

## 1 Supplemental text

## 2 **Materials and Methods**

### 3 *General health check*

4 Behavioral experiments were started one week after desflurane anesthesia. At the start of  
5 each test battery, each mouse was observed in a clean cage for a general health check  
6 (Supplemental table 1), followed by neurological screening. Posture was observed in the home  
7 cage (Crawley, 2007; Miyakawa et al., 2001; Takase et al., 2012).

8

### 9 *Neurological screening test*

10 Following the general health check, each mouse was challenged to evaluate their reflex  
11 responses (Crawley, 2007; Miyakawa et al., 2001; Takase et al., 2012). The neurological  
12 screening tests were designed to detect any gross abnormalities in physical function. The ear-  
13 twitch reflex was tested by approaching one ear from behind and touching the pinna, eliciting  
14 immediate movement of that ear. The eye-blink reflex was tested by approaching one eye with  
15 the covered end of a cotton-tipped applicator, eliciting immediate blinking by that eye. The

1 postural reflex was tested by shaking the cage, eliciting the extension of all four legs to maintain  
2 an upright, balanced position. The righting reflex was tested by turning the mouse over onto its  
3 back, eliciting an immediate turnover response to restore the upright posture of standing on all  
4 four paws. The whisker-touch reflex was tested by lightly touching one set of vibrissae, eliciting  
5 cessation of whisker movement and causing the mouse to turn its head ipsilaterally to the  
6 vibrissae that was touched.

7

## 8 ***Behavioral test batteries***

9 Each behavioral test battery started when the mice were 8 weeks old (control group, n = 10  
10 to 11/ a test battery; desflurane-treated group, n = 10/ a test battery) and ended by they were 9  
11 weeks old. Our behavioral test batteries consisted of 7 test batteries as outlined in Supplementary  
12 Fig. 1, which minimize potential carry-over effects between behavioral tests (McIlwain *et al.*,  
13 2001; Paylor *et al.*, 2006; Yonezaki *et al.*, 2015). The experiments to examine the postanesthetic  
14 effects of desflurane were not performed all at once, since sufficient cage space is not available  
15 to breed large number of mice simultaneously. Therefore, a different control group was prepared

1 for the behavioral testing for desflurane-treated group. Behavioral testing, with the exception of  
2 the two bottle choice test, was performed between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM. Before performing  
3 each test, the apparatus to be used was cleaned with 70% ethyl alcohol. The experimental rooms  
4 (Room A, 165 x 165 x 175 cm; Room B, 128 x 128 x 195 cm; Room C, 128 x 128 x 195 cm)  
5 were illuminated at 185 lx as measured at the floor of the room. The mice were habituated for 30  
6 min before performing the behavioral tests in the room. The balance-beam test, attention tests,  
7 and contextual/cued fear conditioning test were performed in Room A. The anxiety tests,  
8 depression test, novel place/object recognition test, and social recognition test were performed in  
9 Room B. The sensory tests, motor tests (except the balance-beam test), and sociability tests were  
10 performed in Room C.

11

## 12 ***Sensory test battery***

### 13 ***Visual placing test***

14 Visual function was assessed using the visual placing test (Crawley, 2007; Heyser, 2003;  
15 Takase *et al.*, 2012). This test involves holding the mouse by its tail approximately 30 cm above

1 a flat table surface. As the mouse is gradually lowered to the table, it extends its forepaws for a  
2 “soft landing”. A blind mouse does not see the approaching surface and does not extend its  
3 forelimbs until its whiskers or nose touch the table. Extension of the forepaws was recorded as a  
4 yes or no response by the investigator.

### 5 ***Preyer reflex test***

6 Auditory function was assessed by the Preyer reflex test (Crawley, 2007; Henry and Willott,  
7 1972; Huang *et al.*, 1995; Takase *et al.*, 2012). The Preyer reflex is a flinch response to the sound  
8 of a loud hand clap. The reflex was recorded as a yes or no response by the investigator.

### 9 ***Von Frey hairs touch test***

10 Tactile function was assessed using the Von Frey hairs touch test (Crawley, 2007; Fuchs *et*  
11 *al.*, 1999; Pitcher *et al.*, 1999). The mouse stood on an elevated platform with wide gauge wire  
12 mesh on the surface. The Von Frey hair (2.9 N) was inserted through the holes in the mesh from  
13 below to poke the undersurface of a hind paw. A normal response was defined as the mouse  
14 quickly flicking its paw away from the Von Frey hair. If the mouse showed the normal responses  
15 in two out of three consecutive trials, its tactile ability was recorded as normal.

1

2

### 3 ***Two bottle choice test***

4 Gustatory function was assessed using the two bottle choice test (Crawley, 2007; Takase *et*  
5 *al.*, 2012). The mouse was placed in a square aluminum cage (22 x 32 x 11 cm) and habituated  
6 for approximately 24 h. During this habituation period, the mouse was allowed to drink from two  
7 bottles containing water. After the habituation period, one of the two bottles was replaced with a  
8 bottle containing 5% sucrose and consumption monitored for 24 h as gram per gram of body  
9 weight. Standard pellet laboratory diet was provided *ad libitum* for the entire experimental  
10 period. The preference for sucrose was calculated using the following formula:

11 Preference (%) = sucrose consumption (g) / total consumption (g) x 100.

### 12 ***Olfactory habituation/dishabituation test***

13 Olfaction was assessed by an olfactory habituation/dishabituation test (Silverman *et al.*,  
14 2010; Wrenn *et al.*, 2003). The odorant stimuli were tap water, vanilla extract (Golden Kelly Pat.  
15 Flavor, Osaka, Japan) diluted 1:100 in tap water, and bitter almond extract (Golden Kelly Pat.

1 Flavor) diluted 1:100 in tap water. The odorant and dilution choices were based on data from  
2 pilot experiments in our laboratory. Experimenters presented stimuli by dipping a cotton-tipped  
3 applicator into the stimulus solution and then placing it through the wire lid of the cage. The  
4 applicator was stabilized 4.4 cm from the bottom of the cage. Each stimulus was presented for 3  
5 min and then replaced by a new applicator three times in succession, for a total of nine  
6 presentations. The order of presentation was water (3x), vanilla (3x), and bitter almond (3x). An  
7 experimenter using a stopwatch recorded the cumulative time that the mouse spent sniffing the  
8 cotton-tipped applicator. Sniffing was defined as (a) tilting the head upward with the nose  
9 oriented toward and within 2 cm of the applicator, (b) rearing with the nose oriented toward and  
10 within 2 cm of the applicator, and (c) physically contacting the muzzle to the applicator if the  
11 mouth was closed. Occasional open-mouth contacts were considered to be chewing and not  
12 included in the cumulative sniff time.

### 13 ***Hot-plate test***

14 The hot-plate test was performed by placing the mouse on a metal surface (19 cm in  
15 diameter, Muromachi Kikai, Tokyo, Japan) maintained at  $54^{\circ} \pm 0.1^{\circ}\text{C}$ . The hot plate was

1 surrounded by a transparent plastic barrier 20 cm in diameter and 25 cm in height. The latency to  
2 jumping off the plate or licking a hind paw was recorded. Sixty seconds was used as a cut-off  
3 time to protect the paw against injury (Blakeman et al., 2003; Crawley, 2007).

4

## 5 ***Motor test battery***

### 6 ***Rotarod test***

7 Motor coordination and balance were assessed using an accelerating rotarod (Muromachi  
8 Kikai) as described previously (Holmes *et al.*, 2001; Paylor *et al.*, 2006). Mice were placed on a  
9 cylinder that slowly accelerated from 4 to 40 rpm the latency to fall recorded for a maximum of  
10 300 s. Each mouse performed three trials.

### 11 ***Balance-beam test***

12 Motor coordination and balance were also assessed by measuring the ability of the mice to  
13 traverse a graded series of narrow beams to reach an enclosed safety platform (Carter *et al.*,  
14 1999). The beams consisted of long square or round strips of metal (1 m in length) with a cross-  
15 section of 5-, 12-, or 28-mm or diameter of 11, 17, or 28 mm, respectively. The beams were

1 placed horizontally 50 cm above the bench surface, with one end mounted on a narrow support  
2 and the other end attached to an enclosed box (20 cm square) into which the mouse could escape.  
3 Lights (1200 lx) were positioned above and to one side of the start of the beam. During training  
4 (1 day), mice were placed at the start of the 12-mm square beam and trained for 6 trials to  
5 traverse the beam to the enclosed box. Twenty four hours after the training, the mouse performed  
6 one trial on each of the square beams and each of the round beams, progressing from the  
7 narrowest to the widest. Mice were allowed up to 60 s to traverse each beam. The latency to  
8 traverse each beam and the number of times the hind feet slipped off were recorded for each trial.

### 9 ***Hanging wire test***

10 Motor function was assessed using the wire hang test, which requires balance and grip  
11 strength (Crawley, 2007; Sango *et al.*, 1999; Takase *et al.*, 2012). A standard wire cage lid was  
12 used for this test. Masking tape placed around the perimeter of the lid prevented the mouse from  
13 walking off the edge. The test was performed by placing the mouse on the top of a wire cage lid.  
14 The investigator shook the lid lightly three times to cause the mouse to grip the wires and then  
15 turned the lid upside down. The upside-down lid was held approximately 40 cm above the cage



1 litter, high enough to prevent the mouse from easily climbing down but not high enough to cause  
2 harm in the event of a fall. Each mouse performed two trials. The investigator used a stopwatch  
3 to time the latency in falling off the wire lid with a maximum of 60 s.

4

### 5 ***Anxiety test battery***

#### 6 ***Elevated plus-maze test***

7 The elevated plus-maze test was conducted as described previously (Holmes *et al.*, 2002a,b;  
8 Holmes *et al.*, 2003). The apparatus consisted of two open arms (29.7 x 5.4 cm) and two closed  
9 arms (30 x 6 x 15 cm) extending from a common central platform (6 x 6 cm). A small raised lip  
10 (0.3 cm) around the perimeter of the open arms prevented the mouse from falling. The apparatus  
11 was constructed from polypropylene, with gray floor and gray walls, and elevated 40 cm above  
12 the floor. Mice were placed individually on the center square facing an open arm and allowed to  
13 freely explore the apparatus under overhead fluorescent lighting (200 lx) for 5 min. Time spent  
14 in the open arms and open and closed arm entry (all four paws in an arm) were scored by a  
15 highly trained observer using behavioral scoring software (ANY-maze, Stoelting, IL, USA).

1

## 2 ***Open field test***

3       The open field test was conducted as described previously (Paylor *et al.*, 1998). Each subject  
4 was placed in the center of a clear Plexiglas (50 x 50 x 40 cm) chamber in standard room-  
5 lighting conditions (70 lx). Activity in the open field was quantitated by TimeOFCR4 (O'hara,  
6 Tokyo, Japan). Horizontal activity in the center (30 x 30 cm) or peripheral area, total distance  
7 (cm), and time in the center or periphery were recorded in seconds. The center distance was also  
8 divided by the total distance to obtain a center distance/total distance ratio, which can be used as  
9 an index of anxiety. Data were collected during 10 min test sessions.

## 10 ***Light-dark exploration test***

11       The light-dark exploration test was performed as described previously (Holmes *et al.*,  
12 2002a,b; Holmes *et al.*, 2003; Mathis *et al.*, 1994). The apparatus consisted of a polypropylene  
13 cage (44 x 21 x 21 cm, Muromachi Kikai) separated into two compartments by a partition with a  
14 small aperture (12 x 5 cm) at floor level. The larger compartment (28 cm long) was open-topped,  
15 transparent, and brightly illuminated by white light from a 40 W desk lamp (1000 lx). The

1 smaller compartment (14 cm long) was close-topped and painted black. Mice were placed  
2 individually in the center of the light compartment, facing away from the partition, and allowed  
3 to freely explore the apparatus for 10 min. The number of light-dark transitions between the two  
4 compartments and the total time spent in the dark compartment were automatically recorded by  
5 ANY-maze.

6

## 7 ***Depression test battery***

### 8 ***Porsolt forced swim test***

9 Antidepressant activity was assessed by the Porsolt forced swim test. For swim sessions,  
10 mice were placed in individual glass cylinders (24.5 cm tall, 19 cm in diameter) filled with water  
11 (23° to 25°C water) to a depth of 15 cm. The depth was deep enough so that mice could not  
12 support themselves by placing their paws on the base of the cylinder. The procedure was similar  
13 to that of Porsolt *et al.* (1977). Behavioral scoring employed a standard 6-min test duration  
14 (Borsini and Meli, 1988). The water was changed between subjects. All test sessions were  
15 recorded, and the duration of immobility during the last 4 min of the test period and the latency

1 to first immobility during the 6 min test period automatically quantified by ANY-maze. A mouse  
2 was judged to be immobile when making only those movements necessary to keep its head  
3 above water.

#### 4 ***Tail suspension test***

5 Antidepressant activity was also assessed by the tail suspension test as described previously  
6 (Cryan and Mombereau, 2004; Holmes *et al.*, 2002a,b). Mice were securely fastened to a flat  
7 metallic surface by the tip of the tail (2 to 3 cm) using medical adhesive tape and suspended 30  
8 cm above the ground in a 40 cm<sup>3</sup> white Plexiglas box that isolated the mouse from visual  
9 distractions but permitted observation of behavior from above. The latency to first immobility,  
10 defined as the absence of limb movement, and the time of immobility was sampled by ANY-  
11 maze.

12

#### 13 ***Sociability test battery***

#### 14 ***Social interaction test***

1 Social behavior was examined using the conventional social interaction test (Crawley, 2007;  
2 Silverman *et al.*, 2010; Yonezaki *et al.*, 2015). Each subject was placed in the center of a cubical  
3 box (30 x 36 x 17 cm) in standard room-lighting conditions. A naive same-sex mouse was then  
4 introduced into the cubical box and allowed to explore freely for 5 min. The interaction  
5 frequency and total duration of the interaction were recorded. Social interaction comprised  
6 sniffing, grooming, exploring, following, kicking, mounting, jumping on, wrestling, and other  
7 forms of physical contact.

### 8 ***Tube test***

9 The tube test assay was adapted from Lindzey *et al.* (1961). The test employed a transparent  
10 Plexiglas tube 30 cm in length with a 3 cm inside diameter, which is sufficient to permit one  
11 adult mouse to pass through without reversing direction. For training, each mouse was released  
12 at alternating ends of the tube to run through the tube, sometimes with the help of a plastic stick  
13 pushing at its back. Each animal was given eight training trials per day on two successive days.  
14 On the third day, the mice were given the test trial. During the test trial, two mice were released  
15 simultaneously into opposite ends, and care was taken to ensure that they met in the middle of

1 the tube. The mouse that first retreated from the tube within 2 min was designated the “loser” of  
2 that trial. In rare cases when no mouse retreated within 2 min, the tests were repeated. Between  
3 each trial, the tube was cleaned with 70% ethanol. Between the control and desflurane-treated  
4 groups, paired encounters were staged based on body weight.

### 5 ***Attention test battery***

### 6 ***Prepulse inhibition test***

7 The prepulse inhibition test was performed as described by Miyakawa *et al.* (2003) using a  
8 startle reflex measurement system (O’hara). A test session began by placing a mouse in a  
9 Plexiglas cylinder, where it was left undisturbed for 5 min. The duration of white noise used as  
10 the startle stimulus was 40 ms for all trial types. The startle response was recorded for 160 ms  
11 (measuring the response every 1 ms), starting with the onset of the prepulse stimulus. The  
12 background noise level in each chamber was 70 dB. The peak startle amplitude recorded during  
13 the 160-ms sampling window was used as the dependent variable. A test session consisted of six  
14 trial types (i.e., two types for startle stimulus-only trials, and four types for prepulse inhibition  
15 trials). The intensity of the startle stimulus was 110 or 120 dB. The prepulse sound was presented

1 100 ms before the startle stimulus, and its intensity was 74 or 78 dB. Four combinations of  
2 prepulse and startle stimuli were employed (74-110, 78-110, 74-120, and 78-120). Six blocks of  
3 the six trial types (four trial types with the combinations of prepulse and startle stimulus and two  
4 startle stimulus-only trials) were presented in pseudorandom order, such that each trial type was  
5 presented once within a block. The average intertrial interval was 15 s (range, 10 to 20 s). The  
6 percentage of prepulse inhibition was calculated as follows: ((startle response for pulse alone -  
7 startle response for pulse with prepulse) / startle response for pulse alone) x 100.

### 8 ***Latent inhibition test***

9 This experiment was performed similar to that reported by Miyakawa *et al.* (2003). On the  
10 first day, each mouse was placed in a conditioning chamber (Muromachi Kikai). The mice were  
11 divided into two groups: pre-exposed (P) and non-pre-exposed (NP). The P group was exposed  
12 to 40 white noise (68 dB, 5-s duration, 25-s interstimulus interval), and the NP group was  
13 exposed to no stimulus during an equivalent period. Immediately after the pre-exposure period,  
14 white noise -shock pairs consisting of a 5-s white noise co-terminating with a 2-s foot shock at  
15 0.4 mA were delivered to both groups with a 25-s interstimulus interval. Afterward, mice

1 remained in the chamber for 25 s before being returned to the home cage. On day 2, the mice  
2 were placed in the conditioning chamber for 5 min to measure freezing to the context. On day 3,  
3 the mice were put in a white Plexiglas chamber scented with vanilla essence, and after 180 s, a  
4 180-s white noise was delivered to measure cued freezing.

5

## 6 ***Learning test battery***

### 7 ***Novel place/object recognition test***

8       The novel place/object recognition test was performed using a cubical box (30 x 36 x 17 cm)  
9 made of clear Plexiglas (Ng *et al.*, 2009). All behavioral events were scored and analyzed by a  
10 highly trained observer. The test consisted of three sessions with intertrial intervals of 2 min,  
11 during which mice were returned to their home cages. During the habituation session, four  
12 different plastic objects were presented in the cubical box. Exploration of the four different  
13 plastic objects in the cubical box was measured every 5 min for 15 min under dim lighting (4 lx).  
14 In the place recognition session, the four objects initially placed in a square arrangement were  
15 reconfigured into a polygon-shaped pattern by moving two objects (displaced objects, DOs). The



1 remaining two objects were left at the same location (non-displaced objects, NDOs). The time  
2 spent exploring the DOs and NDOs was recorded for 5 min and expressed as a percentage of the  
3 total time for object investigation. In the object recognition session, one of the NDOs was  
4 replaced with a new object (NO) at the same location, and the two DOs were removed. The time  
5 examining the NO or familiar NDO (FO) was recorded for 5 min and expressed as a percentage  
6 of the total time for object investigation.

### 7 ***Social recognition test***

8 Recognition memory about other individuals was assessed by a social recognition test  
9 (Crawley, 2007; Silverman *et al.*, 2010; Yonezaki *et al.*, 2015). For training, mice were placed in  
10 a cubical box (30 x 36 x 17 cm) with a naïve mouse for 10 min. One hour later, the mouse was  
11 returned to the cubical box and exposed to the same mouse and a novel mouse for 10 min. The  
12 time spent exploring each mouse was recorded during both the training and test phases. The  
13 percentage of novelty preference was calculated follows: (novel individual exploration duration)  
14 / (novel individual exploration duration + familiar individual exploration duration) x 100.

### 15 ***Cued/contextual fear conditioning test***

1        This cued/contextual fear conditioning test was performed as described by Miyakawa *et al.*  
2        (2003). On the first day, each mouse was placed in a conditioning chamber (Muromachi Kikai).  
3        The mice were habituated to the chamber for 1200 s. Immediately after exposure to the chamber,  
4        white noise-shock pairs consisting of a 5-s white noise co-terminating with a 2-s foot shock at  
5        0.4 mA were delivered with a 25-s interstimulus interval. Afterward, mice remained in the  
6        chamber for 25 s before being returned to their home cage. On day 2, the mice were placed back  
7        in the conditioning chamber for 5 min to measure freezing to the context. On day 3, the mice  
8        were put in a white Plexiglas chamber scented with vanilla essence, and after 180 s, a 180-s  
9        white noise was delivered to measure cued freezing.

## 1 **References**

- 2 Borsini F, Meli A (1988). Is the forced swimming test a suitable model for revealing  
3 antidepressant activity? *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* **94**: 147-60.
- 4 Carter RJ, Lione LA, Humby T, Mangiarini L, Mahal A, Bates GP, et al. (1999).  
5 Characterization of progressive motor deficits in mice transgenic for the human Huntington's  
6 disease mutation. *J Neurosci* **19**: 3248-57.
- 7 Crawley JN (2007). *What's Wrong with My Mouse? Behavioral Phenotyping of Transgenic and*  
8 *Knockout Mice*. New York: Wiley-Liss.
- 9 Cryan JF, Mombereau C (2004). In search of a depressed mouse: utility of models for studying  
10 depression-related behavior in genetically modified mice. *Mol Psychiatry* **9**: 326-57.
- 11 Fuchs PN, Roza C, Sora I, Uhl G, Raja SN (1999). Characterization of mechanical withdrawal  
12 responses and effects of mu-, delta- and kappa-opioid agonists in normal and mu-opioid  
13 receptor knockout mice. *Brain Res* **821**: 480-6.
- 14 Henry KR, Willott JF (1972). Unilateral inhibition of audiogenic seizures and Preyer reflexes.  
15 *Nature* **240**: 481-2.

- 1 Heyser CJ (2003). Assessment of developmental milestones in rodents. In: *Current Protocols in*  
2 *Neuroscience*. New York: Wiley-Liss; pp 8.18.1-15.
- 3 Holmes A, Hollon TR, Gleason TC, Liu Z, Dreiling J, Sibley DR, et al. (2001). Behavioral  
4 characterization of dopamine D5 receptor null mutant mice. *Behav Neurosci* **115**: 1129-44.
- 5 Holmes A, Kinney JW, Wrenn CC, Li Q, Yang RJ, Ma L, et al. (2003). Galanin GAL-R1  
6 receptor null mutant mice display increased anxiety-like behavior specific to the elevated  
7 plus maze. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **28**: 1031-44.
- 8 Holmes A, Wrenn CC, Harris AP, Thayer KE, Crawley JN (2002a) Behavioral profiles of inbred  
9 strains on novel olfactory, spatial and emotional tests for reference memory in mice. *Genes*  
10 *Brain Behav* **1**: 55-69.
- 11 Holmes A, Yang RJ, Crawley JN (2002b) Evaluation of an anxiety-related phenotype in galanin  
12 overexpressing transgenic mice. *J Mol Neurosci* **18**: 151-65.
- 13 Huang JM, Money MK, Berlin CI, Keats BJ (1995). Auditory phenotyping of heterozygous  
14 sound-responsive (+/dn) and deafness (dn/dn) mice. *Hear Res* **88**: 61-4.

- 1 Lindzey G, Winston H, Manosevitz M (1961). Social dominance in inbred mouse strains. *Nature*  
2 **191**: 474-6.
- 3 Mathis C, Paul SM, Crawley JN (1994). Characterization of benzodiazepine-sensitive behaviors  
4 in the A/J and C57BL/6J inbred strains of mice. *Behav Genet* **24**: 171-80.
- 5 McIlwain KL, Merriweather MY, Yuva-Paylor LA, Paylor R (2001). The use of behavioral test  
6 batteries: effects of training history. *Physiol Behav* **73**: 705-17.
- 7 Miyakawa T, Leiter LM, Gerber DJ, Gainetdinov RR, Sotnikova TD, Zeng H, et al. (2003).  
8 Conditional calcineurin knockout mice exhibit multiple abnormal behaviors related to  
9 schizophrenia. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **100**: 8987-92.
- 10 Miyakawa T, Yared E, Pak JH, Huang FL, Huang KP, Crawley JN (2001). Neurogranin null  
11 mutant mice display performance deficits on spatial learning tasks with anxiety related  
12 components. *Hippocampus* **11**: 763-75.
- 13 Ng D, Pitcher GM, Szilard RK, Sertié A, Kanisek M, Clapcote SJ, et al. (2009). Neto1 is a novel  
14 CUB-domain NMDA receptor-interacting protein required for synaptic plasticity and  
15 learning. *PLoS Biol* **7**: e41.

- 1 Paylor R, Nguyen M, Crawley JN, Patrick J, Beaudet A, Orr-Urtreger A (1998). Alpha7 nicotinic  
2 receptor subunits are not necessary for hippocampal-dependent learning or sensorimotor  
3 gating: a behavioral characterization of  $\alpha 7$ -deficient mice. *Learn Mem* **5**: 302-16.
- 4 Paylor R, Spencer CM, Yuva-Paylor LA, Pieke-Dahl S (2006) The use of behavioral test  
5 batteries, II: effect of test interval. *Physiol Behav* **87**: 95-102.
- 6 Pitcher GM, Ritchie J, Henry JL (1999). Paw withdrawal threshold in the von Frey hair test is  
7 influenced by the surface on which the rat stands. *J Neurosci Methods* **87**: 185-93.
- 8 Porsolt RD, Le Pichon M, Jalfre M (1977). Depression: a new animal model sensitive to  
9 antidepressant treatments. *Nature* **266**: 730-2.
- 10 Sango K, McDonald MP, Crawley JN, Mack ML, Tiffit CJ, Skop E, et al. (1996). Mice lacking  
11 both subunits of lysosomal beta-hexosaminidase display gangliosidosis and  
12 mucopolysaccharidosis. *Nat Genet* **14**: 348-52.
- 13 Silverman JL, Yang M, Lord C, Crawley JN (2010). Behavioural phenotyping assays for mouse  
14 models of autism. *Nat Rev Neurosci* **11**: 490-502.

- 1 Takase K, Yamamoto Y, Yagami T (2012). Maternal deprivation in the middle of a stress  
2 hyporesponsive period decreases hippocampal calcineurin expression and causes abnormal  
3 social and cognitive behaviours in adult male Wistar rats: relevance to negative symptoms of  
4 schizophrenia. *Behav Brain Res* **232**: 306-15.
- 5 Wrenn CC, Harris AP, Saavedra MC, Crawley JN (2003). Social transmission of food preference  
6 in mice: methodology and application to galanin-overexpressing transgenic mice. *Behav*  
7 *Neurosci* **117**: 21-31.
- 8 Yonezaki K, Uchimoto K, Miyazaki T, Asakura A, Kobayashi A, Takase K, et al. (2015).  
9 Postanesthetic effects of isoflurane on behavioral phenotypes of adult male C57BL/6J mice.  
10 *PLoS One* **10**: e0122118.  
11

1 **Supplementary Table 1.** The items in the general health check

2 -----

3 Bald patch

4 Body size

5 Body weight

6 Crustiness around the nostrils/ eyes

7 Ear pinna/ Footpad color

8 Fur

9 Gait

10 Lesions on the feet/ tail

11 Posture

12 Scabs on the tail, rump, back

13 Tumor

14 Whisker

15 -----