# Supplementary Materials for: Altered association of plasmatic oxytocin with affective stress responses in alcohol use disorder

Mayer, A.V., Schwarze, Y., Stierand, J., Voges, J., Schröder, A., von der Gablentz, J., Junghanns, K., Voß, O., Krach, S., Paulus, F.M., & Rademacher, L.

## Contents

Inclusion and exclusion criteria	1
Changes in study protocol due to SARS-CoV-2 pandemic	1
MRI experiments	2
Analysis software	2
Supplementary Tables	3
Table S1. Summary of affective and physiological stress measures per task and group3	3
Table S2: Model comparisons of linear mixed-effect models	4
Table S3: Oxytocin and anxiety change: results of linear mixed-effects model	ō
Table S4: Oxytocin and pulse rate change: results of linear mixed-effects model	ō
Table S5: Oxytocin and cortisol increase: results of linear mixed-effects model	7
Table S6: Oxytocin, stress and depression: results of linear regression analyses	3
References	9

### Inclusion and exclusion criteria

General inclusion criteria were an age between 18 and 60 years and sufficient German language skills. Participants were excluded if they (1) suffered from any neurological disease, traumatic brain injuries, acute inflammatory disease or chronic inflammatory bowel disease, (2) were taking medication that exerted a direct influence on the HPA axis, in particular beta-blockers or medication containing hydrocortisone. Since parts of this study were carried out using magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), subjects were also required to be free of any metallic implants such as pacemakers, defibrillators or copper IUDs, as well as metallic splinters or shrapnel. Other MRI contraindications included large tattoos or permanent make-up, claustrophobia, and pregnancy.

Participants with alcohol use disorder (AUD) were additionally required to meet the criteria for moderate to severe AUD according to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders fifth edition (DSM-5) and to be abstinent for at least 9 days at the time of study participation. Participants with AUD were excluded if they (1) had a history of substance abuse or dependency other than alcohol or nicotine within the last 12 months, (2) were diagnosed with major depression, social anxiety disorder, antisocial or borderline personality disorder, (3) were in an acute state of psychosis or suicidality. Control participants were excluded if they (1) suffered from any current or past psychiatric disorders, (2) scored ≥8 on the Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test (AUDIT) (Bohn et al., 1995), (3) had any first-degree relatives with alcohol use disorder, (4) had consumed drugs (except for alcohol, nicotine, and irregular use of cannabis) in the past year. All inclusion and exclusion criteria were checked by telephone or in a personal interview before participants were included in the study.

## Changes in study protocol due to SARS-CoV-2 pandemic

Due to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, data collection was temporarily halted between March 2020 and October 2021. The study was continued as soon as the risk for infection was sufficiently reduced by available vaccinations and testing. Forty-nine participants were enrolled before the pandemic, and thirty-one participants were enrolled during the pandemic. Following the pause, several procedural adjustments were made. For instance, participants underwent a rapid COVID-19 test upon arrival, and face masks were worn throughout the visits. Additionally, before the pandemic, blood samples were collected at four time points using indwelling venous catheters: ten minutes after arrival (T0), immediately after the stress

or control task (T2), after MRI measurements (T4) and at the end of each visit (T5). During the pandemic, we decided to reduce the number of blood draws. Blood was now only collected at the beginning (T0) and end (T5) of each study visit using venipuncture.

## **MRI experiments**

The present analysis is part of a larger fMRI study investigating the acute behavioral, physiological, and neural responses to social stress in AUD, involving two MRI experiments for participants. Both experiments examined brain function associated with social vs. non-social stimuli, which might be altered after stress in individuals with AUD. The first experiment was a modified version of the monetary and social incentive delay (MID/SID) paradigm (Knutson et al., 2001; Rademacher et al., 2010; Spreckelmeyer et al., 2009), which is a well-established task to study participants' neural responses to anticipated rewards. During the task, participants respond as quickly as possible to a target stimulus after visual cues indicate a potential reward, with fast responses earning either social rewards (smiling faces) or monetary rewards (small amounts of money). This task is known to activate the dopaminergic reward system, which has been associated with addiction and stress. The second experiment involved a novel paradigm aimed at exploring neural and behavioral responses to images of social situations. Participants viewed images of both social and non-social scenes with differing numbers of people and were then asked to rate how much they would like to be in the depicted situation. Results of the fMRI analyses will be reported elsewhere.

## **Analysis software**

We used R version 4.1.0 (R Core Team, 2021) and the following R packages: afex v. 1.3.0 (Singmann et al., 2023), arsenal v. 3.6.3 (Heinzen et al., 2021), cocor v. 1.1.3 (Diedenhofen & Musch, 2015), DescTools v. 0.99.48 (Signorell, 2023), effectsize v. 0.8.5 (Ben-Shachar et al., 2020), ggExtra v. 0.10.1 (Attali & Baker, 2023), ggpubr v. 0.6.0 (Kassambara, 2023), ggrain v. 0.0.3 (Allen et al., 2021), irr v. 0.84.1 (Gamer et al., 2019), Ime4 v. 1.1.28 (Bates et al., 2015), mlmtools v. 1.0.2 (Jamison et al., 2022), and sjPlot v. 2.8.16 (Lüdecke, 2024).

# **Supplementary Tables**

	AUD gro	oup (N=40)	Control group (N=37)			
	Control task	TSST	Control task	TSST		
Anxiety pre task [STAI-S]						
Mean (SD)	24.34 (10.12)	23.15 (9.96)	23.57 (8.27)	22.49 (8.40)		
Range	12 - 57	10 - 52	10 - 41	10 - 46		
Anxiety post task [STAI-S]						
Mean (SD)	26.28 (10.39)	41.48 (13.89)	24.76 (7.69)	34.70 (12.28)		
Range	12 - 50	12 - 73	10 - 39	10 - 59		
Cortisol T0 [nmol/l]						
Mean (SD)	9.22 (5.79)	8.98 (5.43)	8.22 (4.89)	8.68 (5.49)		
Range	2.38 - 23.39	2.21 - 23.17	1.74 - 27.39	0.99 - 24.28		
Cortisol T1 [nmol/l]						
Mean (SD)	6.76 (5.97)	5.95 (4.85)	8.35 (7.20)	8.64 (8.72)		
Range	0.95 - 38.50	1.35 - 29.75	1.54 - 34.14	1.28 - 37.83		
Cortisol T2 [nmol/l]						
Mean (SD)	5.01 (3.74)	5.36 (3.34)	6.49 (5.84)	10.20 (7.52)		
Range	1.02 - 23.53	1.30 - 18.80	1.23 - 23.68	1.82 - 27.80		
Cortisol T3 [nmol/l]						
N-Miss	1	0	0	0		
Mean (SD)	4.05 (2.63)	6.19 (3.29)	5.24 (3.57)	13.28 (8.40)		
Range	1.13 - 13.94	1.47 - 14.81	1.12 - 13.70	1.63 - 32.54		
Cortisol T4 [nmol/l]						
Mean (SD)	4.19 (4.20)	4.26 (2.74)	5.00 (5.20)	6.52 (3.95)		
Range	1.35 - 28.05	0.83 - 17.20	0.95 - 32.85	1.07 - 19.59		
Cortisol increase from T1						
N-Miss	1	0	0	0		
Mean (SD)	165 (219)	300 (216)	155 (220)	524 (494)		
Range	-417 - 956	-92 - 1001	-767-636	-366 - 2027		
Pulse rate pre task [bpm]						
N-Miss	0	0	1	0		
Mean (SD)	81.29 (12.13)	79.82 (13.18)	71.16 (11.70)	71.91 (12.52)		
Range	56.12 - 111.03	51.19 - 104.43	48.76 - 100.13	48.43 - 105.80		
Pulse rate during task [bpm]						
N-Miss	0	0	1	1		
Mean (SD)	92.34 (13.44)	92.59 (19.07)	79.64 (12.20)	89.98 (17.75)		
Range	69.94 - 124.79	54.99 - 130.30	55.42 - 103.92	53.22 - 135.15		

#### Table S1. Summary of affective and physiological stress measures per task and group.

*Note.* STAI-S: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory - State measure (Laux et al., 1981). Higher STAI-S values indicate higher levels of subjectively perceived nervousness, tension, and worry. AUCi: area under the curve with respect to increase (Pruessner et al., 2003), calculated between T1 and T4. Higher AUCi indicates a stronger increase in cortisol levels between T1 and T4. Negative values indicate a decrease of cortisol levels between T1 and T4.

#### Table S2: Model comparisons of linear mixed-effect models.

	Model neme		Model fit				LRT against nested		
DV	Model name	AIC	BIC	LL	df	χ²	p		
Anxiety change	main effects model	1202.9	1230.2	-592.4					
	two-way interactions model	1200.4	1236.8	-588.2	3	8.51	0.037		
	three-way interaction model	1199.6	1239.1	-586.8	1	2.81	0.094		
Pulse rate change	main effects model	1135.5	1162.7	-558.8					
	two-way interactions model	1130.7	1167.0	-553.4	3	10.79	0.013		
	three-way interaction model	1132.7	1172.0	-553.4	1	0.00	0.994		
Cortisol change	main effects model	2200.1	2227.4	-1091.1					
	two-way interactions model	2196.1	2232.4	-1086.0	3	10.09	0.018		
	three-way interaction model	2197.9	2237.3	-1085.9	1	0.19	0.664		

*Note*. We constructed three models per dependent variable, each containing a random intercept for each participant, as well as task (TSST vs. control task), group (AUD vs. control group) and oxytocin as fixed effects. The models differed only in whether and which interaction effects were included: the first model only included main effects, the second model included all main effects and two-way interactions between oxytocin, task and group, and the third model included all main effects, two-way interactions and the three-way interaction of oxytocin × group × task. All models were estimated using maximum likelihood (ML) for the purpose of model comparisons. The respective winning models are highlighted in bold. DV: dependent variable, LRT = likelihood ratio test, AIC = Akaike information criterion, BIC = Bayesian information criterion, LL = log likelihood.

Fixed effects						
	Dutu	05	95%	CI		
	вета	SE	lower	upper	t	р
Intercept	5.77	2.24	1.52	10.01	2.57	0.012
Group	1.71	0.99	-0.18	3.59	1.72	0.090
Age	0.07	0.12	-0.15	0.29	0.57	0.571
Gender	-2.75	2.24	-6.99	1.49	-1.23	0.223
Task	6.96	0.86	5.29	8.64	8.10	< 0.001
Order	1.23	1.02	-0.71	3.16	1.20	0.233
Oxytocin	0.08	1.57	-2.90	3.07	0.05	0.959
Group × Oxytocin	3.61	1.57	0.62	6.59	2.29	0.024
Group × Task	1.46	0.86	-0.22	3.13	1.69	0.095
Task × Oxytocin -0.71		1.34	-3.25	2.01	-0.53	0.595
Random effects						
	Variance		SD			
Participant (Intercept)	18.2		4.3			
Model fit						
R <sup>2</sup>	Marginal		Conditional			
	0.32		0.42			

## Table S3: Oxytocin and anxiety change: results of linear mixed-effects model.

Note. P-values for fixed effects have been calculated using Satterthwaite's approximations. Model equation: anxiety difference  $\sim$  (1|id)+ group + age + gender + task + order + oxytocin + oxytocin\*group + group\*task + oxytocin\*task

Fixed effects						
	Data	05	95% (			_
	Bela	SE	lower	upper	L	ρ
Intercept	12.97	2.41	8.39	17.55	5.38	<0.001
Group	-0.81	1.04	-2.79	1.16	-0.78	0.438
Age	-0.11	0.12	-0.34	0.11	-0.95	0.347
Gender	0.33	2.41	-4.25	4.91	0.14	0.891
Task	2.58	0.58	1.46	3.73	4.44	< 0.001
Order	-1.49	1.06	-3.51	0.52	-1.41	0.164
Oxytocin	-0.20	1.52	-3.09	2.68	-0.13	0.895
Group × Oxytocin	-1.16	1.52	-4.08	1.79	-0.76	0.447
Group × Task	-1.75	0.58	-2.89	-0.62	-2.99	0.004
Task × Oxytocin	-1.01	0.92	-2.79	0.76	-1.10	0.274
Random effects						
	Variance		SD			
Participant (Intercept)	56.39		7.51			
Model fit						
R <sup>2</sup>	Marginal		Conditional			
	0.12		0.58			

## Table S4: Oxytocin and pulse rate change: results of linear mixed-effects model.

Note. *P*-values for fixed effects have been calculated using Satterthwaite's approximations. Model equation: pulse rate difference  $\sim$  (1|id)+ group + age + gender + task + order + oxytocin + oxytocin\*group + group\*task + oxytocin\*task

Fixed effects						
	Data	Data OF		CI		_
	Вета	SE	lower	upper	t	р
Intercept	208.2	63.9	87.1	329.3	3.26	0.002
Group	-52.5	28.4	-106.4	1.3	-1.85	0.069
Age	-0.8	3.3	-7.0	5.5	-0.23	0.818
Gender	-82.7	63.8	-203.6	38.2	-1.30	0.199
Task	127.5	21.4	86.0	169.0	5.97	< 0.001
Order	8.0	29.1	-47.1	63.1	0.28	0.784
Oxytocin	-32.4	43.9	-115.7	50.8	-0.74	0.461
Group × Oxytocin	67.1	44.0	-16.3	150.6	1.53	0.130
Group × Task	-57.8	21.4	-99.5	-16.2	-2.70	0.009
Task × Oxytocin	-1.3	33.5	-65.8	63.7	-0.04	0.968
Random effects						
	Variance		SD			
Participant (Intercept)	26017		161			
Model fit						
R <sup>2</sup>	Marginal		Conditional			
	0.21		0.43			

## Table S5: Oxytocin and cortisol increase: results of linear mixed-effects model.

Note. P-values for fixed effects have been calculated using Satterthwaite's approximations. Model equation: AUCi ~ (1|id)+ group + age + gender + task + order + oxytocin + oxytocin\*group + group\*task + oxytocin\*task

Table S6: Oxytocin,	stress and depres	sion: results of linear	regression analyses.

Depression [BDI-FS]			Stress reactivity [SRS]			Chronic stress [TICS]			
Predictors	β	CI	p	β	CI	p	β	CI	р
Intercept	0.28	-2.74 - 3.30	0.854	57.55	45.07 - 70.04	<0.001	20.24	11.11 - 29.37	<0.001
Mean oxytoci	n 1.37	0.22 - 2.52	0.020	-0.48	-5.22 - 4.26	0.840	0.36	-3.10 - 3.83	0.836
Group	2.68	-1.59 – 6.96	0.215	-1.68	-19.37 – 16.01	0.850	-6.92	-19.86 - 6.02	0.290
Mean oxytocii × Group	n -2.15	-3.810.49	0.012	-3.04	-9.89 – 3.81	0.379	-1.44	-6.45 - 3.58	0.570
Observations	76			77			77		
R <sup>2</sup> / R <sup>2</sup> adjusted	0.328 / 0.300			0.217 / 0.185	i		0.384 / 0.358	3	

*Note.* BDI-FS: Beck Depression Inventory Fast Screen (Beck et al., 2000), SRS: Stress-Reactivity-Scale (Schulz et al., 2005), TICS: screening scale of the Trier Inventory for the Assessment of Chronic Stress (Schulz & Schlotz, 1999). Significant effects are highlighted in bold.

#### References

- Allen, M., Poggiali, D., Whitaker, K., Marshall, T. R., Langen, J. van, & Kievit, R. A. (2021). Raincloud plots: A multi-platform tool for robust data visualization [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. Wellcome Open Research, 4(63). https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15191.2
- Attali, D., & Baker, C. (2023). ggExtra: Add Marginal Histograms to `ggplot2', and More `ggplot2' Enhancements. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggExtra
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using Ime4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1–48. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01
- Beck, A. T., Steer, R., & Brown, G. (2000). *BDI-Fast Screen for Medical Patients Manual. Psychological Corporation.*
- Ben-Shachar, M. S., Lüdecke, D., & Makowski, D. (2020). effectsize: Estimation of Effect Size Indices and Standardized Parameters. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 5(56), 2815. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.02815

Bohn, M. J., Babor, T. F., & Kranzler, H. R. (1995). The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification
Test (AUDIT): Validation of a screening instrument for use in medical settings.
*Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 56(4), 423–432.
https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.1995.56.423

- Diedenhofen, B., & Musch, J. (2015). cocor: A Comprehensive Solution for the Statistical Comparison of Correlations. *PLOS ONE*, *10*(4), e0121945–e0121945. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0121945
- Gamer, M., Lemon, J., & Singh, P. (2019). *irr: Various Coefficients of Interrater Reliability and* Agreement. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=irr

Heinzen, E., Sinnwell, J., Atkinson, E., Gunderson, T., & Dougherty, G. (2021). arsenal: An

Arsenal of `R' Functions for Large-Scale Statistical Summaries.

https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=arsenal

- Jamison, L., Mazen, J., & Ruzek, E. (2022). *mlmtools: Multi-Level Model Assessment Kit*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mlmtools
- Kassambara, A. (2023). ggpubr: `ggplot2' Based Publication Ready Plots. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpubr
- Knutson, B., Adams, C. M., Fong, G. W., & Hommer, D. (2001). Anticipation of increasing monetary reward selectively recruits nucleus accumbens. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *21*(16), RC159–RC159.

https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.21-16-j0002.2001

Laux, L., Glanzmann, P., Schaffner, P., & Spielberger, C. D. (1981). Das

State-Trait-Angstinventar (STAI): Theoretische Grundlagen und Handanweisung. Beltz.

Lüdecke, D. (2024). sjPlot: Data Visualization for Statistics in Social Science.

https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=sjPlot

- Pruessner, J. C., Kirschbaum, C., Meinlschmid, G., & Hellhammer, D. H. (2003). Two formulas for computation of the area under the curve represent measures of total hormone concentration versus time-dependent change. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 28(7), 916–931. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4530(02)00108-7
- R Core Team. (2021). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/

Rademacher, L., Krach, S., Kohls, G., Irmak, A., Gründer, G., & Spreckelmeyer, K. N. (2010).
Dissociation of neural networks for anticipation and consumption of monetary and social rewards. *NeuroImage*, 49(4), 3276–3285.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.10.089

Schulz, P., Jansen, L. J., & Schlotz, W. (2005). Stressreaktivität: Theoretisches Konzept und Messung. *Diagnostica*, *51*(3), 124–133. https://doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924.51.3.124 Schulz, P., & Schlotz, W. (1999). Trierer Inventar zur Erfassung von chronischem Streß (TICS):
Skalenkonstruktion, teststatistische Überprüfung und Validierung der Skala
Arbeitsüberlastung. *Diagnostica*, 45(1), 8–19.
https://doi.org/10.1026//0012-1924.45.1.8

Signorell, A. (2023). *DescTools: Tools for Descriptive Statistics*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DescTools

- Singmann, H., Bolker, B., Westfall, J., Aust, F., & Ben-Shachar, M. S. (2023). *afex: Analysis of Factorial Experiments*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=afex
- Spreckelmeyer, K. N., Krach, S., Kohls, G., Rademacher, L., Irmak, A., Konrad, K., Kircher, T., & Gründer, G. (2009). Anticipation of monetary and social reward differently activates mesolimbic brain structures in men and women. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *4*(2), 158–165. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsn051