

Accepted Manuscript

Title: The Role of Endogenous Opioids in Non-Suicidal Self-Injurious Behavior: Methodological Challenges

Author: Olivia J. Kirtley Ronan E. O'Carroll Rory C. O'Connor



PII: S0149-7634(14)00292-9
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.11.007>
Reference: NBR 2073

To appear in:

Received date: 23-10-2013
Revised date: 21-2-2014
Accepted date: 7-11-2014

Please cite this article as: Kirtley, O.J., O'Carroll, R.E., O'Connor, R.C., The Role of Endogenous Opioids in Non-Suicidal Self-Injurious Behavior: Methodological Challenges, *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* (2014), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.11.007>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1
2
3
4 The Role of Endogenous Opioids in Non-Suicidal Self-Injurious Behavior: Methodological
5 Challenges
6

7
8 Olivia J. Kirtley, Ronan E. O'Carroll and Rory C. O'Connor
9

10
11
12 Highlights
13

- 14
15 • We currently lack the methodological tools to fully investigate endogenous
16
17 opioids
18
- 19
20 • Nothing is known about the role of endogenous opioids in self-injury ideation
21
- 22
23 • Other candidate systems such as the endocannabinoid system should also be
24
25 explored
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 The Role of Endogenous Opioids in Non-Suicidal Self-Injurious Behavior:
15 Methodological Challenges
16

17 Olivia J. Kirtley ^{a*}, Ronan E. O'Carroll ^b and Rory C. O'Connor ^a
18
19
20
21
22

23 ^a University of Glasgow, Suicidal Behaviour Research Laboratory, Institute of Health and
24 Wellbeing, College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences, University of Glasgow,
25 Gartnavel Royal Hospital, 1055 Great Western Road, Glasgow, G12 0XH, United Kingdom
26

27 ^b University of Stirling, Division of Psychology, School of Natural Sciences, University of
28 Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, UK.
29
30
31
32

33 *Corresponding author:
34

35 Olivia J. Kirtley
36 o.kirtley.1@research.gla.ac.uk
37
38 Tel: +44 (0)141 211 0623
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract:

1
2 Relief from emotional pain is a frequently cited reason for engaging in non-suicidal
3 self-injury. The exact mechanism by which self-injury brings about this relief is
4
5 unknown, but the potential role of endogenous opioids in affective regulation has
6
7 been posited. Few studies have investigated this and there are a number of
8
9 methodological challenges to measuring endogenous opioid activity in this
10
11 population. Furthermore as the majority of research to date has focused on inpatients
12
13 with borderline personality disorder (BPD), it is uncertain if the findings of previous
14
15 studies would also apply to those who self-injure but who do not have BPD. Whether
16
17 or not altered endogenous opioid levels are a cause or a consequence of self-injury is
18
19 unknown and to this end, comparing self-injury ideators with enactors, may offer a
20
21 window of insight. Another candidate system, the endocannabinoid system, should
22
23 also be explored in relation to this research question. The current commentary aims
24
25 to tease apart the methodological issues in this area of research and stimulate further
26
27 discussion of this topic.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **KEYWORDS:** NSSI, Self-Harm, Self-Injury, Opioids, Ideation, Cannabinoids,
40

41 **Methodology**
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Bresin and Gordon's (2013) timely and detailed review of the extant literature on the potential role of endogenous opioids in non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) gives rise to a number of issues. It highlights many important limitations of the current body of evidence; namely the paucity of studies investigating the role of endogenous opioids within self-injury, the lack of studies measuring the effects of experimental manipulation on levels of endogenous opioids and the complete absence of studies that have used non-clinical samples. We were pleased to see this neglected facet of self-injury research receive much needed critical attention and also that their review yields several key hypotheses to guide future studies.

We believe that there are a number of potential methodological challenges to testing these hypotheses, specifically in terms of measuring endogenous opioid activity and also eliciting the release of endogenous opioids within laboratory settings. The primary aim of this commentary is to attempt to tease apart some of these challenges, as well as to stimulate further dialogue on this topic with a view to surmounting some of these obstacles. An additional aim is to expand upon some of the points raised by Bresin and Gordon and to direct attention to other important areas of uncertainty.

Measuring endogenous opioid activity

A key problem is that the research community lacks some of the methodological infrastructure required to fully explore the hypotheses identified within Bresin and Gordon's review. The authors highlight the disparity between plasma (peripheral) and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF; central) measures of endogenous opioid activity. Indeed there is some evidence to suggest that plasma levels may not be wholly reflective of central circulating levels of opioids (Baker et al., 1997; De Riu et al., 1997), although

1 there appears to be little research on the subject and very few recent studies. De Riu
2 and colleagues' (1997) findings suggest that CSF beta-endorphin levels are not as
3
4 vulnerable to the effects of stress as plasma levels. In this case, there may be merit in
5
6 exploring this difference further in order to ascertain whether CSF measures may be
7
8 more appropriate for natural baseline endogenous opioid levels, whereas those
9
10 conducting studies requiring more dynamic measures of endogenous opioids
11
12 following experimental manipulations, may be better using plasma measures.
13
14
15
16

17
18
19 CSF measures are more invasive and possibly less palatable to potential participants
20
21 than an intravenous blood draw, which may result in small sample sizes and thus the
22
23 associated problem of low statistical power; unfortunately this is already a well-
24
25 known issue within the field of neuroscientific research (Button et al., 2013). Whilst
26
27 CSF measures of endogenous opioids may always be the gold standard to which we
28
29 approximate, the relative ease of employing plasma measures in a sufficiently large
30
31 sample to meet statistical power considerations must also be taken into account when
32
33 designing studies. Lumbar puncture is more resource intensive than plasma measures
34
35 and it can also cause more severe side effects, such as post-dural puncture headaches
36
37 (PDPH). Such reported side effects are a frequent complication of lumbar puncture
38
39 procedures (Bezov, Lipton & Ashina, 2010) and in a small number of cases they can
40
41 result in impaired daily functioning lasting a week or more (Amorim, Gomes de
42
43 Barros, & Valenca, 2012; Tohomo, Vuorinen & Muuronen, 1998). Evidence would
44
45 suggest however, that the incidence of PDPH can be greatly reduced by using small
46
47 gauge or atraumatic needles (e.g. Lavi et al., 2006), although it is uncertain how
48
49 widely this practice is used (Birnbach et al., 2001; Davis et al., 2014). Small gauge
50
51 needles should be used as standard practice within CSF research in order to minimize
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

side-effects to participants.

Given that plasma levels of endogenous opioids such as beta-endorphins have been widely employed as outcome measures in numerous studies spanning many different areas of research (e.g. Bruehl, Burns, Chung and Chont, 2012; Tordjman et al., 2009) and generally with successful results, we would urge researchers to carefully evaluate the costs and benefits of different methods of endogenous opioid assessment.

The potential for measurement reactivity of CSF sampling may also be a confounding factor when investigating endogenous opioid activity within the context of both pain tolerance and affect regulation. Moreover, work by Gratz and colleagues (2011) has demonstrated that pain tolerance may vary as a function of distress. Given that altered pain sensitivity has been posited to be the result of differential endogenous opioid activity in those who self-injure, relative to controls, it may be reasonable to anticipate that levels of endogenous opioids may also differ as a function of distress. Investigating such a hypothesis using CSF lumbar puncture may therefore not be a viable option; and plasma measures may be more suitable.

An alternative methodology to both CSF and peripheral measures of endogenous opioids is the use of imaging techniques, such as Positron Emission Tomography (PET). Numerous studies have explored endogenous opioid activity using this method (e.g. Hirvonen et al., 2009; Prossin, Love, Koeppe, Zubieta & Silk, 2010; Tuominen et al., 2012), employing the radioligand [¹¹C] carfentanil, which selectively binds to μ -opioid receptors; a high-affinity binding site for β -endorphin (McDonald & Lambert, 2005). This technique has yielded promising results when investigating

1 dynamic levels of endogenous opioids in response to peripherally applied noxious
2 stimuli, such as topical capsaicin (Bencherif et al., 2002) and also in response to
3
4 affective manipulation (Prossin et al., 2009). Imaging techniques allow us a valuable
5
6 window into central basal and crucially, dynamic endogenous opioid activity; the
7
8 latter being problematic to assess with CSF and to some extent, also with plasma
9
10 measures. As with all methodologies, there are caveats: PET imaging often requires
11
12 arterial blood sampling to be performed, in order to quantitatively assess the
13
14 metabolic rate and distribution of the radiotracer. This can be an unpleasant
15
16 experience for participants and the pain and stress that can potentially result from
17
18 arterial cannulation could also confound results, however there are several non-
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Whilst the use of PET gives information about the binding potential (availability) of
opioid receptors, the results may not be wholly indicative of whether or not the
receptors are in use, but may also denote the number of receptors (Vincent & Tracey,
2010). The interpretation of results from PET as a possible reflection of circulating
levels of endogenous opioids, should therefore be made with caution. Furthermore,
several studies have highlighted differences in endogenous opioid binding potential as
a function of gender (e.g. Smith et al., 2006; Zubieta, Dannals & Frost, 1999).

Specifically, higher levels of estrogen in women were associated with both increased
basal availability of μ -opioid receptors and also increased endogenous opioid activity
during application of a painful stimulus (Smith et al., 2006). Irrespective of
methodology, this is an important variable to take into consideration when
investigating endogenous opioids in relation to non-suicidal self-injury, as women are

1 often overrepresented in this population (Hawton, Harriss & Rodham, 2010; Nock,
2 Prinstein & Sterba, 2009; O'Connor, Rasmussen, Miles & Hawton, 2009).
3
4
5

6
7 In short, we recommend that further work be conducted to refine the methodological
8 tools that we have at our disposal for investigating the role of endogenous opioids in
9 non-suicidal self-injury, taking account of both static and dynamic levels of
10 endogenous opioids.
11
12
13
14
15

16 17 18 *Experimentally manipulating endogenous opioid levels* 19

20
21
22
23 Extant research that has explored the role of endogenous opioids in self-injurious
24 behavior has followed two pathways: opioid blockade in the form of the
25 administration of opioid antagonists such as naloxone (Russ et al., 1994) and
26 measurement of resting levels of opioid activity (Stanley et al., 2010). Whilst the use
27 of naloxone and other non-specific opioid antagonists (Herz, 1997) would elicit little
28 information regarding the type of endogenous opioids that were at work, more basic
29 scientific work of this type is needed to demonstrate the role of this system in self-
30 injury more fully. As Bresin and Gordon (2013) highlight, we know little to nothing
31 about dynamic fluctuations in endogenous opioid levels as a function of affect. In
32 addition to the challenges of measuring such activity, being able to reliably elicit the
33 release of endogenous opioids within a laboratory setting is also a topic about which
34 the existing literature is sparse.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 54 *The role of endogenous opioids in self-injury ideation* 55

56
57 Many people contemplate self-harm (ideators) but only a proportion engage in the
58 behavior (enactors). We need to know more about the psychobiological factors that
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 distinguish ideators from enactors and to investigate this by directly comparing these
2 two groups. Whether or not endogenous opioids play a role in self-injury ideation is
3 something that has, to our knowledge, never been investigated and it is perhaps for
4 this reason that no mention of self-harm ideation is made in Bresin and Gordon's
5 (2013) review. The lower resting levels of β -endorphins found in self-injury enactors
6 relative to controls by Stanley et al. (2010) may suggest that low levels of endogenous
7 opioids are a risk factor for developing self-injurious behavior. However, as the
8 individuals in the study had already engaged in self-injury (in addition to having a
9 history of at least one suicide attempt), it is uncertain whether the low endorphin
10 levels observed were a cause or a consequence of self-injury. Those who ideate about
11 self-injury without engaging in the behavior are sometimes a difficult population to
12 capture (e.g. Hooley, Ho, Slater & Lockshin, 2010). However if we are to gain a
13 greater understanding of the role that endogenous opioids play within self-injury
14 behavior and its genesis, it is crucial to investigate their role within the ideation and
15 intention formation phase of the self-injury process (O'Connor et al., 2012).

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Among those who ideate about and enact self-injurious behavior, there appear to be
39 distinct subgroups, with some spending more time contemplating self-injury before
40 they engage in the behavior and others spending little to no time thinking about it
41 (Hawton et al., 2010; O'Connor et al., 2009). More than 40% of the adolescents who
42 had engaged in self-injury in a recent study (O'Connor et al., 2014) said that they had
43 thought about it for less than an hour beforehand (41%), whereas the remainder had
44 thought about it for several hours (9%), more than a day but less than a week (12%)
45 or in some cases, for more than a week (38%). The amount of time spent ideating
46 about self-injury prior to enactment may also differ depending on the method used;

1 more of those who had engaged in self-injury within an hour of thinking about it,
2 reported self-cutting as opposed to overdose (Hawton et al., 2010). Prospective work
3 should also be conducted to explore how levels of endogenous opioids may fluctuate
4 as a function of longer-term psychological distress and self-injurious
5 thoughts/behaviors.
6
7
8
9
10

11 *Specificity of endogenous opioid dysfunction to self-injury in Borderline Personality*

12 *Disorder*

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Bresin and Gordon (2013) draw attention to the almost exclusive focus of previous
research upon psychiatric inpatients and more specifically, individuals with borderline
personality disorder (BPD), although this is a pervasive problem within self-injury
research in general (Andover & Gibb, 2010; Hawton et al., 2010). Indeed, all
participants in the study by Stanley et al. (2010), even those in the non-NSSI control
group, had a current diagnosis of BPD and additionally all were psychiatric inpatients.
As there have been only a handful of studies directly investigating endogenous
opioids in self-injurious behavior; most of which were conducted on patients with
BPD (e.g. Coid Allolio & Rees, 1983; Stanley et al., 2010), it is therefore uncertain
whether these lower resting levels of beta-endorphins would also be present in those
who self-injure but do not have BPD. Future studies should attempt to investigate the
involvement of the endogenous opioid system within affect regulation and pain
sensitivity in non-clinical samples.

66 *Other potential mechanisms of affect regulation and altered pain tolerance*

67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
Similar to how endogenous opioids are naturally produced opiate-like substances
within the body (Holden, Jeong & Forrest, 2005), endocannabinoids are naturally
occurring cannabinoid-like neurotransmitters (Mechoulam & Parker, 2013). These

1 are thought to act pre-synaptically, relaying signals towards the cell body from the
2 nerve endings as fast retrograde synaptic messengers (Howlett et al., 2002). To our
3 knowledge, no studies have explored the potential role of endocannabinoids in affect
4 regulation or altered pain sensitivity in self-injury. There have been a small number of
5 studies examining their role in depression, however. For example, Hill, Miller, Ho,
6 Gorzalka and Hillard (2008) found lower levels of the endocannabinoid 2-AG in
7 those with major depression and also that length of depressive episode was
8 significantly negatively correlated with 2-AG level. Endocannabinoids could provide
9 another fertile area for research in terms of affect regulation and self-injury and a
10 recent study by Benedetti et al. (2013) found that framing a painful tourniquet task as
11 positive led, not only to increased pain tolerance, but it appeared to activate the
12 endogenous opioid and endocannabinoid systems. Furthermore, the results suggested
13 that there was differential activation of the two systems across participants, with
14 increased pain tolerance in some participants being associated with endogenous
15 opioids and in others, with endocannabinoids. The anticipation that self-injury would
16 bring relief from a terrible state of mind could mean that the associated pain is viewed
17 positively, leading to increased pain tolerance and activation of the endogenous
18 opioid and endocannabinoid systems. Recently, imaging methods similar to those
19 used to investigate *in vivo* endogenous opioid activity, have also been employed in the
20 investigation of endocannabinoid activity. Hirvonen and colleagues (2012) used the
21 radioligand [^{18}F]FMPEP- d_2 in a prospective PET study of CB₁ receptor binding
22 potential in patients with alcohol dependence, during early and later-stage abstinence,
23 compared to non-alcohol dependent healthy controls. fMRI has also been used to
24 explore endocannabinoids and a large-scale multi-study investigation into the
25 neurophysiology of the endocannabinoid system is currently underway: the

1 Pharmacological Imaging of the Cannabinoid System (PhICS) study (van Hell,
2 Bossong, Jager, Kahn & Ramsey, 2011). Both techniques suffer similar limitations in
3 their application here as they do in endogenous opioid research: use of arterial
4 cannulation in PET and potential interaction of hormonal cycle with endocannabinoid
5 activity in both PET and fMRI.
6
7
8
9
10

11 Exploring the neurobiological bases of self-injurious thoughts and behaviors is a key
12 area for future research, particularly relating to the role of endogenous opioids, where
13 so many questions remain yet to be defined, as well as to be answered. Investigating
14 the relationship between pain and self-injury is an important gateway that could
15 potentially facilitate the exploration of the affect regulating properties of endogenous
16 opioids within the context of self-injury and should not be overlooked.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Methodological advances must be made in terms of measuring endogenous opioid
29 activity if the hypotheses put forward in Bresin and Gordon's (2013) review are to be
30 truly testable. Perhaps the use of more peripheral measures of endogenous opioid
31 activity could be thought of, not as a fatally flawed substitute, but instead as a
32 complementary foundation upon which more refined measures of central opioid
33 activity can be built through the increased research activity that Bresin and Gordon's
34 (2013) hypotheses have the potential to generate. Furthermore as we are still in the
35 early stages of this new and exciting avenue of research, the benefits of forging
36 forward with a perhaps imperfect proxy for central endogenous opioid levels should
37 not be obfuscated by the existence of more direct, but potentially more problematic
38 methodologies.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References:

- 1
2 Amorim, J. A., Gomes de Barros, M. V., & Valenca, M. M. (2012). Post-dural (post-lumbar)
3
4 puncture headache: Risk factors and clinical features. *Cephalalgia*, *32*(12), 916–923.
5
6 doi:10.1177/0333102412453951
7
8
9
10 Andover, M. S., & Gibb, B. E. (2010). Non-suicidal self-injury, attempted suicide and
11
12 suicidal intent among psychiatric inpatients. *Psychiatry Research*, *178*, 101-105. doi:
13
14 10.1016/j.psychres.2010.03.019
15
16
17 Baker, D. G., West, S. A., Orth, D. N., Hill, K. K., Nicholson, W. E., Ekhtor, N. N., ...
18
19 Geraciotti, T. D. (1997). Cerebrospinal fluid and plasma β -endorphin in combat
20
21 veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *22*(7), 517–
22
23 529.
24
25
26 Bencherif, B., Fuchs, P. N., Sheth, R., Dannals, R. F., Campbell, J. N., & Frost, J. J. (2002).
27
28 Pain activation of human supraspinal opioid pathways as demonstrated by [^{11}C]-
29
30 carfentanil and positron emission tomography (PET). *Pain*, *99*(3), 589–598.
31
32
33
34 Benedetti, F., Thoen, W., Blanchard, C., Vighetti, S., & Arduino, C. (2013). Pain as a reward:
35
36 Changing the meaning of pain from negative to positive co-activates opioid and
37
38 cannabinoid systems. *Pain*, *154*(3), 361–367. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2012.11.007
39
40
41 Bezov, D., Lipton, R. B., & Ashina, S. (2010). Post-Dural Puncture Headache: Part I
42
43 Diagnosis, Epidemiology, Etiology, and Pathophysiology. *Headache: The Journal of*
44
45 *Head and Face Pain*, *50*(7), 1144–1152. doi:10.1111/j.1526-4610.2010.01699.x
46
47
48 Birnbach, D. J., Kuroda, M. M., Sternman, D., & Thys, D. M. (2001). Use of atraumatic
49
50 spinal needles among neurologists in the United States. *Headache: The Journal of*
51
52 *Head and Face Pain*, *41*(4), 385–390.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Bresin, K., & Gordon, K. H. (2013). Endogenous opioids and nonsuicidal self-injury: A mechanism of affect regulation. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *37*(3), 374–383. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.01.020
- Bruehl, S., Burns, J. W., Chung, O. Y., & Chont, M. (2012). What do plasma beta-endorphin levels reveal about endogenous opioid analgesic function?: Beta-endorphin and opioid function. *European Journal of Pain*, *16*(3), 370–380. doi:10.1002/j.1532-2149.2011.00021.x
- Button, K. S., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Mokrysz, C., Nosek, B. A., Flint, J., Robinson, E. S. J., & Munafò, M. R. (2013). Power failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *14*(5), 365–376. doi:10.1038/nrn3475
- Coid, J., Allolio, B., & Rees, L. H. (1983). Raised plasma metenkephalin in patients who habitually mutilate themselves. *The Lancet*, *322*(8349), 545–546.
- Davis, A., Dobson, R., Kaninia, S., Espasandin, M., Berg, A., Giovannoni, G., & Schmierer, K. (2014). Change practice now! Using atraumatic needles to prevent post lumbar puncture headache. *European Journal of Neurology*, *21*(2), 305–311. doi:10.1111/ene.12307
- De Riu, P. L., Petruzzzi, V., Caria, M. A., Mameli, O., Casu, A. R., Nuvoli, S., ... Madeddu, G. (1997). β -Endorphin and Cortisol Levels in Plasma and CSF Following Acute Experimental Spinal Traumas. *Physiology & Behavior*, *62*(1), 1–5.
- Endres, C. J., Bencherif, B., Hilton, J., Madar, I., & James Frost, J. (2003). Quantification of brain μ -opioid receptors with [^{11}C] carfentanil: reference-tissue methods. *Nuclear Medicine and Biology*, *30*(2), 177–186.
- Gratz, K. L., Hepworth, C., Tull, M. T., Paulson, A., Clarke, S., Remington, B., & Lejuez, C. W. (2011). An experimental investigation of emotional willingness and physical pain

tolerance in deliberate self-harm: the moderating role of interpersonal distress.

Comprehensive Psychiatry, 52(1), 63–74. doi:10.1016/j.comppsy.2010.04.009

Hawton, K., Harriss, L., & Rodham, K. (2010). How adolescents who cut themselves differ from those who take overdoses. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 19, 513–523. doi: 10.1007/s00787-009-0065-0

Herz, A. (1997). Endogenous opioid systems and alcohol addiction. *Psychopharmacology*, 129(2), 99–111.

Hill, M., Miller, G., Ho, W.-S., Gorzalka, B., & Hillard, C. (2008). Serum Endocannabinoid Content is Altered in Females with Depressive Disorders: A Preliminary Report. *Pharmacopsychiatry*, 41(2), 48–53. doi:10.1055/s-2007-993211

Hirvonen, J., Aalto, S., Hagelberg, N., Maksimow, A., Ingman, K., Oikonen, V., ... Scheinin, H. (2009). Measurement of central μ -opioid receptor binding in vivo with PET and [¹¹C]carfentanil: a test–retest study in healthy subjects. *European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging*, 36(2), 275–286. doi:10.1007/s00259-008-0935-6

Hirvonen, J., Zanotti-Fregonara, P., Umhau, J. C., George, D. T., Rallis-Frutos, D., Lyoo, C. H., ... Heilig, M. (2012). Reduced cannabinoid CB1 receptor binding in alcohol dependence measured with positron emission tomography. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 18(8), 916–921. doi:10.1038/mp.2012.100

Holden, J. E., Jeong, Y., & Forrest, J. M. (2005). The endogenous opioid system and clinical pain management. *AACN Advanced Critical Care*, 16(3), 291–301.

Hooley, J. M., Ho, D. T., Slater, J., & Lockshin, A. (2010). Pain perception and nonsuicidal self-injury: A laboratory investigation. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 1(3), 170–179. doi:10.1037/a0020106

- Howlett, A. C., Barth, B. F., Bonner, T. I., Cabral, G., Casellas, P., Devane, W. A., ...
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Pertwee, R. G. (2002). Classification of cannabinoid receptors. *Pharmacological Reviews*, *54*(2), 161–202.
- Lavi, R., Yernitzky, D., Rowe, J. M., Weissman, A., Segal, D., & Avivi, I. (2006). Standard vs atraumatic Whitacre needle for diagnostic lumbar puncture: A randomized trial. *Neurology*, *67*(8), 1492–1494. doi:10.1212/01.wnl.0000240054.40274.8a
- McDonald, J. (2005). Opioid receptors. *Continuing Education in Anaesthesia, Critical Care & Pain*, *5*(1), 22–25. doi:10.1093/bjaceaccp/mki004
- Mechoulam, R., & Parker, L. A. (2013). The Endocannabinoid System and the Brain. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *64*(1), 21–47. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143739
- Nock, M. K., Prinstein, M. J., & Sterba, S. K. (2009). Revealing the form and function of self-injurious thoughts and behaviors: A real-time ecological assessment study among adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *118*(4), 816–827. doi:10.1037/a0016948
- O'Connor, R.C., Rasmussen, S., & Hawton, K. (2014). Adolescent Self-harm: A School-based Study in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, in press.
- O'Connor, R.C., Rasmussen, S., & Hawton, K. (2012). From Thoughts to Action: Distinguishing Adolescents Who Think About Self-harm From Those Who Engage in Self-harm. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *200*, 330-335. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.111.097808
- O'Connor, R. C., Rasmussen, S., Miles, J., & Hawton, K. (2009). Self-harm in adolescents: self-report survey in schools in Scotland. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *194*, 68–72. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.107.047704

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Prossin, A. R., Love, T. M., Koeppe, R. A., Zubieta, J.-K., & Silk, K. R. (2010).
Dysregulation of regional endogenous opioid function in borderline personality
disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *167*(8), 925–933.
- Russ, M. J., Roth, S. D., Kakuma, T., Harrison, K., & Hull, J. W. (1994). Pain perception in
self-injurious borderline patients: naloxone effects. *Biological Psychiatry*, *35*(3), 207–
209.
- Smith, Y. R. (2006). Pronociceptive and Antinociceptive Effects of Estradiol through
Endogenous Opioid Neurotransmission in Women. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *26*(21),
5777–5785. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5223-05.2006
- Stanley, B., Sher, L., Wilson, S., Ekman, R., Huang, Y., & Mann, J. J. (2010). Non-suicidal
self-injurious behavior, endogenous opioids and monoamine neurotransmitters.
Journal of Affective Disorders, *124*(1-2), 134–140. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2009.10.028
- Tohmo, H., Vuorinen, E., & Muuronen, A. (1998). Prolonged impairment in activities of
daily living due to postdural puncture headache after diagnostic lumbar puncture.
Anaesthesia, *53*(3), 299–302. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2044.1998.00326.x
- Tordjman, S., Anderson, G. M., Botbol, M., Brailly-Tabard, S., Perez-Diaz, F., Graignic, R.,
... Bronsard, G. (2009). Pain Reactivity and Plasma β -Endorphin in Children and
Adolescents with Autistic Disorder. *PLoS ONE*, *4*(8), e5289.
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0005289
- Tuominen, L., Salo, J., Hirvonen, J., Någren, K., Laine, P., Melartin, T., ... Hietala, J. (2012).
Temperament trait Harm Avoidance associates with μ -opioid receptor availability in
frontal cortex: A PET study using [11C]carfentanil. *NeuroImage*, *61*(3), 670–676.
doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.03.063
- van Hell, H. H., Bossong, M. G., Jager, G., Kahn, R. S., & Ramsey, N. F. (2011). Methods of
the Pharmacological Imaging of the Cannabinoid System (PhICS) study: towards

1 understanding the role of the brain endocannabinoid system in human cognition:

2 Pharmacological Imaging of the Cannabinoid System (PhICS). *International Journal*
3 *of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 20(1), 10–27. doi:10.1002/mpr.327
4
5
6

7 Vincent, K., & Tracey, I. (2010). Sex Hormones and Pain: The Evidence From Functional
8
9 Imaging. *Current Pain and Headache Reports*, 14(5), 396–403. doi:10.1007/s11916-
10
11 010-0139-1
12
13

14 Zubieta, J.-K., Dannals, R. F., & Frost, J. J. (1999). Gender and age influences on human
15
16 brain mu-opioid receptor binding measured by PET. *American Journal of Psychiatry*,
17
18 156(6), 842–848.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65