

What has sex got to do with it? Commentary on a BJP themed issue about sex differences in pharmacology research.

Andrea Gogos^{1,2}, Christopher Langmead³, Jennifer C Sullivan⁴, Andrew J Lawrence^{1,2}

1 Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health, Parkville, VIC, Australia;

2 Florey Department of Neuroscience and Mental Health, University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia;

3 Monash Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Parkville, VIC, Australia;

4 Department of Physiology, Medical College of Georgia at Augusta University, Augusta, GA, USA.

There still exists a sex bias in preclinical research where male subjects are primarily used. In this themed issue of the British Journal of Pharmacology, we discuss why this problem exists and how it might contribute to translation and reproducibility issues in research. The articles herein highlight sex differences in psychiatric disorders, addiction, dementias, metabolic diseases and cardiovascular risk. The role of sex hormones, and inflammatory processes as mediators of the observed sex differences is discussed. Given the variety of disorders highlighted in this issue that show sex differences, these articles underscore the importance of examining both sexes in research.

In 2014 the National Institutes of Health in the US released policies stating that for preclinical research to be funded, that sex as a biological variable must be considered and single sex studies must be justified (Clayton and Collins 2014). Similar policies are now being introduced by funding bodies around the world. The repercussions of a history of selectively studying males is not only the lack of knowledge, but also the potential for harm when attempting to treat females with drugs developed and tested only in males. It has been acknowledged that some of the issues with translation and reproducibility that have plagued preclinical research may be driven by the inadequate inclusion of females or inadequate analysis of data to allow for sex-specific conclusions. Astonishingly, even when the disease of interest is a female-prevalent disorder, a male bias exists. Only 56% of the studies researching female-prevalent disorders reported which sex was used, and of these

only 12% included female animals or both sexes (Voop et al 2014). This problem is

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: [10.1111/bph.14819](https://doi.org/10.1111/bph.14819)

emphasised in the review by Kokras et al (2019) in this issue. Here, they describe how hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis-based compounds that have potential as new therapeutic targets for depression, have not translated successfully. Depression is twice as likely to occur in women, compared to men; Kokras et al (2019) propose that sex differences in the function of various HPA axis elements may well contribute to the failure of novel HPA axis-based drugs in clinical trials.

In a large study that consolidates the importance of sex, the International Mouse Phenotyping Consortium examined ten institutes, fourteen thousand wildtype and over forty thousand mutant mice for 234 traits. They found that sex was often a significant source of variation and a modifier of treatment effects (Karp et al., 2017). In this issue, Karp and Reavey (2019) consider why the male bias exists and highlight reasons to include females in biomedical research. Notably, they provide a solution for changing the current standard practice of sex bias in preclinical research and the resistance to change. They suggest using organisational change theory as a tool to shape strategies needed at an individual and institute level to change the *status quo* and create a scientific environment that automatically implements sex sensitive approaches (Karp and Reavey, 2019). Encouragingly, since the introduction of policies to promote the consideration and inclusion of both sexes in preclinical research, a plethora of papers, including original research and reviews, have been published highlighting significant sex differences. In this issue we provide an up-to-date account on how sex influences disease processes, response to therapeutics and therefore drug development.

Sex differences have been observed in many disorders, from psychiatric disorders including schizophrenia and anxiety, through to substance abuse, dementias and even metabolic disorders such as cardiovascular disease and obesity, highlighting the need to consider sex in all realms of preclinical research. In this issue, Gogos and colleagues (2019) describe the sex differences in prevalence, onset, symptom profiles and disease outcome that are evident in three psychiatric disorders: schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and post-traumatic stress disorder. Likely candidates to explain these sex differences are gonadal hormones. The review by Gogos et al (2019) details the clinical evidence that estradiol and progesterone are dysregulated in females with these psychiatric disorders and conclude that low levels of estradiol may increase the risk of disease development and worsen

symptom severity. Interestingly, original research by Yoest et al (2019) provides evidence that estradiol acutely and rapidly regulates dopamine release in females and dopamine reuptake in males in the nucleus accumbens shell. Post-traumatic stress disorder is a female-prevalent disorder characterised by impaired fear inhibition. Using mouse models of fear inhibition, Clark et al (2019) provide evidence that sex differences influence processing of fear, but not safety-based behaviour in C57Bl/6J mice. Female mice exhibited decreased fear recall following conditioning but slower fear extinction, whereas the acquisition and recall of safety were not overtly influenced by sex (Clark et al, 2019).

Addiction vulnerability involves complex gene \times environment interactions leading to a pathological response to drugs. Identification of the genes mediating these interactions is an important step in understanding the underlying neurobiology and are potential targets for pharmacotherapy. Yet, rarely have such analyses examined sex-specific influences. Bagley et al (2019) demonstrated that sex was a significant factor that mediates the effects of early life stress on cocaine responsiveness.

In this issue, Hornarpisheh and McCullough (2019) present a review on sex differences in neurodegenerative and neurovascular disease (Alzheimer's disease, cerebral amyloid angiopathy, and stroke). They suggest that sex differences in brain structure, molecular and genetic markers, and cumulative estrogen exposure are key risk factors for Alzheimer's disease, while sex differences in stroke may be driven by sex hormones, or differences in microglial function and in the immunoregulatory role of microRNAs. They also outline sex differences in the response to various approved pharmacological therapies for these dementias (Hornarpisheh and McCullough, 2019).

As discussed in this issue, sex differences are observed in disorders beyond the brain. Henstridge et al (2019) review the literature on sex differences in metabolic disease and how this may be mediated by inflammatory pathways. Men have a higher risk of metabolic diseases, such as diabetes, compared to pre-menopausal women. This review outlines how estradiol and sex-specific behaviours play a role in the observed sex differences in immune function, metabolic syndrome, various tissues relevant to inflammatory-related metabolic syndrome, and several pro- and anti-inflammatory cytokines (Henstridge et al, 2019). Arterial stiffness is an independent predictor of cardiovascular disease risk. The review by DuPont et al (2019) details evidence that there are sex differences in the time course of

aging-related arterial stiffness and the associated cardiovascular disease risk which increases disproportionately in post-menopausal women. The authors focus on sex differences in vascular stiffness induced by aging, obesity, hypertension and sex-specific risk factors, as well as the impact of hormonal status, diet and exercise on vascular stiffness (DuPont et al, 2019). The review by Taylor et al (2019) examines sex differences in high-fat diet- and obesity-induced increases in blood pressure and vascular dysfunction, with a particular focus on the role of the immune system and inflammatory processes. They conclude that women have higher rates of obesity and are more susceptible to hypertension and vascular dysfunction due to a number of different factors, including dysregulation in the immune cell response and cytokine/adipokine profiles to promote inflammation (Taylor et al, 2019). Given the variety of mediators of metabolic disorders and vascular dysfunction that show sex differences, these reviews underscore the importance of examining both sexes in such studies.

In conclusion, the literature in this issue suggests that women may be more likely than men to suffer from certain diseases, depending on their hormonal (menopausal) status; yet, females remain understudied. Further, the mechanisms underlying these disorders are unclear. Therefore, it is imperative that researchers do not exclude 50% of the population by selecting to examine only males. Repeatedly, the take-home message from the articles in this issue is that studying both males and females is necessary in all research, including cells, animals and humans, that “the default position should be to automatically study both sexes and account for sex as a source of variation” (Karp and Reavey, 2019). Future studies require a more considered approach in regard to the mechanism(s) underlying the: i) sex difference, be it the presence of certain gonadal hormones, ii) sex chromosomes, iii) sex-specific behaviours. As targeted, personalised medicine approaches should increasingly produce effective treatments for patients, developing treatments based on sex is a goal that is in reach.

References

Bagley JR, Szumlinski KK, Kippin TE (2019). Discovery of early life stress interacting and sex-specific quantitative trait loci impacting cocaine responsiveness. *Br J Pharmacol*

Clark JW, Drummond SPA, Hoyer D, Jacobson L (2019). Sex differences in mouse models of fear inhibition: fear extinction, safety learning, and fear-safety discrimination. *Br J Pharmacol*

Clayton JA, Collins FS (2014). Policy: NIH to balance sex in cell and animal studies. *Nature* 509: 282–283.

DuPont JJ, Kenney RM, Patel AR, Jaffe IZ (2019). Sex differences in mechanisms of arterial stiffness. *Br J Pharmacol*

Gogos A, Ney L, Seymour N, Van Rheenen T, Felmingham K (2019). Sex differences in schizophrenia, bipolar disorder and PTSD: Are gonadal hormones the link? *Br J Pharmacol*

Henstridge DC, Abildgaard J, Lindegaard B, Febbraio MA (2019). Metabolic control and sex: A focus on inflammatory-linked mediators. *Br J Pharmacol*

Hornarpisheh P and McCullough LD (2019). Sex as a biological variable in pathology and pharmacology of Neurodegenerative and Neurovascular Disease. *Br J Pharmacol*

Karp NA, Mason J, Beaudet AL, Benjamini Y, Bower L, Braun RE, et al. (2017). Prevalence of sexual dimorphism in mammalian phenotypic traits. *Nat Commun* 8: 15475.

Karp NA and Reavey N (2019). Sex bias in preclinical research and an exploration of how to change the status quo. *Br J Pharmacol*

Kokras N, Hodes GE, Bangasser DA, Dalla C (2019). Sex differences in the HPA axis: an obstacle to antidepressant drug development? *Br J Pharmacol*

Taylor LE, Ramirez LA, Sullivan JC (2019). Tipping the Scales: Are Females More at Risk for Obesity and High Fat Diet-Induced Hypertension and Vascular Dysfunction? *Br J Pharmacol*

Yoest K, Cummings J, Becker J (2019). Estradiol influences on dopamine release from the nucleus accumbens shell: Sex differences and the role of selective estradiol receptor subtypes. *Br J Pharmacol*

Comment [AL1]: Production note – please insert vol/page nos etc as appropriate

Yoon DY, Mansukhani NA, Stubbs VC, Helenowski IB, Woodruff TK, & Kibbe MR (2014). Sex bias exists in basic science and translational surgical research. *Surgery* 156: 508-516.