Journal of Neuroscience Methods 286 (2017) 1–5

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Neuroscience Methods

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jneumeth

Short communication

A shortened protocol for assessing cognitive bias in rats

Nichola M. Brydges*, Lynsey Hall

Centre for Cardiovascular Science, QMRI, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

HIGHLIGHTS

- Cognitive bias assays are useful proxy measures of emotion in animals.
- Current protocols are lengthy or suffer from confounds of motivation and negative experiences.
- We have developed a shortened cognitive bias protocol, suitable for use with laboratory rodents.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 8 June 2016
Received in revised form 13 April 2017
Accepted 9 May 2017
Available online 11 May 2017

Keywords:
Cognitive bias
Emotion
Affect
Rat
Protocol

ABSTRACT

Background: Reliable measurement of affective state in animals is a significant goal of animal welfare. Such measurements would also improve the validity of pre-clinical mental health research which relies on animal models. However, at present, affective states in animals are inaccessible to direct measurement. In humans, changes in cognitive processing can give reliable indications of emotional state. Therefore, similar techniques are increasingly being used to gain proxy measures of affective states in animals. In particular, the 'cognitive bias' assay has gained popularity in recent years. Major disadvantages of this technique include length of time taken for animals to acquire the task (typically several weeks), negative experiences associated with task training, and issues of motivation.
New method: Here we present a shortened cognitive bias protocol using only positive reinforcers which must actively be responded to.
Results: The protocol took an average of 4 days to complete, and produced similar results to previous, longer methods (minimum 30 days). Specifically, rats housed in standard laboratory conditions demonstrated negative cognitive biases when presented with ambiguous stimuli, and took longer to make a decision when faced with an ambiguous stimulus.
Comparison with existing methods: Compared to previous methods, this protocol is significantly shorter (average 4 days vs. minimum 30 days), utilises only positive reinforcers to avoid inducing negative affective states, and requires active responses to all cues, avoiding potential confounds of motivational state.
Conclusions: We have successfully developed a shortened cognitive bias protocol, suitable for use with laboratory rats.

1. Introduction

Understanding the affective experiences of animals is fundamental for safeguarding animal welfare and enhancing the reliability and reproducibility of scientific studies (Balcombe, 2006). Greater understanding of affective experiences in animals would also benefit pre-clinical studies utilising animal models of human affective disorders (Panksepp, 2015). Determining mental or affective wellbeing is notoriously difficult to accomplish, as subjective experiences are not directly observable and animals are unable to communicate verbally.

A number of different methods have been proposed to provide proxy measures of affective states in animals (Brydges and Braithwaite, 2008; Paul et al., 2005). In particular, cognitive bias (also known as judgement or interpretation bias) assays have gained popularity over recent years (Bethell, 2015). Cognitive bias assays work on the principal that affective state can impact cognition, producing biases in cognitive processing. In humans, affective state has been shown to alter how information is evaluated, interpreted and remembered, and can alter decision making (Blanchette and Richards, 2010). This is particularly apparent when considering the interpretation of ambiguous information. For example,

* Corresponding author at: Neuroscience and Mental Health Research Institute, Hadyn Ellis Building, Maindy Road, Cardiff, UK.
E-mail addresses: brydgesn@cardiff.ac.uk (N.M. Brydges), Lynsey.Hall@ncl.ac.uk (L. Hall).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2017.05.015

anxious individuals tend to interpret ambiguous or neutral information, such as an ambiguous statement ('that is an interesting pair of shoes you are wearing') or ambiguous facial expressions, in a more negative manner than non-anxious individuals (Gebhardt and Mitte, 2014). It has thus been suggested that determining an individual's interpretation of ambiguous stimuli can give information on their affective state (Mendl et al., 2009). Using this principle, several studies have employed cognitive bias assays to investigate animal responses to ambiguous stimuli in an effort to gain insight into their affective state, commonly before and after an intervention designed to alter affective state. Typically, exposure to negative events, such as unstable housing, removal of environmental enrichment or exposure to anxiety-provoking conditions results in negative responses to ambiguous stimuli in species as diverse as rats, starlings and bees (Bethell, 2015). Conversely, exposure to positive events, such as environmental enrichment, results in more optimistic responses (Bethell, 2015). However, this is not always the case, for example, juvenile stress resulted in more positive responses to ambiguous stimuli in rats (Brydges et al., 2012).

Bethell (2015) has identified three main types of cognitive bias assay. The most widely used approach is the 'Go/No Go Task'. Here animals are trained to make a response (such as lever press) when exposed to one 'positive' cue (e.g. high pitched tone), usually to obtain a food reward, and avoid making a response when exposed to another 'negative' cue (e.g. low pitched tone) to avoid a negative outcome, such as an electric shock. Responses to intermediate, ambiguous cues (e.g. tone of intermediate pitch) are then investigated. Main problems with this type of assay include i) length of training, ii) exposure to negative events during task training, which may induce negative affective states and cognitive biases in themselves, and iii) an inability to determine if lack of response reflects a negative cognitive bias or differences in motivational state (Brydges et al., 2011). A second category of assay follows the same outline as the 'Go/No Go Task' but here animals are required to make an active response when exposed to the 'negative' cue, such as pressing a different lever to avoid a negative outcome, overcoming confounds of differences in motivational state. A third category of assay uses positive and less positive rewards (instead of positive and negative outcomes), and again requires active responses to two different cue presentations. As animals are not exposed to negative events during training, the task itself should not induce negative affective states or cognitive biases. Generally, extensive training is required for all three categories of assay. Specifically for laboratory rats, training and testing ranges between 5 and 62 days, with shorter assays relying on exposure to positive and negative events (Bethell, 2015). The aim of the current study was to design a cognitive bias assay that overcame limitations of existing methods, specifically for rats, by: i) reducing training and testing time, ii) exposing animals to positive and less positive events only, and iii) requiring active responses to all events. This assay was based on a cognitive bias task we have successfully used in our laboratory (Brydges et al., 2012; Brydges et al., 2011), combined with techniques commonly used to assess intra-dimensional extra-dimensional (ID:ED) shift behaviour (Birrell and Brown, 2000). Unlike the ID:ED task, reward stimuli and predictive cues were never altered.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Animals

5 female and 5 male Lister Hooded rats were bred from 3 adult pairs in house and raised by their own mothers at the University of Edinburgh. After weaning, animals were pair housed in standard, same-sex, same-litter cages (61 cm × 43.5 cm, 21.5 cm high), lined with wood shavings (Lillico, UK), on a 12:12 h light/dark cycle with food (standard rat chow, RM1, Special Services Diet, Lillico, UK) and water ad libitum. Humidity and temperature were maintained between 45 and 60% and 19 and 21 °C respectively. Rats were identified by rings of permanent markers around the tail. They were approximately 4 months old at the start of testing, and weighed daily during testing. At the end of the experiment they were killed via a rising concentration of CO_2. All procedures were carried out in accordance with local ethics guidelines, the UK Home Office Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act, 1986, EU directive 2010/63/EU for animal experiments and comply with the ARRIVE guidelines.

2.2. Apparatus

In a separate room from the housing area, a simple Perspex maze was assembled (54 cm long × 36 cm wide × 20 cm high). This maze was divided internally into three sections, one start compartment (34 cm long × 36 cm wide), and two reward compartments (13 cm long × 18 cm wide). A small panel of wood separated the two reward compartments. A series of wooden sticks were glued to the walls of the maze between the start and reward compartments: this allowed insertion of Perspex barriers to physically separate the start and reward compartments (Fig. 1). The reward compartments contained one ceramic foraging bowl each (7.5 cm diameter × 4 cm high), and the entire maze was set on a bench side (1 m high) under regular room lighting. A strip of sandpaper (5 cm × 36 cm) could be attached by Velcro strips in the start area, in front of the reward compartments, when required

2.3. Protocol

Animals were handled for 10 min and fed Cheerios daily for 3 days to habituate them to handling and food rewards. On the third day, food was removed from the home cage overnight, and two ceramic sand filled bowls (the same bowls used in the main task) containing 10 cheerios per bowl were provided in the home cage to habituate animals to the bowls and the rewards. Animals were given 2 h free access to food daily after testing. During a trial, animals were placed individually into the start compartment, and after 10 s, the Perspex barriers blocking the reward compartments were removed. The experimenter recorded the time taken for the rat to choose a bowl (decision time, signified by the rat commencing digging in a particular bowl), which bowl was chosen (with or without reward), and time taken to choose the correct bowl (if not chosen first, and in trials where this was permissible). After completion of a trial, the rat was gently encouraged back into the start compartment, the Perspex barriers were replaced, bowls were removed and rebaited, and the sandpaper removed and replaced before the next trial began. Within a day, testing continued until the rat ceased performing, or 60 min had elapsed, whichever came sooner.

2.3.1. Phase 1–Habituation

This phase was designed to habituate the animals to the maze apparatus. One sand filled bowl was placed into each reward compartment of the maze apparatus. One bowl contained coriander-scented sand (1% by weight coriander), the other cinnamon scented sand (1% by weight cinnamon). For each rat, a large, positive reward of 3 cheerios was associated with one particular scent (coriander or cinnamon) and compartment (left or right), and a small, less positive reward of half a cheerio with the other scent and compartment. This arrangement remained consistent for an individual throughout the experiment (e.g. large reward always in the cinnamon scented bowl on the left, small reward always in the coriander scented bowl on the right), but was randomized between individuals. Therefore, animals had several cues they could utilize to learn which compartment was associated with which reward,