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Background. Lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) is a potent serotonergic hallucinogen or psychedelic that modulates consciousness in a marked and novel way. This study sought to examine the acute and mid-term psychological effects of LSD in a controlled study.

Method. A total of 20 healthy volunteers participated in this within-subjects study. Participants received LSD (75 µg, intravenously) on one occasion and placebo (saline, intravenously) on another, in a balanced order, with at least 2 weeks separating sessions. Acute subjective effects were measured using the Altered States of Consciousness questionnaire and the Psychotomimetic States Inventory (PSI). A measure of optimism (the Revised Life Orientation Test), the Revised NEO Personality Inventory, and the Peter’s Delusions Inventory were issued at baseline and 2 weeks after each session.

Results. LSD produced robust psychological effects; including heightened mood but also high scores on the PSI, an index of psychosis-like symptoms. Increased optimism and trait openness were observed 2 weeks after LSD (and not placebo) and there were no changes in delusional thinking.

Conclusions. The present findings reinforce the view that psychedelics elicit psychosis-like symptoms acutely yet improve psychological wellbeing in the mid to long term. It is proposed that acute alterations in mood are secondary to a more fundamental modulation in the quality of cognition, and that increased cognitive flexibility subsequent to serotonin 2A receptor (5-HT2AR) stimulation promotes emotional lability during intoxication and leaves a residue of ‘loosened cognition’ in the mid to long term that is conducive to improved psychological wellbeing.
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Introduction

Lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) is a potent serotonergic hallucinogen or ‘psychedelic’ that alters consciousness in a marked and unusual way. The drug was first intentionally consumed by the Swiss chemist Albert Hofmann in 1943 in a self-experiment in which he ingested 250 µg (a high dose) in his laboratory before travelling home. In a detailed report of his experience, written a few days later, Hofmann describes an initially unpleasant experience, characterized by altered perception, fear and paranoia: his next-door neighbour transformed into a ‘malevolent, insidious witch with a coloured mask’, he sensed a ‘dissolution of [his] ego’ and was ‘seized by a dreadful fear of going insane’ (Hofmann, 1980).

From this account, it would be reasonable to suspect that Dr Hofmann was negatively affected by this experience but his description of his mental state the next day suggests otherwise: ‘I then slept, to awake the next morning with a clear head... A sensation of wellbeing and renewed life flowed through me. Breakfast tasted delicious and gave me extraordinary pleasure. When I later walked out into the garden, in which the sun shone now after a spring rain, everything glistened and sparkled in a fresh light. The world was as if newly created.’(Hofmann, 1980)

When LSD was first distributed by Sandoz pharmaceuticals in 1948, product guidelines stipulated two main applications: (1) analytical psychotherapy and (2) experimental studies on psychoses. The rationale for the former was that LSD could ‘elicit [the] release of repressed material and provide mental relaxation for anxiety and obsessional neuroses’, and, for the
latter, that it could model aspects of psychosis and facilitate an understanding of its nature and pathogenesis (Hofmann, 1980). These two properties formed the basis of a large number of research projects with LSD in the 1950s and 1960s. However, the apparent paradox by which the same compound can be both a model of, and yet a treatment for, psychopathology has never been properly addressed.

In the early years of research with LSD, its remarkable potency (LSD is psychoactive in doses of 25 µg or lower; Hintzen & Passie, 2010) led psychiatrists to speculate about the existence of an endogenous LSD-like ‘schizotoxin’ in the brains of patients with schizophrenia (Osmond & Smythies, 1952). In subsequent years, however, focus shifted more onto therapeutic applications, such as treating alcohol dependence, mood disorders and anxiety related to dying. Human research with LSD was brought to a halt in the late 1960s due to political pressure, motivated in part by reports of adverse psychological reactions among people using the drug improperly. Ironically, however, at the same time, reports of therapeutic success in the treatment of various psychiatric disorders were beginning to amount (Grinspoon & Bakalar, 1979). In the last 18 months, five new reports on clinical research with LSD have appeared in the scientific press (Carhart-Harris et al. 2014a; Gasser et al. 2014; Schmid et al. 2014; Dolder et al. 2015; Kaelen et al. 2015), one of which focused on the drug’s therapeutic effects (Gasser et al. 2014) and, another, its psychotomimetic effects (Schmid et al. 2014).

Clinical research with psychedelics is currently undergoing a major revival and modern studies are documenting the same paradoxical properties that were historically described with LSD. For example, in a controlled study in healthy volunteers, high-dose psilocybin produced strong or extreme fear in 30% of healthy volunteers and yet 80% reported improvements in wellbeing after the experience, with none reporting any decreases (Griffiths et al. 2006). Remarkably, in follow-up of the same sample, 65% reported improved wellbeing 14 months after their (single) psilocybin experience (Griffiths et al. 2008) and significant increases in the personality trait openness were also evident (MacLean et al. 2011). These findings in healthy volunteers are supplemented by an increasing number of patient studies. Clinical improvements have been observed with psilocybin-assisted psychotherapy for the treatment of tobacco (Johnson et al. 2014) and alcohol addiction (Bogenschutz et al. 2015), obsessive–compulsive disorder (Moreno et al. 2006) and anxiety related to dying (Grob et al. 2011). Many of these reports mention some psychological discomfort during the acute experience; yet, the therapeutic benefits have been impressive and enduring.

Case reports of persistent psychological problems apparently precipitated by a psychedelic have considerable potential to excite alarm (Reich & Hepps, 1972). However, such cases are rare and largely restricted to recreational use. Evidence does not support the view that psychedelics are harmful to mental health (Hendricks et al. 2015). Indeed, to the contrary, two recent population studies found decreased rates of suicidality and psychological distress among persons reporting previous use of psychedelics (Hendricks et al. 2015) and no evidence of any increased rates of mental health problems (Krebs & Johansen, 2013). Similarly, large meta-analyses of controlled research have found that cases of mental health complications following exposure to a psychedelic are extremely rare (i.e. <0.1%), even in vulnerable populations (i.e. <0.2%), and are rarer still if volunteers are properly screened (Cohen & Ditman, 1962; Studerus et al. 2011).

The main aim of the present study was to investigate the acute and ‘mid-term’ (i.e. 2 weeks after the acute experience) psychological effects of LSD in a placebo-controlled study in healthy volunteers. Validated measures of personality, optimism and psychotic symptoms were collected at baseline and 2 weeks post-LSD/placebo and measures of mood, cognition and psychotomimetic states were collected at the end of each dosing day. It was predicted that LSD would induce emotional lability and psychosis-like symptoms acutely but increase psychological wellbeing and openness in the longer term.

Method

Experimental design

This was a placebo-controlled, within-subjects/cross-over study, with a balanced-order design. A total of 20 healthy volunteers were recruited to the study via word of mouth. The study received a favourable opinion from NRES Committee London – West London and was conducted in accordance with Good Clinical Practice guidelines, NHS Research Governance Framework and complied with the ethical standards of the declaration of Helsinki (1975, revised 2008). Imperial College London sponsored the research and a Home Office license was obtained for research with schedule one drugs. All volunteers were sent a study information sheet and asked to read it before their screening visit.

Volunteers made three study visits: screening, dosing session 1 and dosing session 2. Dosing sessions were separated by at least 2 weeks in every case and the order of receipt of LSD was balanced, i.e. half of the volunteers received LSD in dosing session 1 and
half in dosing session 2. Volunteers were blind to the
dosing order but the research team was not. Dosing
order was determined sequentially so that all odd-
numbered volunteers (i.e. S1 was the first volunteer
recruited and S20 was the last) received LSD in dosing
session 1, whereas all even-numbered volunteers
received it in dosing session 2. Subjective ratings
were completed electronically and remotely soon
after screening (baseline) and 2 weeks after a dosing
session and sent to the researchers via email.
Volunteers were instructed to complete the question-
naires in a quiet space without rushing. Two question-
naires pertaining to the acute drug experience were
completed electronically within the research centre at
the close of dosing days.

**Screening**

Prior to study enrolment, volunteers attended a screen-
ing visit at the Imperial Clinical Research Facility
(ICRF) at the Hammersmith Hospital in West
London. The study design, procedures and psycho-
logical effects of LSD were explained and signed
informed consent taken. Key exclusion criteria were:
<21 years of age, personal history of diagnosed psychi-
atric illness, immediate family history of a psychotic
disorder, an absence of previous experience with a
classic psychedelic drug (e.g. LSD, mescaline, psilocy-
bin/magic mushrooms or dimethyltryptamine/ayahu-
sasca), pregnancy, problematic alcohol use (assessed
via psychiatric interview and reported weekly units),
or a medically significant condition rendering the vol-
unteer unsuitable for the study. The decision to recruit
only individuals with prior experience with psychede-
lics was motivated by safety considerations, i.e. to min-
imize the risk of an adverse response to the drug.
Screening involved routine blood tests, electrocardio-
gram, heart rate, blood pressure and a brief neurolog-
al examination. All enrolled participants were deemed
physically and mentally healthy by the study psychi-
atrist, and none had histories of drug or alcohol de-
pendence or diagnosed psychiatric disorder. Volunteers
were asked to remain abstinent from alco-
hol the evening before a dosing day and to refrain
from using other recreational drugs for the duration
of the study.

**Study procedures**

Participants were asked to arrive at the study centre
(Cardiff University’s Brain Research Imaging Centre,
CUBRIC) at a specific time at or before 09.00 hours.
A urine test for drugs of abuse and pregnancy
(where relevant) was carried out. Participants were
re-briefed about the procedures for the day and any re-
cent drug and alcohol use was documented. The study
physician inserted a cannula into a vein in the antecu-
bital fossa in preparation for intravenous (i.v.) dosing
and the volunteer was encouraged to relax prior to
drug/placebo administration. The dose of LSD was
75 µg (by mouth, p.o.) in 10 ml saline. Previous re-
search has found this dose to produce robust psycho-
logical effects that are generally well tolerated
(Carhart-Harris et al. 2014). Placebo was 10 ml saline
(i.v.). Both solutions were infused over 2 min.

After dosing, volunteers completed a functional neu-
roimaging protocol. This aspect of the study will be
covered in detail in separate publications. In brief, sub-
jects spent a period habituating to a scanner environ-
ment in a mock magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)
scanner before entering a real MRI scanner (1 h post-
dosing). The MRI scanning session lasted for 1 h after
which a structured interview was performed and
some ratings completed. Participants entered a magne-
toencephalography (MEG) scanner approximately
3.5 h post-dosing. MEG scanning lasted for just over
1 h. Participants were then interviewed and completed
a battery of cognitive and behavioural tests (these will
be detailed in a separate publication). Tasks were com-
pleted 6–7 h post-dosing.

The subjective effects of LSD were detected approxi-
mately 10 min post-infusion, peaked approximately
120 min post-infusion, and subsided to a negligible
level approximately 7–8 h post-infusion. Participants
were discharged by the study physician when they
were considered to be functioning normally. Volunteers
were either picked up by a friend or part-
ner, ordered a taxi, or accompanied home by the re-
search team as far as was feasible. Volunteers were
asked to contact a researcher via telephone or text mes-
sage once they had arrived home safely. A study
psychiatrist was present for the duration of each dos-
ing session and one researcher was allocated to each
participant to assist them throughout the day. For
each participant, the same researcher was present for
both dosing days.

**Main outcomes and measures**

**Acute outcomes**

Participants completed two questionnaires at the end
of each study day before being discharged by the
study physician. These questionnaires enquired about
different aspects of the subjective experience. The
first was the Altered States of Consciousness question-
naire (ASC), a well validated and widely used tool for
defining different altered states of consciousness that
has been usefully revised in recent years (Studerus
et al. 2010) and the second was the Psychotomimetic
States Inventory (PSI), a tool developed to probe the
psychotomimetic effects of different drugs (Mason
Participants were asked to complete the questionnaires with reference to the peak subjective effects of LSD (i.e. when the effects were most intense) or with reference to how they generally felt throughout the day – e.g. if they did not notice any effects.

**Mid-term outcomes**

Mid-term outcomes were completed 2 weeks after each dosing session (as well as at baseline) and these included: the Revised Life Orientation Test (LOT-R; Glaesmer et al. 2012), the revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1995) and Peters’ Delusions Inventory (PDI; Peters et al. 1999). The LOT-R was chosen as it is a well-validated measure of trait or dispositional optimism (Scheier et al. 1994), the NEO PI-R was chosen as it is well-validated and previous research has shown its sensitivity to the enduring effects of psychedelics (MacLean et al. 2011), and the PDI was chosen as it is a well-validated measure of delusional thinking that has shown to be sensitive to psychotic-like symptoms in the general population (Peters et al. 1999).

**Additional measures**

Additional questionnaires completed at baseline included the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI; Beck et al. 1961), the Quick Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology (QIDS; Rush et al. 2003), the State–Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; Hodges & Spielberger, 1969), the Ruminative Response Scale (RRS; Roelofs et al. 2006), the Dysfunctional Attitudes Scale (DAS; Floyd et al. 2004) and the modified version of the Tellegen Absorption Scale (MODTAS; Tellegen & Atkinson, 1974).

**Data analysis**

Repeated-measures analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to test between-condition differences in the ASC, PSI and PDI, which have multiple factors. However, since a strong prior hypothesis was held that the personality trait ‘openness’ would be significantly increased post-LSD (MacLean et al. 2011), this was analysed using a paired t test rather than an ANOVA. The remaining four personality dimensions in the NEO PI-R were analysed using paired t tests with Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. A paired t test was used to analyse changes in the LOT-R, as this has only one dimension. To test for order confounds in relation to primary outcomes, order was included as a variable in significant tests, and to further test for the influence of placebo/participation, baseline versus 2 weeks post-placebo differences in outcomes were tested for those who received placebo in their first dosing session (potential carry-over effects of LSD precludes the inclusion of those who received placebo in their second dosing session). Effect sizes (Cohen’s d) were calculated for primary outcomes. For correlational analyses, Pearson product-moment coefficients were calculated and two-tailed hypotheses tested. The problem of multiple comparisons was accounted for by Bonferroni correction.

**Results**

**Participants**

A total of 20 healthy volunteers participated in the study (four females, mean age = 30.9, s.d. = 7.8, range = 22–47 years). All had at least one previous experience with a classic psychedelic drug (mean estimated LSD uses = 14, s.d. = 17.8, range = 0–70) but not within 14 days of the first dosing session (mean last use of LSD = 899.3, s.d. = 1363, range = 14–5400 days). Self-estimates of other drug use were as follows: mean weekly alcohol units = 10.3 (s.d. = 9); mean number of daily cigarettes = 0.3 (s.d. = 1.1, range = 0–5); mean number of cannabis uses = 705 (s.d. = 639, range = 30–2000); mean number of 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA) uses = 27 (s.d. = 24, range = 2–100); mean number of psilocybin/magic mushroom uses = 9.4 (s.d. = 7.8, range = 1–35); mean number of ketamine uses = 3.6 (s.d. = 5, range = 0–20); mean number of cocaine uses = 9.6 (s.d. = 9.4, range = 0–30). Other mean baseline scores were as follows: BDI = 0.6 (s.d. = 0.9, range = 0–3); QIDS = 4.2 (s.d. = 3.1, range = 0–10); DAS = 105.5 (s.d. = 23, range = 55–146); RRS = 35.4 (s.d. = 7.9, range = 24–52); STAI = 29.2 (s.d. = 4.6, range = 20–38); MODTAS = 58.3 (s.d. = 19.8, range = 19–89).

**Acute subjective effects of LSD**

A repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of drug (F_{1,19} = 82.6, p < 0.001) and a significant drug × ASC interaction (F_{1,19} = 10.3, p < 0.001). Post-hoc t tests revealed that all 11 dimensions or factors of the ASC were rated significantly higher after LSD than placebo (p < 0.01). Mean scores for each factor are displayed in the radar chart in Fig. 1. It is notable that although the LSD experience was dominated by changes in visual perception (i.e. elementary imagery, complex imagery and audio-visual synaesthesia), the factor ‘blissful state’ was markedly elevated under the drug (t_{0.37} = 0.28, Cohen’s d = 1.65). Although still significantly increased, the factor ‘anxiety’ was the least elevated under LSD (t_{0.15} = 0.2, Cohen’s d = 1.03). These results indicate a marked increase in emotional arousal and lability under LSD but with a distinct bias towards positive affect. Reinforcing this, a t test revealed that increases in
‘blissful state’ under LSD were significantly greater than increases in ‘anxiety’ \( t = -3.7, \) degrees of freedom (df) = 19, \( p < 0.01, \) Cohen’s \( d = 0.91 \).

A repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of condition on the PSI (\( F_{1,19} = 65.19, \) \( p < 0.001 \)) and a significant condition × PSI interaction (\( F_{5,95} = 35.2, \) \( p < 0.001 \)). Mean scores for each factor of the PSI are shown in the bar chart in Fig. 2.

Post-hoc \( t \) tests revealed that all factors, except ‘anhedonia’, were significantly increased under the drug (\( p < 0.01 \)). The most marked effect was on ‘cognitive disorganization’ (Cohen’s \( d = 2.37 \)) which is related to thought disorder in psychosis, but other highly characteristic aspects of psychosis such as ‘delusional thinking’ (Cohen’s \( d = 1.63 \)) and ‘paranoia’ (Cohen’s \( d = 0.83 \)) were also markedly increased under the drug.

**Mid-term subjective effects of LSD**

Optimism was significantly increased 2 weeks after LSD (\( t = 2.91, \) df = 18, \( p = 0.005, \) Cohen’s \( d = 0.56 \)), as was trait openness (\( t = 1.95, \) df = 19, \( p = 0.03, \) Cohen’s \( d = 0.16 \)) (Fig. 3), and there were no such changes in optimism or personality post-placebo. In exploratory \( t \) tests, there was a trend towards an increase in trait agreeableness post-LSD (\( t = 2.2, \) df = 19, \( p = 0.038, \) Cohen’s \( d = 0.21 \)); however, this did not survive correction for multiple comparisons [corrected \( p = 0.15 \)].

Repeated-measures ANOVA found no change in delusional thinking (PDI scores) 2 weeks after LSD (\( p > 0.05 \)). In fact, exploratory \( t \) tests suggested a trend towards less distress (\( t = 1.92, \) df = 19, \( p = 0.068 \)) and preoccupation with ‘delusional thoughts’ (\( t = 1.92, \) df = 19, \( p = 0.07 \)) but these trends were not significant, even before correction for multiple comparisons. There were no changes in PDI scores post-placebo.

**Predictors of the mid-term effects of LSD**

Regarding baseline predictors of the mid-term effects of LSD, focus was placed on personality (as measured by the NEO PI-R), depression (measured by the QIDS) and anxiety (measured by the STAI). A negative correlation was found between baseline agreeableness and increases in optimism post-LSD (\( r = -0.56, \) \( r^2 = 0.31, \) \( p = 0.014 \)) and positive correlations were found between baseline depression (\( r = 0.53, \) \( r^2 = 0.28, \) \( p = 0.024 \)) and anxiety (\( r = 0.49, \) \( r^2 = 0.24, \) \( p = 0.04 \)) and the post-LSD increases in openness. However, none of these survived correction for multiple comparisons (revised \( p = 0.05/7 = 0.007 \)).

Regarding acute predictors of the mid-term effects of LSD, there was a negative correlation between acute anxiety (ASC) and post-LSD increases in optimism (\( r = -0.47, \) \( r^2 = 0.22, \) \( n = 19, \) \( p = 0.04 \)) and positive correlations between impaired/disorganized cognition scores on the ASC and PSI and post-LSD increases in openness (ASC: \( r = 0.44, \) \( r^2 = 0.2, \) \( n = 20, \) \( p = 0.049 \); PSI: \( r = 0.52, \) \( r^2 = 0.26, \) \( n = 20, \) \( p = 0.019 \)) but these correlations also failed to survive correction for multiple comparisons (revised \( p = 0.5/17 = 0.003 \)).

**Discussion**

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the acute and mid-term subjective effects of LSD in a controlled study in order to advance our understanding of its psychological effects. It was hypothesized that LSD would increase emotional lability and psychosis-like symptoms acutely, and increase optimism and
openness 2 weeks later, and these hypotheses were supported by the data.

Focusing first on LSD’s acute effects, scores on the PSI reinforce the view that LSD is a potent psychotomimetic. Previous studies have examined PSI scores after sleep deprivation (Petrovsky et al. 2014), dreaming (Mason & Wakerley, 2012), cannabis (Mason et al. 2008), tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) (Stokes et al. 2009) and ketamine intoxication (Mason et al. 2008). Although both dreaming and sleep deprivation elevated subscales of the PSI, only the aforementioned drugs produced appreciable psychosis-like symptoms – and still not to the same extent as LSD in the present study. For example, mean total scores on the PSI were 24 (S.D. = 10.9) post-ketamine infusion (150 mg/ml plasma), 15.9 (S.D. = 11) post-THC (10 mg, p.o.) and 33.3 (S.D. = 19.5) post-cannabis use (smoked, quantity unknown), whereas the mean total PSI score in the present study was 45.8 (S.D. = 21). To our knowledge, only cannabis in highly schizotypal individuals (Mason et al. 2009) has produced PSI scores of an equivalent magnitude to those seen here with LSD.

More generally, relatively strong subjective effects were produced by the present dose of LSD (i.e. 75 µg, i.v.) as indexed by the ASC. In previous studies, psilocybin (115–350 µg/kg, p.o.), MDMA (1.5–1.7 mg/kg, p.o.) and ketamine (6–12 µg/kg per min, i.v.) produced effects of a lower magnitude than those seen here (Studerus et al. 2010) but in a recent study with 200 µg LSD (p.o.), ASC scores were of a similar magnitude to those observed here (Schmid et al. 2014).

With the PSI results in mind, it is worth briefly discussing the relative merits of different drug models of psychosis. Ketamine is often described as an especially meritorious model of psychosis because it can induce both positive and negative symptoms (Krystal et al. 1994). However, the premise that negative symptoms can be modelled by an acute drug state is questionable (Carhart-Harris et al. 2013). For example, it has been argued that negative symptoms are non-specific for psychosis (i.e. they are also prevalent in depression; Kaiser et al. 2011; Carhart-Harris et al. 2013). Positive symptoms are specific for psychosis, but comparison studies have suggested that these are better modelled by classic psychedelics than ketamine (Gouzoulis-Mayfrank et al. 2005; Carhart-Harris et al. 2013). Others have shown that THC is a particularly potent inducer of positive psychotic symptoms (Morrison et al. 2009). Thus, future studies might compare the psychotomimetic properties of THC, ketamine and a classic psychedelic in a controlled, cross-over design to systematically assess the relative value of these different models.

Based on the PSI results, one might infer that participants’ acute LSD experiences were dominated by unpleasant psychosis-like phenomena; however, this was not the case. Some volunteers did show frank psychotic phenomena during their LSD experiences (e.g. paranoid and delusional thinking) but at the group level, positive mood was more common. For example, scores on the (positively valenced) ‘blissful experience’ dimension of the ASC were significantly higher than scores on the (negatively valenced) ‘anxiety’ dimension. Consistent with the view that LSD is more likely to produce positive than negative mood, a separate study with LSD (200 µg, p.o.) reported marked
positive mood effects, described as ‘MDMA-like’ (Schmid et al. 2014); an important caveat, however, is that both the Schmid et al. study and the present one recruited volunteers with previous experience with psychedelics. Thus, positive prior experiences and positive regard towards LSD may have biased outcomes.

The findings that optimism and openness are increased 2 weeks after LSD are consistent with previous findings (Griffiths et al. 2006, 2008; MacLean et al. 2011), suggesting that improved psychological well-being and increased openness are relatively reliable mid- to long-term effects of psychedelics. That there were no increases in psychotic symptomatology at the 2 week end point is also consistent with reports of preserved or even improved mental health among populations of people that have used psychedelic drugs (Bouso et al. 2012; Krebs & Johansen, 2013; Hendricks et al. 2015). These results are also consistent with previous findings that psychedelics can be useful in treating certain psychiatric disorders (Moreno et al. 2006; Grob et al. 2011; Gasser et al. 2014; Johnson et al. 2014; Bogenschutz et al. 2015) as well as the notion that they may have therapeutic potential in the treatment of mood disorders such as depression (Carhart-Harris et al. 2014b). High dispositional optimism is associated with a range of positive health and socio-economic outcomes (Carver & Scheier, 2014); thus, the increases in optimism observed here may be treated as further evidence of the therapeutic potential of psychedelic drugs.

A limitation of the present study was the relatively short duration of the follow-up period (i.e. 2 weeks); however, longer-term follow-up is planned and 2 weeks is still relevant when considering potential therapeutic applications (Zarate et al. 2006). Another limitation is the single-blind design; however, the classic double-blind model can feel contrived in the context of controlled studies with psychoactive compounds such as LSD, since the blind is almost universally ineffective. A single-blind design allowed us to introduce some uncertainty, however, and so was considered better than an entirely open-label design. The inclusion of an ‘active placebo’ condition might improve the ineffectiveness of the blind in studies with psychedelics; however, an inert placebo was required in the present study in order to provide a valid baseline for the neuroimaging contrasts. Related to this, a final limitation is that the LSD and placebo sessions involved MRI and MEG scans that each lasted for over 60 min. Brain imaging environments can be demanding for some individuals, particularly under the influence of psychedelics (Studerus et al. 2011). Individuals are known to be especially sensitive to the environment in which they experience the effects of a psychedelic (Johnson et al. 2008), and so the drug plus scanner combination may have contributed to the especially high PSI scores observed here with LSD.

With these caveats entered, it is important to attempt an explanation of how LSD can be both acutely psychotomimetic and yet psychologically beneficial in the mid to long term, and insights from neurobiology may be helpful in this regard. There is a consensus that serotonin 2A receptor (5-HT2AR) agonism is central to the psychopharmacology of psychedelics, e.g. affinity for the 5-HT2AR correlates strongly with their potencies (Glennon et al. 1984), and pre-treatment with a 5-HT2AR antagonist effectively abolishes the classic ‘psychedelic’ effects of psilocybin.

---

**Fig. 3. Mid-term effects of lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD).** These charts display paired data points for optimism (a) and openness (b) scores at baseline and 2 weeks after LSD for each participant. Also displayed on each chart are the mean scores (horizontal bars) and the positive standard errors of the mean (s.e.m.). Both optimism and openness were significantly increased after LSD. There was no effect of order of receipt of LSD nor were there any changes in optimism or personality 2 weeks after receipt of placebo. LOT-R, Revised Life Orientation Test; NEO PI-R, Revised NEO Personality Inventory.
The principal psychological purpose or function of the 5-HT2AR is poorly understood; however, it is known that 5-HT2AR stimulation promotes certain aspects of learning (Harvey, 2003; Harvey et al. 2004; Romano et al. 2010) and cognition (King et al. 1972; Williams et al. 2002). Specifically, 5-HT2AR stimulation enhances the flexibility of cognition (Boulougouris et al. 2008), which may be related to reports of enhanced imagination (Carhart-Harris et al. 2014a) and creative thinking (Frecska et al. 2012) with psychedelics. Interestingly, an association has been found between positive mood and flexible, creative thinking (Hirt et al. 2008; Lin et al. 2014) and this may explain why both are associated with psychedelics. Indeed, the positive mood effects of psilocybin (a direct 5-HT2AR agonist) and MDMA (a potent serotonin ‘releaser’) are significantly attenuated by pretreatment with the 5-HT2AR antagonist ketanserin (Kometer et al. 2012; Van Wel et al. 2012).

Psychedelics also transiently impair certain aspects of cognition, however, such as the ability to focus and concentrate (Umbricht et al. 2003; Vollenweider et al. 2007), which is consistent with the high ratings of impaired cognition in the present study (Figs. 1 and 2). It is also important to acknowledge that while 5-HT2AR antagonism attenuates the positive mood effects of psilocybin (and MDMA), it also attenuates the positive psychotic symptoms that can be produced by the drug (Carter et al. 2007) and 5-HT2AR agonism has been linked with anxiety-related behaviours in rodents (Weisstaub et al. 2006).

Thus, 5-HT2AR stimulation has been associated with both positive and negative facets of the acute psychedelic state (i.e. positive mood but also anxiety and psychotic symptoms), so how can we reconcile these things with each other? Is there a more fundamental action of psychedelics that can explain both effects? As reported above, 5-HT2AR stimulation has been associated with enhanced cognitive flexibility, and inspired by recent neuroimaging findings (Carhart-Harris et al. 2014b; Muthukumaraswamy et al. 2013; Petri et al. 2014; Roseman et al. 2014; Tagliazucchi et al. 2014), the psychedelic state has been characterized as an ‘entropic’ state in which the mind/brain operates outside of its normal, optimal level of order, in a realm of relative disorder (Carhart-Harris et al. 2014b). It may be that what underlies both facets of the psychedelic state and can resolve the ‘valence paradox’ therefore, is this principle of increased cognitive entropy (see Fig. 4). Accordingly, we predict that disordered or entropic cognition is a more fundamental characteristic of the psychedelic state than either positive or negative mood. This hypothesis could be tested by carrying out a principal components analysis of the ASC data;

---

**Fig. 4.** Action of psychedelics on the mind and brain: This empirically informed model illustrates the hypothesized relationship between three different neurobiological or physiological states and their psychological counterparts. Specifically, it is predicted that deficient serotonin 2A receptor (5-HT2AR) stimulation has a stultifying influence on cognition, promoting pessimism, neuroticism and rigid thinking (phase 1). Informed by neuroimaging studies with psychedelics (Carhart-Harris et al. 2014b), 5-HT2AR stimulation is associated with unconstrained brain network dynamics and the characteristic ‘entropic’ quality of cognition in the psychedelic state (phase 2). Finally, it is hypothesized that an acute ‘onslaught’ or ‘blast’ of 5-HT2AR stimulation, via the action of a psychedelic, has a residual influence on brain network dynamics and associated cognition (phase 3). 5-HT2AR stimulation is described as having a ‘loosening’ or ‘lubricating’ influence on cognition and this is hypothesized to be conducive to improved psychological wellbeing. * The long-term effects of psychedelics on brain network dynamics have yet to be formally investigated.
we would predict that valence non-specific items and particularly those related to ‘entropic cognition’ (such as loss of self/ego, loss of ego-boundaries, altered meaning and muddled thinking) would load more heavily onto the first principal component than valence-specific items (such as feeling euphoric or sad) – e.g. see Lebedev et al. (2015). Acute entropic processes may also be useful predictors of the mid/long-term effects of psychedelics, and the (trend-level) relationship between impaired/disordered cognition and subsequent increases in trait openness might be suggestive of such an association.

Before concluding, it is worth considering one final important matter. The discussion so far has focused mainly on the paradoxical acute psychological effects of psychedelics. However, as the present results have demonstrated, the acute effects of psychedelics can be quite different to their longer-term effects, and it is arguably the latter that are more clinically relevant. Previous studies have shown that trait characteristics, such as personality and outlook, can be significantly altered by psychedelics (Griffiths et al. 2008; MacLean et al. 2011). Moreover, associations have been found between certain psychological traits and the 5-HT2AR (Turecki et al. 1999; Meyer et al. 2003; Ott et al. 2005; Bhagwagar et al. 2006; Frokjaer et al. 2008). Specifically, deficient 5-HT2AR stimulation has been linked with depression-related behaviours such as suicide (Turecki et al. 1999), dysfunctional or excessively pessimistic attitudes (Meyer et al. 2003; Bhagwagar et al. 2006) and neuroticism (Frokjaer et al. 2008). In this context, increased psychological wellbeing (Griffiths et al. 2008), openness (MacLean et al. 2011), decreased suicidality (Hendricks et al. 2015) and now increased optimism after a ‘blast’ of 5-HT2AR stimulation may begin to make functional sense. We predict that deficient 5-HT2AR stimulation causes cognition to ‘stultify’, whereas 5-HT2AR stimulation loosens cognition and associated brain dynamics, serving as a metaphorical ‘lubricant’ for the mind and brain. We predict that this loosening effect persists beyond the acute intoxication phase and can potentially explain the mid- to long-term psychological effects of psychedelics. Recent reports of enduring brain changes with 5-HT2AR stimulation and psychedelic drug-use (Bouso et al. 2015), as well as speculations on the function of serotonin in the brain (Branchi, 2011), may herald the beginnings of an understanding of this important matter. We intend to detail the acute brain effects of LSD in forthcoming neuroimaging papers and to investigate the long-term psychological and brain effects of psychedelics in future studies.

In conclusion, this study sought to investigate the paradoxical psychological effects of LSD in a controlled study in healthy volunteers. LSD produced robust acute psychological effects that were characterized by psychosis-like symptoms but also positive mood. Mid-term effects included significant increases in optimism and the personality trait openness and no increases in delusional thinking. A mechanistic explanation for these findings was proposed based on the ‘entropic brain’ hypothesis (Carhart-Harris et al. 2014b).
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