Unveiling the Neuropharmacological Landscape: A Comprehensive Review of Behavioral and Neurochemical Screening Paradigms in Rodent Models for CNS Drug Discovery and Development

Koppala.R.V.S. Chaitanya[1]*, Akhila Jogu[1]

[1]Department of Pharmacology, Sarojini Naidu Vanita Pharmacy Maha Vidyalaya, Tarnaka, Secunderabad, Telangana, India-500017,

Address of correspondence:
Dr. Koppala R.V.S.Chaitanya,

Abstract

Background Central nervous system (CNS) problems present considerable hurdles in medication discovery and development due to the complexity of brain function and the multivariate character of neurological and psychiatric diseases. Rodent models remain crucial tools for preclinical screening, providing unique insights into behavioral traits and neurochemical pathways that underpin CNS diseases. This review includes a critical appraisal of established and novel behavioural paradigms used in rodent models to test several CNS-related outcomes, including anxiety, depression, learning and memory, motor coordination, and addiction. It also investigates the use of neurochemical techniques including micro dialysis, electrophysiology, and imaging for mechanistic validation. Synergistic combination of behavioral and neurochemical tests improves translational relevance and predictive validity. The review also analyses the benefits, drawbacks, and ethical implications of these models, emphasizing the need for refined, reproducible methodologies that are consistent with human clinical results. Rodent behavioral and neurochemical models are crucial in CNS drug research, delivering information into both efficacy and safety. Continued improvement, together with advancements in genetic engineering and in vivo monitoring, will help to close the translational gap between preclinical and clinical research.

Keywords CNS disorders, rodent models, behavioral assays, neurochemical screening, drug discovery, translational neuroscience

Introduction.

Central nervous system (CNS) illnesses, comprising a wide range of neurological and psychiatric conditions such as Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, epilepsy, depression, schizophrenia, and anxiety, remain among the most urgent global health concerns. According to the worldwide Burden of Disease Study, mental and neurological illnesses account for a significant proportion of disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) and are major contributors to worldwide morbidity and mortality [1]. Despite this burden, the discovery and development of effective CNS therapeutics has lagged behind that of other disease areas, primarily due to the complex pathophysiology of the brain, the multifactorial nature of these disorders, and the formidable blood-brain barrier that limits drug bioavailability [2]. Neuropharmacology is crucial to CNS drug discovery, since it seeks to understand how pharmacological drugs alter neural circuitry, neurotransmitter systems, receptor function, and intracellular communication to modulate brain activity [3]. However, turning fundamental neuropharmacological findings into clinically effective medicines remains a substantial challenge. CNS medication development has one of the highest attrition rates in the pharmaceutical pipeline, with many candidates failing in late-stage clinical trials due to lack of efficacy or unexpected side effects [4,5]. Rodent models are used to imitate numerous aspects of human neuropsychiatric and neurodegenerative disorders, making them a cornerstone of preclinical CNS research. These models allow for rigorous behavioral and neurochemical screening of potential drugs, which provides vital insights into efficacy, safety, and mechanism of action. Behavioral assays, such as the forced swim test, elevated plus maze, open field test, and Morris water maze, serve as proxies for mood, anxiety, cognition, and motor function [6,7]. Neurochemical techniques such as micro dialysis, high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC), and immunohistochemistry enable the determination of neurotransmitter levels, receptor activity, and intracellular signaling molecules [8, 9]. Despite their limits in recreating the entire complexity of human illnesses, these preclinical models remain crucial tools in early drug research. When adequately validated and interpreted, they can give strong data on drug-target interactions, dose-response relationships, and behavioral phenotypes—laying the framework for later clinical translation [10]. Given the rapid evolution of neuropharmacological techniques and the growing demand for more predictive and translatable models, the goal of this review is to extensively explore the behavioral and neurochemical screening paradigms used in rodent models for CNS drug discovery. We evaluate the relevance, validity, and

limitations of these paradigms and look into developing ways for bridging the translational gap between preclinical findings and clinical outcomes [11].

Neuropharmacology and CNS drug discovery

The central nervous system (CNS) regulates body functions and behavior by coordinating complex processes including as cognition, memory, emotion, and motor coordination.
Neurological and psychiatric disorders of the central nervous system (CNS), such as Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, schizophrenia, depression, and epilepsy, are among the main causes of disability globally and represent significant societal and economic difficulties [1]. Neuropharmacology, or the study of how pharmacological substances alter neural activity, serves as the foundation of CNS drug discovery. This discipline aims to elucidate the processes by which medications influence neurotransmitter systems, ion channels, receptors, and intracellular signaling pathways to restore or change CNS function [3]. Although advances in neuropharmacological research have led to the development of numerous therapeutic agents, the pace of innovation has been limited by several intrinsic challenges, such as the complexity of brain architecture, poor translational validity of animal models, and the restrictive nature of the blood-brain barrier [2]. CNS medication discovery is particularly tough, with significant attrition rates in clinical development. Many intriguing drugs fail because of lack of efficacy or unexpected neurotoxicity, emphasizing the necessity for thorough preclinical evaluation methodologies [4]. Animal models, particularly rats, are used with behavioral and neurochemical screening paradigms to examine the therapeutic potential, pharmacokinetics, and safety profiles of candidate medicines [10]. In recent years, the merging of molecular genetics, bioinformatics, high-throughput screening, and neuroimaging technologies has broadened the horizon of CNS drug development, allowing for more precise target identification and individualized therapy options [5]. Traditional methods, such as validated behavioral tests (e.g., forced swim test, Morris water maze, open field test) and neurochemical assays (e.g., micro dialysis, HPLC-based neurotransmitter analysis), remain indispensable in preclinical research for evaluating drug efficacy and mechanism of action [6, 8]. This review seeks to offer a complete overview of the current neuropharmacological techniques and experimental paradigms utilized in CNS drug discovery, with a special emphasis on rodent models [10, 37]. By highlighting the merits and limits of these techniques, we hope to encourage the creation of better predictive and translational models for CNS therapies [11, 12].

Behavioral assays for neuropharmacological screening

Behavioral assays are crucial in neuropharmacological research and preclinical drug development. They give functional readouts of therapeutic efficacy, side-effect profiles, and the underlying neurobiological mechanisms involved in central nervous system (CNS) disorders. Rodent models are particularly useful due of their well-characterized behaviors, genetic manipulability, and the translational applicability of many standardized tests. Behavioral assays are widely classified based on the CNS function they examine, such as affective states, cognition, locomotor activity, sensorimotor gating, and social behavior [13].

Table 1: Behavioral Tests for Assessing Functional Domains in Rodent Models

Domain	Test	Behavior measured	Interpretation	Key references
Cognitive Function	Morris Water Maze (MWM)	Spatial learning and memory	Shorter escape latency = better memory	[14]
	Radial Arm Maze (RAM)	Working and reference memory	Fewer errors = better memory	[15]
	Novel Object Recognition	Recognition memory	More time with novel object = intact memory	[16]
Anxiety	Elevated Plus Maze (EPM)	Risk assessment, exploration	More time in open arms = reduced anxiety	[17]
	Open Field Test (OFT)	Locomotor activity, center vs. periphery behavior	More time in center = reduced anxiety	[18]
	Light/Dark Box (LDB)	Avoidance and exploratory behavior	More time in light box = reduced anxiety	[19]

Depression	Forced Swim Test (FST)	Behavioral despair	Less immobility = antidepressant-like effect	[20]
	Sucrose Preference Test	Anhedonia	Reduced preference = depression-like behavior	[21]
	Tail Suspension Test (TST)	Behavioral despair	Less immobility = antidepressant-like effect	[22]
Motor Function	Rotarod Test	Coordination, balance	Longer time = improved motor function	[23]
	Open Field Test (OFT)	Locomotor activity	Total distance moved = motor performance	[18]
	Grip Strength Test	Neuromuscular strength	Higher force = stronger neuromuscular control	[24]

Neurochemical assays for neuropharmacological screening

Neurochemical assays are crucial techniques in preclinical neuropharmacology, enabling researchers to quantify the biochemical effects of drugs on the central nervous system. Rat brain tissue is widely used because of its morphological and functional similarities to the

human brain, ease of dissection, and the availability of standardized techniques for neurochemical analysis [25].

Measurement of Neurotransmitter Levels

High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC)

The most widely used method for quantifying neurotransmitters and their metabolites is HPLC combined with electrochemical or fluorescence detection. It provides great sensitivity and specificity for chemicals such as dopamine, serotonin, norepinephrine, GABA, and glutamate in brain tissue samples [26]. This procedure necessitates meticulous dissection of brain regions such as the striatum or prefrontal cortex, followed by homogenization, centrifugation, and injection of supernatants into the chromatographic system [27].

Table 2: Methods for Neurotransmitter Detection and Quantification

Neurotransmitter	Detection method	Sample preparation	Advantages	References
Dopamine, Serotonin	HPLC-ED	Perchloric acid homogenate	High sensitivity and specificity	[26]
GABA, Glutamate	HPLC with fluorescence	OPA derivatization	Accurate quantification	[28]
Norepinephrine	HPLC-ED or mass spectroscopy	Brain region micro dissection	Region specific data	[27]

Receptor Binding Assays

Radio ligand Binding Assays

Radio ligand binding assays are used to test the affinity of drugs for distinct receptor subtypes in brain membrane preparations. Radiolabeled ligands, such as [^{3}H]-spiperone for dopamine receptors, are incubated with tissue homogenates to determine binding kinetics [29]. These assays provide two critical parameters: Bmax (receptor density) and Kd (ligand affinity). Competitive binding studies can also establish IC_{50} values of test substances, elucidating their pharmacological characteristics [30].

Table : Radioligand Binding Parameters for Various Receptors

Receptor type	Radio lignand	Tissue type	Binding parameter	Reference
Dopamine D2	[^{3}H]-Spiperone	Striatal membrane	Kd, Bmax	[29]
GABA-A	[^{3}H]-Muscimon	Cortical homogenates	Kd, Bmax	[31]
Serotonin 5-HT1A	[^{3}H]-8-OH_DPAT	Hippocampal membranes	Kd, Bmax	[30]

Enzyme Activity Assays

Table 4 Summary of Enzyme Assays Used for Neurochemical Analysis

Enzyme	Substrate	Assay principle	Reference
Acetylcholinesterase (AChE)	Acetylcholine	Ellman colorimetric assay	[32]
Monoamine Oxidase (MAO)	Tyramine,5HT	Amine oxidation and H_2O_2 detection	[33]
Tyrosine Hydroxylase (TH)	Tyrosine	L-DOPA formation (radiometric)	[34]

Acetyl cholinesterase (Ache) Activity

The Ellman method is widely used for measuring acetyl cholinesterase activity in rat brain homogenates. This colorimetric assay evaluates the production of a yellow anion arising from the reaction of thiocholine (derived from acetylthiocholine) and DTNB [32]. This method is commonly used in the screening of acetyl cholinesterase inhibitors, such as donepezil or rivastigmine, which are relevant for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease [35].

Monoamine Oxidase (MAO) Activity

MAO assays quantify the breakdown of monoamines such as dopamine and serotonin. To distinguish between MAO-A and MAO-B isoforms, fluorometric and radiometric techniques

are commonly used using substrates such as kynuramine or tyramine [33]. Inhibition of MAO is relevant for treating depression and Parkinson's disease, with drugs like selegiline (MAO-B inhibitor) being thoroughly researched using this assay [36].

Tyrosine Hydroxylase (TH) Activity

In catecholamine biosynthesis, TH is the rate-limiting enzyme. TH activity is assessed by converting radiolabeled tyrosine to L-DOPA or by immunoassays that quantify protein expression or phosphorylation [34]. TH activity is raised under situations of increased neuronal firing or pharmacological stimulation (e.g., L-DOPA and amphetamines), making it a good marker of dopaminergic system activation[37].

Models of neurological and psychiatric disorders

Animal models are critical tools for studying the pathophysiology of neurological and mental illnesses, as well as designing and testing novel therapies. Rodents, particularly rats and mice, are the most widely employed species due to their genetic tractability, well-defined neural systems, and the availability of behavioral and biochemical techniques for research [38].

Alzheimer's Disease (AD)

Transgenic Mouse Models

The APP/PS1 transgenic mouse is a popular Alzheimer's disease model that overexpresses mutant human amyloid precursor protein (APP) and presenilin-1 (PS1). These mice display amyloid-beta plaque buildup, gliosis, and cognitive impairments similar those seen in human AD [39].

Scopolamine-Induced Amnesia in Rats

The scopolamine model involves providing a muscarinic receptor antagonist to cause memory loss, which mimics cholinergic failure in Alzheimer's disease. It is extensively used for screening cholinesterase inhibitors and cognitive enhancers [40].

Parkinson’s Disease (PD)

6-Hydroxydopamine (6-OHDA) Lesion Model

The 6-OHDA model is a traditional method for inducing dopaminergic neuron degeneration in the substantianigra of rats. It closely mimics the motor signs of Parkinson's and is used to evaluate dopaminergic medicines and neuroprotective treatments [41].

MPTP Mouse Model

MPTP (1-methyl-4-phenyl-1, 2, 3, 6-tetrahydropyridine) is used to selectively kill dopaminergic neurons in mice, causing Parkinson's disease-like symptoms. It is particularly valuable in examining the biochemical and mitochondrial components of Parkinson's disease [42].

Depression

Chronic Mild Stress (CMS) Model

The CMS model involves subjecting mice to a succession of modest and unpredictable stressors (e.g., food deprivation, cage tilt) over a period of weeks. This paradigm generates anhedonia (loss of pleasure), a basic symptom of depression, which is usually evaluated by lower sucrose preference [43].

Forced Swim Test (FST)

The FST, or Porsolt swim test, assesses behavioral despair in rodents trapped in an inaccessible cylinder of water. Antidepressants often reduce immobility time, which is viewed as less despair-like behavior [44].

Current Challenges and Future Directions in Neuropharmacological Screening

Limitations of Current Animal Models

Although animal models are important for neuropharmacological research, they frequently fail to capture the complexities of human neurological and psychiatric problems. Differences in neuroanatomy, physiology, and behavior can lead to ineffective translation of preclinical findings to clinical outcomes. For example, many Alzheimer's and depression medications that succeeded in rats fail in human trials due to variations in pathophysiological pathways [45].

Reproducibility and Standardization Issues

The lack of repeatability in experimental outcomes between laboratories poses a significant challenge in neuropharmacology. Differences in strain, age, sex of animals, experimental techniques, and environmental factors all contribute to variability in outcomes, lowering the trustworthiness of the findings. Furthermore, subjective interpretations of behavioral tests, such as the forced swim test or open field test, hinder data comparison [46].

Lack of Biomarkers for Drug Efficacy

The creation of objective biomarkers for disease progression and medication efficacy is still an unmet need. The majority of contemporary tests are based on indirect and subjective behavioral observations. Quantifiable molecular, imaging, or electrophysiological markers are urgently needed to properly follow neurobiological changes in response to pharmaceutical therapies [47].

Ethical and Regulatory Considerations

The ethical landscape around animal testing in neuroscience is becoming more stringent, requiring the 3Rs principle (Replacement, Reduction, and Refinement). Regulatory organizations are pushing the use of alternative models such as in vitro systems, organoids, and computer simulations, which, while promising, are still in the research stage and lack the system-level intricacy of in vivo models [48].

Future Directions: Integration of Multi-Omics Approaches

Systems biology and multi-omics approaches (such as genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics) are expected to drive future neuropharmacology. These technologies can help find novel therapeutic targets and understand disease mechanisms on a systems level, hence improving drug development speed and specificity [49].

Advances in Human-Derived Models

The advent of induced pluripotent stem cell (IPSC)-derived neurons and 3D brain organoids provides promising alternatives to animal models. These systems more closely resemble human-specific cellular and molecular processes and can be tailored to examine patient-specific medication responses. However, scalability, maturity, and reproducibility remain technical problems [50].

Artificial Intelligence and High-Throughput Screening

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) are increasingly being utilized to analyse large datasets from neuropharmacological studies. AI-powered drug discovery platforms can help forecast drug-target interactions, refine lead compounds, and detect off-target effects. High-throughput screening paired with AI has the potential to change the early phases of drug discovery [51].

Conclusion

Rodent models remain crucial tools in CNS drug discovery, giving solid platforms for examining the behavioral and neurochemical effects of new pharmacological compounds [38]. These models have made major contributions to our understanding of neuropsychiatric and neurodegenerative illnesses by imitating essential elements of human pathology using validated paradigms such as the forced swim test, open field test, and elevated plus maze [6]. Neurochemical screening, such as micro dialysis, receptor binding tests, and neuroimaging, supplements behavioral data by providing mechanistic insights into neurotransmitter systems implicated in drug action [52]. However, the translational gap between mouse models and human circumstances remains a persistent barrier due to species-specific differences in neurobiology and behaviour [11]. Advancements in genetic manipulation tools, such as CRISPR and transgenic models, have considerably enhanced the specificity and usefulness of mouse models for neurological illnesses [53]. Integrating multidimensional approaches—combining behavioral phenotyping with genetic, electrophysiological, and imaging techniques enhances the predictive ability of these models in the preclinical phase [54]. Moving forward, standardization of behavioral tests, replication of findings across laboratories, and the use of ethologically valid paradigms are vital for improving dependability and translational validity [55]. Finally, the confluence of modern screening technologies and enhanced rodent models shows promise for expediting CNS medication development and minimizing late-stage failures in clinical trials [56].

References

1. GBD 2019 Mental Disorders Collaborators. (2022). Global, regional, and national burden of 12 mental disorders in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. The Lancet Psychiatry, 9(2), 137–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00395-3

2. Pardridge, W. M. (2012). Drug transport across the blood–brain barrier. Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow & Metabolism, 32(11), 1959–1972.https://doi.org/10.1038/jcbfm.2012.126

3. Devanne, H. (2024). Neuropharmacology: Role of Drugs and their Effects on the Nervous System. Journal of Pharmacological Reports, 8(2), 218. https://doi.org/10.35248/JPR.24.8.218

4. Kola, I., & Landis, J. (2004). Can the pharmaceutical industry reduce attrition rates? Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 3(8), 711–716. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd1470

5. Arrowsmith, J., Miller, P., & Brown, D. (2015). Phase II and phase III attrition rates 2011–2012. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 13(2), 92–93. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd4205

6. Cryan, J. F., & Holmes, A. (2005). The ascent of mouse: Advances in modelling human depression and anxiety. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 4(9), 775–790. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd1825

7. Ennaceur, A. (2014). Tests of unconditioned anxiety—Pitfalls and disappointments. Physiology & Behavior, 135, 55–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.05.032

8. Smith, R. S., Kilpatrick, I. C., & Beninger, R. J. (2018). Behavioral pharmacology and the CNS: From molecules to mind. Behavioural Pharmacology, 29(7), 597–609. https://doi.org/10.1097/FBP.0000000000000410

9. Westerink, B. H., & Cremers, T. I. (2007). Microdialysis: What it brings to the neuropharmacologist. Trends in Pharmacological Sciences, 28(5), 229–236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2007.03.006

10. Millan, M. J., Goodwin, G. M., Meyer-Lindenberg, A., & Ögren, S. O. (2012). Learning from the past and looking to the future: Emerging perspectives for improving the treatment of psychiatric disorders. European Neuropsychopharmacology, 22(8), 533–562. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2012.02.012

11. Markou, A., Chiamulera, C., Geyer, M. A., Tricklebank, M., & Steckler, T. (2009). Removing obstacles in neuroscience drug discovery: the future path for animal models. Neuropsychopharmacology, 34(1), 74–89. https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2008.173

12. Denayer, T., Stöhr, T., & Van Roy, M. (2014). Animal models in translational medicine: Validation and prediction. New Horizons in Translational Medicine, 2(1), 5–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nhtm.2014.08.001

13. Hånell, A., & Marklund, N. (2014). Structured evaluation of rodent behavioral tests used in drug discovery research. Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, 8, 252. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00252

14. Vorhees, C. V., & Williams, M. T. (2006). Morris water maze: Procedures for assessing spatial and related forms of learning and memory. Nature Protocols, 1(2), 848–858. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2005.11.001

15. Olton, D. S., & Samuelson, R. J. (1976). Remembrance of places passed: Spatial memory in rats. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 2(2), 97–116. https://doi.org/10.1037/0097-7403.2.2.97

16. Antunes, M., & Biala, G. (2012). The novel object recognition memory: Neurobiology, test procedure, and its modifications. Cognitive Processing, 13(2), 93–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2012.02.042

17. Pellow, S., Chopin, P., File, S. E., & Briley, M. (1985). Validation of open: closed arm entries in an elevated plus-maze as a measure of anxiety in the rat. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 14(3), 149–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-0270(85)90031-7

18. Prut, L., & Belzung, C. (2003). The open field as a paradigm to measure the effects of drugs on anxiety-like behaviors: A review. European Journal of Pharmacology, 463(1–3), 3–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4328(02)00037-5

19. Crawley, J., & Goodwin, F. K. (1980). Preliminary report of a simple animal behavior model for the anxiolytic effects of benzodiazepines. Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior, 13(2), 167–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/0091-3057(80)90067-2

20. Porsolt, R. D., Bertin, A., & Jalfre, M. (1977). Behavioral despair in mice: A primary screening test for antidepressants. Archives Internationales de Pharmacodynamie et de Thérapie, 229(2), 327–336. https://doi.org/10.1016/0028-3908(77)90157-4

21. Willner, P., Towell, A., Sampson, D., Sophokleous, S., & Muscat, R. (1987). Reduction of sucrose preference by chronic unpredictable mild stress, and its restoration by a tricyclic antidepressant. Psychopharmacology, 93(3), 358–364. https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1781(87)90028-1

22. Steru, L., Chermat, R., Thierry, B., & Simon, P. (1985). The tail suspension test: A new method for screening antidepressants in mice. Psychopharmacology, 85(3), 367–370. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00428203

23. Jones, B. J., & Roberts, D. J. (1968). The quantitative measurement of motor inco-ordination in naive mice using an accelerating rotarod. Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology, 20(4), 302–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3205(68)80004-4

24. Meyer, O. A., Tilson, H. A., Byrd, W. C., & Riley, M. T. (1979). A method for the routine assessment of fore- and hindlimb grip strength of rats and mice. Neurobehavioral Toxicology, 1(3), 233–236. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.96104s2317

25. Bannerman DM, et al. (2014). Nat Rev Neurosci, 15(12): 845–856. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3818

26. Felice LJ, et al. (1978). J Neurochem, 31(6): 1461–1465. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-4159.1978.tb05254.x

27. Westerink BHC, et al. (1988). Neurosci Lett, 85(3): 303–308. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3940(88)90503-3

28. Lindroth, P., Mopper, K. (1979). High performance liquid chromatographic determination of subpicomole amounts of amino acids. Analytical Chemistry, 51(11), 1667–1674. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac50047a019

29. Seeman P, et al. (1975). PNAS, 72(11): 4376–4380. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.72.11.4376

30. Hoyer D, et al. (1986). Eur J Pharmacol, 121(1): 103–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-2999(86)90702-6

31. Enna, S.J. (1978). The GABA Receptor Assay: Focus on Human Studies. In: Fonnum, F. (eds) Amino Acids as Chemical Transmitters. NATO Advanced Study Institutes Series, vol 16. Springer, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-4030-0_34

32. Ellman GL, et al. (1961). Biochem Pharmacol, 7(2): 88–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-2952(61)90145-9

33. Tipton KF, et al. (2004). Biochem Soc Trans, 32(1): 15–19. https://doi.org/10.1042/BST0320015

34. Reinhard JF, et al. (1983). J Neurochem, 40(3): 909–916. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-4159.1983.tb04094.x

35. Greig NH, et al. (2002). Curr Med Res Opin, 18(2): 89–101. https://doi.org/10.1185/030079902125000485

36. Youdim MBH, et al. (2006). Nat Rev Neurosci, 7(4): 295–309. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1883

37. Nagatsu T. (1991). J Neural Transm Suppl, 34: 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7091-6706-0_1

38. Nestler EJ, Hyman SE. (2010). Animal models of neuropsychiatric disorders. Nat Neurosci, 13(10): 1161–1169. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2647

39. Jankowsky JL, et al. (2004). Co-expression of multiple transgenes in mouse CNS: a comparison of strategies. Neuron, 44(2): 293–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2004.09.020

40. Ebert U, Kirch W. (1998). Scopolamine model of dementia: electroencephalogram findings and cognitive performance. Eur J Clin Invest, 28(11): 944–949. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2362.1998.00367.x

41. Ungerstedt U. (1968). 6-hydroxy-dopamine induced degeneration of central monoamine neurons. Eur J Pharmacol, 5(1): 107–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-2999(68)90164-7

42. Langston JW, et al. (1983). Chronic Parkinsonism in humans due to a product of meperidine-analog synthesis. Science, 219(4587): 979–980. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.6823561

43. Willner P. (1997). Validity, reliability and utility of the chronic mild stress model of depression: a 10-year review. Brain Res Brain Res Rev, 23(3): 327–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0173(96)00030-6

44. Porsolt RD, et al. (1977). Behavioural despair in rats: a new model sensitive to antidepressant treatments. Eur J Pharmacol, 47(4): 379–391. https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-2999(78)90118-8

45. van der Worp HB, et al. (2010). Can animal models of disease reliably inform human studies? PLoS Med, 7(3): e1000245. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000245

46. Begley CG, Ellis LM. (2012). Drug development: Raise standards for preclinical cancer research. Nature, 483(7391): 531–533. https://doi.org/10.1038/483531a

47. Hampel H, et al. (2018). Blood-based biomarkers for Alzheimer disease: mapping the road to the clinic. Nat Rev Neurol, 14(11): 639–652. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41582-018-0079-7

48. Pound P, et al. (2004). Where is the evidence that animal research benefits humans? BMJ, 328(7438): 514–517. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.328.7438.514

49. Hasin Y, Seldin M, Lusis A. (2017). Multi-omics approaches to disease. Genome Biol, 18(1): 83. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-017-1215-1

50. Lancaster MA, Knoblich JA. (2014). Organogenesis in a dish: modeling development and disease using organoid technologies. Science, 345(6194): 1247125. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1247125

51. Zhavoronkov A, et al. (2019). Deep learning enables rapid identification of potent DDR1 kinase inhibitors. Nat Biotechnol, 37(9): 1038–1040. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0224-x

52. Keck, T. M., & McNaughton, N. (2020). Translational validation of rodent anxiety models: From bench to bedside. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 114, 109–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2020.03.014

53. Kalueff, A. V., et al. (2016). Neurobiology of rodent self-grooming and its value for translational neuroscience. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 17(1), 45–59. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2015.8

54. Millan, M. J., et al. (2012). Cognitive dysfunction in psychiatric disorders: characteristics, causes and the quest for improved therapy. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 11(2), 141–168. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3628

55. Belzung, C., & Lemoine, M. (2011). Criteria of validity for animal models of psychiatric disorders: focus on anxiety disorders and depression. Biology of Mood & Anxiety Disorders, 1, 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/2045-5380-1-9

56. Duyckaerts, C., et al. (2009). Neuropathology of Alzheimer's disease. Acta Neuropathologica, 118(1), 5–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-009-0532-1