## Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences/College of Osteopathic Medicine

# Cognitive Recovery in Early Substance Abuse Treatment

# Alicia Ito Ford PhD, Shannon Headley MA, & Elizabeth Landers BS

#### BACKGROUND

Impairments to cognition following substance abuse may not be entirely repaired by sobriety<sup>1-2</sup>.

Working memory, executive function, and attention are the most often recognized cognitive impairments in substance use disorders<sup>3-4</sup>. In addition, opioid use disorder has been shown to impair memory<sup>5-6</sup>.

Impairments in these areas of cognitive functioning not only impact the individuals' daily functioning, but may also present additional obstacles in these individuals' pursuit of substance abuse treatment. Studies have shown that cognitive impairment is associated with worse treatment outcomes including higher rates of relapse<sup>4,7</sup>.

**Objective:** Pilot study testing recruitment and retention rates and the natural rate of cognitive recovery in early substance abuse treatment.

Primary Outcome: Compare Baseline and Endpoint scores on the NIH Toolbox Cognitive Measures to determine if there are significant changes in cognition during the first 4 weeks of recovery from substance use.

#### **METHODS**

#### <u>Participants</u>

Participants were 28 adults newly admitted to a residential substance abuse treatment facility. All participants had completed detoxification. The majority of participants were being treated for polysubstance abuse, with 15 participants having primary opioid abuse.

- Demographics:
- 89% male 89% right-handed
- 68% Caucasian, 32% multiracial; 86% non-Hispanic
- Mean age of 35.25 years (SD 8.58)
- Mean education of 17.5 years (SD 4.73)

#### Procedure

The participants were evaluated at the beginning of their treatment and again after 4 weeks of treatment.

Participants were evaluated on attention, executive functioning, episodic and working memory, language, and processing speed using the NIH Toolbox Cognition Battery: •Flanker Inhibitory Control and Attention Test Picture Sequence Memory Test

- •List Sorting Working Memory Test
- •Picture Vocabulary Test
- •Oral Reading Recognition Test
- •Dimensional Change Card Sort Test
- Pattern Comparison Processing Speed
- •Rey Auditory Verbal Learning Test
- •Oral Symbol Digit Test.

#### Table 1: NIH Toolbox Subtest Mean T-Scores

Pictu

Oral

List S

Patte

Pictu

Flank

Dim.

Audi

Oral

### Tabl

# Sul

Fluid Cognit

Crysta Cognit Cogniti Total

### Table 3: Treatment Completers vs. Dropouts

Pictur Oral R List So

Patter

Picture Flanke

Dimer

Audito

Oral S

Fluid

Crysta

Cognit

Subtest	Time1	T1 SD	Time2	T2 SD	Change (T2-T1)	Change SD	Change Sig.
ture Vocabulary	48.46	10.861	51.65	13.679	2.47	7.771	0.458
I Reading Recognition	53.54	8.634	58.88	9.74	3.82	9.547	0.062
Sorting Working Mem.	44.04	8.039	50.76	8.066	5.06	9.556	0.045*
tern Comparison	41.96	19.091	57.24	13.818	16.47	16.923	0.002**
ture Sequence Mem.	51.61	11.259	53.06	10.262	-0.47	7.946	0.864
nker Inhibitory Control	43	14.103	48.82	13.201	8.82	9.235	0.002**
n. Change Card Sort	51.75	13.321	60.41	13.811	6.47	11.063	0.013*
ditory Verbal Learning	22.75	5.254	26.06	5.08	1.59	4.124	0.141
I Symbol Digit	72.93	17.67	84.12	19.374	10.06	12.774	0.001**
	, 2.35	±7.07					

ole 2: Composite Mean T-Scores								All Toolbox scores are fully corrected t-sco where available.		
ıbtest	Time1 Score	T1 SD	Time2 Score	T2 SD	Change Score	Change SD	Change Sig	(Auditory Verbal Learning and Oral Symbol are raw scores)		
ition	44.57	12.55	56.12	12.678	11.41	9.849	0.001**	<u>Key</u> *=p<0.05		
allized	51.04	10.627	55.94	11.819	3.59	8.063	0.108	**=p<0.001		
itive	47.39	10.874	57.18	11.626	8.76	6.906	0.001**	C=Treatment Completers NC=Non-completers		

Subtest	Mean-C	SD	Mean-NC	SD	Sig.
ire Vocabulary	49.18	13.483	47.44	5.548	0.019*
Reading Recognition	55.06	10.213	50.11	4.807	0.134
Sorting Working Memory	45.71	6.844	41.11	10.422	0.151
ern Comparison	40.76	17.669	45.11	22.302	0.27
ire Sequence Memory	53.53	12.797	48.33	8.916	0.24
ker Inhibitory Control	40	15.079	48.78	12.215	0.321
ensional Change Card Sort	53	13.555	51.33	13.73	0.918
tory Verbal Learning	24.47	5.735	19.33	2.693	0.084
Symbol Digit	74.06	18.301	71.33	16.485	0.758
Cognition	44.71	12.097	45.44	14.284	0.418
tallized Cognition	52.35	13.276	48.44	4.096	0.011*
nitive Total	48.41	12.525	46.11	8.462	0.424



## **CENTER FOR HEALTH SCIENCES** OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

#### **RESULTS SUMMARY**

- Primary cognitive weaknesses at baseline were in processing speed (Pattern Comparison mean t-score=41.96), attention and executive function (Flanker mean t-score=43.0) and working memory (List Sorting mean t-score=44.04).
- Cognitive recovery during the normal course of early inpatient treatment was significant in the areas of processing speed, attention and executive functioning and yielded significant improvement in the Cognitive Function Composite Score (p<.01).
- Treatment retention rate of participants was higher than the overall rate for this treatment unit.
- Participants who completed at least 4 weeks of inpatient treatment versus those who left treatment early had significantly higher baseline vocabulary and crystallized cognition scores.
- ADHD as an exclusionary criteria had a significant impact on recruitment, yielding 9 of the 14 exclusions.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

- Substance abuse is known to cause injury to the brain that may not be fully repaired by sobriety. Consistent with previous research, this pilot study found that patients commonly enter inpatient treatment with inefficiencies in fluid cognition skills.
- Over the course of 1-month of inpatient treatment, this sample of patients experienced significant improvement across multiple domains, with significant improvements in composite Fluid and Total Cognition scores.
- This pilot study informs a series of planned studies on cognitive recovery. Further study on the pattern of cognitive changes during substance abuse treatment may be used to help better match intervention strategy to cognitive level and possibly develop cognitive rehabilitation protocols to increase treatment engagement and extend abstinence via improvement in cognitive capacity.

#### REFERENCES

1. Perry CJ. Cognitive Decline and Recovery in Alcohol Abuse. J Mol Neurosci. 2016 Nov;60(3):383-389. Epub 2016 Jul 27. 2. Vik PW, Cellucci T, Jarchow A, Hedt J. Cognitive impairment in substance abuse. Psychiatr Clin North Am. 2004 Mar; 27(1):97-109, ix. 3. Manning V, Verdejo-Garcia A, Lubman DI. Neurocogr ive impairment in addiction and opportunities for intervention. Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences. 2017; 13:40-45. 4. Sofuoglu M, DeVito EE, Waters AJ, Carroll KM. Cognitive enhancement as a treatment for drug addictions. Neuropharmacology, 2013; 64; 452-46 5. Bassiony MM, Youssef UM, Hassan MS, Salah El-Deen GM, El-Gohari H, Abdelghani M, Abdalla A, Ibrahim DH. Cognitive Impairment and Tramadol Dependence. J Clin Psychopharmacol. 2017 Feb;37(1):61-66. doi: 10.1097/JCP.0000000000000617 6. Wilson M. Compton, Joe Gfroerer, Kevin P. Conway, and Matthew S. Finger.

Unemployment and substance outcomes in the United States 2002-2010. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2014 Sep 1; 0: 350–353.

7. Stevens L, Verdejo-Garcia A, et al. Impulsivity as a vulnerability for factor for poor addiction treatment outcomes: A review of neurocognitive findings. J Subst Abuse Treat. 2014 Jul;47(1):58-72. doi: 10.1016/j.jsat.2014.01.008.