## Pentylenetetrazol: Failure to Improve Memory in Mice

Pentylenetetrazol purportedly improves memory in mice. Irwin and Benuazizi (1) suggested that pretrial doses of pentylenetetrazol improve short-term retention, that posttrial doses improve longer-term retention, and that the doses that facilitate retention are much less than those that produce convulsions. We tried to confirm the salient parts of their findings.

Our method was similar to theirs. Male CF1 mice, 9 to 10 weeks old, were placed individually in a small antechamber that led into a larger chamber. When they stepped on the grids of the large chamber, the mice received 0.2 ma of electric shock for 0.5 second. When replaced in the antechamber, these mice took longer to reenter the large chamber than did unshocked mice, a result noted previously (1).

Sixteen groups of 14 mice each received oral doses of either pentylenetetrazol or distilled water either 30 minutes before (pretrial) or immediately after the shock (posttrial). Either 8 minutes or 24 hours after the shock, the mice received a second trial, with a cutoff latency of 180 seconds for reentry. Procedure and results are summarized in Table 1.

Pentylenetetrazol had no statistically significant effects on reentry latencies. The two groups receiving posttrial doses of 10 mg/kg had slightly longer reentry latencies than did the two corresponding control groups only because 16 of the drugged mice, as opposed to 11 of the control mice, did not reenter the shock chamber.

As for the pretrial results, none of the drugged groups had significantly longer reentry latencies than did their control groups. Like Irwin and Benuazizi, we did find relatively great varia-

Table 1. Mean reentry latencies.

Interval between		Dose (mg/kg, free base)			
trials (hr)	Nil	1	3	10	30
*******		Pa	osttrial		
$24 \\ 24^* \}$	110)	98†	108†	124†} 134†{§	108†
24*∫	115 <i>)</i>			134†∫ <sup>8</sup>	
		Pr	etrial		
24	76) 110∫		118‡} 87†{ <sup>§</sup>	114‡} 110†∫§	
24*∫	110 <b>∫</b>		87†∫ <sup>s</sup>	110†∫ <sup>°</sup>	
0.133	71		90†	71†	

\* Replication.  $\dagger P's > .25$  for comparisons of control and drugged groups within each condition, according to two-tailed rank-sum test (N, 14 per group).  $\ddagger P's > .10 (N, 14 \text{ per group})$ . \$ P's > .30 when the data for replication are pooled (N, 28 per group).

tion between some of the mean latencies in attempting to replicate our results, especially under the pretrial conditions. (That the duration of the interval between training and testing affects reentry latencies has already been suggested by Irwin and Benuazizi.)

Observation of additional mice that had been drugged with pentylenetetrazol at 10 or 30 mg/kg indicated that they were more prone to "freeze" than were control mice when replaced in the antechamber after being shocked. Accordingly, any marginal effects that pentylenetetrazol may have had on reentry latencies may have had more to do with emotionality than with cognition. At all events our results do not favor the notion that pentylenetetrazol improves memory in mice (2).

JACK PEARL

DONNA B. MCKEAN Department of Pharmacology, Sterling-Winthrop Research Institute, Rensselaer, New York

## **References and Notes**

- 1. S. Irwin and A. Benuazizi, Science 152, 100 (1966).
- 2. Because slight differences between the procedures of experiments may lead to different results, we describe our method in detail. The antechamber (17.5 by 5 by 12.5 cm high) had plexiglass walls, the rear wall being hinged. The larger chamber, in which the mice were shocked, was a converted Skinner box (Grason-Stadler, model E3125A-100) with the food cup removed. To enter the shock chamber the mice had to cross a 1.5-cm barrier. A Grason-Stadler model-E1064GS shock generator was set at the 0.2-ma calibration. Of 333 mice, 324 entered the shock chamber within 50 seconds on the first trial; the remaining nine were discarded. The mice were fasted for about 4 hours before the start of testing. The volume of medication was 0.1 ml/10 g. Pentylenetetrazol solutions were from the Knoll Pharmaccutical Co. (lot 633). The experimenter was not informed of the nature of the dosage.

26 April 1967

Important in demonstrating the ability of pentylenetetrazol to increase response latency is an experimental arrangement that results in marked reduction of control latencies after 24 hours. This condition was achieved in neither Pearl's study nor (I now note) in my own control study with strychnine, though it was present in the pentylenetetrazol study. In reviewing our data I have found the source of the discrepancy and must confess error in describing the experimental arrangement; it was accurate for the strychnine but not for the pentylenetetrazol study. For the latter, the animals were not equilibrated overnight in their home cages, but were placed in plastic cages (12.5 by 12.5 by 27.5 cm), without access to food or water, on each test day for the period of fasting and for the several hours required for testing all the animals; later they were returned to their home cages.

With this arrangement there appears to be an interaction effect that usually results in markedly reduced control latencies after 24 hours—the condition required for demonstrating drug-induced enhancement. I have been authorized by R. I. Taber of Schering Corporation and J. Gogerty of Sandoz Pharmaceuticals to report that they have been able to confirm my findings with pentylenetetrazol, when these conditions obtained, in about 2 to 3 of every 5 studies undertaken.

We have found "blind" ratings (on a 0-to-8 scale) of the apprehension levels of the animals, during the first 15 seconds in the apparatus, significantly correlated with their subsequent response latencies. I am inclined, therefore, to agree with Pearl's inference that the effect of pentylenetetrazol "may have had more to do with emotionality than with cognition." Furthermore I am convinced it is the apprehension level rather than memory per se that is predominantly measured by the one-trial learning procedure.

SAMUEL IRWIN

Department of Psychiatry, University of Oregon Medical School, Portland 5 June 1967

## Tetrodotoxin: Comments on Effects on Squid Axons

We would like to clarify an apparent misunderstanding by Watanabe, Tasaki, Singer, and Lerman (1) of our report on the blocking of squid axons by tetrodotoxin (TTX) (2). Our experimental findings are compatible, as they noted, and agreement should be complete when semantic difficulties are removed.

Watanabe et al. (1) cited our report, saying, "It has been argued that TTX may be specific for the 'sodium channel,' rather than for the sodium ion." Although this term has been used loosely and frequently to designate that path through which sodium ions normally flow when they are present either inside or outside the nerve membrane, in our paper (2) we used the expression early "transiently open conductance channel" to distinguish effects on the early conductance increase (early channel) from those on the late conductance increase (late channel). Alkali cations other than sodium have been shown

SCIENCE, VOL. 157