.46	0.002	17	-1.76 ± 4.75	-1.53	0.15	-0.63
SAAM avoidance	22	-0.40 ± 0.71	-2.63	0.016	18	0.06 ± 0.98	0.24	0.81	-0.61
SAAM security	22	0.27 ± 0.77	1.62	0.12	18	-0.05 ± 0.66	-0.31	0.76	0.63
SAAM anxiety	22	-0.14 ± 0.75	-0.90	0.38	18	0.28 ± 0.95	1.24	0.23	-0.62
IPPA Peers	22	1.45 ± 3.85	1.77	0.091	18	0.56 ± 4.05	0.58	0.57	0.30
IPPA Mother	21	-0.52 ± 2.71	-0.88	0.39	18	0.44 ± 3.45	0.55	0.59	-0.39
IPPA Father	21	0.43 ± 3.30	0.60	0.56	18	-0.61 ± 3.81	-0.68	0.50	0.29
WHO-QOL	22	1.77 ± 8.04	1.03	0.31	17	-1.35 ± 6.74	-0.83	0.42	0.63
<i>Profile of mood states</i>									
Tension	22	-2.00 ± 2.29	-4.10	0.0005	18	-2.39 ± 3.03	-3.34	0.004	0.14
Anger	22	0.00 ± 4.05	0.00	1.00	18	-0.61 ± 2.73	-0.95	0.35	0.18
Depression	22	-1.14 ± 4.50	-1.19	0.25	18	-0.33 ± 2.81	-0.50	0.62	-0.21

Vigor	22	-1.00 ± 2.53	-1.86	0.077	18	-2.94 ± 3.64	-3.43	0.003	0.62
Fatigue	22	-2.09 ± 3.99	-2.46	0.023	18	-1.11 ± 5.12	-0.92	0.37	-0.21

One-month Retention effect (T2)

Primary outcomes

SRS-A self-report	22	-5.64 ± 12.57	-2.10	0.048	18	-7.67 ± 12.09	-2.69	0.015	0.22
SRS-A informant-based	17	-9.59 ± 10.98	-3.60	0.002	15	-1.20 ± 10.73	-0.43	0.67	-0.83

Secondary outcomes

RBS-R	22	-4.91 ± 6.33	-3.64	0.002	17	-2.35 ± 3.43	-2.83	0.012	-0.50
SAAM avoidance	22	-0.38 ± 0.70	-2.58	0.018	18	-0.06 ± 0.76	-0.35	0.73	-0.53
SAAM security	22	0.04 ± 1.01	0.18	0.86	18	-0.40 ± 0.99	-1.70	0.11	0.62
SAAM anxiety	22	0.08 ± 1.05	0.36	0.72	18	0.11 ± 0.87	0.54	0.60	-0.05
IPPA Peers	22	1.32 ± 3.71	1.67	0.11	18	0.06 ± 3.70	0.06	0.95	0.45
IPPA Mother	21	-0.38 ± 3.43	-0.51	0.62	18	0.06 ± 4.35	0.05	0.96	-0.14
IPPA Father	21	0.52 ± 3.59	0.67	0.51	18	-0.33 ± 3.87	-0.37	0.72	0.31
WHO-QOL	22	1.14 ± 5.48	0.97	0.34	17	0.35 ± 4.53	0.32	0.75	0.24

Profile of mood states

Tension	22	-2.64 ± 2.80	-4.41	0.0002	18	-2.11 ± 3.22	-2.76	0.013	-0.17
Anger	22	0.36 ± 3.68	0.46	0.65	18	-0.39 ± 3.91	-0.42	0.68	0.20
Depression	22	-0.82 ± 2.63	-1.46	0.16	18	0.22 ± 3.41	0.28	0.79	-0.34
Vigor	22	0.14 ± 3.58	0.18	0.86	18	-1.44 ± 4.33	-1.42	0.17	0.40
Fatigue	22	-2.69 ± 2.71	-4.63	0.0001	18	-2.33 ± 4.47	-2.21	0.04	-0.09

One-year Retention effect (T3)

Primary outcomes


SRS-A self-report	22	-8.59 ± 20.95	-1.92	0.07	18	-6.72 ± 21.01	-1.36	0.19	-0.12
SRS-A informant-based	17	-7.41 ± 19.26	-1.59	0.13	15	-4.13 ± 24.64	-0.65	0.53	-0.18
<i>Secondary outcomes</i>									
RBS-R	22	-4.91 ± 9.46	-2.43	0.02	17	-0.41 ± 4.27	-0.40	0.70	-0.98
SAAM avoidance	22	-0.52 ± 1.18	-2.07	0.05	18	0.0 ± 0.75	0.00	1.00	-0.80
SAAM security	22	0.20 ± 1.52	-0.62	0.54	18	-0.14 ± 0.66	-0.91	0.37	-0.05
SAAM anxiety	22	0.17 ± 0.94	0.83	0.42	18	0.11 ± 1.21	0.39	0.70	0.06
IPPA Peers	22	0.68 ± 6.26	0.51	0.61	18	1.28 ± 4.17	1.30	0.21	-0.20
IPPA Mother	21	0.33 ± 3.91	0.39	0.70	18	1.50 ± 5.44	1.17	0.26	-0.30
IPPA Father	21	0.57 ± 4.08	0.64	0.53	18	-0.50 ± 4.53	-0.47	0.65	0.33
WHO-QOL	22	1.14 ± 8.37	0.64	0.53	17	0.29 ± 4.21	0.29	0.78	0.27
<i>Profile of mood states</i>									
Tension	22	-1.86 ± 2.29	-3.81	0.001	18	-2.28 ± 3.46	-2.79	0.012	0.14
Anger	22	0.59 ± 3.69	0.75	0.46	18	0.06 ± 3.84	0.06	0.95	0.14
Depression	22	0.50 ± 2.63	0.89	0.38	18	-0.28 ± 3.51	-0.34	0.74	0.25
Vigor	22	1.14 ± 3.88	1.37	0.18	18	-0.61 ± 3.27	-0.79	0.43	0.50
Fatigue	22	-0.23 ± 6.04	-0.18	0.86	18	0.39 ± 4.73	0.35	0.73	-0.11

SRS-A = Social Responsiveness Scale adult version, RBS-R = Repetitive Behavior Scale – Revised, SAAM = State Adult Attachment Measure, IPPA = Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment, WHO-QOL = World Health Organization Quality of Life questionnaire. Screening for mood changes are based on the Profile of Mood States (POMS) questionnaire. For SRS-A, RBS-R, SAAM avoidance, SAAM anxiety, and POMS tension, anger, depression and fatigue; negative scores indicate pre-to-post improvement. Cohen's d effect sizes (change from baseline_{OT}—change from baseline_{PL})/pooled SD) are reported where 0.2 is indicative of a small effect, 0.5 a medium effect and 0.8 a large effect. Data printed in bold show Cohen's d effect sizes equal to or larger than .50 (medium-sized effect).

1 **Figures**

2 **Figure 1. CONSORT Flow diagram**

3 CONSORT Flow diagram. Data were analysed using an intention-to-treat format with last-
 4 observations-carried-forward to replace missing data. For participants with missing baseline
 5 data, analysis for that measure was excluded list-wise. SRS-A: Social Responsiveness Scale
 6 adult version, RBS-R: Repetitive Behavior Scale Revised, SAAM: State Adult Attachment
 7 Measure, IPPA: Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment, WHO-QOL: World Health
 8 Organization Quality of Life.




9

10

1 **Figure 2. Effects of oxytocin treatment on autism symptoms and attachment**

2 Mean pre-to-post changes (change from baseline) on self-report and informant-based
 3 questionnaires are visualized for the oxytocin (OT) and placebo (PL) treatment groups at
 4 assessment session ‘T1’ (immediately after the four-week treatment), ‘T2’ (at follow-up, one
 5 month post-treatment) and ‘T3’ (at follow-up, one year post-treatment). Mean changes from
 6 baseline are visualized separately for (A) Social Responsiveness Scale (SRS-A) self-report
 7 version, (B) SRS-A informant-based version, (C) Repetitive Behavior Scale – Revised (RBS-
 8 R), (D) State Adult Attachment Measure (SAAM) Avoidance subscale, (E) SAAM Security
 9 subscale, and (F) SAAM Anxiety subscale. Lower scores indicate improvement for the SRS-
 10 A, RBS-R, SAAM Avoidance and SAAM Anxiety questionnaires. For the SAAM Security
 11 questionnaire, higher scores indicate improvement. Vertical bars denote +/- standard errors.
 12 Asterisks (*) indicate Cohen’s $d \geq .50$ (medium-sized effect). Circles (°) indicate Cohen’s $d \geq .80$
 13 (large-sized effect).



14