

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/99457/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Gasalla, Patricia, Soto, Alberto, Dwyer, Dominic M. and López, Matías 2017. Blocking of flavor-nausea learning by non-flavor cues: assessment through orofacial reactivity responses. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 43 (2) , pp. 171-182. 10.1037/xan0000135 file

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/xan0000135> <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/xan0000135>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



1
2
3
4
5
6 Blocking of flavor-nausea learning by non-flavor cues:

7
8 Assessment through orofacial reactivity responses
9

10
11
12 Patricia Gasalla^{1,2}, Alberto Soto¹, Dominic M. Dwyer² and Matías López¹
13
14

15
16
17 *1 Department of Psychology, University of Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain*
18

19
20 *2 School of Psychology, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK*
21

22
23
24
25 Short Title: CONTEXT & CONDITIONED DISGUST
26

27
28
29 January 2017, revised manuscript resubmission
30

31
32 WORDS: 11289
33

34
35
36
37
38 Address for correspondence:

39
40 Matías López

41
42 Departamento de Psicología

43
44 Universidad de Oviedo

45
46 Plaza Feijóo, s/n

47
48 33003 Oviedo (Spain)

49
50 Phone: +34 985103269

51
52 Fax: +34 985104144

53
54 E-Mail: mlopez@uniovi.es (M. López)
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract

We investigated, using orofacial reactivity assessment, whether non-flavor context cues can elicit conditioned aversive reactions, and also whether context cues interfere, through blocking, with the reduction in taste palatability during taste aversion conditioning. Experiment 1 showed that a context previously paired with LiCl evoked aversive orofacial reactions, and also attenuated the reduction in palatability of a saccharin solution which was paired with LiCl in that context. In Experiment 2, this blocking effect was abolished when the rats were given non-reinforced exposure to the previously LiCl-paired context (context extinction) before aversive conditioning of the saccharin in compound with the context. These results confirm that context stimuli can elicit conditioned aversive reactions in the absence of any flavor component, and demonstrate that context cues can interfere with the affective aspects of taste aversion learning. Thus non-flavor cues appear to engage the same processes as taste cues in aversion learning. These results are consistent with the idea that taste aversion learning is governed by general associative mechanisms and the special properties of nausea, rather than by a selective mechanism for poison-avoidance.

Keywords: conditioned taste aversion, taste palatability, context blocking, taste reactivity, rats

1 Rats readily learn to avoid foods paired with toxins that have previously caused them
2
3
4 gastrointestinal malaise (Garcia, Hankins, & Rusiniak, 1974). This phenomenon is termed
5
6 conditioned taste aversion (CTA) and potentially represents a key behavioral mechanism for
7
8 toxin avoidance (Domjan, 1980; Garcia, Kimmeldorf, & Koelling, 1955; Garcia & Koelling,
9
10 1967; Reilly & Schachtman, 2009). Moreover, pairing a novel taste with nausea produced by
11
12 a drug with emetic properties (such as lithium chloride; LiCl) not only results in a reduction
13
14 in consumption of that taste, but also produces a reduction in its affective value or palatability
15
16 that can be revealed through a range of techniques (for reviews see, Lin, Arthurs, & Reilly,
17
18 2014; Parker, Rana, & Limebeer, 2008). In addition, classic studies (e.g. Garcia & Koelling,
19
20 1966) suggest selective learning effects where rats learn more readily to associate tastes with
21
22 internal aversive events (e.g. nausea) than with external aversive events (e.g. pain produced
23
24 by footshock) and that the reverse is true with audiovisual stimuli. However, there is also
25
26 clear evidence that pairing contextual cues with the aversive effects of LiCl will support at
27
28 least some conditioned responses (e.g. Batson & Best, 1979; Boakes, Westbrook, & Barnes,
29
30 1992). Thus one key issue in the analysis of CTA is whether non-flavor stimuli engage the
31
32 same range of processes as do foods and flavors in aversion learning. This is particularly
33
34 important in the context of modelling anticipatory nausea in chemotherapy which can be
35
36 elicited by the treatment context (Parker, 2014). Here, we address the critical question of how
37
38 non-flavor cues are engaged in “taste” aversion learning by examining affective responses
39
40 elicited by LiCl-paired contexts, and by examining the ability of context cues to block
41
42 changes in affective responses to taste stimuli. But before turning to the analysis of contexts
43
44 and aversion learning, it is important to consider the experimental methods used to assess
45
46 affective responses in rodents.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 In the orofacial reactivity test¹, rats are implanted with intraoral cannulas and the
2
3
4 orofacial and somatic responses accompanying an intraoral infusion of the taste are recorded
5
6 (Grill & Norgren, 1978). This supports a direct examination of the affective responses
7
8 elicited by the infused solution. These can be classified as aversive (i.e., rejection responses)
9
10 such as gaping, chin rubbing, and paw treading (elicited, for example, by unpleasant sour or
11
12 bitter tastes), or appetitive (i.e. ingestive responses) such as tongue protrusions and paw licks
13
14 (elicited, for example, by pleasant sweet tastes). In terms of taste aversion, Pelchat, Grill,
15
16 Rozin, and Jacobs (1983) observed that pairing sucrose with LiCl-induced nausea reduced
17
18 both voluntary consumption of sucrose and a change in orofacial reactivity responses (both
19
20 an increase in aversive responses and a decrease in appetitive responses). It should be noted
21
22 that appetitive and aversive orofacial responses can be interpreted as lying on either a single
23
24 dimension (from highly positive with large numbers of appetitive responses to highly
25
26 aversive with large numbers of aversive responses – with an intermediate point with low
27
28 numbers of either appetitive or aversive responses: see for example, Breslin, Grill, & Spector,
29
30 1992); or on two separate dimensions (where aversive responses are indicative of disgust and
31
32 appetitive responses are indicative of positive hedonic value – with these being at least
33
34 partially independent of each other: see for example, Berridge & Grill, 1983, 1984). While
35
36 these differences in interpretation are important and have a material impact on some aspects
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 ¹ This method was originally described as the taste reactivity test. Although this terminology
47
48 remains in common use (especially because it is most commonly applied to taste and flavor
49
50 stimuli), we have chosen to emphasize the nature of the response here because we are
51
52 considering its application to non-taste stimuli. There are also other means of assessing
53
54 palatability, most notably the analysis of licking microstructure (e.g., Davis, 1989; Dwyer,
55
56 2012; Lin et al., 2014). Although this has been used extensively in the examination of taste
57
58 aversion learning (e.g., Arthurs, Lin, Amodeo, & Reilly, 2012; Baird, St. John, & Nguyen,
59
60 2005; Dwyer, Gasalla, & López, 2013) we will not consider it in detail here because the
61
62 method requires voluntary consumption and is thus unsuitable for examining responses to
63
64 contextual stimuli.
65

1 of the analysis of taste aversion learning (compare, for example, Lin, Arthurs, & Reilly,
2
3
4 2016; with, Parker, 2014) they share the important common ground that one of the distinct
5
6 features of taste aversion learning is a reduction in affective value and palatability. We do not
7
8 take a strong position on the merits of the one- or two-dimensional interpretations of the
9
10 orofacial reactivity responses here, save to note that either an increase in aversive responses
11
12 or a decrease in appetitive responses would be indicative of a reduction in palatability or
13
14 affective value.
15

16
17
18 Returning to the central question of how non-flavor stimuli engage in aversion
19
20 learning, it is well established that pairing contextual cues with LiCl will endow the context
21
22 with at least some conditioned aversive properties. However, the full nature of these aversive
23
24 properties has yet to be determined. In particular, it is not clear whether context-nausea
25
26 pairings endow the context with the same range of conditioned aversive properties as do
27
28 taste-nausea pairings. Many different test procedures have been employed to assess context
29
30 aversion learning, including the amount consumed of a palatable solution in the conditioned
31
32 context (Best, Brown, & Sowell, 1984; Boakes et al., 1992), the amount of time spent in an
33
34 environment previously paired with LiCl on a place-preference test (Tenk, Kavaliers, &
35
36 Ossenkopp, 2005; White & Carr, 1985), and blocking of a taste aversion by prior nausea-
37
38 based context conditioning (Batson & Best, 1979; Willner, 1978). Using a blocking
39
40 procedure, Batson and Best (1979), for example, reported that rats previously given pairings
41
42 of a black chamber with LiCl-induced nausea showed reduced aversion to a saccharin
43
44 solution that was presented in compound with the pretrained context and followed by LiCl
45
46 administration. This result has been confirmed through the use of conceptually similar
47
48 blocking procedures (Krane, 1980; Kwok & Boakes, 2012; Rodríguez, López, Symonds, &
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Hall, 2000; Symonds & Hall, 1997; Symonds, Hall, López, Loy, Ramos, & Rodríguez, 1998)
2
3 demonstrating that pretrained contextual cues reliably interfere with taste aversion learning².
4

5
6 At present, in all of these context-blocking studies, the degree of aversion was
7
8 assessed through examining the amount of the flavor consumed at test, the most commonly
9
10 employed measure of a conditioned aversion. However, as mentioned previously, taste
11
12 aversion learning not only reduces voluntary consumption of the flavor, it also results in
13
14 reduction in the affective value of that flavor. Most notably, normally positive flavors (such
15
16 as sucrose or saccharin) paired with nausea induced by LiCl come to elicit fewer appetitive
17
18 and more aversive orofacial reactivity responses than they would otherwise. Critically, the
19
20 reduction in palatability depends on the nature of the aversive stimulus: in some cases, such
21
22 as pain produced by footshock, a reduction in consumption is not accompanied by an increase
23
24 in aversive orofacial reactions (e.g. Pelchat et al., 1983). Thus measures of voluntary
25
26 consumption alone do not provide a full picture of the nature of context-nausea learning
27
28 because this does not address the issue of a reduction in affective value.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Using the analysis of orofacial reactivity, there is some recent evidence showing that
36
37 rats might display conditioned changes in affective value to a contextual cue paired with
38
39 LiCl. The first example comes from Limebeer, Hall and Parker (2006), who reported that
40
41 when rats were repeatedly infused with saccharin in a context previously paired with LiCl,
42
43 they not only displayed aversive orofacial reactivity reactions during the flavor infusions but
44
45 also during the inter-infusion intervals, indicating that contextual cues can acquire the ability
46
47 to elicit responses indicating reduced affective value. However, in these experiments an
48
49
50
51
52

53 ² Although blocking is commonly interpreted as a deficit in acquisition, there are
54
55 demonstrations of recovery from blocking suggestive of performance/retrieval effects
56
57 (Blaisdell, Gunther, & Miller, 1999; Pineno, Urushihara, & Miller, 2005). None of the studies
58
59 of context blocking of taste aversion noted here distinguish between contributions of
60
61 acquisition or performance to the observed effects.
62
63
64
65

1 explicit olfactory cue (vanilla flavor extract) was used as a part of the context. Thus the
2
3
4 aversive orofacial reactivity reactions to the context may have actually been elicited only by
5
6 this flavor component. Therefore, examining contexts without an odor component is
7
8 necessary for a true comparison between flavor and non-flavor stimuli. Two previous studies
9
10 examined this issue. In an experiment reported by Limebeer, Krohn, Croos-Mellor, Litt,
11
12 Ossenkopp, and Parker (2008), rats displayed conditioned aversive orofacial reactivity
13
14 reactions during exposure to a distinctive context paired with LiCl even in the absence of a
15
16 flavored solution or any odor cue. However, in a similar experiment by Meachum and
17
18 Bernstein (1992) animals displayed conditioned aversive orofacial reactivity responses to a
19
20 context paired with LiCl only if an odor cue (pine scent) was presented as a part of the
21
22 context. Therefore, the ability of non-flavor context cues to elicit conditioned aversive
23
24 orofacial reactivity responses remains controversial.
25
26
27
28

29
30 Whereas it has long been known that nausea-based context conditioning can interfere
31
32 with taste aversion as revealed by suppressed consumption, its effectiveness in blocking
33
34 changes in affective value has not been yet examined. It is therefore unclear if context
35
36 blocking of a taste aversion reflects a modulation of affective value (such that the reduction
37
38 in taste palatability is attenuated as a result of context blocking) or is simply the result of
39
40 reduced avoidance independent of changes in affective value. In short, it is not yet clear
41
42 whether context-nausea pairings result in the context acquiring the same conditioned
43
44 properties as do nausea-paired taste stimuli. Therefore, Experiment 1 tested context-blocking
45
46 of affective value by examining orofacial reactivity responses elicited by the context cues,
47
48 and by saccharin that had been trained in a context which had, or had not, been previously
49
50 paired with LiCl. Experiment 2 extended this to examine whether blocking of conditioned
51
52 changes in affective reactions to saccharin was obtained when rats were given non-reinforced
53
54 exposure to the context previously paired with the LiCl (i.e., context extinction) before the
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 saccharin was conditioned in compound with the context. Both experiments also examined
2
3
4 the ability of contextual cues paired with LiCl to directly elicit orofacial responses indicative
5
6 of changes in affective value.
7
8
9

10 11 **Experiment 1**

12
13 The specific aim of this experiment was to test whether a context previously paired
14
15 with lithium injections interferes with conditioned changes in the palatability of a LiCl-paired
16
17 flavor as assessed by the orofacial reactivity test. In a pilot study one group of rats was
18
19 injected with LiCl (pretrained group) and the other with saline (non pretrained) before being
20
21 placed in a distinctive context produced by the chamber used for intra-oral (IO) infusion and
22
23 recording of orofacial reactions. All rats subsequently received an IO infusion of saccharin
24
25 while in the conditioning chamber followed by an injection of LiCl. During test, rats were IO
26
27 infused with the saccharin and the pretrained group displayed fewer aversive orofacial
28
29 reactions than the non pretrained group, suggesting that pretraining with LiCl interfered with
30
31 the reduction in saccharin palatability. These results are consistent with the idea that a LiCl-
32
33 paired context can block the conditioned changes in the affective value of a flavor. However,
34
35 the blocked cue (saccharin) was presented in compound with the blocking cue (context), and
36
37
38 we did not have a measure of how context-based responding may have contributed to the
39
40 observed responses to saccharin at test. In principle, one way to resolve this problem is to use
41
42 separate contexts for conditioning and testing. However, our previous studies of latent
43
44 inhibition using this procedure (López et al., 2010) suggest that the IO infusion itself and the
45
46 chamber used to observe/record the orofacial reactions is the dominant contextual feature (see
47
48 also Dwyer, Gasalla, & López, 2013).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
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
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3
4 Therefore, Experiment 1 (see Table 1) evaluated the potential of the contextual cues
5 alone (i.e., in the absence of the flavor) to display conditioned orofacial reactions, as well as
6 the degree to which the context blocks conditioned orofacial reactions to the flavor cue. Two
7 groups of rats (Groups Pre-Li and Pre-Sal) were given context-LiCl pairings whereas other
8 two groups (Groups Non-Li and Non-Sal) received saline injections during pretraining. In the
9 saccharin conditioning sessions using the same context, subjects in Groups Pre-Li and Non-
10 Li were injected with LiCl after an intraoral infusion of saccharin whereas those in Groups
11 Pre-Sal and Non-Sal were given saline injections. In the orofacial reactivity test, each subject
12 was tested with the context alone, an intraoral infusion of saccharin, and finally, with an
13 infusion of water, while their orofacial reactions were recorded. It was expected that rats
14 pretrained with LiCl before conditioning of saccharin in compound with the context (Group
15 Pre-Li) would both display aversive orofacial reactions when exposed to the context alone,
16 and that they would display fewer aversive orofacial reactions when infused with the
17 saccharin solution during testing compared to the controls.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Method**

42
43 **Subjects.** Thirty two male Wistar rats, approximately 90 days old and with a mean
44 free-feeding weight of 331 g (range, 220-393 g) at the start of the experiment, were used for
45 the present study. Upon arrival, they were housed individually in standard plastic cages in a
46 colony room maintained on a 12-h light/dark cycle (lights on at 08:00 h) and at an ambient
47 temperature of 21° C. All experimental manipulations took place during the light phase.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 Throughout the experiment, rats were maintained on a water deprivation-schedule as
56 described below. Food was always available in the home cages. All behavioral procedures
57
58
59
60 were conducted in accordance with guidelines of the European Council Directive
61
62
63
64
65

1 (86/609/EEC) and Spanish regulation RD-1201/2005 regarding the care and use of laboratory
2
3
4 animals.

5
6 **Fluids and apparatus.** The fluids used were solutions of lithium chloride (0.15 M
7
8 LiCl), isotonic saline (0.9% NaCl solution), and saccharin (0.1% w/v). LiCl and NaCl were
9
10 administered intraperitoneally (i.p.) at a volume of 10 ml/kg of body weight. The saccharin
11
12 solution was infused directly into the mouth of the subject through an oral cannula implanted
13
14 prior to the experiment, the details of which are described below.
15

16
17 The behavioral procedures took place in a conditioning chamber located in a dark
18
19 room. The chamber was made of clear Plexiglas sides (26 cm x 23 cm x 14 cm) with a dark
20
21 lid, and was placed on a table with a clear Plexiglas top. Two 50-Watt white lights on each
22
23 side of the table provided a light illumination. A mirror beneath the chamber on a 45° angle
24
25 facilitated viewing of the ventral surface of the rat during the intraoral infusion. Fluids were
26
27 administered to the animals through an infusion pump (KD Scientific) connected to the
28
29 implanted cannula. While the rats were infused with the fluids, their orofacial responses were
30
31 recorded using a video camera (Sony Optical 20 X) connected to a computer. The videos
32
33 were manually scored using the Observer XT 9.0 (Noldus Information Technology, Sterling,
34
35 VA) event recording program.
36
37

38
39 Based on the procedure followed by Parker (1984; 1995), and as previously used in
40
41 our lab (Gasalla, Begega, Soto, Dwyer, & López, 2016; Lopez et al., 2010), the aversive
42
43 behaviors scored included the frequency of the responses of gaping (rapid, large-amplitude
44
45 opening of the mandible with retraction of the corners of the mouth), chin rubbing (mouth or
46
47 chin in direct contact with the floor or wall of the chamber and body projected forward) and
48
49 paw treading (forward and backward movement of the forepaws in synchronous alternation).
50
51 These scores were summed to provide a total aversive response score. The appetitive
52
53 responses scored were tongue protrusions (extension of the tongue out the mouth), mouth
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 movements (movement of the lower mandible without opening the mouth), and paw licks
2
3
4 (midline extension of the tongue directed to the forepaws). The number of seconds that the
5
6 rats displayed the responses was used as the appetitive response score. Appetitive and
7
8 aversive responses were scored on different scales (duration vs frequency) because they
9
10 display very different properties: appetitive responses are typically displayed over extended
11
12 periods of time, while aversive responses occur as isolated behaviors (Berridge, 2000). The
13
14 videos were scored by two raters blind to the experimental groups.
15
16

17 **Cannulation surgery.** The rats were surgically implanted with an intraoral cannula
18
19 using a very similar method to that described in Parker (1995). The surgical anesthesia
20
21 preparation included administration of an i.p. injection of ketamine (50 mg/kg) combined
22
23 with medetomidine hydrochloride (0.15 mg/kg), a drug with analgesic properties. Following
24
25 surgery, the rats were administered ketoprofen (1.5 mg/kg, s.c.), an anti-inflammatory drug,
26
27 and the antibiotic enrofloxacin (0.3 mg/kg, s.c.). In order to implant the cannula a thin-walled
28
29 15-gauge stainless steel needle was inserted at the back of the neck, directly subcutaneously
30
31 around the ear and brought out behind the first molar inside mouth. A length of intramedic
32
33 polyethylene tubing with an inner diameter of 0.86 mm and an outer diameter of 1.27 mm
34
35 was then run through the needle after which the needle was removed. Two square elastic
36
37 discs were placed over the tubing and drawn to the exposed skin at the back of the neck for
38
39 the purpose of stabilizing the cannula. The tubing was held secure in the oral cavity by an O-
40
41 ring, which was sealed behind the tubing prior to cannulation surgery. Following surgery, rats
42
43 were monitored for three days and had their cannula flushed daily with chlorhexidine to
44
45 prevent infection. For the purpose of fluid infusion, the cannula was connected to the infusion
46
47 pump by slipping the tubing of the cannula inside a second polyethylene tubing (inner
48
49 diameter 1.19 mm; outer diameter 1.70 mm) attached to the infusion pump.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Procedure.** Three rats lost their cannula during the experiment and were removed
2
3
4 from the sample. The remaining animals were randomly assigned to four groups: Group Pre-
5 Li (n=7); Group Non-Li (n=8); Group Pre-Sal (n=7); and Group Non-Sal (n=7). Three days
6 after the surgery, the rats were placed on a water deprivation-schedule, comprising 1-h access
7
8 to water each day, given approximately 2 h after the experimental sessions. Throughout the
9
10 experiment, this water deprivation regime was maintained (unless otherwise noted).
11
12
13

14
15 On each of 4 pre-training sessions (see Table 1), rats were placed in the conditioning
16 chamber, where they spent 5 min before being injected with lithium (0.15 M; 10 ml/kg)
17
18 (Group Pre-Li and Pre-Sal) or physiological saline (0.9%; 10 ml/kg) (Group Non-Li and
19
20 Non-Sal). Rats spent 60 min after the injection in the conditioning chamber before being
21
22 returned to the home cage. After the second and fourth pre-training sessions, the animals
23
24 received a water recovery day in their home cages. On the next day, the rats were habituated
25
26 to the infusion procedure. They were placed in the conditioning chamber (the orofacial
27
28 reactivity apparatus) with their cannula attached to the infusion pump for fluid delivery. After
29
30 a period of 5 min, water was infused into their intraoral cannula for 1 min at the rate of 1
31
32 ml/min in order to habituate them to this fluid delivery method.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The next four days constituted the saccharin conditioning phase. The rats received two
40
41 conditioning trials separated by a recovery day during which they were given water in their
42
43 home cages. On each of the two conditioning trials, the animals were placed in the
44
45 conditioning chamber and intra-orally infused with 0.1% saccharin for 5 min at a rate of 1
46
47 ml/min while their orofacial responses were recorded. Immediately following the fluid
48
49 infusion, the rats in Groups Pre-Li and Non-Li were injected (i.p.) with LiCl whereas those in
50
51 Groups Pre-Sal and Non-Sal received an injection of physiological saline. After the
52
53 injections, the animals were kept 60 min in the conditioning chamber before being returned to
54
55 the home cages.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The orofacial reactivity test occurred the next day. This test was divided into three 2.5
2
3 min-periods. During this session, each rat was placed in the conditioning chamber for 2.5 min
4 while their orofacial responses were recorded; for half of the animals they were then
5
6 intraorally infused with the saccharin solution (0.1%) for 2.5 min at a rate of 1 ml/min, and
7
8 finally, with water (1 ml/min) for another 2.5 min; for the remaining animals, the order of
9
10 saccharin and water infusion was reversed. During the fluid infusions the rats' orofacial
11
12 responses were recorded. On the next three days, consumption tests were administered. On
13
14 each of these sessions, the rats were given access to a drinking tube containing the saccharin
15
16 solution for 15 min in their home cages, and the amounts consumed were measured (by
17
18 weight). Rats were given supplementary water for 60 min in their home cages at the end of
19
20 each of these tests.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Data analysis.** Aversive and appetitive orofacial reactions during conditioning were
28
29 separately analyzed with 2 (pretraining: context pretrained vs not pretrained) \times 2
30
31 (conditioning: saccharin paired with LiCl vs saline) \times 2 (trial) mixed ANOVAs. The orofacial
32
33 reactivity scores for the context alone, saccharin infusion, and water infusion during testing
34
35 were analyzed by separate 2 (pretraining) \times 2 (conditioning) ANOVAs. A 2 (pretraining) \times 2
36
37 (conditioning) \times 3 (trial) mixed ANOVA was used to examine the consumption data from the
38
39 final bottle tests. For the ANOVA analyses we report partial eta squared as our measure of
40
41 effect size with 95% confident intervals (CIs) using the procedure described by Steiger
42
43 (2004). For contrast and t-test analyses, we report effect sizes as the Mean Difference with
44
45 CIs calculated using Exploratory Software for Confident Intervals (ESCI, Cumming, 2013).
46
47 All tests reported here used a criterion for significance of $p = 0.05$. The inter-rater reliability
48
49 (r's > 0.87) for each behavior scored was highly significant.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Results and discussion

Figure 1 (panel A) shows the mean number of aversive orofacial reactions elicited by the infusion of saccharin during the conditioning phase. On trial 2, rats in Group Non-Li displayed more aversive orofacial reactions to saccharin than the rats from the other three groups. A mixed ANOVA revealed significant main effects of trial $F(1,25) = 27.87$, $MSE = 4.25$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .53$, 95% CI [.23, .69], pretraining $F(1,25) = 5.94$, $MSE = 5.38$, $p = .022$, $\eta_p^2 = .19$, 95% CI [0, .32], and conditioning $F(1,25) = 38.22$, $MSE = 5.38$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .60$, 95% CI [.32, .74]. The interactions involving these factors were all significant: pretraining \times trial $F(1,25) = 30.72$, $MSE = 4.25$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .55$, 95% CI [.25, .70]; conditioning \times trial $F(1,25) = 50.75$, $MSE = 4.25$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .67$, 95% CI [.41, .78]; pretraining \times conditioning $F(1,25) = 14.76$, $MSE = 5.38$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .37$, 95% CI [.09, .57]; and pretraining \times conditioning \times trial $F(1,25) = 15.69$, $MSE = 4.25$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .39$, 95% CI [.10, .59]. A simple effect analysis of the triple interaction revealed that Group Non-Li displayed significantly more aversive reactions in the second conditioning trial than the first $F(1,25) = 132.84$, $MSE = 2.27$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .84$, 95% CI [.69, .90], but no other group showed a change in the number of aversive reactions between trials (largest $F(1,25) = 2.84$, $MSE = 7.34$, $p = .104$ for group Pre-Sal). In addition, a simple effect analysis of the pretraining \times trial interaction revealed that the groups which had received context-LiCl pairings displayed more aversive responses on the first conditioning trial ($F(1,25) = 7.31$, $p = .012$, $\eta_p^2 = .23$, 95% CI [.01, .46]).

FIGURE 1

1 The mean duration (in seconds) of appetitive orofacial reactions elicited by the
 2
 3
 4 infusion of saccharin during the conditioning phase is presented in Table 2. While there was a
 5
 6 significant reduction in appetitive reactions in Groups Pre-Li and Non-Li compared with
 7
 8 Groups Pre-Sal and Non-Sal, the reduction in appetitive reactions was larger in Group Non-
 9
 10 Li than Group Pre-Li. The ANOVA conducted with these scores revealed significant main
 11
 12 effects of trial $F(1,25) = 154.99, MSE = 853.75, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .86, 95\% CI [.73, .91]$, and
 13
 14 conditioning $F(1,25) = 108.65, MSE = 2098.43, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .81, 95\% CI [.64, .88]$, but not
 15
 16 a significant effect of pretraining $F(1,25) = .33, MSE = 2098.43, p = .569, \eta_p^2 = .01, 95\% CI$
 17
 18 $[0, .19]$. The interactions involving these factors were all significant: pretraining \times trial
 19
 20 $F(1,25) = 10.29, MSE = 853.76, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .29, 95\% CI [.04, .51]$; conditioning \times trial
 21
 22 $F(1,25) = 174.23, MSE = 853.76, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .87, 95\% CI [.75, .92]$ but conditioning \times
 23
 24 pretraining $F(1,25) = .40, MSE = 1049.21, p = .509, \eta_p^2 = .18, 95\% CI [0, .2]$; and pretraining
 25
 26 \times conditioning \times trial $F(1,25) = 9.25, MSE = 853.76, p = .005, \eta_p^2 = .27, 95\% CI [.03, .50]$. A
 27
 28 simple effect analysis of the triple interaction revealed that both conditioned groups, Group
 29
 30 Pre-Li and Non-Li, showed significantly fewer appetitive reactions in the second
 31
 32 conditioning trial than the first, $F(1,25) = 91.41, MSE = 1219.72, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .78, 95\% CI$
 33
 34 $[.59, .86]$ and $F(1,25) = 281.65, MSE = 1732.62, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .92, 95\% CI [.84, .95]$,
 35
 36 respectively, but the non-conditioned groups did not show a change in the duration of
 37
 38 appetitive reactions between trials (largest $F(1,25) = .793, MSE = 1219.72, p = .391, \eta_p^2 =$
 39
 40 $.03, 95\% CI [0, .23]$ for group Pre-Sal). Moreover, Group Non-Li displayed less appetitive
 41
 42 reactions on trial 2 than did Group Pre-Li, $F(1,25) = 5.21, MSE = 1732.62, p = .031, \eta_p^2 =$
 43
 44 $.17, 95\% CI [0, .41]$. In addition, a simple effect analysis of the pretraining \times trial interaction
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

1 revealed that the groups which had received context-LiCl pairings displayed fewer appetitive
 2
 3 responses to saccharin on the first conditioning trial ($F(1,25) = 5.92, p = .022, \eta_p^2 = .19, 95\%$
 4
 5
 6
 7 CI [.01, .43]). The fact that appetitive reactions to saccharin were high, and aversive reactions
 8
 9 low, on the first saccharin conditioning trial after prior context-LiCl pairings suggests that
 10
 11 saccharin elicits unconditioned appetitive responses which obscured conditioned aversive
 12
 13 responses to the context. However, groups which had received context-LiCl pairings
 14
 15
 16 displayed both fewer appetitive reactions and more aversive reactions than groups that had
 17
 18 not, indicating an influence of prior context training at the outset of the conditioning phase.
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23

TABLE 2

24
 25
 26
 27
 28 Panel B of Figure 1 shows the mean number of aversive reactions displayed by the
 29
 30 various groups during the orofacial reactivity test. Analysis of the rates of aversive reactions
 31
 32 elicited by the context alone revealed significant main effects of pretraining, $F(1,25) = 18.32,$
 33
 34 $MSE = 23.54, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .42, 95\% \text{ CI} [.12, .61]$ and conditioning, $F(1,25) = 27.74, MSE =$
 35
 36 $23.54, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .53, 95\% \text{ CI} [.22, .69],$ as well as a significant interaction between these
 37
 38 two factors, $F(1,25) = 4.94, MSE = 23.54, p = .036, \eta_p^2 = .16, 95\% \text{ CI} [0, .40].$ Simple effect
 39
 40 analysis of the interaction revealed that Group Pre-Li showed more aversive reactions than
 41
 42 Group Pre-Sal $F(1,25) = 27.19, MSE = 23.54, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .52, 95\% \text{ CI} [.22, .68],$ and
 43
 44 Group Non-Li showed more aversive reactions than Group Non-Sal $F(1,25) = 4.80, MSE =$
 45
 46 $23.54, p = .038, \eta_p^2 = .16, 95\% \text{ CI} [0, .40].$ These reflect the fact that pairing the context with
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65 LiCl resulted in conditioned aversive reactions to that context regardless of whether LiCl was
 injected in the pretraining or conditioning phases (or both).

1 Analysis of the number of aversive reactions displayed by the rats during the intraoral
 2
 3 infusion of saccharin in the orofacial reactivity test³ revealed significant main effects of
 4
 5 pretraining, $F(1,25) = 5.31$, $MSE = 20.21$, $p = .030$, $\eta_p^2 = .17$, 95% CI [0, .41], and
 6
 7 conditioning, $F(1,25) = 20.22$, $MSE = 20.21$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .45$, 95% CI [.15, .63], as well as
 8
 9 a significant pretraining by conditioning interaction, $F(1,25) = 5.31$, $MSE = 20.21$, $p = .030$,
 10
 11 $\eta_p^2 = .17$, 95% CI [0, .41]. Simple effect analysis of the interaction revealed that Group Non-
 12
 13 Li displayed more aversive reactions to the saccharin solution than Group Pre-Li, $F(1,25) =$
 14
 15 10.98, $MSE = 20.21$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .30$, 95% CI [.04, .52], but Group Non-Sal and Pre-Sal
 16
 17 did not differ, $F < 1$. This confirms the blocking of aversive reactions to saccharin by context
 18
 19 pretraining. Finally, analysis of the number of aversive reactions during the water infusion
 20
 21 revealed a main effect of conditioning, $F(1,25) = 14.63$, $MSE = 15.24$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .37$,
 22
 23 95% CI [.08, .57], but no effect of pretraining nor any interactions between these two factors
 24
 25 ($F_s < 1$).

26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36 Table 2 presents the mean duration of appetitive reactions displayed by the rats
 37
 38 during the infusion of saccharin in the orofacial reactivity test. The ANOVA performed with
 39
 40 these scores revealed significant main effects conditioning, $F(1,25) = 850.09$, $MSE = 150.57$,
 41
 42 $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .97$, 95% CI [.94, .98], but no effect of pretraining, $F(1,25) = 0.59$, $MSE =$
 43
 44 150.57, $p = .449$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, 95% CI [0, .22], or significant pretraining by conditioning
 45
 46 interaction, $F(1,25) = 1.29$, $MSE = 150.57$, $p = .267$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, 95% CI [0, .26].

51
 52
 53 ³ In order to analyse if the aversive reactions are subject to ‘fatigue’ over the test session, data
 54
 55 from saccharin and water infusions at test was analysed including an order factor, that is, if
 56
 57 the saccharin was administered before or after the water infusion. There were no effects of
 58
 59 order on aversive responses to water infusions, $F(1,27) = .11$, $MSE = 22.29$, $p = .747$, $\eta_p^2 =$
 60
 61 .01, 95% CI [0, .14], or to saccharin infusion, $F(1,27) = .04$, $MSE = 43.09$, $p = .850$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$,
 62
 63 95% CI [0, .11].
 64
 65

1 Panel C of Figure 1 shows the mean amount of saccharin solution consumed during
 2
 3
 4 the subsequent consumption tests. Fluid intake by groups Pre-Li and Non-Li increased over
 5
 6 the trials, whereas consumption intake by groups Pre-Sal and Non-Sal remained high across
 7
 8 the sessions. There were significant main effects of trial $F(2,50) = 17.39$, $MSE = 5.25$, $p <$
 9
 10 $.001$, $\eta_p^2 = .41$, 95% CI [.19, .55], pretraining $F(1,25) = 4.82$, $p = .038$, $\eta_p^2 = .16$, 95% CI [0,
 11
 12 $.40]$, conditioning $F(1,25) = 74.49$, $MSE = 18.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .75$, 95% CI [.53, .83], and a
 13
 14 significant pretraining \times trial interaction, $F(2,50) = 3.27$, $MSE = 5.25$, $p = .046$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$,
 15
 16 95% CI [0, .35]. There was neither a significant conditioning \times trial interaction, nor a
 17
 18 significant interaction of the three factors ($F_s < 1$). The pretraining \times conditioning interaction
 19
 20 also was not significant $F(1,25) = 1.46$, $MSE = 18.48$, $p = .238$. The main effect of pre-
 21
 22 training, and the pretraining by trial interaction, are consistent with a blocking of saccharin
 23
 24 aversion by the context, this was confirmed by a 2-way ANOVA examining only the groups
 25
 26 which received saccharin paired with LiCl in the conditioning phase: this revealed significant
 27
 28 main effects of pretraining, $F(1,13) = 7.43$, $MSE = 69.63$, $p = .017$, $\eta_p^2 = .36$, 95% CI [.01,
 29
 30 $.58]$, and trial $F(2,26) = 19.55$, $MSE = 5.13$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .60$, 95% CI [.30, .73], as well as a
 31
 32 significant trial by group interaction $F(2,26) = 4.31$, $MSE = 5.13$, $p = .024$, $\eta_p^2 = .25$, 95% CI
 33
 34 [0, .42].
 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

In summary, when rats received saccharin-LiCl training without pretraining to the
 conditioning context (Group Non-Li) they displayed few aversive reactions to the context
 alone, and high levels of aversive reactions to saccharin. In contrast, when rats received
 context-LiCl pairings prior to saccharin-LiCl training (Group Pre-Li) they displayed a high
 rate of aversive reactions to the context alone, but few aversive reactions to saccharin. While
 appetitive orofacial reactions were at floor levels during test for both groups receiving

1 saccharin-LiCl pairings, the rate of reduction in appetitive responses to saccharin across
2
3
4 conditioning was lower in Group Pre-Li than Non-Li. The comparison of responding to the
5
6 saccharin infusion and to the context alone between these two groups demonstrates that
7
8 pairing a context with LiCl can result in the context eliciting aversive reactions, the blocking
9
10 of aversive orofacial reactions to a taste conditioned in that context, and (notwithstanding
11
12 floor effects on test) blocking of reductions in appetitive orofacial reactions to the
13
14 conditioned taste. That is not to say that saccharin-LiCl pairings were entirely without effect
15
16 when following context-LiCl pairings: Group Pre-Li displayed fewer appetitive reactions and
17
18 more aversive reactions at test than did groups which did not receive saccharin-LiCl pairings.
19
20
21 So blocking of taste-LiCl learning by the context was partial rather than complete. We would
22
23 note that this is not a standard blocking test, because the blocked cue (saccharin) is tested in
24
25 combination with the blocking cue (context). However, this does not affect the conclusions
26
27 reached here because this design would be likely to underestimate any true blocking effect as
28
29 responding to the blocking cue might mask any reduction in responding to the blocked cue. In
30
31 light of the overall aim of these studies, these results confirm that context stimuli can elicit
32
33 conditioned aversive orofacial reactions in the absence of any flavor component, and
34
35 demonstrate for the first time that context cues can also interfere with the conditioned
36
37 reduction in palatability of a taste receiving aversion training in that context.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Experiment 2**

49
50 Because of the theoretical importance of the novel results from Experiment 1, we
51
52 sought to replicate and extend them by examining whether the context-blocking effect on
53
54 conditioned changes in taste palatability depends on the strength of the context-LiCl
55
56 association. That is, we examined context blocking as a function of whether or not the
57
58 context-LiCl association has been extinguished by exposing the rats to the context alone
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 before saccharin was conditioned in compound with the context. It is known that extinction
2
3
4 reduces the strength of the context-LiCl association and therefore the ability of the context to
5
6 block a subsequent taste aversion as assessed by a consumption test (Batson & Best, 1979;
7
8 Boakes, Westbrook, Elliott, & Swinbourne, 1997; Iguchi, Fukumoto, Sawa, & Ishii, 2014).
9
10 Based on this finding, it would be expected that extinction would also weaken the association
11
12 between the context and nausea, allowing for the establishment of conditioned reductions in
13
14 palatability for the saccharin solution when it is paired with LiCl in the extinguished context.
15
16

17 The design of this experiment is summarized in Table 1. Two groups of rats, Pre and
18
19 Pre-Ext, were administered with LiCl in a distinctive context (the conditioning apparatus)
20
21 four times. Rats in Group Pre-Ext were then exposed to the context four times and given
22
23 saline injections in order to extinguish its ability to elicit conditioned nausea, whereas rats in
24
25 Group Pre received the saline in the home cages (a third group of rats, Group Non, was given
26
27 saline injections during pretraining and extinction sessions in the context). Following this, all
28
29 rats received two conditioning trials in which an infusion of saccharin in the presence of the
30
31 contextual cues was paired with LiCl. The affective responses to the context alone and to
32
33 saccharin was then examined in the orofacial reactivity test.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Method**

44 **Subjects, fluids, and apparatus.** Thirty male Wistar rats, approximately 90 days
45
46 old, weighing from 273 to 379 g at the start of the experiment served as subjects. Except
47
48 otherwise stated, deprivation conditions, apparatus, and other procedural details were the
49
50 same as in Experiment 1. Each subject was implanted with an oral cannula using the
51
52 procedure described in Experiment 1. The flavor used during the experiment was a 0.1 %
53
54 (w/v) saccharin solution. The rats were injected with either 10 ml/kg of 0.15 M LiCl or
55
56 physiological saline (10 ml/kg). Two rats lost their cannula during the experiment, so that the
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 number of subjects in each group was: Group Pre (n=8); Group Non (n=10); and Group Pre-
2
3
4 Ext (n=10).

5 **Procedure.** The pretraining phase was similar to that of Experiment 1 (see Table 1).
6
7
8 In each of four trials (one per day), the rats were placed in the conditioning chamber for 2.5
9
10 min while their orofacial responses were video-recorded. Immediately afterwards the subjects
11
12 were injected with LiCl (Group Pre and Group Pre-Ext) or saline (Group Non). The rats were
13
14 returned to the conditioning chamber for 60 min after the injection. They received a water
15
16 recovery day after the second and fourth pretraining trials. The next four sessions constituted
17
18 the extinction phase. During these sessions, the rats in Group Non and Group Pre-Ext were
19
20 placed in the conditioning chamber for 2.5 min and their orofacial responses recorded before
21
22 being injected with saline (10 ml/kg; 0.9 % NaCl solution). They were returned to the
23
24 conditioning apparatus for 60 min after the injection. The animals in Group Pre received a
25
26 saline injection in each session before being returned to their home cages. After completion
27
28 of this phase, the rats were habituated to the orofacial reactivity procedure by infusion with
29
30 water for a period of 1 min at the rate of 1 ml/min.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 On each of the following two sessions, the rats received the saccharin conditioning
39
40 trials. On these sessions, the rats were placed in the conditioning chamber and intraorally
41
42 infused with 0.1 % saccharin for 5 min while their reactions were video-recorded.
43
44 Immediately following the saccharin infusion, the rats were all injected with LiCl. The rats
45
46 were kept for 60 min in the conditioning chamber before being returned to their home cages.
47
48 After a recovery day with water in the home cages, the orofacial reactivity test was
49
50 administered. As in Experiment 1, each rat was placed in the conditioning chamber for 2.5
51
52 min while their orofacial responses were recorded; they were then intraorally infused with
53
54 saccharin (0.1%) for 2.5 min at a rate of 1 ml/min, and finally, with water (1 ml/min) for
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 another 2.5 min. The sequence of infusions (saccharin and water) was counterbalanced as in
 2
 3
 4 Experiment 1. No consumption test was conducted in this experiment.

5
 6 **Data analysis.** The behaviors scored during pretraining were analyzed with a 3
 7
 8 (group) \times 4 (trial) mixed ANOVA. During the extinction phase a similar ANOVA was used
 9
 10 (but with only 2 levels of the group factor because Group Pre did not received any
 11
 12 experimental manipulations in this phase). The data during the conditioning trials was
 13
 14 analyzed by means of a 3 (group) \times 2 (trial) mixed ANOVA. The orofacial reactivity scores
 15
 16 for context alone, saccharin infusion, and water infusion during testing were analyzed by
 17
 18 separate one-way ANOVAs with group as between-group factor. The inter-rater reliability
 19
 20 (r's > 0.93) for each behavior scored was highly significant.
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27

28 **Results and discussion**

29
 30 Panel A of Figure 2 (left-hand side) shows the mean number of aversive orofacial
 31
 32 reactions displayed by the rats to contextual cues on each of the four pretraining sessions. The
 33
 34 number of aversive reactions increased over the trials to the same extent in Groups Pre and
 35
 36 Pre-Ext. The 3 \times 4 ANOVA conducted on these data revealed significant main effects of trial
 37
 38 and group ($F(3,75) = 37.69$, $MSE = 4.20$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .60$, 95% CI [.44, .69], and $F(2,25) =$
 39
 40 16.77 , $MSE = 5.64$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .57$, 95% CI [.26, .71] respectively) and a significant
 41
 42 interaction between trial and group, $F(6,75) = 10.01$, $MSE = 4.20$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .44$, 95% CI
 43
 44 [.23, .54]. Follow-up contrast analysis of the interaction revealed no differences between
 45
 46 groups on trials 1 and 2 (largest $t(25) = 1.23$, $p = .229$, Mean Difference = 0.68, 95% CI [-.45,
 47
 48 1.80] for the difference between Group Non against Groups Pre and Pre-Ext combined),
 49
 50 while Group Non displayed fewer aversive reactions on trials 3 and 4 than either of Groups
 51
 52 Pre and Pre-Ext combined ($t(25) = 2.76$, $p = .01$, Mean Difference = 5.37, 95% CI [1.37,
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

1 9.38] and $t(25) = 5.75, p < .001$, Mean Difference = 15.55, 95% CI [9.99, 21.11]
 2
 3
 4 respectively), which did not themselves differ ($t(25) = 0.32, p = .751$, Mean Difference =
 5
 6 0.37, 95% CI [-2.03, 2.78] and $t(25) = 1.20, p = .241$, Mean Difference = 1.95, 95% CI [-
 7
 8 1.39, 5.29] respectively for trials 3 and 4).
 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

Figure 2A (right-hand side) presents the mean number of aversive orofacial reactions expressed by rats in Groups Pre-Ext and Non during the extinction phase. The 2 (group) \times 4 (trial) ANOVA of the number of aversive reactions during these sessions revealed significant main effects of group, $F(1,18) = 24.77, MSE = 3.56, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .58, 95\% \text{ CI } [.22, .74]$ and trial, $F(3,54) = 11.56, MSE = 2.98, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .39, 95\% \text{ CI } [.16, .52]$, and a significant group \times trial interaction, $F(3,54) = 11.56, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .39, 95\% \text{ CI } [.16, .52]$. Analysis of group differences for each trial revealed that during extinction trials 1 and 2, Group Pre-Ext displayed significantly more aversive reactions than Group Non ($t(18) = 4.56, p < .001$, Mean Difference = 5.80, 95% CI [3.13, 8.47] and $t(18) = 2.47, p = .024$, Mean Difference = 2.10, 95% CI [0.36, 3.88] respectively), but that the groups did not differ on extinction trials 3 and 4 ($t(18) = 1.25, p = .229$, Mean Difference = 0.50, 95% CI [-.34, 1.34] for trial 3 and a t-test could not be computed as all values were 0 for trial 4).

During the saccharin conditioning phase Groups Non and Pre-Ext displayed significantly more aversive reactions than Group Pre as conditioning proceeded. Figure 2 (panel B) presents the mean number of conditioned aversive reactions elicited by the infusion of saccharin during the two conditioning trials. The 3 \times 2 ANOVA revealed significant main effects of group, $F(2,25) = 3.65, MSE = 6.87, p = .041, \eta_p^2 = .22, 95\% \text{ CI } [0, .43]$ and trial,

$F(1,25) = 73.94$, $MSE = 6.87$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .75$, 95% CI [.53, .83], and a significant interaction between these factors, $F(2,25) = 3.55$, $MSE = 6.87$, $p = .044$, $\eta_p^2 = .22$, 95% CI [0, .43]. Follow-up contrast analysis of the interaction revealed no differences between groups on trial 1 (largest $t(25) = 1.18$, $p = .250$, Mean Difference = 0.10, 95% CI [-.07, 0.27] for the difference between Groups Pre-Ext and Non), and that Group Pre displayed fewer aversive reactions on trial 2 than Groups Non and Pre-Ext combined ($t(25) = 2.63$, $p = .014$, Mean Difference = 8.15, 95% CI [1.78, 14.52]), which did not themselves differ ($t(25) = 0.54$, $p = .592$, Mean Difference = 0.90, 95% CI [-2.52, 4.33]). The duration of appetitive reactions displayed by the animals during the conditioning phase is presented in Table 2. The 3×2 ANOVA revealed significant main effect of trial $F(1,25) = 876.78$, $MSE = 619.44$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .97$, 95% CI [.94, .98] but no significant effect of group, $F(2,25) = 1.82$, $MSE = 701.37$, $p = .182$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$, 95% CI [0, .29] or a significant interaction between these factors, $F(2,25) = 2.83$, $MSE = 619.44$, $p = .078$, $\eta_p^2 = .18$, 95% CI [0, .33]. Although the interaction did not reach standard levels of significance, Group Pre displayed both less appetitive reactions on conditioning trial 1 ($t(25) = 2.14$, $p = .043$, Mean Difference = 35.40, 95% CI [1.26, 69.54]) and a smaller reduction between conditioning trials 1 and 2 ($t(25) = 2.25$, $p = .034$, Mean Difference = 37.56, 95% CI [3.18, 71.94]) than did group Pre-Ext (although Group Non did not differ from either of the other two groups on conditioning trial 1 or two, largest $t(25) = 1.54$, $p = .137$, Mean Difference = 23.98, 95% CI [-56.17, 8.20], for the difference between Groups Pre-Ext and Non on trial 1).

Panel C of Figure 2 presents the mean number of aversive reactions for the different groups during the orofacial reactivity tests. The one-way ANOVA conducted with the aversive reactions elicited by the context alone revealed a significant effect of group, $F(2,25)$

1 = 4.54, $MSE = 29.22$, $p = .021$, $\eta_p^2 = .26$, 95% CI [0, .47]. Follow-up contrast analysis
2
3
4 revealed that Group Pre displayed more aversive reactions to the context than Groups Non
5
6 and Pre-Ext combined ($t(25) = 2.99$, $p = .006$, Mean Difference = 4.52, 95% CI [1.41, 7.63]),
7
8 which did not themselves differ ($t(25) = 0.41$, $p = .683$, Mean Difference = 2.42, 95% CI [-
9
10 9.96, 14.80]), indicating that the LiCl-associated context acquired the ability to elicit
11
12 conditioned aversive responses, and that non-reinforced exposures to the context after
13
14 lithium-context pairings resulted in attenuated reductions in affective value. Analysis of the
15
16 number of aversive reactions during the intraoral infusion of saccharin revealed a significant
17
18 effect of group, $F(2,25) = 4.61$, $MSE = 16.24$, $p = .019$, $\eta_p^2 = .27$, 95% CI [.01, .47]. Follow-
19
20 up contrast analysis revealed that Group Pre displayed fewer aversive reactions to saccharin
21
22 than Groups Non and Pre-Ext combined ($t(25) = 3.06$, $p = .005$, Mean Difference = 10.30,
23
24 95% CI [3.38, 17.22]), which did not themselves differ ($t(25) = 0.11$, $p = .913$, Mean
25
26 Difference = 0.20, 95% CI [-3.62, 4.02]). These results suggest that the reduction in
27
28 palatability of LiCl-paired saccharin was attenuated when taste-LiCl training occurred in a
29
30 context able to elicit aversive orofacial reactions. The ANOVA also revealed that there was
31
32 no significant effect of group on the number of aversive reactions displayed by the rats during
33
34 the water infusion ($F < 1$). Finally, appetitive reactions elicited by the saccharin during the
35
36 orofacial reactivity test were at floor levels (see table 2) and ANOVA revealed no significant
37
38 effect of group, $F(2,25) = 1.25$, $MSE = 4.9$, $p = .304$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$, 95% CI [.0, .29].
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47
48
49 In summary, as in Experiment 1, animals that received context-LiCl pairings
50
51 displayed aversive orofacial reactions to the context alone, and after saccharin-LiCl pairings
52
53 in the same context displayed fewer aversive orofacial reactions to saccharin than animals
54
55 which had not received context-LiCl pairings. Moreover, extinction of the context-LiCl
56
57 association through context alone presentations removed this blocking effect. As in
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Experiment 1, despite this blocking effect there was still some evidence of saccharin-LiCl
2
3 learning as all groups showed an increase in aversive reactions and a decrease in appetitive
4 reactions to saccharin across training. These results confirm that the observations from
5
6 Experiment 1 are reliable, and demonstrate that the blocking effect depends on the current
7
8 strength of the context-LiCl association and cannot be explained by non-specific effects of
9
10 LiCl or context exposure alone.
11
12
13

14 15 16 17 18 **General discussion**

19
20
21 This study explored the role of contextual stimuli in LiCl-based aversion learning by
22 examining (1) whether non-flavor contextual cues can elicit conditioned changes in affective
23 responses, and (2) whether context-nausea associations could interfere with the establishment
24 of conditioned changes in palatability to a flavor trained in a nausea-paired context. In both of
25 Experiments 1 and 2, contextual cues alone (with no flavor component) that had been paired
26 with LiCl elicited conditioned aversive orofacial responses. Moreover, in both experiments
27 context-LiCl pairings subsequently reduced the number of aversive orofacial responses
28 elicited by saccharin when it was trained with LiCl in the same context. The blocking effect
29 was not total as there was evidence for increases in aversive reactions and decreases in
30 appetitive reactions to saccharin even in the blocked groups. Experiment 2 demonstrated that
31 this blocking effect was removed when context-LiCl associations were extinguished prior to
32 saccharin-LiCl pairings, indicating that the blocking effect depended on the strength of the
33 context-LiCl association. Although appetitive orofacial responses were at floor levels on test
34 for all groups receiving saccharin-LiCl pairings, there was evidence (especially in
35
36 Experiment 1) for blocking in that the rate of reduction of appetitive responses across training
37 with saccharin was lower when this occurred in a LiCl-paired context. Finally, Experiment 1
38 confirmed that the blocking effect extended to consumption measures.
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 Taking first the demonstration of aversive orofacial reactions to a LiCl-paired context:

2
3
4 Prior studies had provided inconsistent results, with one (Limebeer et al., 2008) reporting
5
6 conditioned aversive reactions to contexts which had no flavor component, while another
7
8 (Meachum & Bernstein, 1992) reporting aversive orofacial reactions only to contexts which
9
10 had an explicit odor component (even though the context without an odor did elicit other
11
12 conditioned reactions). The fact that we consistently observed aversive orofacial reactions to
13
14 contexts (which were entirely without an explicit odor or flavor component) across both of
15
16 Experiments 1 and 2 would appear to settle this issue. While it is not entirely clear why
17
18 Meachum and Bernstein (1992) failed to observe aversive orofacial reactions to a context
19
20 without an explicitly added odor, one possible contribution to the different patterns of results
21
22 is the sensitivity of the behavioral scoring methods: Meachum and Bernstein relied on live
23
24 observation of 6 animals at a time (scoring 10s of behavior for each rat every minute across a
25
26 30min test), while we (and Limebeer et al., 2008) recorded close-up video of individual
27
28 animals for off-line scoring (including the facility for slow-motion observation).
29
30
31
32
33

34 Turning to the issue of context-blocking: As before mentioned, a number of previous
35
36 studies (including Batson & Best, 1979; Krane, 1980; Kwok & Boakes, 2012; Rodríguez et
37
38 al., 2000; Symonds & Hall, 1997; Symonds et al., 1998) have used measurements of
39
40 consumption to demonstrate that LiCl-paired contexts can interfere with learning about taste
41
42 stimuli paired with LiCl in those contexts. However, because none of these context-blocking
43
44 studies assessed orofacial reactivity, they left open the possibility that the conditioned
45
46 reduction in palatability typically observed in taste aversion might be impervious to
47
48 interference from prior context-nausea learning. Again, the current results appear to settle this
49
50 issue: In Experiment 1 saccharin-LiCl pairings given in a LiCl-paired context resulted in
51
52 fewer aversive reactions and a slower reduction in appetitive reactions to saccharin, as well as
53
54 greater subsequent consumption of saccharin, compared to controls trained in a context that
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 had not been paired with LiCl; Experiment 2 confirmed the attenuation of aversive orofacial
2
3
4 reactions and extended it to show that extinction of the context prior to saccharin
5
6 conditioning removed the effect, demonstrating that blocking depends on the strength of the
7
8 context-LiCl association. Taken together, these results indicate that all aspects of taste
9
10 aversion learning (in particular conditioned changes in taste palatability) are susceptible to
11
12 interference from non-taste contextual stimuli⁴. We have already considered a number of
13
14 demonstrations of context-blocking of consumption in flavor aversion that suggest learning
15
16 about flavor and non-flavor cues interact. In addition, the ability of environmental cues can
17
18 modulate conditioned changes in taste palatability has also been examined in other ways. For
19
20 example, Brown, Penney, Skinner, and Martin (2011) used a context discrimination task
21
22 where rats received a saccharin solution paired with LiCl injections in one context,
23
24 alternating with presentations of the saccharin followed by saline in another context. They
25
26 found that both consumption of saccharin, and orofacial responses to it, differed between the
27
28 two contexts. More recently, Sticht, Leach, Wilson, and Parker (2015), demonstrated through
29
30 a second-order conditioning procedure that flavors presented in a previously LiCl-paired
31
32 context can themselves develop the ability to elicit aversive orofacial reactions.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 ⁴ This conclusion holds regardless of whether a one- or two-dimensional interpretation of
45 orofacial reactivity responses is preferred. On a one-dimensional characterization the
46
47 conditioned change in palatability was lower in the blocking groups because saccharin moved
48 from eliciting many appetitive to few appetitive reactions, but did not elicit many aversive
49 responses (in contrast to the control groups where saccharin moved from eliciting many
50 appetitive reactions to eliciting a large number of aversive responses). On a two dimensional
51 characterization there was clear evidence of blocking of conditioned disgust from the
52
53 aversive orofacial responses, and some evidence of blocking of the reduction in positive
54 hedonic value as the rate of decrease in appetitive responses was slowed across conditioning
55 (although this was somewhat obscured by floor effects). However the affective changes
56
57 produced by taste aversion are characterized, prior context-LiCl pairings interfere with them
58 through blocking.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 While perhaps not the predominant perspective for specialists, the idea that flavor
2
3
4 aversion learning is based on highly specialized mechanisms for avoiding poisonous foods
5
6 has both a long history and remains prevalent in the more general literature (e.g., Bures,
7
8 Bermúdez-Rattoni, & Yamamoto, 1998; Buss, 2012; Domjan, 2005; Rozin & Kalat, 1971).
9
10 This view initially derived from the demonstration that when a compound of audio-visual
11
12 stimuli with a flavor predicted illness in rats, only the flavor was subsequently avoided, while
13
14 the same compound stimulus predicting footshock led to the audio-visual stimuli being
15
16 avoided (Garcia et al., 1955; Garcia & Koelling, 1966). Moreover, palatable flavors rejected
17
18 after being pairing with illness elicit aversive orofacial reactions, while palatable flavors
19
20 rejected because they predict non-illness aversive consequences such as shock do not elicit
21
22 the same aversive reactions (Pelchat, et al., 1983). If flavor-aversion is based on a unique
23
24 process, then non-flavor cues paired with nausea should not elicit the full range of
25
26 conditioned responses (in particular conditioned changes in affective responses) – but context
27
28 cues do elicit these reactions. If flavor-aversion is based on a selective process, then it should
29
30 be unaffected by interference from non-flavor cues – but context cues do block nausea-
31
32 induced reductions in taste palatability. Thus the current results confirm that a strong version
33
34 of the idea that taste aversion learning is a special process is untenable.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 That said, it is clear that there are at least some differences between flavored cues and
44
45 those from other modalities with respect to learning about nausea-producing outcomes.
46
47 Garcia’s seminal studies (e.g. Garcia et al., 1955; Garcia & Koelling, 1966) elegantly
48
49 demonstrated that it was easier to establish flavor-nausea learning than flavor-shock learning
50
51 (and the opposite was true for audio-visual stimuli). While this was taken to be a qualitative
52
53 difference between flavor and other cue modalities, the fact that we have clear evidence for
54
55 context-nausea learning questions such an interpretation. Our results are certainly consistent
56
57 with differences in the rate of acquisition between flavor and context cues – for example, a
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 comparison of the rates of acquisition of aversive orofacial reactions to the context in Figure
2
3
4 2A and to saccharin in Figures 1A and 2B suggest that a single saccharin-LiCl pairing was
5
6 sufficient to elicit some evidence of aversive reactions while at least two pairings were
7
8 needed to establish aversive responding to the context (in addition, responding to the context
9
10 on test, after 6 context-LiCl pairings, was roughly equivalent to that of saccharin after 2
11
12 saccharin-LiCl pairings – see Figures 1B and 2C). Similarly, the demonstration of context-
13
14 based second order conditioning by Sticht et al. (2015) was only apparent after 4 or 8
15
16 context-LiCl pairings and not after 2 context-LiCl pairings. Therefore, the apparent
17
18 qualitative distinction in Garcia’s classic work may simply be the product of insufficient
19
20 training. There might also be differences between modalities in response to timing
21
22 manipulations: For example flavor-shock learning can be enhanced by using a delayed
23
24 presentation of the shock, but delay has the opposite effects on audio-visual cues (Krane &
25
26 Wagner, 1975). Thus there may be a tendency to conflate differences of degree with
27
28 differences of kind.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Finally, there is evidence that nausea as an outcome results in somewhat different
36
37 response patterns than do some other types of aversive stimulation. Nausea paired cues elicit
38
39 aversive orofacial reactions, while cues paired with some other aversive outcomes appear to
40
41 be rejected without an increase in aversive reactions (Dwyer, Boakes, & Hayward, 2008;
42
43 Parker, 2003, 2014; Parker, Limebeer, & Rana, 2009; but see also Lin et al. 2014; 2016 for
44
45 analysis of the fact that many different aversive outcomes produce a reduction in appetitive
46
47 orofacial responses and lick cluster size). Because these studies are typically conducted with
48
49 flavor stimuli, it is possible that the response properties elicited by nausea-producing agents
50
51 are attributed to flavor-nausea learning rather than to nausea itself.
52
53
54
55

56
57 Regardless of the reasons why the idea persists in the general literature that flavor
58
59 aversion learning is based on highly selective cognitive processes, there is a breadth of
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 evidence inconsistent with this view. In demonstrating that conditioned aversive orofacial
2
3 responses can be elicited by context cues and are not unique to flavors, and that context cues
4
5 paired with nausea will attenuate through blocking the reduction in palatability of a nausea-
6
7 paired taste, the current results exemplify and extend this evidence. Thus, our results are
8
9 consistent with the operation of general associative mechanisms and the special properties of
10
11 nausea itself rather than a selective mechanism for avoiding food poisoning: contextual, non-
12
13 flavor, cues paired with LiCl appear to acquire the same conditioned aversive properties as do
14
15 LiCl-paired flavors.
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

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

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by grants from the Ministry of Science and Innovation of Spain (Grant No. MICINN-PSI-2012-34743) to M.L., the Regional Government of Asturias to P.G. (Grant No. FICYT-BP10-016), and by a Leverhulme Trust research grant to D.M.D (RPG-2014-342). The authors would like to thank John Pearce for his comments during drafting of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest, financial or otherwise, related to this work.

References

- 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
- Arthurs, J., Lin, J.-Y., Amodeo, L. R., & Reilly, S. (2012). Reduced palatability in drug-induced taste aversion: II. Aversive and rewarding unconditioned stimuli. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, *126*(3), 433-444. doi:10.1037/a0027676
- Baird, J. P., St. John, S. J., & Nguyen, E. A. N. (2005). Temporal and qualitative dynamics of conditioned taste aversion processing: Combined generalization testing and licking microstructure analysis. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, *119*(4), 983-1003. doi:10.1037/0735-7044.119.4.983
- Batson, J.D. & Best, P.J. (1979). Drug-preexposure effects in flavor-aversion learning: Associative interference by conditioned environmental stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes*, *5*, 273-283. doi: 10.1037/0097-7403.5.3.273
- Berridge, K. C. (2000). Measuring hedonic impact in animals and infants: microstructure of affective taste reactivity patterns. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *24*(2), 173-198.
- Berridge, K. C., & Grill, H. J. (1983). Alternating ingestive and aversive consummatory responses suggest a two-dimensional analysis of palatability in rats. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, *97*(4), 563-573. doi:10.1037/0735-7044.97.4.563
- Berridge, K. C., & Grill, H. J. (1984). Isohedonic tastes support a two-dimensional hypothesis of palatability. *Appetite*, *5*(3), 221-231.
- Best, M.R., Brown, E.R., & Sowell, M.K. (1984). Taste-mediated potentiation of noningestional stimuli in rats. *Learning and Motivation*, *15*, 244-258. doi: 10.1016/0023-9690(84)90021-3
- Blaisdell, A. P., Gunther, L. M., & Miller, R. R. (1999). Recovery from blocking achieved by extinguishing the blocking CS. *Animal Learning & Behavior*, *27*, 63-76.

- 1
2
3
4 Boakes, R.A., Westbrook, R.F., & Barnes, B.W. (1992). Potentiation by a taste of toxicosis-
5 based context conditioning: Effects of varying the test fluid. *Quarterly Journal of*
6 *Experimental Psychology*, 45B, 303-325. doi: 10.1037/0097-7403.23.1.56
7
8
9
10
11 Boakes, R.A., Westbrook, R.F., Elliott, M., & Swinbourne, A.L. (1997). Context dependency
12 of conditioned aversions to water and sweet tastes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
13 *Animal Behavior Processes*, 23(1), 56-67. doi: 10.1037/0097-7403.23.1.56
14
15
16
17
18 Breslin, P. A. S., Grill, H. J., & Spector, A. C. (1992). A quantitative comparison of taste
19 reactivity behaviors to sucrose before and after lithium chloride pairings: a unidimensional
20 account of palatability. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 106(5), 820-836.
21
22
23
24
25
26 Brown, A.R., Penney, A.M., Skinner, D.M., & Martin, G.M. (2011). Aversive, appetitive and
27 flavour avoidance responses in the presence of contextual cues. *Learning & Behavior*, 39,
28 95-103. doi: 10.3758/s13420-010-0008-x
29
30
31
32
33 Bures, J., Bermudez-Rattoni, F., & Yamamoto, T. (1998). Conditioned taste aversion.
34 Memory of a special kind. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
35
36
37
38 Buss, D. M. (2012). *Evolutionary psychology: The new science of the mind* (4th ed.). Boston:
39 Allyn & Bacon.
40
41
42
43 Cumming, G. (2013). Exploratory Software for Confidence Intervals - ESCI. Retrieved from
44 www.thenewstatistics.com.
45
46
47
48 Davis, J. D. (1989). The microstructure of ingestive behavior. *Annals of the New York*
49 *Academy of Sciences*, 575(1), 106-121.
50
51
52
53 Domjan, M. (1980). Ingestional aversion learning: Unique and general processes. *Advances*
54 *in the study of behavior*, 11, 275-336.
55
56
57
58 Domjan, M. (2005). Pavlovian conditioning: A functional perspective. *Annual Review of*
59 *Psychology*, 56, 179-206. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141409
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Dwyer, D.M. (2012). Licking and liking: The assessment of hedonic responses in rodents.

2
3
4 *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 65, 371-394. doi:
5
6 10.1080/17470218.2011.652969

7
8 Dwyer, D. M., Boakes, R. A., & Hayward, A. J. (2008). Reduced palatability in lithium-and
9
10 activity-based, but not in amphetamine-based, taste aversion learning. *Behavioral*
11
12 *Neuroscience*, 122(5), 1051. doi: 10.1037/a0012703
13

14
15 Dwyer, D.M., Gasalla, P. & López M. (2013). Nonreinforced flavor exposure attenuates the
16
17 effects of conditioned taste aversion on both flavor consumption and cue palatability.
18

19
20
21 *Learning & Behavior*, 41, 390-401. doi: 10.3758/s13420-013-0114-x
22

23 Garcia, J., Hankins, W. G., & Rusiniak, K. W. (1974). Behavioral regulation of the milieu
24
25 interne in man and rat. *Science*, 185(4154), 824-831.
26

27
28 Garcia, J., Kimmeldorf, D.J., Koelling, R.A. (1955). Conditioned aversion to saccharin
29
30 resulting from exposure to gamma radiation. *Science*, 122, 157-158.
31

32
33 Garcia, J. & Koelling, R.A. (1966) Relation of cue to consequence in avoidance learning,
34
35 *Psychonomic Science* 4, 123-124.
36

37
38 Garcia, J., & Koelling, R. A. (1967). A comparison of aversions induced by X rays, toxins,
39
40 and drugs in the rat. *Radiation Research Supplement*, 7, 439-450.
41

42
43 Gasalla, P., Begega, A., Soto, A., Dwyer, D. M., & López, M. (2016). Functional brain
44
45 networks underlying latent inhibition of conditioned disgust in rats. *Behavioural Brain*
46
47 *Research* , 315, 36-44. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2016.07.051
48

49
50 Grill, H.C. & Norgren, R. (1978). The taste reactivity test: I. Mimetic responses to gustatory
51
52 stimuli in neurologically normal rats. *Brain Research*, 143, 263-279. doi: 10.1016/0006-

53
54
55 8993(73)90568-1
56

57 Iguchi, Y., Fukumoto, K., Sawa, K., & Ishii, K. (2014). Effects of extended context

58
59
60 discrimination training and context extinction on transfer of context dependency of
61
62
63
64
65