Decynium-22 affects behavior in the zebrafish light/dark test
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Abstract
Decynium-22 (D-22) is an inhibitor of the uptake2 system of monoamine clearance, resulting in increased levels of dopamine and norepinephrine (NE), and serotonin (5-HT) released in the nervous system and elsewhere. Uptake1 is mediated by low-affinity, high-capacity transporters which include the NE transporter (SLC6A2, NET), and the serotonin transporter (SLC6A4, SERT) [6,7]. This SLC6A family has been implicated in the pathophysiology of mental disorders, including alterations of anxiety [8–11], and are the target for major classes of anxiolytic drugs, including tricyclic antidepressants, selective 5-HT reuptake inhibitors, and 5-HT–NE reuptake inhibitors [12]. Uptake2 is mediated by low-affinity, high-capacity transporters which include organic cation transporters (OCT1-3; SLC22A1-3) and the plasma membrane monoamine transporter (PMAT; SLC29A4) [4,5,13–15]. Evidence suggests that uptake2 plays significant roles in the regulation of monoaminergic neurotransmission and maintenance of synaptic homeostasis [2,3,7], with numerous studies suggesting that uptake2 plays significant roles in various psychological disorders, such as anxiety and depression [16–23].

Uptake2 has been described as an “extraneuronal transport system” [2,3], due to its low-affinity, high-capacity, “promiscuous” characteristic, and evidence for that includes the perisynapticlocation of transporters [1] and the fact that the uptake2 inhibitor decynium-22 does not necessarily increase basal serotonin levels, but may instead produce effects in situations in which 5-HT brain concentrations are high [24]. Uptake2 is an interesting system not only because it is best suited for extraneuronal uptake, but also because it is blocked by glucocorticoids [13,25]. Glucocorticoids have been shown to inhibit OCT3 [26], and, with low affinity, PMAT [27]. As a result, uptake2 represents an intersection in the pathophysiology of stress and anxiety, a mechanism by which circulating glucocorticoids (GCs) can rapidly increase monoamine levels in the brain [9]. Uptake2 has been shown to participate in anxiety-like behavior: SLC22A3 knockout mice show decreased anxiety-like behavior in the open field test and in the elevated plus-maze [19, but see 28]. Knockdown of SLC22A3 expression in the brains of mice decreases immobility time in the forced swim test [17], a screen for antidepressant-like effects [29]. Finally, while decynium-22 (D-22), an uptake2 inhibitor [4], had no behavioral effect by itself, co-treatment with fluvoxamine produced synergistic effects on 5-HT clearance and immobility in the forced swimming test [23].

Zebrafish (Danio rerio Hamilton 1822) have been proposed as model organisms in the study of behavioral functions and its dis-
orders [30–33]. The advantages of using this species in behavioral studies stem from its use in developmental biology (i.e., small size, fast generation times, high reproduction rates) and the availability of tools to image and manipulate its nervous system [33]. Zebrafish demonstrate a robust endocrine response to acute stressors [34–37]; importantly, simple acute stressors such as net chasing induce robust behavioral responses which are blocked by 5-HT reuptake inhibitors [38,39] and DAergic and NErgic drugs [36,37]. A few behavioral assays for anxiety-like behavior have been described for adult zebrafish, with the novel tank test (NPT) and the light/dark test (LDT) being the most widely used at the moment [40]. In particular, the LDT involves an approach–avoidance motivational conflict [41] that results in scototaxis (preference for dark environments vs brightly-lit or white environments) that is accompanied by risk assessment (brief entries in the white compartment), erratic swimming, freezing, and thigmotaxis while in the white compartment [40–42]. These variables are particularly sensitive to anxiolytic compounds [40,43], and drug effects on scototaxis are negatively correlated with drug effects on 5-HT turnover [43]. The LDT has been used to investigate the role of specific 5-HTergic mechanisms [44], but little is known about the role of uptake2 in behavior in this test.

Currently, it is unknown whether zebrafish possess a functional uptake2 system. Fourteen slc22 genes have been identified in zebrafish, and OCT3 appears absent [45,46]; oct3 shows moderate expression in the brain, suggesting a role in neurotransmitter homeostasis [45], and therefore is likely to be of behavioral relevance. Little information on zebrafish PMAT is available [47,48]; Sivasubbu et al. [49] reported a gene that is “Similar to solute carrier family 29, member 4” (deposited on ZFIN as ZDB-GENE-070112-1932 and Ensembl as ENSDARG00000059690), but expression patterns and function have not yet been described. Nonetheless, the interplay between serotonin, dopamine, and cortisol in behavioral responses to threatening and stressful stimuli in zebrafish [see 50 for a review] suggests a participation of uptake2. Here, I show that D-22 dose–dependently increases anxiety-like behavior in the zebrafish LDT. These results suggest that uptake2 is present in this species, and that it functions as a mediator of stress and defensive behavior.

This manuscript is a complete report of all the studies performed to test the hypothesis of a dose–dependent effect of D-22 on anxiety-like behavior. I report all data exclusions, all manipulations, and all measures in the study.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Animals and housing

A total of 100 animals were used. Animals were bought from a commercial vendor (AcquaPeixes, Goiânia/GO, Brazil) and arrived in the laboratory with an approximate age of 3 months (standard length = 13.2 ± 1.4 mm), and were quarantined for two weeks; the experiment began when animals had an approximate age of 4 months (standard length = 23.0 ± 3.2 mm). Housing standards were as described by Pimentel et al. [51]: “Animals were kept in mixed–sex tanks during acclimation, with an approximate ratio of 50–50 males to females (confirmed by body morphology). Adult zebrafish from the wildtype strain (longfin phenotype) were used in the experiments. Outbred populations were used for increased genetic variability, thus decreasing the effects of random genetic drift which could lead to the development of uniquely heritable traits [52,53]. Thus, the animals used in the experiments were expected to better represent the natural populations in the wild. The breeder was licensed for aquaculture under Ibama’s (Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis) Resolution 95/1993. Animals were group–housed in 40 L tanks, with a maximum density of 25 fish per tank, for at least 2 weeks before experiments begun. Tanks were filled with non–chlorinated water at room temperature (28 °C) and a pH of 7.0–8.0. Lighting was provided by fluorescent lamps in a cycle of 14:10 hours (LD), according to standards of care for zebrafish [54]. Water quality parameters were as follows: pH 7.0–8.0; hardness 100–150 mg/L CaCO3; dissolved oxygen 7.5–8.0 mg/L; ammonia and nitrite < 0.001 ppm. All manipulations minimized their potential suffering of animals, and followed Brazilian legislation [55]. Animals were used for only one experiment and in a single behavioural test, to reduce interference from apparatus exposure. Experiments were approved by UEPG’s IACUC under protocol 06/18.”

2.2. Sample size calculation and exclusion criteria

Sample sizes were calculated based on a power analysis, using the effects of fluoxetine on the light/dark test [44] as estimates of effect sizes. Using an effect size of 0.7, a significance level of 0.005, and a power of 90%, a sample size of 11 animals per group was calculated. Final sample sizes were 20 animals/group. Animals were excluded if they displayed signals of overt ataxia (swimming on a side, swimming upside–down, vertical swimming) during the exposure period [56]. Outliers were detected using an a priori rule based on median absolute deviation (MAD) of time on white (the main endpoint of the LDT), with values above or below 3 MADs being removed [57].

2.3. Drug treatments

Zebrafish were randomly drawn from the holding tank immediately before injection and assigned to four independent groups (n = 20/group). Animals were injected with vehicle (Cortland’s salt solution) or D-22 (CAS #977-96-8, Cat#: 323764, Sigma-Aldrich/Merck, Brazil; 0.01, 0.1, 1, or 10 mg/kg). The injection volume was 1 µL/0.1 g bw. following procedures described by Kinkel et al. [58]. The order with which groups were tested was randomized via generation of random numbers using the randomization tool in http://www.randomization.com/. The experimenter and data analyst was blinded to treatment by using coded vials for drug doses and by using coding to reflect treatments in the resulting datasets; after analysis, data was unblinded. Codes were created and kept by a research assistant.

2.4. Light/dark test

The light/dark preference (scototaxis) test was performed as described elsewhere [32,59]. Animals were individually tested, and groups were independent from each other. 30 min after drug injection, an individual was individually transferred to the central compartment of a half-black, half–white tank (15 cm height × 10 cm width × 45 cm length; Figure 1A) and left for 3 min, during which the animal accimated to the tank. After this acclimation period, the doors which delimit this compartment were removed, allowing the animal to freely explore the apparatus. Spatiotemporal variables (below) were recorded for the entire 15 min trial. While the whole experimental tank was illuminated from above by a homogeneous light source, due to differences the reflectivity of the apparatus walls and floor average illumination (measured just above the water line) above each compartment was different: 225 ± 62.2 (mean ± S.D.) lux above the black compartment, and 307 ± 96.7 lux above the white compartment. A digital video camera (Samsung ES68, Carl Zeiss lens) was installed above the apparatus to record the behavioral activity of the zebrafish. The following variables were recorded:

- **Time in the white compartment**: the time spent in the white half
Figure 1. (A) Test apparatus. (B) Scototaxis (time spent in the white compartment). (C) Transitions to the white compartment. (D) Duration of entries in the white compartment. (E) Risk assessment. (F) Erratic swimming. (G) Thigmotaxis. (H) Freezing duration. The Hedges’ g for 4 comparisons against the shared control 0 mg/kg are shown in the above Cumming estimation plots. The raw data is plotted on the upper axes. On the lower axes, mean differences are plotted as bootstrap sampling distributions. Each mean difference is depicted as a dot. Each 95% confidence interval is indicated by the ends of the vertical error bars. 5000 bootstrap samples were taken; the confidence interval is bias-corrected and accelerated. Letters indicate results from post-hoc tests; different letters indicate statistically significant differences (p < 0.05).

- **White transitions**: the number of entries in the white compartment made by the animal throughout the session;
- **Entry duration**: the average duration of an entry (time on white/transitions);
- **Number of erratic movements**: defined as the number of zig-zag, fast, and unpredictable swimming behavior of short duration;
- **Duration in freezing**: the duration of freezing events (s), defined as complete cessation of movements with the exception of eye and operculum movements;
- **Duration in thigmotaxis**: the duration of thigmotactic events (s), defined as swimming in a distance of 2 cm or less from the
white compartment’s walls;
• Frequency of risk assessment: defined as a fast (<1 s) entry in the white compartment followed by re-entry in the black compartment, or as a partial entry in the white compartment (i.e., the pectoral fin does not cross the midline).

Two independent observers, blinded to treatment, manually measured the behavioral variables using X-Plo-Rat 2005 (https://github.com/lanec-unifesspa/x-plo-rat). Inter-observer reliability was at least > 0.95.

2.5. Data analysis

Drug effects were assessed using asymptotic general independence tests, using the R package ‘coin’ [60]. Independence tests are conditional, resampling-based procedures which replace the unknown null distribution by a conditional null distribution (i.e., the distribution of a given test statistic given the actually observed data), and are therefore not limited by distributional assumptions and by the assumption that random samples of a population (instead of randomization of a nonrandom sampling) took place [60–62]. Post-hoc analysis was made using pairwise permutation tests with correction for the false discovery rate. Data were presented as Cumming estimation plots, with Hedges’ g used to estimate effect sizes, using the R package DAEBSTR [63]. Cumming estimates were made using 5000 bootstrap resamples, and confidence intervals were bias-corrected and accelerated. Bootstrapping was used to derive sampling-error curves due to the robustness of this method in relation to deviations from normality and unequal variances [64]. Estimation statistics were chosen for graphical representation because they estimate effect sizes and their uncertainties, emphasizing quantitative reasoning beyond dichotomous thinking (effect/no effect) [63,65].

3. Results

5 animals were removed from analysis in the highest dose group due to overt ataxia, and 2 animals were removed from the 1 mg/kg group for the same reason. 1 animal from the 1 mg/kg group was detected as outlier and removed from further analysis. A dose-dependent decrease in time on white was found (maxT = -3.773, p = 0.0007; Figure 1B); significant effects were found for 0.1–10 mg/kg. Likewise, dose-dependent decreases were found for transitions to white (maxT = 4.0277, p = 0.0003; Figure 1C); significant effects were found for all doses, except 0.1 mg/kg. No significant effects were found for entry duration (maxT = 1.8191, p = 0.2779; Figure 1D). An inverted U-shaped response was found for risk assessment (maxT = 4.6248, p = 0.019; Figure 1E), with 0.1, and 1 mg/kg increasing risk assessment, and 0.01 mg/kg having no effect; the effect of 10 mg/kg was smaller than the other effects. A main effect of dose was found in erratic swimming (maxT = 3.106, p = 0.0091; Figure 1F), but post-hoc comparisons failed to detect differences. No effects were found for thigmotaxis (maxT = 2.1474, p = 0.1396; Figure 1G) or freezing (maxT = 2.0629, p = 0.1688; Figure 1H). Table 1 presents false discovery rate-adjusted p-values for multiple comparisons.

4. Discussion

The present experiment showed evidence that D-22, an uptake2 inhibitor, dose-dependently increased anxiety-like behavior in the LDT in unstressed zebrafish. Dose-dependent effects were found for time on white (scototaxis), transitions to white, and risk assessment, with the latter suggesting better effects at intermediate doses (0.1 and 1 mg/kg). No effects were observed in other variables (freezing and erratic swimming, thigmotaxis). D-22 decreased time on white (suggesting an increase in preference for dark), an index of anxiogenic-like effects [40,41,43,66], at doses of 0.1 mg/kg and higher, while decreasing transitions to white and increasing risk assessment. In general, effect sizes for time on white and transitions to white were small, while effect sizes for risk assessment were average.

The LDT has been proposed as a screening test for anxiolytic-like and anxiogenic-like effects of treatments in adult zebrafish [66]. The test shows good predictive validity, being sensitive to agents that act at different targets [40]. The main endpoint of this test, light/dark preference, is sensitive to anxiolytic-like and anxiogenic-like effects, and represents an “avoidance” dimension of behavior in the LDT, while risk assessment clusters in a different group and represents a more “cognitive” aspect of anxiety-like behavior [43]. Moreover, exposure to the LDT induces a cortisol response in unstressed animals [40], suggesting that the conflict that is induced in the test is mildly stressful.

Behavioral effects of D-22 have been described in rodents; while by itself D-22 (0.01–0.32 mg/kg) was not able to change immobility time in the tail suspension test in mice, a screen for antidepressant-like effects, it produced a synergistic effect with fluvoxamine [23]. Species- and strain-specific effects can be responsible for this lack of effect of D-22, as this drug (0.001–0.01 mg/kg) reduced immobility time in the forced swim test (another screen for antidepressant-like effects) in Wistar-Kyoto, but not Long Evans, rats [67]. Although these effects are usually attributed to effects on serotonin clearance [1], it is not possible to discard an effect on norepinephrine.

Importantly, effects of manipulations of the uptake2 system in rodents produce either opposite [19] or no effect [28] in transgenic mice. These differences could be attributed to a role of monoamines in adulthood (e.g., fast modulation of mood and behavior) vs. their roles during development [68–70]. Similar effects are observed with acute drug treatment vs. transgenics in the case of serotonin transporters [e.g. 71], suggesting that monoamines participate in the development of brain regions that are involved in defensive/emotional behavior, and that lacking monoamine transporters disrupts these developmental trajectories in ways that acute drug treatment does not. Indeed, it has been shown that serotonin participates in the development of neural circuits associated with emotion in a sensitive developmental window [71], and since knocking out uptake2 transporters from birth should affect the levels of monoamines at periods which are critical for the development of neural circuits associated with anxiety-like behavior, the effects of this manipulation are expected to be different than acute treatment with D-22 in adult animals.

D-22 blocks the uptake2 monoamine transport system [1]. D-22 does not readily discriminate between OCT and PMAT systems [72], and therefore it is currently impossible to pharmacologically uncouple both transporters. Due to its low-affinity, high-capacity character, transporters in the uptake2 system (OCT and PMAT) are “promiscuous”, participating in the elimination of most monoamines from synaptic and extrasynaptic sites [73]. Importantly, uptake2 may represent a link between acute stress and monoaminergic neurotransmission [9], as these transporters are blocked by glucocorticoids [25]. While currently it is not known whether the effects reported in this experiment are due to serotonin, norepinephrine, dopamine, or histamine, there is some evidence for anxiety-like behavior in zebrafish being increased by serotonin [74] and catecholamines [37].

Overall, these results suggest that uptake2 is present in zebrafish, and that it functions as a mediator of stress and defensive behavior. These results point to novel avenues of investigation in the stress–monoamine interaction in anxiety, stress, and defensive behavior. Further studies are needed to better understand the mechanisms by which D-22 produces its behavioral effects.
Table 1. False discovery rate-adjusted p-values for multiple comparisons

| Endpoint                  | Dose vs | 0.01 mg/kg | 0.1 mg/kg | 1 mg/kg | 10 mg/kg |
|---------------------------|---------|------------|-----------|---------|----------|
| Time on white             |         | 0.2648     | 0.0050    | 0.0003  | 0.0056   |
| 0.01 mg/kg                | 0.0048  |            | 0.0634    | 0.0018  | 0.8041   |
| 0.1 mg/kg                 |         | 0.0018     | 0.0007    | 0.3303  | 0.0035   |
| 1 mg/kg                   |         |            | 0.0137    |         | 0.0137   |
| Transitions to white      |         | 0.0053     | 0.3522    | 0.0056  |          |
| 0.01 mg/kg                | 0.0324  |            | 0.0078    |         |          |
| 0.1 mg/kg                 |         | 0.0025     |           | 0.0137  |          |
| 1 mg/kg                   |         |            |           |         |          |
| Entry duration            |         | 0.7876     | 0.8143    | 0.7888  | 0.7875   |
| 0.01 mg/kg                | 0.7876  |            | 0.7876    |         |          |
| 0.1 mg/kg                 |         | 0.8143     | 0.7888    |         |          |
| 1 mg/kg                   |         |            | 0.8143    |         |          |
| Risk assessment           |         | 0.5085     | < 0.0001  | < 0.0001| 0.0159   |
| 0.01 mg/kg                |         |            | < 0.0001  | < 0.0001| 0.0124   |
| 0.1 mg/kg                 |         | 0.2216     |           | 0.0865  | 0.0184   |
| 1 mg/kg                   |         |            |           |         |          |
| Erratic swimming          |         | 0.9562     | 0.0594    | 0.9562  | 0.0594   |
| 0.01 mg/kg                | 0.0594  |            | 0.0594    |         |          |
| 0.1 mg/kg                 |         | 0.0817     | 0.3241    |         |          |
| 1 mg/kg                   |         |            | 0.0594    |         |          |
| Thigmotaxis               |         | 0.2386     | 0.0152    | 0.8082  | 0.0385   |
| 0.01 mg/kg                | 0.0449  |            | 0.5570    | 0.0794  |          |
| 0.1 mg/kg                 |         | 0.0449     | 0.8553    |         |          |
| 1 mg/kg                   |         |            | 0.0770    |         |          |
| Freezing                  |         | 0.2865     | 0.3952    | 0.0609  | 0.2865   |
| 0.01 mg/kg                | 0.9243  |            | 0.2865    | 0.6259  |          |
| 0.1 mg/kg                 |         | 0.3952     | 0.7481    |         |          |
| 1 mg/kg                   |         |            | 0.5310    |         |          |

Significance statement

Uptake2 is a low-affinity, high-capacity transport system that contributes to the clearance of extraneuronal monoamines (mainly norepinephrine, serotonin, and dopamine) and is sensitive to glucocorticoids, therefore representing a putative mechanism of glucocorticoid-monoamine interaction. Since both monoamines and glucocorticoids have been implicated as mediators of stress-induced behavioral adjustments, this interaction can be of relevance to understanding the mechanisms through which stress influences neurochemical and behavioral responses. Here I report that, in zebrafish, the uptake2 inhibitor decynium-22 increases dark preference and risk assessment in the light/dark test, an assay for anxiety-like behavior. Thus, uptake2 appears to act as a modulator of defensive behavior, and its inhibition by, e.g., glucocorticoids could represent a mechanism through which stress produces fast neurobehavioral adjustments in vertebrates.
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This paper showed that decynium-22 (D-22; an uptake2 inhibitor) produced a dose-dependent increase in scototaxis and risk taking behaviour without altering other anxiety-related behaviours such as thigmotaxis or freezing. This experiment shows for the first time that zebrafish do indeed have an uptake2 mechanism, but more research is needed to understand which neurochemicals play a role in this mechanism (dopamine, serotonin, norepinephrine or histamine).
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Overall, the paper presents an interesting finding about the interaction of D-22 with neuronal receptors in zebrafish. Convincing evidence is presented that zebrafish have a similar mechanism of stress-anxiety response mediated by uptake2 receptors compared to other vertebrates. However, since the mechanism of D-22 is not detailed and the findings contradict other studies looking at the uptake2 system, it is unknown the true effect of the drug. The behavioral studies were blinded for both researcher and behavioral evaluator which is a strength of the study. In addition, the authors use a well established behavioral test as well as strong interpretation measures for the data. Finally, this paper adds important knowledge of the existence of the uptake2 system in zebrafish as well as its possible role in defense behaviors.

Reviewer 3 - Statistical Review (Shawn Zheng Kai Tan, European Bioinformatics Institute (EMBL-EBI), United Kingdom.)

In their manuscript, the author uses, in my opinion, non-standard, though rather progressive statistics and visualisations to measure the effects of various dosages of decynium-22 on behavioural measures in zebrafish light/dark test. The data and statistics in this paper are fully disclosed and available on their github, something that should be applauded. While the author has employed admirable statistical methodology that addresses some issues in the field, the major issue I have is the lack of justification/explanation of them. Even if these statistics were more common in the zebrafish field (which I am not sure they are), the wider behavioural neuroscience readership of the journal would likely find it useful to further understand these choices. Therefore, having the right papers cited, together with basic explanation of why the statistical methods were chosen would greatly increase trust in the statistical methods, and help the reader understand why such methods were used.
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I examined the literature review and checked cited references for appropriateness. I found no evidence of citations to predatory journals or papers under editorial notices and references generally provided good support to the claims that they were being cited for. However, I did find several instances where the introduction of the uptake2 and uptake3 systems could have provided a more complete and nuanced description of the system. For example, while papers showing glucocorticoid inhibition of uptake2 were cited, there are also papers that suggest only low affinity inhibition of PMAT by corticosterone. I also suggested several citations to facilitate a more complete description of uptake2/uptake3 and in a couple of places I suggested alternative citations that provided a more up-to-date or comprehensive discussion of issues. I am not an author on any of the citations I recommended.

References

1. Daws LC. Unfaithful neurotransmitter transporters: Focus on serotonin uptake and implications for antidepressant effi-
cacy. Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2009;121(1):89–99. doi: 10.1016/j.pharmthera.2008.10.004.

2. Iversen LL. Catecholamine uptake processes. British Medical Bulletin. 1973;29(2):130–135. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjour-
nals.bmb.a070982.

3. Iversen LL. Role of transmitter uptake mechanisms in synap-
 tic neurotransmission. British Journal of Pharmacology. 1971;44(4):571–591. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2581.1971.tb00666.x.

4. Wang J. The plasma membrane monoamine trans-
 porter (PMAT): Structure, function, and role in organic cation disposition. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2016;100(5):489–499. doi: 10.1002/cpt.442.

5. Eisenhofer G. The role of neuronal and extraneuronal plasma membrane transporters in the inactivation of peripheral cate-
cholamines. Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2001;91(1):35–62. doi: 10.1016/s0163-7258(01)00144-9.

6. Rudnick G, Krämer R, Blakely RD, Murphy DL, Verrey F. The SLC6 transporters: perspectives on structure, functions, reg-
ulation, and models for transporter dysfunction. Pflligers Archiv - European Journal of Physiology. 2013;466(1):25–42. doi: 10.1007/s00424-013-1410-1.

7. Duan H, Wang J. Selective transport of monoamine neuro-
transmitters by human plasma membrane monoamine trans-
porter and organic cation transporter 3. Journal of Pharmacol-
ogy and Experimental Therapeutics. 2010;335(3):743–753. doi: 10.1124/jpet.110.170142.

8. Mohammad F, Ho J, Woo JH, Lim CL, Poon DJJ, Lamba B, et al. Concordance and incongruence in preclinical anxiety-
model studies: Systematic review and meta-analyses. Neu-oscience & Biobehavioral Reviews. 2016;68:504–529. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.04.011.

9. Machiraju C. Serotonin and anxiety. Neuroanatomical, pharma-
cological, and functional aspects. New York, NY: Springer; 2012. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4614-4048-2.

10. Shelton RC. Serotonin and Norepinephrine Reuptake In-
hibitors. In: Macaluso M, Preshorn SH, editors. Antidepres-
sants. vol. 250 of Handbook of Experimental Pharmacology. Cham: Springer; 2019. p. 145–180. doi: 10.1007/164_2018_162.

11. Aggarwal S, Mortensen OV. Overview of Monoamine Trans-
porters. Current Protocols in Pharmacology. 2017;79(1). doi: 10.1002/cpph.32.

12. Gorman JM. Treatment of generalized anxiety disorder. The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry. 2002;63(Suppl 8):17–23. PMID: 12044104.

13. Wu X, Kekuda R, Huang W, Fei YJ, Leibach FH, Chen J, et al. Identity of the organic cation transporter OCT3 as the ex-
traneuronal monoamine transporter (uptake2) and evidence for the expression of the transporter in the brain. Jour-
nal of Biological Chemistry. 1998;273(49):32776–32786. doi: 10.1074/jbc.273.49.32776.

14. Zhou M, Engel K, Wang J. Evidence for significant contribution of a newly identified monoamine transporter (PMAT) to sero-
tonin uptake in the human brain. Biochemical Pharmacology. 2007;73(1):147–154. doi: 10.1016/j.bcp.2006.09.008.
Watts LT, et al. Organic cation transporter 3: Keeping the brake

CH, Gerlai R, et al. Molecular psychiatry of zebrafish. Molecular Psychiatry. 1984;83(1):1–16. doi: 10.1038/mp.1984.128.

Gerlai R. Fish in behavior research: Unique tools with a great promise! Journal of Neuroscience Methods. 2014;234:54–58. doi: 10.1016/j.jneumeth.2014.04.015.

Maximino C, de Brito TM, da Silva Batista AW, Herculano AM, Morato S, Gouveia A. Measuring anxiety in zebrafish: A critical review. Behavioural Brain Research. 2010;214(2):157–171. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2010.05.031.

Rinkwitz S, Mournain B, Becker TS. Zebrafish: An integrative system for neurogenomics and neurosciences. Progress in Neurobiology. 2011;93(2):231–243. doi: 10.1016/j.pneurobio.2010.11.003.

Fuzen MLM, Van Der Kraak G, Bernier NJ. Stirring up new ideas about the regulation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-interrenal axis in zebrafish (Danio rerio). Zebrafish. 2010;7(4):349–358. doi: 10.1089/zeb.2010.0662.

Tran S, Chatterjee D, Gerlai R. Acute net stressor increases whole-body cortisol levels without altering whole-brain monoamines in zebrafish. Behavioral Neuroscience. 2012;128(5):621–622. doi: 10.1037/a0000005.

Idalencio R, Kalichak F, Rosa JGS, Keoghabi G, Gusso D, et al. Waterborne risperidone decreases stress response in zebrafish. PLOS ONE. 2015;10(10):e0140800. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0140800.

Idalencio R, de Alcântara Barcellos HH, Kalichak F, da Rosa JGS, Oliveira TA, de Abreu MS, et al. α-Methyltyrosine, a tyrosine hydroxylase inhibitor, decreases stress response in zebrafish (Danio rerio). General and Comparative Endocrinology. 2017;252:236–238. doi: 10.1016/j.ygcen.2017.07.012.

Giacomini ACVV, Abreu MS, Giacomini LV, Siebel AM, Zimmerman FP, Rambo CL, et al. Fluoxetine and dizapam acutely modulate stress-induced behavior. Behavioural Brain Research. 2016;296:301–310. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2015.09.027.

Abreu MS, Giacomini ACVV, Koakoski G, Piallo ALS, Barcelos LG. Divergent effect of fluoxetine on the response to physical or chemical stressors in zebrafish. PeerJ. 2017;5:e3330. doi: 10.7717/peerj.3330.

Kysil EV, Meshalkina DA, Frick EE, Echevarria DJ, Rosenberg DB, Maximino C, et al. Comparative analyses of zebrafish anxiety-like behavior using conflict-based novelty tests. Zebrafish. 2017;14(3):397–320. doi: 10.1089/zeb.2016.2145.

Maximino C, de Oliveira DL, Broock Rosenberg D, de Jesus Oliveira Batista E, Herculano AM, Matos Oliveira KR, et al. A comparison of the light/dark and novel tank tests as anxiety-like behavioral tools in zebrafish (Danio rerio). General and Comparative Endocrinology. 2012;190(12):1099–1123. doi: 10.1016/j.ygcen.2012.08.009.

Maximino C, da Silva AWB, Gouveia A, Herculano AM. Pharmacological analysis of zebrafish (Danio rerio) scototaxis. Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry. 2011;35(2):624–631. doi: 10.1016/j.pnpbp.2011.01.006.

Maximino C, da Silva AWB, Araújo J, Lima MG, Miranda V, Puty B, et al. Fingerprinting of psychoactive drugs in zebrafish (Danio rerio) anxiety-like behaviors. PLoS ONE. 2014;9(7):e103943. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0103943.

Maximino C, Puty B, Benzercy R, Araújo J, Lima MG, de Jesus Oliveira Batista E, et al. Role of serotonin in zebrafish (Danio rerio) anxiety: Relationship with serotonin levels and effect of busipirone, WAY 106655, SB 224289, fluoxetine and para-chlorophenylalanine (pCPA) in two behavioral models. Neuropharmacology. 2013;71:83–97. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropharm.2013.03.006.

Mihaljević I, Popović M, Zaja R, Smital T. Phylogenetic, syntenic, and tissue expression analysis of sclk2 genes in zebrafish (Danio rerio). BMC Genomics. 2016;17(1). doi: 10.1186/s12864-016-2981-y.

Mihaljević I, Popović M, Zaja R, Maraković N, Šinko G, Smital T. Interaction between the zebrafish (Danio rerio) organic cation transporter 1 (Oct1) and endo-
xenobiotics. Aquatic Toxicology. 2017;187:18–28. doi: 10.1016/j.aquatox.2017.03.012.

47. Maximino C, Costa B, Lima M. A review of monoaminergic neuropharmacology in zebrafish, 6 Years Later: Towards paradoxes and their solution. Current Psychopharmacology. 2016;5(2):96–138. doi: 10.2174/18726558016666616027105104.

48. Verri T, Terova G, Romano A, Barca A, Pisani P, Storrelli C, et al. The SoLuTe Carrier (SLC) Family Series in Teleost Fish. In: Saroglia M, Liu Z, editors. Functional Genomics in Aquaculture. Ames, Iowa: Wiley–Blackwell; 2012. p. 219–320. doi: 10.1002/9781118350041.ch10.

49. Sivasubbu S, Balciunas D, Davidson AF, Pickart MA, Hermanson SB, Wangensteen KJ, et al. Gene–breeding transposon mutagenesis reveals an essential role for histone H2afza in zebrafish larval development. Mechanisms of Development. 2006;123(7):513–529. doi: 10.1016/j.mod.2006.06.002.

50. Soares MC, Gerlai R, Maximino C. The integration of sociality, monoamines and stress neuroendocrinology in fish models: Applications in the neurosciences. Journal of Fish Biology. 2018;93(2):170–191. doi: 10.1111/jfb.13757.

51. Pimentel AFN, Lima–Maximino MG, Soares MC, Maximino C. Zebrafish cooperate while inspecting predators: experimental evidence for conditional approach. bioRxiv [Preprint]. 2020. doi: 10.1101/814434.

52. Parra KV, Adrian JR, Gerlai R. The synthetic substance hypoxythine 3-N-oxide elicits alarm reactions in zebrafish (Danio rerio). Behavioural Brain Research. 2009;205(2):336–351. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2009.06.037.

53. Speedie N, Gerlai R. Alarm substance induced behavioral responses in zebrafish (Danio rerio). Behavioural Brain Research. 2008;188(1):168–177. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2007.10.031.

54. Lawrence C. The hatchery of zebrafish (Danio rerio): A review. Aquaculture. 2007;269(1-4):1–20. doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2007.04.077.

55. CONCEA. Anexo I. Peixes mantidos em instalações de instituições de ensino ou pesquisa científica. In: Diretiz brasileira para o cuidado e a utilização de animais para fins científicos e didáticos – DBCA. Brasília: Conselho Nacional de Controle de Experimentação Animal; 2017.

56. Demín KA, Kolesnikova TO, Khatsko SL, Meshalkina DA, Efimova EV, Morshzin YI, et al. Acute effects of amitriptyline on adult zebrafish: Potential relevance for antidepressant drug screening and modeling human toxicodermies. Neurotoxicology and Teratology. 2017;62:27–33. doi: 10.1016/j.ntt.2017.04.002.

57. Ley S, Ley C, Klein O, Bernard P, Licata L. Detecting outliers: Do not use standard deviation around the mean, use absolute deviation around the median. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 2013;49(4):764–766. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2013.03.013.

58. Kinkel MD, Eames SC, Philipson LH, Prince VE. Intraperitoneal injection into adult zebrafish. Journal of Visualized Experiments. 2010;(42):e2126. doi: 10.3791/2126.

59. Maximino C. Light/dark preference test for adult zebrafish (Danio rerio) v2. protocols.io. 2018;doi: 10.17504/protocols.io.xr6fjn.

60. Hothorn T, Hornik K, van de Wiel MA, Zeileis A. A Lego System for Conditional Inference. The American Statistician. 2006;60(3):257–263. doi: 10.1198/0003130606x18430.

61. Ludbrook J, Dudley H. Why Permutation Tests Are Superior to t Tests in Biomedical Research. The American Statistician. 1998;52(2):127. doi: 10.2307/26885740.

62. Anderson MJ. Permutation tests for univariate or multivariate analysis of variance and regression. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences. 2001;58(3):626–639. doi: 10.1139/f01-004.

63. Ho J, Tumikaya T, Aryan S, Choi H, Claridge-Chang A. Moving beyond P values: data analysis with estimation graphics. Nature Methods. 2019;16(7):565–566. doi: 10.1038/s41592-019-0470-3.

64. Efren B, Tilbhirani RJ. An introduction to the bootstrap. vol. 57 of Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC; 1994. OCLC: 780817758.

65. Cumming G. The New Statistics. Psychological Science. 2012;23(5):7–29. doi: 10.1177/0956797612466706.

66. Maximino C, Marques de Brito T, Dias CAGdM, Gouveia A, Morato S. Scototaxis as anxiety-like behavior in fish. Nature Protocols. 2010;5(2):209–216. doi: 10.1038/nprot.2009.225.

67. Marcinikiewicz CA, Devine DP. Modulation of OCT3 expression by stress, and antidepressant-like activity of decynium-22 in an animal model of depression. Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior. 2015;131:33–41. doi: 10.1016/j.pbb.2015.01.004.

68. Nairoux-Nème N, Angenard G, Mosienko V, Klempin F, Pithyouths PM, Deneris E, et al. Postnatal growth defects in mice with constitutive deletion of central serotonin. ACS Chemical Neuroscience. 2012;4(1):171–181. doi: 10.1021/cm300165x.

69. Altieri SC, García–Galicia AL, Leonardo ED, Andrews AM. Re-thinking 5-HT1A receptors: Emerging modes of inhibitory feedback of relevance to emotion-related behavior. ACS Chemical Neuroscience. 2012;4(1):72–83. doi: 10.1021/cm3002174.

70. Gutknecht L, Waider J, Kraft S, Kriegbaum C, Holtmann B, Reif A, et al. Deficiency of brain 5-HT synthesis but serotonergic neuron formation in Tph2 knockout mice. Journal of Neural Transmission. 2008;115(8):1127–1132. doi: 10.1007/s00702-008-0966-6.

71. Suri D, Teixeira CM, Cagliostro MKC, Mahadevia D, Ansorge MS. Monoamine-sensitive developmental periods impacting adult emotional and cognitive behaviors. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2014;40(1):88–112. doi: 10.1038/npp.2014.231.

72. Fraser-Spears R, Krause-Heuer AM, Basiouny M, Mayer FP, Hakan MS. Monoamine-sensitive developmental periods impacting adult emotional and cognitive behaviors. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2014;40(1):88–112. doi: 10.1038/npp.2014.231.

73. Manishimwe B, Wyatt NA, et al. Comparative analysis of novel decynium-22 analogs to inhibit transport by the low-affinity, high-capacity monoamine transporters, organic cation transporters 2 and 3, and plasma membrane monoamine transporter. European Journal of Pharmacology. 2019;842:351–364. doi: 10.1016/j.ejphar.2018.10.028.

74. Hagan CE, Schenk JO, Neumaier JE. The contribution of low-affinity transport mechanisms to serotonin clearance in synaptosomes. Synapse. 2011;65(10):1055–1023. doi: 10.1002/syn.20929.

75. Herculano AM, Maximino C. Serotonergic modulation of zebrafish behavior: Towards a paradox. Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry. 2014;45:50–66. doi: 10.1016/j.pnpbp.2014.03.008.

76. Maximino C. Dataset: Effect of decynium-22 on zebrafish anxiety-like behavior. Zenodo. 2021;doi: 10.5281/zenodo.5121722.

Copyright and License

Copyright © 2021. Caio Maximino. Except where otherwise noted, the content of this article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. You are free to reuse or adapt this article for any purpose, provided appropriate acknowledgement is provided. For additional permissions, please contact the corresponding author.