Introduction

Although our understanding of pain and effective pain management has increased greatly over the last decade, many patients still suffer from unmanageable chronic pain and many patients still experience post-operative hyperalgesia and suboptimal pain control (Wilder-Smith & Arendt-Nielsen 2006). Animal pain studies have greatly contributed to our understanding of acute and chronic pain processing. They resulted in validated and reproducible analgesiometric animal tests for research and development of new analgesics for patients, but also were accompanied by suffering in a large number of animals in these tests. An optimal balance between scientific progress and animal welfare is of utmost importance.

The acceptance of animal experiments by the public is strongly related to the degree of animal suffering. This acceptance has been the subject of several polls in European countries over the last decade (MORI / Medical Research Council 1999; Intomart GfK / The Dutch Society for the Protection of Animals, 2004; MORI / Coalition for Medical Progress, 2002; MORI / Coalition for Medical Progress, 2005).

A reduction in the degree of animal suffering in analgesiometric tests can be achieved by the use of anaesthesia as a refinement. The attained improvement in animal welfare by the use of anaesthesia would be welcomed by both researchers and the general public as long as the validity of the analgesiometric tests remains. Refinement is one of the three Rs (Replacement, Reduction and Refinement) criteria as first described in “The Principles of Humane Experimental Technical” (Russell & Burch, 1959).

The pain research community has adapted these principles with the publication of the International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) guidelines (Zimmermann, 1983).
Currently, analgesiometric tests frequently use pain related (reflex) behaviour as the primary outcome and therefore require conscious animals. The debate on optimal choice of behavioural pain tests has been broadened by Vierck et al. (2008), who encourage the use of complex behavioural tests for pain assessment. Within the context of the high attrition rate of drugs at the preclinical / clinical interface, the introduction of complex behavioural tests in the preclinical phase may improve the translational validity of preclinical phase tests. At the moment, however, analgesiometric reflex tests are still performed in large numbers of animals by pharmaceutical companies and the search for alternatives therefore is very relevant.

Analgesiometric tests with an optimal animal welfare profile would use unconscious animals and non-invasive techniques. Unconsciousness would prevent animals from experiencing pain. Non-invasive techniques would minimize discomfort in the animals after recovery from the analgesiometric tests. The possibility to reuse the same animals for different tests of different drugs would also greatly reduce the number of required animals.

Analgesiometric tests in unconscious animals with an optimal scientific profile would provide either the same (reflex) behaviour as under conscious conditions or a useful alternative measure for pain related behaviour. Relevant alternative objective measures could be EEG or fMRI (measurement of blood oxygenation changes in the brain by MRI), both non-invasive approaches, or by monitoring c-fos (a protein marker of neuronal activity monitored by immunohistochemical staining). For EEG, a review on refinement options, including the minimal anaesthesia model, has recently been published (Murrell & Johnson, 2006). Therefore, this review will focus only on c-fos and fMRI as alternative measures for (reflex) pain related behaviour.

The aim of this review is firstly to present an overview of the influence of anaesthesia on pain related reflex behaviour and on c-fos or functional MRI as alternative measures in analgesiometric tests. Secondly, the implications for animal welfare from the use of anaesthesia in analgesiometric tests will be described.

**Analgesiometric tests overview**

Analgesiometric tests each have their specific scientific and welfare characteristics (Table 1). Pain testing characteristics include the applied stimulus, the measured response and the applicability for different types of analgesics. Animal welfare characteristics include group size and level of discomfort. Anaesthesia may influence the outcome of analgesiometric tests. When this influence is present, it is important to find out whether this influence improves or reduces the translational validity of the tests. In general, the translational validity to humans of analgesiometric tests during anaesthesia in animals is indicated by the extent to which analgesic dosages in the animal test correlate with the required dosages for analgesic effects in humans. Anaesthetic influence on pain models depends largely on the chosen outcome measure. Reflex behaviour like a withdrawal reflex will be less susceptible to anaesthetic influence and thus a possible target for refinement than higher order behaviour like aggression. When other response functions than behaviour are chosen as the outcome measure, anaesthetic influence again depends on the particular experimental setup. For example, neural activation as represented by spinal c-fos expression may still be present although pain behaviour has disappeared or vice versa. Therefore, different measures for analgesiometric tests will be discussed in relation to anaesthetic influence on testing results.

**Anaesthesia effects on pain related behaviour and neural c-fos expression**

Several inhalation anaesthetics have been used in published pain test studies, including halothane, isoflurane and sevoflurane. Halothane is a halogen substituted ethane and more or less comparable to chloroform, a halogen substituted methane, while isoflurane and sevoflurane are halogenated ethers. These different molecular structures can result in distinctive anaesthetic/analgetic properties and spe-
specific effects in pain tests.

When both inhalation anaesthetics and injection anaesthetics are equally suitable for analgesiometric testing, the preference should go to inhalation anaesthetics because of better pharmacokinetic control of the administration. Modern inhalation anaesthetics like isoflurane and sevoflurane have the advantage that pharmacokinetics are very stable in time and metabolism is minimal. This stability results in a robust level of anaesthesia. Injection anaesthetics have the disadvantage that plasma concentrations are likely to increase over time. Their pharmacokinetics are also more likely to interact with the pharmacokinetics of the analgesic study drug.

**Halothane** is a suitable anaesthetic for the study of spinal reflexes e.g. the withdrawal reflex and spinal neural activity as marked e.g. by c-fos expression. Halothane may under certain conditions even improve the sensitivity to detect nociceptive (mechanical) neural responses (c-fos) in rats (Novikova et al., 2004). Halothane does not influence tail flick testing of morphine when used at moderate dosages (Goto et al., 1996). In the formalin test, halothane alone does not influence spinal c-fos expression and in combination with nitrous oxide it is suitable to reduce discomfort by anaesthesia during phase I and subsequently let the animal recover to study phase II flinching and licking behaviour (O’Connor & Abram, 1995).

**Isoflurane** does not influence the analgesic effect of morphine on tail flick tests (Goto et al., 1996), but dose-dependently antagonizes nitrous oxide analgesia.

---

**Table 1. Analgesiometric test characteristics summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Stimulus</th>
<th>Type*</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Escape</th>
<th>Discomfort</th>
<th>Response**</th>
<th>Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tail flick</td>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Reflex</td>
<td>W (D’Amour &amp; Smith, 1941)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail immersion</td>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Reflex</td>
<td>W (Farre et al., 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paw flick</td>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Reflex</td>
<td>W (Hargreaves et al., 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paw pressure</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Reflex</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Electric Tail Stimulation</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>TEVD (Charpentier 1961; Jourdan et al., 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Train Tail Stimulation</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>WV (Carroll &amp; Lim, 1960; Borszcz et al., 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Train Paw Stimulation (NIWR)</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Reflex</td>
<td>W (Duysens &amp; Gybels, 1988; Matsumoto et al., 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalin paw test</td>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Reflex</td>
<td>FL (Dubuisson &amp; Dennis, 1977; Vissers et al., 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writhing test</td>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Reflex</td>
<td>Wr (Siegmund et al., 1957)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* TH: Threshold; SM: Supramaximal
** D: Defence; E: Escape; F: Flinching; L: Licking; T: Twitching; V: Vocalisation; W: Withdrawal; Wr: Writhing;
Sevoflurane at light anaesthesia levels can be used to quantitatively measure the withdrawal reflex in the hindpaw noxious induced withdrawal reflex (NIWR) model, but dose dependently reduces this reflex (van den Broek et al., 2006).

Urethane is a suitable anaesthetic for the study of normal physiology. Despite its carcinogenic properties, it is frequently used for terminal physiological measurements. Reflex behaviour can also be reproduced under anaesthesia for the paw flick test (Yeomans et al., 1996; Yeomans & Proudfit, 1994) in the rat, but tail flick latencies are fully suppressed in mice (Banks et al., 1988b). These observed assay influences may not only be related to species, but also to dose. In general, spinal mechanisms are still intact under light urethane anaesthesia and this provides a good starting point for other spinally mediated reflexes and measures of (nociceptive) neural activity. However, not only clinical signs of inflammatory pain, including swelling and edema, but also spinal c-fos expression are strongly decreased by urethane in the carrageenan hindpaw inflammation model (Buritova & Besson, 2001) compared to conscious animals (Buritova & Besson, 1998) for NSAIDs like flurbiprofen.

Propofol has strong excitatory effects on ascending nociceptive pathways, autonomic and stress-related functions (Kubota et al., 2007). These excitatory effects may be related to the fact that intravenous propofol injection can be painful. Despite this observation, propofol can be used as an anaesthetic to study brain activation after heat stimulation (Kubota et al., 2007), although pentobarbital anaesthesia results in larger brain activation (Kubota et al., 2007). Propofol anaesthesia cannot be used to measure tail flick latencies (Sawamura et al., 2004). Only sedative dosages (6 mg/kg/hr) combined with nitrous oxide 75% result in a detectable, although still strongly increased (40% maximum possible effect), tail flick latency. Propofol can be used to measure the hindpaw withdrawal reflex in the NIWR model at low continuous infusion rates, but dose-dependently reduces this reflex at higher infusion rates or intermittent boluses (Dirksen et al., 1997).

Pentobarbital can be used as an anaesthetic to study heat induced c-fos activation in the brain (Kubota et al., 2007) at a medium dosage (60 mg/kg/hr). Tail flick latencies in mice are unaffected under pentobarbital anaesthesia. Unfortunately, the sensitivity of the tail flick test for opioids is also decreased. However, in mice latency effects of non-opioid analgesics like serotonin (5HT \(_2\)-receptor mediated) can be measured more sensitively in the tail flick assay under pentobarbital anaesthesia than under conscious conditions (Banks et al., 1988a). In the latter study, the increased sensitivity under anaesthesia can be attributed to an increased response combined with a decreased group variation.

Anaesthesia effects on functional MRI pain studies

Functional MRI is an important complementary tool to evaluate the analgesic efficacy and mechanisms of candidate drugs (Negus et al., 2006) for classical pain testing. An attractive feature of functional MRI experiments is the possibility of repeated measurement in the same animals. This reduces variability in longitudinal studies and reduces the number of animals required, although individual discomfort increases. This review focuses on acute pain; fMRI representations of persistent, chronic pain have been reviewed elsewhere (Verne et al., 2004).

The majority of experimental functional MRI studies in animals are currently performed under anaesthesia, for obvious reasons. The first studies used alpha-chloralose, but new alternatives that provide promising results include isoflurane. The number of experimental functional MRI pain/nociception studies is limited and mainly performed under anaesthesia. The number of functional human MRI pain studies is extensive and mainly performed under conscious conditions. Both animal and human pain studies are of interest to evaluate the effects of anaesthesia in animal experiments and the extrapolation of their results to pain in humans.

In conscious humans, functional imaging of brain responses to acute pain were reviewed in a meta-analysis (Peyron et al., 2000) and newer publications were recently summarized (Borsook & Becerra,
in fMRI pain studies in laboratory animals, the periaqueductal gray are not always present, but activation of pain control areas in the brain stem like the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) are mainly involved in affective-motivational nociceptive processing (Wiech et al., 2001). Activation of pain control areas in the brain stem like the periaqueductal gray are not always present, but are fairly frequent. In fMRI pain studies in laboratory animals, anaesthesia is often a mandatory prerequisite. The somatosensory cortex is still activated by stimulation under anaesthetic conditions. This is true for both noxious and non-noxious stimulations (Masamoto et al., 2007; Chang & Shyu, 2001; Lowe et al., 2007). The comparability of blood-oxygen-level dependent fMRI (BOLD) activation depends on the stimulation protocol used and has to be optimized for each anaesthetic (Masamoto et al., 2007). It is clear that BOLD responses after stimulation are attenuated by anaesthesia, e.g. the hypercapnic response is reduced under 1% and 2% isoflurane (Sicard et al., 2003). Whether this attenuation also influences BOLD responses to noxious stimulation is less clear. Volatile anaesthetics increase cerebral blood flow compared to opioids or pentobarbital (Hendrich et al., 2001). Hence, the choice of volatile anaesthetic dosage will determine the sensitivity of the fMRI measurement.

In rats, functional imaging of brain responses to acute pain stimuli is mostly performed under anaesthesia. A summary of the activated brain areas is presented in Table 2. A full comparison with human publications is not achievable, since the majority of animal publications include only particular regions of the brain in the functional imaging setup. 

**Alpha-chloralose** is frequently used in fMRI studies. It has some negative properties (Silverman & Muir, III, 1993), including poor solubility, slow pharmacokinetics, development of metabolic acidosis and hyperreactivity to auditory stimulation. Apart from these side-effects, it can only be used in terminal experiments, because it also induces peritonitis and adynamic ileus. These properties should be taken into consideration when fMRI pain studies are interpreted. Alpha-chloralose use in the capsaicin hyperalgesia model resulted in spinal dorsal horn activation after injection in the hindpaw (Malisza et al., 2003b) or the forepaw (Malisza & Stroman, 2002). Brain studies demonstrated activation of the somatosensory cortex, the motor cortex, the frontal cortex and the cingulate cortex after injection in the hindpaw (Malisza et al., 2003a) or the forepaw (Malisza & Docherty, 2001). In the latter study, subsequent morphine application resulted in decreased activity in frontal and cingulate cortex. In the formalin model, alpha-chloralose has been used to map brain activity. The same areas as in the capsaicin model demonstrated a positive BOLD response after formalin application in the forepaw and this response was reduced by pre-application of morphine (Tuor et al., 2000). In a second study, the nociceptive specific effects were separated from fMRI effects caused by increases in blood pressure (Tuor et al., 2002); especially fMRI effects during the first five minutes after formalin injection are correlated with blood pressure increases. Noxious electrical stimulation of the sciatic nerve led to a BOLD increase not only of the somatosensory and cingulate cortex, but also medial thalamic and hypothalamic activations were detected (Chang & Shyu, 2001); the activation in all four areas was significantly suppressed by prior morphine application. This finding of morphine suppression is in concordance with Tuor et al. (Tuor et al., 2000; Chang & Shyu, 2001); however, the somatosensory cortex activity did not decrease after morphine application, but activity of all regions decreased after nitrous oxide inhalation in that study. 

**Isoflurane** has an interesting set of properties for fMRI studies compared to alpha-chloralose. It has fast pharmacokinetics in combination with an easily
Table 2. Activated spinel and brain areas in functional MRI animal nociception studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Stimulation</th>
<th>Stimulation details</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Anaesthesia</th>
<th>DH</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>PG</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>RS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spinal studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>formalin</td>
<td>(Porszasz et al., 1997)</td>
<td>Iso/N₂O 1.0/67 % insp</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>capsaicin</td>
<td>(Malisz et al., 2003b)</td>
<td>Iso/Air 1.5 % insp &gt; α-Chloralose 80+40mg/kg IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>capsaicin</td>
<td>(Malisz &amp; Stroman, 2002)</td>
<td>Iso/Air 1.5 % insp &gt; α-Chloralose 80+40mg/kg IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brain studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td>Peltier</td>
<td>(Hess et al., 2007)</td>
<td>Iso/Air 1-2 % insp</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>capsaicin</td>
<td>(Moylan Governo et al., 2006)</td>
<td>Iso/N₂O 1.5/65 % insp</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>Capsaicin</td>
<td>(Malisz &amp; Docherty, 2001)</td>
<td>Iso/Air 1.5 % insp &gt; α-Chloralose 80+40mg/kg IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>capsaicin</td>
<td>(Malisz et al., 2003a)</td>
<td>Iso/Air 1.5 % insp &gt; α-Chloralose 80+40mg/kg IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>formalin</td>
<td>(Yu et al., 2007)</td>
<td>Propofol 250 mg/kg IP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>formalin</td>
<td>(Shah et al., 2005)</td>
<td>Halo/N₂O 1-2/70 % insp</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical + Electrical</td>
<td>formalin</td>
<td>(Tuor et al., 2002)</td>
<td>Iso/Air 1.5 % insp &gt; α-Chloralose 80+40mg/kg IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical +</td>
<td>non+ noxious</td>
<td>(Tuor et al., 2000)</td>
<td>Iso/Air 1.5 % insp &gt; α-Chloralose 80+40mg/kg IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical +</td>
<td>non+ noxious</td>
<td>(Chang &amp; Shyu, 2001)</td>
<td>Iso/Air 1.5 % insp &gt; α-Chloralose 80+40mg/kg IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical +</td>
<td>non+ noxious</td>
<td>(Lowe et al., 2007; Chang &amp; Shyu, 2001)</td>
<td>Halo? 3 &gt; α-Chloralose 60+25 mg/kg IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DH: spinal dorsal horn; S1, S2: primary and secondary somatosensory cortex; M: motor cortex; I: insular cortex; C: cingulated cortex; FC: (pre)frontal cortex; PB: parabrachial nucleus; T: thalamus; HT: hypothalamus; HC: hippocampus; PG: periaqueductal gray; RS: retrosplenial cortex; A: amygdala
accessible administration route, provides adequate muscle relaxation, maintains the acid-base balance and is very suitable for repeated measurements. Furthermore, as its (end-) expiratory concentration can be measured on-line, it is easier to maintain constant levels of anaesthesia. At the minimal alveolar inhalation anaesthetic concentration for isoflurane (1 MAC₅₀ ~1.45%), flow-metabolism coupling of the cortex persists (Hansen et al., 1989). Therefore, it promises to be a suitable alternative candidate for fMRI studies. Indeed, it has been used in a number of fMRI pain studies in rats in an air/oxygen or nitrous oxide/oxygen mixture. Most studies mentioned above under alpha-chloralose used isoflurane during the preparation phase of the experiment. Isoflurane (in N₂O/O₂) use in the formalin test resulted in spinal dorsal horn activation (Porszasz et al., 1997); this activation was blocked by local lidocaine application. In a recent article, capsaicin noxious activation in the brain was investigated (Moylan Governo et al., 2006); several subcortical regions responded to the noxious stimulation, including periaqueductal gray, hypothalamus and thalamus and the parabrachial and hippocampal areas. The activation of most areas increased by superimposed mechanical stimulation after capsaicin application, although periaqueductal gray activation decreased (Moylan Governo et al., 2006). Finally, Hess et al. used isoflurane in air. They found an activation of many cortical brain regions (Hess et al. 2007), including somatosensory, motor, insular, cingulate, retrosplenial, and subcortical brain regions, including lateral and medial thalamus, hypothalamus and the periaqueductal gray. Pre-treatment with zymosan in the latter study (Hess et al., 2007) increased noxious heat BOLD effects.

**Propofol** was only used in one formalin pain study. It was applied in a non-standard way (250 mg/kg IP) and resulted in amygdala activation (Yu et al., 2007).

**Anaesthesia recommendations for analgesiometric tests**

In this review, it was demonstrated that the use of anaesthetics in pain research is feasible, especially in the first phase of preclinical analgesic assessment. This will reduce the number of animals necessary for subsequent pain testing in conscious animals. It is very likely that the use of anaesthetics in pain research will contribute significantly to the welfare of laboratory animals in analgesiometric tests. However, it should be realized that fMRI under anaesthesia provides mostly information about nociception rather than pain.

It is important to realize that there is a limited number of studies that compare both the conscious response and a response under anaesthetic conditions. Also, studies that compare two different anaesthetics within the same study are generally not available. Therefore, preliminary anaesthetic recommendations for the analgesiometric tests below should be used cautiously and further research is required to provide evidence based recommendations.

**Tail flick testing** can be performed under anaesthetic conditions. A low dosage of isoflurane is a good anaesthetic choice for opioid analgesia testing, since it does not influence morphine tail flick latencies (Goto et al., 1996). We recommend a dosage of 1.5% to minimize anaesthetic influence on analgesiometric results.

**Electrical noxious stimulation** can be performed under anaesthetic conditions. A low dosage of isoflurane is a good anaesthetic choice for opioid analgesia testing, since it does not influence morphine tail flick latencies (Goto et al., 1996). We recommend a dosage of 1.5% to minimize anaesthetic influence on analgesiometric results.

**Halothane** effects on fMRI are comparable with those of alpha-chloralose and isoflurane. In the formalin test, activation was found in the cortical areas, including somatosensory and cingulate cortex and subcortical areas, including thalamus, hypothalamus, periaqueductal gray and amygdala (Shah et al., 2005). After electrical noxious stimulation, cortical and thalamic activation was demonstrated (Lowe et al., 2007).

**Formalin testing** may be performed under anaesthetic conditions with the combination of halothane and nitrous oxide to reproduce flinching and licking behaviour during the second phase (O’Connor et al., 2007).
Thiopental is another possibility. Halothane alone only mildly influences spinal c-fos expression in the formalin test. Alternative approaches with different anaesthetics to detect neural activation are described under fMRI studies.

Anaesthesia recommendations for c-fos and fMRI nociceptive testing

The feasibility to use anaesthetics in nociceptive neural activation c-fos studies depends on the analgesic group of interest and the chosen baseline anaesthesia. Some studies have described uncoupling of behaviour and spinal Fos-IR. This requires further investigation. One solution may be to find a correlation between behaviour and neural activation in brain nuclei, to explain the observed discrepancy between c-fos and pain behaviour.

The use of anaesthetics in functional MRI pain studies depends on the research question. There may be a difference in brain activation between isoflurane and alpha-chloralose fMRI studies, both frequently used in functional MRI studies. Somatomotor, cingulate and frontal cortex activation was found in formalin studies with alpha-chloralose. Comparable studies with isoflurane are currently lacking, so it is not clear whether isoflurane in the formalin test would result in the same pattern of brain activation. From thermal and electrical stimulation studies, it is clear that under isoflurane anaesthesia, activation of these areas is possible and also of the thalamus, hypothalamus and periaqueductal gray. Activation of these latter subcortical nuclei has not yet been found under alpha-chloralose anaesthesia.

In this review, publications are referred to that demonstrate the feasibility of anaesthesia in combination with pain/nociceptive testing. However, the number of publications that compared the results of analgesiometric tests under conscious conditions with anaesthetic conditions for a broad range of analgesic agents is still very limited. Therefore, further research on analgesiometric tests under anaesthetic conditions is necessary to validate these recommendations.

Conclusions

Every anaesthetic has its particular sites of action in the central nervous system. These sites of anaesthetic action determine whether components of the pain system remain unaffected, are unresponsive or hyperresponsive and whether the application of the anaesthetic leads to meaningful results. Apart from the anaesthetic action, the interaction between anaesthetic and analgesic agents is important for the interpretation of the results. The analgesic agents also have points of analgesic action that can be influenced by the anaesthetic used. For the proper validation of the feasibility of anaesthetics in analgesiometric tests, it is therefore not only necessary to demonstrate sufficient sensitivity of the response function of the test, but also to demonstrate that analgesic effects on the response function can be measured in a reliable and sensitive way.

Reflex behaviour like the tail flick and withdrawal reflexes and nociceptive processing, including c-fos and functional MRI, can be studied best with low dosage isoflurane. For more complex behaviour, the use of anaesthetics is not suitable because they impair higher cognitive functioning. This is mainly related to the necessity to be conscious to express e.g. aggressive behaviour and partly related to the disturbance of nociceptive processing that anaesthetics have on different supraspinal levels. However, in the future, it may become possible to predict the outcome of complex (pain) behaviour in conscious animals from the results of neural activity measurements like c-fos or fMRI in particular brain nuclei in anesthetized animals. This approach would require a large number of validation studies to prove the predictive value of neural activity for pain behaviour outcome, but would be very beneficial for the anesthetized animals in terms of discomfort reduction.
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