

1 Repeated exposures of naïve and neuropathic pain-suffering mice to serpents in an
2 experimental model to study post-traumatic stress disorder

3

4 Joyce Mendes-Gomes^{abcd}; Tatiana Paschoalin-Maurin^{abc}; Lucy F. Donaldson^e;
5 Bridget M. Lumb^f; D. Caroline Blanchard^g; Norberto Cysne Coimbra^{abch*}

6

7 *^aLaboratory of Neuroanatomy and Neuropsychobiology, Department of*
8 *Pharmacology, Ribeirão Preto Medical School of the University of São Paulo (FMRP-*
9 *USP), Av. Bandeirantes, 3900, Ribeirão Preto, 14049-900, São Paulo, Brazil.*

10 *^bOphidiarium LNN-FMRP-USP/INeC, Ribeirão Preto Medical School of the University*
11 *of São Paulo, Av. Bandeirantes, 3900, Ribeirão Preto, 14049-900, São Paulo, Brazil.*

12 *^cBehavioural Neurosciences Institute (INeC), Avenida do Café, 2450, Ribeirão Preto,*
13 *14050-220, São Paulo, Brazil.*

14 *^dDracena Medical School (UNIFADRA-FUNDEC), Rua Bahia, 332, Dracena, 17900-*
15 *000, São Paulo, Brazil.*

16 *^eArthritis Research UK Pain Centre and School of Life Sciences, QMC, University of*
17 *Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2UH, United Kingdom.*

18 *^fSchool of Physiology, Pharmacology & Neuroscience, Medical Sciences Building,*
19 *University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TD, United Kingdom.*

20 *^gPacific Biosciences Research Centre, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI*
21 *96822, United States of America.*

22 *^hUniversity of São Paulo Neurobiology of Emotions Research Centre (NAP-USP-*
23 *NuPNE), Ribeirão Preto Medical School of the University of São Paulo (FMRP-USP),*
24 *Av. Bandeirantes, 3900, Ribeirão Preto, 14049-900, São Paulo, Brazil.*

25 *corresponding author: Norberto Cysne Coimbra, M.D., M.Sc., Sc.D.

26 Laboratório de Neuroanatomia & Neuropsicobiologia, Departamento de
27 Farmacologia, Faculdade de Medicina de Ribeirão Preto da Universidade de São
28 Paulo, Av. Bandeirantes, 3900, Ribeirão Preto, 14049-900, São Paulo, Brasil. E-mail
29 address: nccoimbr@fmrp.usp.br

30

31 **Abstract**

1 Confrontation of rodents by natural predators provides a number of advantages as a
2 model for traumatic or stressful experience. Using this approach, one of the aims of
3 this study was to investigate a model for the study of post-traumatic stress disorder
4 (PTSD)-related behaviour in mice. Moreover, because PTSD can facilitate the
5 establishment of chronic pain (CP), and in the same way, patients with CP have an
6 increased tendency to develop PTSD when exposed to a traumatic event, our second
7 aim was to analyse whether this comorbidity can be verified in the new paradigm.
8 C57BL/6 male mice underwent chronic constriction injury of the sciatic nerve (CCI), a
9 model of neuropathic CP, or not (sham groups) and were submitted to different
10 threatening situations. Threatened mice exhibited enhanced defensive behaviours, as
11 well as significantly enhanced risk assessment and escape behaviours during context
12 reexposure. Previous snake exposure reduced open-arm time in the elevated plus-
13 maze test, suggesting an increase in anxiety levels. Sham mice showed fear-induced
14 antinociception immediately after a second exposure to the snake, but 1 week later,
15 they exhibited allodynia, suggesting that multiple exposures to the snake led to
16 increased nociceptive responses. Moreover, after reexposure to the aversive
17 environment, allodynia was maintained. CCI alone produced intense allodynia, which
18 was unaltered by exposure to either the snake stimuli or reexposure to the
19 experimental context. Together, these results specifically parallel the behavioural
20 symptoms of PTSD, suggesting that the snake/exuvia/reexposure procedure may
21 constitute a useful animal model to study PTSD.

22

23 **Keywords:** chronic pain; post-traumatic stress disorder; defensive reaction; pain
24 modulation; prey versus serpents confrontation paradigm; *Epicrates cenchria*
25 *crassus*.

26

27 **Abbreviations:** post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD); chronic pain (CP); chronic
28 constriction injury of the sciatic nerve (CCI); elevated plus-maze (EPM).

29

30 1. INTRODUCTION

31 Wild venomous (Coimbra et al., 2017a; Calvo et al., 2019a,b) and non-venomous
32 (Guimarães-Costa et al., 2007; Lobão-Soares et al., 2008; dos Anjos-Garcia et al.,

1 2019) snakes are increasingly used as threat stimuli in studies of defensive
2 behaviours, with a particular goal of analysing the potential relationships between
3 exposure to these predators and animal models of anxiety disorders (Coimbra et al.,
4 2017b).

5 These studies follow a long history of research using confrontations of laboratory
6 rats and mice by natural predators such as *Felis silvestris catus* to elicit defensive
7 responses and enable their measurement under varying circumstances (e.g.
8 Blanchard and Blanchard, 1989; Ribeiro-Barbosa et al., 2005). Notably, cat odour
9 alone can elicit a strong defensive response (Apfelbach et al., 2005; Dielenberg and
10 McGregor, 2001; Takahashi et al., 2005) and can be used as an unconditioned
11 stimulus for rapid fear conditioning (Dielenberg and McGregor, 2001; Hubbard et al.,
12 2004). This observation suggests that predators can be used to provide both
13 unconditioned and conditioned threat stimuli, combinable in ways that potentially
14 extend the range of paradigms designed to produce behaviours that are similar to
15 symptoms of various psychopathologies. In fact, snake exposure has been suggested
16 (Coimbra et al., 2017a; Guimarães-Costa et al., 2007; Lobão-Soares et al., 2008) as
17 an experimental model of panic attack and used to test novel and established drugs
18 with panicolytic-like effects (Coimbra et al., 2017b; Paschoalin-Maurin et al., 2018;
19 Twardowschy et al., 2013; Uribe-Mariño et al., 2012), as well as neuromodulators and
20 the neural networks underlying the control of defensive behaviour (Almada and
21 Coimbra, 2015; Almada et al., 2015).

22 The goal of this study was to determine the effects, in mice, of multiple exposures
23 to a snake and to stimuli associated with the snake. In this context, an advantage of
24 using snakes as predator threats is that they shed their skin periodically, producing
25 exuviae, layers of shed skin. These exuviae provide both snake odour and a visual
26 stimulus somewhat similar to that of the snake itself, potentially eliciting some degree
27 of unconditioned defensiveness, an issue evaluated here in Experiment 1.
28 Simultaneous exposure to both a snake and its exuvia should further increase
29 responsivity to the exuvia, enhancing defensiveness to a stimulus that already serves
30 as an unconditioned threat. Thus, Experiment 2 utilises extended snake exposure,
31 over 4 h, followed at intervals by simultaneous exposure to snake and exuvia and later
32 by exposure to the exuvia alone, with appropriate measures to determine how this
33 protocol may alter the expression of individual defensive behaviours.

1 The hypothesis of the present work was that mice threatened by a natural predator,
2 a wild constrictor snake, and reexposed to the aversive context and partial snake cues
3 would show exacerbated anxiety/fear-related defensive reactions, some of which were
4 similar to those displayed by post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) patients,
5 potentially providing support for mouse-snake confrontation as a new model to study
6 PTSD. Since PTSD could facilitate the establishment of chronic pain (CP) (Sharp and
7 Harvey, 2001; Villano et al., 2007), and in the same way, patients with CP have an
8 increased tendency to develop PTSD when exposed to a traumatic event (Gibson,
9 2012), we also hypothesised that chronic neuropathic pain would enhance defensive
10 responses to the snake and to a conditioned aversive context. The interactive effects
11 of chronic pain with snake plus conditioned aversive context exposure was evaluated
12 by examining allodynia and behaviours displayed by prey in the elevated plus-maze
13 test (EPM), a test of anxiety-like behaviour.

14

15 **2. RESULTS**

16 **2.1. Results of Experiment 1**

17 The *Epicrates cenchria crassus* snakes were kept in the open area of the
18 enclosure, and explored the polygonal arena for snakes versus prey confrontation.
19 Although it could reach the elevated platforms for escape, they demonstrated a place-
20 preference for the enclosure floor, waiting the approach of their potential prey. Even
21 being previously fed, they still reacted vigorously when prey were close to them,
22 threatening their potential prey. In this case, either offensive (with attempt to bite) or
23 defensive (without bites) strikes were observed, however, no mice were actually
24 harmed by the snakes.

25 Risk assessment. Mice exposed either to the exuvia or to the snake exhibited
26 a higher frequency and duration of risk assessment (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p <$
27 0.05) when compared to non-threatened (control) animals. Moreover, animals
28 exposed to the snake also showed a higher duration of risk assessment than those
29 exposed to the exuvia (Figure 1A and B). [One-way ANOVA indicated significant
30 effects on frequency ($F_{2,20} = 21$, $p < 0.0001$) and duration ($F_{1,20} = 20$, $p < 0.0001$) of
31 risk assessment.]

1 Defensive immobility/freezing. Mice exposed to the snake exhibited a higher
2 frequency and duration of defensive immobility/freezing (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, p
3 < 0.05) when compared to non-threatened animals or to those exposed to the exuvia
4 (Figure 1C and D). [One-way ANOVA showed significant effects on frequency ($F_{2,20} =$
5 7.4 , $p < 0.01$) and duration ($F_{1,20} = 8.3$, $p < 0.01$) of defensive immobility.]

6 Time in protected areas. Mice exposed to the snake spent more time in the
7 protected areas (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p < 0.05$) when compared to non-
8 threatened animals or to those exposed to the exuvia (Figure 1E). [One-way ANOVA
9 showed significant effect on time spent in protected areas ($F_{1,20} = 14$, $p < 0.001$).]

10 Escape. Mice exposed either to the exuvia or to the snake showed a higher
11 frequency of escape behaviour (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p < 0.05$) when compared
12 to non-threatened animals (Figure 1F). [One-way ANOVA indicated a significant effect
13 on the frequency of escapes ($F_{2,20} = 23$, $p < 0.0001$).]

14

15 **2.2. Results of Experiment 2**

16 Threatened mice showed both unconditioned and conditioned fear-induced
17 defensive responses, and there were no significant effects of nerve injury on the
18 frequency or duration of risk assessment (Figure 2A and B), frequency or duration of
19 defensive immobility (Figure 2C and D), time in protected areas (Figure 2E) or escape
20 behaviour (Figure 2F).

21 Risk assessment. Both sham and CCI mice exposed to the snake exhibited a
22 higher frequency and duration of risk assessment (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p <$
23 0.0001) than animals not exposed to the predator. During reexposure to the
24 experimental context, animals previously exposed to the snake displayed a decrease
25 in the frequency and duration of risk assessment than they exhibited during exposure
26 to the predator. However, it is important to highlight that animals previously exposed
27 to the snake continued to exhibit a higher frequency of risk assessment (Bonferroni's
28 *post hoc* test, $p < 0.0001$) than those never exposed to the predator (Figure 2A and
29 B). There were significant effects of the following factors: presence of the snake (three-
30 way ANOVA, risk assessment frequency: $F_{1,62} = 188.22$, $p < 0.0001$; duration: $F_{1,62} =$
31 98.48 , $p < 0.0001$), experimental context (risk assessment frequency: $F_{1,62} = 11.06$, p

1 < 0.01; duration: $F_{1,62} = 15,53$, $p < 0.001$) and the interaction of the snake exposure
2 and experimental context (i.e. only mice exposed to the snake showed high frequency
3 and duration of risk assessment during exposure to the experimental context: risk
4 assessment frequency: $F_{1,62} = 39.45$, $p < 0.0001$; duration: $F_{1,62} = 42.98$, $p < 0.0001$).

5 Defensive immobility/freezing. Both Sham and CCI animals exposed to the
6 snake exhibited a higher frequency and duration of defensive immobility than those
7 not exposed to the predator (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p < 0.0001$). During
8 reexposure to the experimental context, animals previously exposed to the snake
9 showed reduced frequency and duration of defensive immobility (Bonferroni's *post hoc*
10 test, $p < 0.001$) than they exhibited during exposure to the predator (Figure 2C and D).
11 There were significant effects of exposure to the snake (three-way ANOVA, defensive
12 immobility frequency: $F_{1,62} = 22.11$, $p < 0.0001$; duration: $F_{1,62} = 12.31$, $p < 0.001$),
13 exposure to the experimental context (defensive immobility frequency: $F_{1,62} = 15.03$, p
14 < 0.001 ; duration: $F_{1,62} = 10.09$, $p < 0.01$) and the interaction of snake exposure and
15 experimental context, i.e. only mice exposed to the snake showed high frequency and
16 duration of defensive immobility during exposure to the experimental context:
17 Defensive immobility frequency: $F_{1,62} = 14.12$, $p < 0.001$, duration: $F_{1,62} = 9.45$, $p =$
18 0.01).

19 Time in protected areas. During the reexposure to the experimental context,
20 animals that were previously exposed to the snake exhibited a decrease in the time
21 spent in the protected areas (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p < 0.001$) when compared to
22 that shown during exposure to the experimental context (Figure 2E). There were
23 significant effects of exposure to the snake (three-way ANOVA, $F_{1,62} = 33.02$, $p <$
24 0.0001) and an interaction of snake exposure and experimental context (i.e. only mice
25 exposed to the snake showed much time in the protected areas during exposure to
26 the experimental context: $F_{1,62} = 19.75$, $p = 0.0001$) on time spent in protected areas.
27 Both sham and CCI animals exposed to the snake spent more time in the protected
28 areas than those not exposed to the snake (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p < 0.001$).

29 Escape. Furthermore, during the reexposure to the experimental context with
30 the snake exuvia, a similar panic attack-like response was elicited (Figure 2F). There
31 was a significant effect of exposure to the snake (three-way ANOVA, $F_{1,62} = 189.08$, p
32 < 0.0001) on the frequency of escape. Both sham and CCI animals exposed to the

1 snake exhibited a higher frequency of escape than those that were not threatened by
2 the predator (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p < 0.0001$).

3 Grooming. Both Sham and CCI mice exposed to the snake exhibited a higher
4 frequency of grooming than those not exposed to the predator (Bonferroni's *post hoc*
5 test, $p < 0.05$). This high frequency of grooming was maintained during the reexposure
6 to the experimental context. CCI but not sham mice showed higher grooming durations
7 during exposure than their non-threatened controls (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p =$
8 0.01). This difference was not significant during reexposure to the experimental
9 context (Figure 3A and B). There were significant effects of exposure to the snake
10 (three-way ANOVA, frequency: $F_{1,62} = 6.55$, $p < 0.05$; duration: $F_{1,62} = 22.77$, $p <$
11 0.0001), as well as an interaction of context with nerve injury (duration: $F_{1,62} = 8.17$, p
12 < 0.05) and an interaction of exposure to the snake, experimental context, and nerve
13 injury (i.e. only during the snake exposure, CCI threated mice showed much longer
14 time of grooming when compared to the CCI non-threatened group: $F_{1,62} = 5.27$, $p <$
15 0.05).

16 Rearing. Sham and CCI animals exposed to the snake exhibited a lower
17 frequency and duration of rearing than non-threatened mice during exposure
18 (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p \leq 0.05$) but not reexposure to the context (Figure 3C and
19 D). There were significant effects of exposure to the snake (three-way ANOVA,
20 frequency: $F_{1,62} = 16.27$, $p < 0.001$; duration: $F_{1,62} = 3.92$, $p = 0.05$) and of the
21 experimental context (rearing frequency: $F_{1,62} = 10.57$, $p \leq 0.01$; duration: $F_{1,62} = 5.18$,
22 $p < 0.05$).

23 Crossings in the polygonal arena. Snake-exposed Sham and CCI animals
24 made fewer crossings than non-threatened rodents during exposure (Bonferroni's *post*
25 *hoc* test, $p < 0.0001$), but not during reexposure to context only. During reexposure,
26 mice previously exposed to the predator made more crossings (Bonferroni's *post hoc*
27 test, $p < 0.01$) than they had done while exposed to the snake (Figure 3E). The effect
28 of snake exposure on crossings was significant (three-way ANOVA, $F_{1,62} = 30.39$, $p <$
29 0.0001), as was the effect of experimental context ($F_{1,62} = 7.58$, $p \leq 0.01$) and the
30 interaction of exposure to snake and experimental context (i.e. only mice exposed to
31 snakes showed fewer crossings during exposure to the experimental context: $F_{1,62} =$
32 6.38 , $p < 0.05$).

1 Ten days after surgery, CCI mice showed a higher nociceptive response, i.e.,
2 allodynia, when compared to themselves prior to surgery and to sham animals after
3 surgery [two-way ANOVA; effects of the nerve injury procedure (baseline vs. 10 days
4 after surgery; $F_{1,66} = 33.78$, $p < 0.0001$, Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p < 0.001$), sham
5 vs. CCI interaction ($F_{1,66} = 6.04$, $p < 0.05$, Figure 4)]. Importantly, at that point, the
6 animals had not yet been exposed to the snake; therefore, they were only divided into
7 two groups according to CCI surgery: sham and CCI.

8 Considering nociceptive behaviour (evaluated by von Frey test), the effects of
9 threat and aversive contextual exposure, the sham group exposed to the snake
10 showed a decreased withdrawal response to mechanical stimulation (i.e.,
11 antinociception) recorded immediately after the exposure to the predator and from 15
12 to 45 min later. On reexposure to the aversive contextual environment with snake
13 exuvia, there were significant effects of nerve injury (three-way repeated measures
14 $F_{1,31} = 46.14$, $p < 0.0001$), snake exposure ($F_{1,31} = 38.88$, $p < 0.0001$) and an interaction
15 between injury and snake exposure ($F_{1,31} = 41.95$, $p < 0.0001$). This last statistical
16 effect means that, interestingly, snake-exposed sham animals displayed allodynia 6
17 days after the last exposure, (i.e., before reexposure), and this hypersensitivity to
18 mechanical stimuli persisted after reexposure to the aversive contextual environment
19 (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p < 0.0001$). Mice with neuropathic pain displayed a long-
20 lasting allodynia in both situations, i.e., before and after exposure to the predator
21 (Bonferroni's *post hoc* test, $p < 0.0001$) and before and after (Bonferroni's *post hoc*
22 test, $p < 0.0001$) reexposure to the experimental context (Figure 5). During exposure,
23 there were significant effects of nerve injury (three-way repeated measures MANOVA,
24 $F_{1,31} = 72.69$, $p < 0.0001$), snake exposure ($F_{1,31} = 14.89$, $p \leq 0.001$) and time ($F_{5,155} =$
25 9.70 , $p < 0.0001$). There were significant interactions between the following factors:
26 nerve injury and snake exposure ($F_{1,31} = 13.89$, $p \leq 0.001$), nerve injury and time ($F_{5,155}$
27 $= 10.37$, $p < 0.0001$), snake and time ($F_{5,155} = 10.41$, $p < 0.0001$), and among all three
28 interventions (interaction among snake, nerve injury and time, i.e. Snake-exposed CCI
29 mice showed allodynia when compared to Snake-exposed Sham mice immediately
30 after the exposure to the predator and from 15 to 45 min later: $F_{5,155} = 11.08$, $p <$
31 0.0001).

32 EPM. Snake-exposed mice spent significantly less time on the open arms than
33 mice not exposed to the snake (two-way ANOVA, $F_{1,31} = 4.84$, $p < 0.05$; Bonferroni's

1 *post hoc* test, $p < 0.05$). No other measures (frequencies of entries into the open and
2 closed arms) showed significant changes to either snake exposure or CCI or the
3 interaction between them (Figure 6).

4

5 **3. DISCUSSION**

6 In the present studies, repeated exposure of mice to a constrictor snake or its
7 exuvia induced defensive responses related to fear, e.g., defensive immobility,
8 escape, and increased time spent in protected areas, and to anxiety, such as risk
9 assessment (Blanchard et al., 1993; Coimbra et al., 2017a; Graeff, 1994; Gray and
10 McNaughton, 2000; McNaughton, 2011). Such results corroborate our previous data,
11 in which Swiss or C57BL/6 mice, gerbils and hamsters were confronted by a
12 constrictor or venomous snake (Almada and Coimbra, 2015; Almada et al., 2015;
13 Coimbra et al., 2017a,b; Guimarães-Costa et al., 2007; Lobão-Soares et al., 2008;
14 Twardowschy et al., 2013; Uribe-Mariño et al., 2012) and displayed a range of
15 defensive responses. In addition, study 1 indicated that the exuvia, alone and without
16 previous association with the snake, elicited some defence behaviour, albeit at a lower
17 level than that which was observed (study 2) when the exuvia had previously been
18 encountered along with the snake. The odour of a predator *per se* is well established
19 to be able to cause aversion (Apfelbach et al., 2005; Dielenberg and McGregor, 2001;
20 Takahashi et al., 2005). Comparisons between the effects of, for example, cat odour
21 (Mackenzie et al., 2010; Souza and Carobrez, 2016) and snake odour (Dell’Omo and
22 Allevia, 1994; Carere et al., 1999), in addition to the present effects seen with exuvia,
23 suggest that the latter include a rather modest unconditioned response (study 1), that
24 appears to be enhanced when the exuvia have been encountered together with the
25 snake (study 2). These data, and the enhanced defence behaviours seen in response
26 to the polygonal arena without the snake after the threatening exposure (performed in
27 that same polygonal arena), demonstrate that the snake can serve both as
28 unconditioned stimuli, for defensive conditioning to the exposure context, and to
29 enhance defensiveness to a cue stimulus (the exuvia) that normally elicits a low but
30 significant level of defensiveness.

31 These conditioning effects were somewhat behaviourally specific, largely
32 involving increased numbers of risk assessment behaviours and escape behaviours

1 rather than defensive immobility (freezing). The latter is perhaps unsurprising given
2 that (1) several days of pre-exposure/habituation to the context had been given before
3 threat exposure; (2) mice may not exhibit as much freezing behaviour as laboratory
4 rats (Blanchard et al., 2001); (3) we used a protocol of conditioned fear different from
5 those commonly used in the literature, in which the unconditioned fear stimuli, usually
6 foot shocks, are paired with neutral visual and olfactory clues and/or with the
7 experimental context (aversive environment) where they were presented (Curzon et
8 al., 2009); (4) the large size of the arena (140 x 62 x 50 cm), coupled with the presence
9 of routes of escape and avoidance, such as the stairs/elevated platforms and burrow,
10 may have permitted the animal the selection of other more efficient defensive
11 behaviours, such as risk assessment and flight behaviour (Blanchard et al., 1989;
12 McNaughton and Corr, 2004).

13 Regarding risk assessment, Blanchard et al. (2011) noted that the information
14 obtained through this behaviour is extremely important in determining the most
15 appropriate defensive behaviour, such as freezing, if the animal cannot flight, or
16 escape, when there are safe places for the animal to hide. Importantly, risk
17 assessment behaviour seems to play a fundamental role in both mild and intense
18 stress situations since it facilitates the acquisition of information about the threat
19 stimulus and situation, leading to the intensification of defensive reactions if the
20 aversive stimulus is identified or to the reduction of those reactions if the threat is not
21 found (Blanchard et al., 1997).

22 Both during the exposure to the polygonal arena or in the reexposure to the
23 experimental context, mice exposed to the snake presented a higher frequency of
24 grooming than those not threatened by the predator. Although grooming is one of the
25 most frequently observed motor activities in mice (Fentress, 1988; Reeves et al.,
26 2016), it can be even more frequently exhibited when these animals are exposed to
27 some types of stressful situations (Kalueff et al., 2016), leading some authors to
28 consider it a displacement behaviour (Cohen and Price, 1979).

29 Although the CCI procedure produced consistent effects on the von Frey test,
30 indicating hypersensitivity to mechanical stimuli, it had very little impact on any of the
31 measures of responsivity to the snake, nor did it alter behaviour on the EPM test. While
32 this lack of change in defensive responses or anxiety was unexpected in view of a
33 range of previous findings suggesting that the sciatic nerve ligation procedure may

1 decrease open-arm proportions in the EPM test and other anxiety measures (e.g.
2 Narita et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2014), the ligature procedure used here was less
3 damaging than is often employed (e.g. Zhang et al., 2014), potentially suggesting that
4 a threshold for the effect of pain on anxiety and defence behaviour may be involved.
5 Moreover, it is important to highlight that some other studies corroborate our results
6 showing that neuropathic pain conditions do not evoke anxiety-like behaviours in mice,
7 evaluated by EPM exposure and other different behavioural tests, 3 and 84 days
8 following spared nerve injury (SNI) surgery (Pitzer et al., 2019) and 7, 14 and 28 days
9 after partial sciatic nerve ligation (PNL) (Hasnie et al., 2007). Also, some studies
10 suggest that much longer duration of pain, such as that verified 16 weeks after SNI in
11 rats, is required for comorbid anxiety to occur (Seminowicz et al., 2009), if even ever
12 occurring (Hubbard et al., 2015). It is important to consider that whether or not pain
13 will influence anxiety-like behaviours may also depend on environmental- or study-
14 related factors, like surgical technique, behavioural assays, and the choice of rodent
15 sub-strain may also be involved.

16 Furthermore, although previous reports demonstrated that stress and PTSD
17 can increase the probability of chronic pain development (Asmundson et al., 2000;
18 Beck and Clapp, 2011; Dunne-Proctor et al., 2016; Sharp and Harvey, 2001; Sharp,
19 2004) or increase sensitivity to acute pain stimuli (Greenwood et al., 2016; He et al.,
20 2013; Jennings et al., 2014; Nyland et al., 2015), the present results showed that CCI
21 mice responded at lower thresholds to von Frey filaments regardless of their exposure
22 to the snake. However, as the CCI mice responded to the lowest weight von Frey test
23 filaments (i.e. 0.008g force), a floor effect may have obscured the effects of chronic
24 stress.

25 In contrast, the snake-associated stressors produced striking effects on
26 withdrawal reflex to mechanical stimuli applied by von Frey's test performed in the
27 sham groups. Consistent with previous studies, the snake (Coimbra et al., 2006,
28 2017a), and later the snake plus its exuvia, induced antinociception responses in sham
29 animals. In aversive situations, unconditioned fear-induced antinociception (Coimbra
30 et al., 2006, 2017a; Cornélio et al., 2011; de Freitas et al., 2013, 2014; Heinricher et
31 al. 2009; Mendes-Gomes and Nunes-de-Souza, 2005, 2009; Mendes-Gomes et al.,
32 2011a,b) has an important adaptive effect, as it permits the exhibition of defensive
33 reactions, such as freezing and flight/escape behaviour, even when an injury has
34 occurred, increasing the animal's chances of survival (Bolles and Fanselow, 1980;

1 Butler and Finn 2009). Thus, after threat exposure, the sham (no CCI) group showed
2 a strong antinociceptive response. However, approximately one week after the initial
3 direct exposure to the snake and its exuvia and both before and after reexposure to
4 the aversive experimental context, threatened sham groups responded to the lowest
5 level of mechanical stimuli, the thinnest von Frey filaments. This observation
6 represents an unusual set of differences from control levels unfolding over time; an
7 initial increase in antinociception after exposure to threat stimuli followed later by a
8 decrease in this initial antinociception, with sham animals showing allodynia that
9 persisted after an additional reexposure to threat. However, the exposure of rodents
10 to a single prolonged stressful (SPS) stimulus (Jennings et al., 2014; Zang et al.,
11 2012), another experimental model of PTSD, has already been demonstrated to
12 induce thermal hyperalgesia and mechanical allodynia, as measured by paw
13 withdrawal latencies to a heat stimulus and the von Frey test, respectively. These
14 alterations in nociceptive responses, displayed by rats never previously submitted to
15 a nociceptive test, were verified as early as 7 days after the initiation of a SPS and
16 lasted the length of the study, 28 days (Zang et al., 2012). Moreover, although it may
17 be unknown whether patients with PTSD develop hypersensitivity to non-painful
18 stimuli, it is known that hyperarousal is one of the key findings in PTSD, and it may
19 represent a heightened response to an incoming somatosensory stimulus (Moeller-
20 Bertram et al., 2014).

21 Unlike the fear-induced antinociception observed in Sham mice, CCI mice did
22 not exhibit antinociception when exposed the snake, but continued to exhibit allodynia.
23 Such data corroborate the hypothesis that in some states of chronic pain, inhibition of
24 descending inhibitory systems and/or activation of the facilitatory pain system may
25 occur (Heinricher et al., 2009, Jennings et al., 2014).

26 A number of animal models for PTSD have been proposed (Bertaina-Anglade
27 et al., 2017; Campos et al., 2013; Goswami et al., 2013; Matar et al., 2006; Perrine et
28 al., 2016; Sullivan et al., 2017, Schoner et al., 2017; Zang et al., 2012). A common
29 feature of these models, reflecting attempts to parallel the chronic nature of PTSD, is
30 that the post-traumatic behavioural response tends to be relatively durable, persisting
31 past the initial or effective exposure event. However, the persistence seen in these
32 models typically involves the consistent maintenance of an enhanced responsivity to
33 stressful events, not an inversion of it, over time. In this context, increased responsivity
34 to von Frey filaments, for threatened compared to non-threat-exposed mice, may be

1 seen as a new and different but also deviant response 6 days following the last
2 exposure to the predator and its exuvia. Such delayed symptom onset is common in
3 PTSD and appears to be relatively specific to that diagnosis (e.g. Tomb, 1994).

4 There are other findings in this study that suggest a link to PTSD. PTSD
5 symptoms often include physical reactivity after exposure to traumatic reminders and
6 heightened startle reactions (Brunello et al., 2001; Nemeroff et al., 2006, van der Kolk,
7 2001), both of which characterise the predator-exposed animals in this study following
8 the initial, although not the subsequent, reexposure. In addition, the likelihood of PTSD
9 appears to vary with the number/types of traumatic experiences to which the individual
10 is exposed (e.g. Bender et al., 2015; Boasso et al., 2015), with (different types of)
11 symptoms emerging only after additional exposures to the snake and its exuvia.
12 Additionally, in PTSD, the emotional response pattern appears to show some degree
13 of generalisation to different stimuli strongly associated with the traumatic experience
14 or even with mild stressor stimuli not primarily associated with the trauma, and
15 exacerbated responsiveness displayed by PTSD patients persists to the traumatic
16 event itself (Monti and Smith, 1976; Morey et al., 2015; Osborne et al., 1975).
17 Accordingly, snake exposure reduced time spent in the open-arm of the EPM test, an
18 environment not associated to the previous aversive place, the enriched polygonal
19 arena for snakes, where psychologically traumatic emotions were experienced by prey
20 in the presence of the wild snake. Notably, the present findings of reduced duration of
21 time spent in open-arms of the EPM test and increased risk assessment to the threat-
22 associated situation as well as to the threat itself both suggest enhanced anxiety, as
23 is frequently associated with PTSD (Brunello et al., 2001; Koenen et al., 2003;
24 Lancaster et al., 2016; Puetz et al., 2015; Sipos et al., 2014).

25 In humans, the great majority of PTSD symptoms are currently accepted as
26 mainly subjective (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), and there are no currently
27 accepted approaches for the measurement of subjective events in animal models to
28 study PTSD. Nonetheless, it is important to consider the findings outlined above, in
29 addition to the primary requirement that post-psychological trauma-induced
30 behavioural changes reflect an aversive/ traumatic event effect on the limbic system
31 (Paschoalin-Maurin et al., 2018). Thereby, the present findings may reinforce the
32 traumatic psychological clues, inherent to the present exposure paradigm in which the
33 mice are exposed to the snake and exuvia, with correspondences between repeated
34 exposure to different threatening situations and PTSD symptoms.

1 In conclusion, this set of psychological parallels between the specifically
2 behavioural symptoms of PTSD displayed by humans and the aversive stimulus-
3 related panic attack-like behavioural responses displayed by threatened prey
4 suggests that this snake/exuvia/reexposure procedure may constitute a useful animal
5 model to study PTSD. In this context, it will be of interest to determine the physiological
6 and endocrine changes that this paradigm may involve over time, as well as the
7 potential links between these behaviour changes and other disorders that are
8 frequently comorbid with PTSD, such as depression and anxiety.

10 **4. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

11 **4.1. Animals**

12 Male C57BL/6 mice (N = 23 and 35 for experiments 1 and 2, respectively) from
13 the animal facility of the Ribeirão Preto Medical School of the University of São Paulo
14 (FMRP-USP), weighing 28–30 g, were used. The mice were housed five per
15 homecage (30 x 20 x 15 cm) with food and water available *ad libitum* in a temperature-
16 controlled room (23 ± 1 °C) under a 12-h/12-h light/dark cycle (lights on at 7 a.m.). The
17 predators were wild constrictor rainbow Boidae snakes (*Epicrates cenchria crassus*;
18 Reptilia; Boidae), weighing 800–2000 g (N = 2). The snakes were individuals of a
19 species endemic of the Brazilian Southeast and were maintained in captivity in snake
20 pits in the animal house of FMRP-USP (licensed by the Brazilian government; *Instituto*
21 *Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e de Recursos Naturais Renováveis* (IBAMA) Committee
22 process 1/35/1998/000846-1). Two days before the experiments, the snakes were
23 moved to a walled sun-lit field with appropriate shelter, grass, and water sources in
24 the Laboratory of Neuroanatomy and Neuropsychobiology of the Ribeirão Preto
25 Medical School of the University of São Paulo (LNN-FMRP-USP)/ Behavioural
26 Neurosciences Institute (INeC) ophidiarium, licensed by the Brazilian government
27 (IBAMA 3543.6986/2012-SP and 3543.6984/2012-SP processes) and by the São
28 Paulo State government (*Secretaria do Meio Ambiente (SMA)/ Departamento de*
29 *Fauna (DeFau)* 15.335/2012 process; Mechanisms of Defensive Behaviour and
30 Unconditioned fear-induced antinociception in Snake-threatened Animals (MEDUSA)
31 Project, *Sistema de Autorização e Informação em Biodiversidade (SISBIO)*
32 authorisation for activities with scientific purposes 41435-1 process; SIGAM
33 authorisation of installation process 39.043/2017; *Sistema Integrado de Gestão*

1 *Ambiental* (SIGAM) authorisation for use and handling of wild snakes process
2 39.044/2017). The snake enclosure in the LNN-FMRP-USP is illuminated by natural
3 sunlight and fluorescent ultraviolet irradiation (ReptiSun; 20 W; 5UVB; Zoo Med
4 Laboratories, San Luis Obispo, CA, USA) on rainy days and has artificial waterfalls
5 and lagoons, natural rocks, and both tropical and artificial plants. The enclosure was
6 kept under a 12-h/12-h light/dark cycle (lights on from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM) at a
7 constant room temperature of 25 ± 1 °C and 40–70% humidity. The snakes were fed at
8 two specific times: once every 24 h with mice previously killed in CO₂ and once
9 immediately before the start of each experiment with a live mouse of the same species
10 and strain used in the study, aiming to decrease the risk of actual attacks. The feeding
11 of the snake reduced the likelihood of attack, but still intimidating for the mice. The
12 experiments were performed in accordance with the recommendations of the
13 Commission of Ethics in Animal Experimentation of FMRP-USP (process 190/2015),
14 which abides by the ethical principles in animal research adopted by the National
15 Council for Animal Experimentation Control (CONCEA) and was approved by FMRP-
16 USP Committee for Ethics in Animal Experimentation (CEUA) on 5/2/2016.

17

18 **4.2. Experimental Protocol: Experiment 1**

19 Experiment 1 was aimed at determining whether the snake exuvia, with its
20 natural odour, was able to induce unconditioned fear-like behaviours. Naïve mice were
21 habituated for two days in a polygonal (rectangular parallelepiped-shaped) transparent
22 three-dimensional acrylic arena (140 cm in length, 62 cm in width and 50 cm in height)
23 composed of seven faces, all of which are parallelograms (Coimbra et al., 2017a,b),
24 with free access to food and water (Figure 7A). The floor of the arena was made of a
25 transparent acrylic sheet placed on a stainless-steel platform. The floor was divided
26 by red lines into 20 equal rectangles (4.2-mm width; Pritt mark-it). To minimise
27 vibratory stimuli, the entire apparatus was placed on a granite surface (150 x 85 x 2
28 cm) that was elevated 83 cm above the floor of the laboratory. A burrow (shelter box:
29 10 x 7 x 5 cm) with black acrylic walls was placed in one corner of the arena. The
30 burrow had one entrance with a 2-cm diameter, allowing the rodents to enter and exit
31 the burrow. The lid of the burrow was made of translucent acrylic to facilitate the
32 recording of mouse behaviour inside the burrow. Three translucent acrylic stairs, with
33 a small platform (7 x 4 x 10.5 cm) at the top, were provided in the arena, one in the

1 corner beside the burrow, another in the opposite side, and the third one, in the arena
2 sidewall (Almada and Coimbra, 2015; Almada et al., 2015).

3 On the third day, the bedding, food and water were removed from the polygonal
4 arena, and mice were individually exposed for 10 min to the same arena to which they
5 had been habituated. However, at this time, the polygonal arena contained a snake
6 (N = 7 mice/group) or only its exuvia (N = 9 mice/group), i.e., layer of skin shed during
7 ecdysis, which contains the snake natural odour, without any barrier preventing direct
8 contact with the predator. A control group (N = 7 mice/group) was similarly habituated
9 and exposed to the polygonal arena, but not confronted with the snake or its moulted
10 skin. The exuvia was always put back in the snake cage and kept with the snake for
11 48 h before the next experiment. It is also important to note that, although different
12 sample sizes have been used in each experimental group, there were no drop outs or
13 accidental deaths during the study, and no mouse was harmed by the snakes during
14 the current investigation.

15 During exposure to the arena (with or without the predator or its exuvia), the
16 frequency and/or duration of the following behaviours were recorded: (a) risk
17 assessment, including (a1) the stretch attend posture, in which the body is stretched
18 forward but the animal's hind paws remain in position, followed by retraction to the
19 original position, (a2) flat back approach, where the mouse slowly moves forward with
20 the body stretched, and (a3) defensive attention or alertness, which is an interruption
21 of the ongoing behaviour for less than 6 s to occasionally scan the environment or sniff
22 the air; (b) defensive immobility or freezing, defined as the absence of movements,
23 except those related to breathing, for at least 6 s, with the animals potentially
24 presenting neurovegetative reactions, such as exophthalmia, defecation and/or
25 micturition; (c) time in protected areas, which were below or on top of the stairs and
26 inside or on top of the burrow; and (d) escape, which included running or jumping
27 towards the stairs and/or burrow or other places of the arena without protected areas
28 (Almada et al., 2015; Blanchard et al., 1993; Coimbra et al., 2017a; Dalvi and Rodgers,
29 1996; Kalueff and Tuohimaa, 2005; Nunes-de-Souza et al., 2002, Sorregotti et al.,
30 2013).

31 **4.3. Experimental Protocol: Experiment 2**

32 **4.3.1. Model of neuropathic pain**

33

1 The animals were submitted to a procedure in which the sciatic nerve was
2 lesioned by its chronic constriction (CCI) (N = 18), as described by Bennett and Xie
3 (1988) and modified by Sommer et al. (1995). However, that procedure causes
4 Wallerian degeneration in the lesioned nerve with several sensorial impairments and
5 autotomy. For this reason, instead of three or four ligations, the animals received only
6 one constriction of the peripheral nerve (Dias et al., 2013; Medeiros et al., 2020). The
7 tension generated in this ligation was mild, only enough to cause a mild ischaemia,
8 without interrupting blood flow completely.

9 Before surgery, the animals were anaesthetised with an intraperitoneal injection
10 of 10% ketamine (100 mg/kg) in 2% xylazine (10 mg/kg). In anaesthetised mice, a
11 longitudinal incision in the proximal third of the thigh at the dorsolateral region and
12 trochanter/femur level was made. The longitudinal muscle layer was then gently
13 divided by blunt dissection with scissors and other microsurgery instruments. A single
14 ligature with chrome catgut 4-0 thread was performed around the right sciatic nerve
15 proximal to its trifurcation until the diameter of the nerve was slightly constricted (Dias
16 et al., 2013). The incision in the skin was sutured with braided silk surgical thread 4-0.
17 The animals were then treated with an intramuscular injection of penicillin G-benzathine
18 (120.000UI/0.1 mL) and maintained in post-operative recovery in their home cages.
19 The sham group (N = 17) underwent the same surgical procedures without CCI. Sham
20 and CCI mice were never housed together in the same home cages, since studies
21 demonstrate that hyperalgesia can be observed in “bystander” mice housed and
22 tested in the same room as mice subjected with inflammatory or neuropathic pain
23 (Baptista-de-Souza et al., 2015; Langford et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2016).

24 25 **4.3.2. Test of mechanical allodynia**

26 To evaluate the nociceptive threshold, von Frey filaments were used (Cunha et
27 al., 2004; Möller et al., 1998; Prado et al., 2002; Vivancos et al., 2004) in all
28 experimental groups. The mice were individually placed in acrylic cages on a wire grid
29 floor and a series of von Frey filaments were used to determine the threshold of
30 response to the mechanical stimulus. Each filament was applied with a mild force for
31 approximately 3-4 s. If the animal did not shake, lick or withdraw the paw, another
32 filament with greater diameter and force was used until a response was observed.
33 Once the animal responded to a determined filament, two other confirmatory
34 recordings were made with the same filament, with an interval of approximately 10 s

1 between each measure. All mice responded when stimulated with a maximum of 9
2 different filament forces that ranged from 0.008 to 1.4 in grams force.

3 The von Frey test was performed before the Sham surgery or surgery for
4 constriction of the sciatic nerve (CCI), and 10 days after surgery. Also, von Frey test
5 was applied in the 22nd day after surgery, at the following times: 1 h before and 0, 15,
6 30, 45 and 60 min after exposure to the polygonal arena (with or without the presence
7 of the predator and its exuvia). In addition, this sequence was repeated before and
8 after the reexposure to the polygonal arena (with or without the predator's exuvia).

9 10 **4.3.3. Exposure of mice to an aversive environment**

11 Nineteen days after CCI, the mice were habituated in groups of approximately
12 12 animals, from three different homecages, for two days in the same polygonal arena
13 enriched with two elevated platforms for escape and a burrow, used in Experiment 1
14 (see 4.2 and Figure 7A). However, it is important to highlight that we never habituated
15 together Sham and CCI mice, for the same reasons mentioned in the last sentence of
16 the item 4.3.1.

17 Twenty-one days after being submitted to surgery for sciatic nerve lesion, Sham
18 (n = 8) or CCI (n = 9) mice were individually placed for 4 h in fenestrated transparent
19 acrylic boxes positioned in the interior of the polygonal arena, and a constrictor snake
20 (*Epicrates cenchria crassus*; Reptila; Boidae) was placed on the upper surface of
21 these boxes (Figure 7B). The snake could move freely on the fenestrated ceiling of
22 boxes containing each mouse in isolation inside entirely fenestrated chambers. These
23 chambers were placed side-by-side covering all the surface of the floor of the
24 polygonal arena. After this procedure, the animals were put back in their homecages.
25 After 24 h, responses to mechanical stimuli were evaluated (von Frey test) in mice for
26 a baseline withdrawal response recording, and 1 h later, mice were individually
27 exposed for 10 min to the enriched polygonal arena with escape elevated platforms
28 and a burrow, in the presence of the snake and its exuvia, without any barrier to
29 prevent direct contact between prey and the predator (Figure 7C and 7D). Two control
30 groups, one with Sham (n = 9) and one with CCI (n = 9) animals, were similarly
31 exposed to the polygonal arena but not confronted by the snake and its moulted skin.

32 During arena exposure (with or without the predator and its exuvia), the
33 frequency and duration of the following behaviours were recorded: risk assessment,
34 defensive immobility or freezing, time in protected areas and escape (for definition of

1 these behaviours, see 4.2). Moreover, the following other behaviours were also
2 recorded: grooming; rearing, defined as vertical movement against the walls; and
3 crossings, defined as the frequency of crossings over each rectangle drawn on the
4 floor of the arena (Almada et al., 2015; Blanchard et al., 1993; Dalvi and Rodgers,
5 1996; Kalueff and Tuohimaa, 2005; Nunes-de-Souza et al., 2002, Sorregotti et al.,
6 2013).

7 Immediately after exposure to the polygonal arena, the mice were submitted to
8 the von Frey test 5 times, with an intertest interval of 15 min. After 6 days, mice that
9 were confronted by the snake and its exuvia were individually reexposed for 10 min to
10 the polygonal arena containing only the exuvia (Figure 7E and 7F). Regarding animals
11 that were not previously confronted by the predator and its exuvia, neither the predator
12 nor its exuvia were present during the reexposure procedure. During reexposure to
13 the arena, the frequency and/or duration of the same behaviours recorded during the
14 initial exposure were recorded. Immediately after reexposure, the mice were again
15 submitted to the von Frey test 5 times with the same 15-min intertrial intervals.

16

17 **4.3.4. Elevated plus-maze (EPM) test**

18 Considering that patients with PTSD tend to be more anxious (Lee et al., 2016),
19 the present study determined whether the same phenomenon could be observed in
20 mice after snake confrontation. Twenty-four hours after the reexposure to the aversive
21 context, the rodents were submitted to the EPM test for 5 min. This animal model of
22 anxiety was originally described by Handley and Mithani (1984) and Pellow et al.
23 (1985) using rats as experimental subjects and was subsequently validated for mice
24 (Lister, 1987; Stephens et al., 1986). This test is based on the natural fear displayed
25 by rodents of open places and is frequently used to evaluate anxiety-related
26 behaviours as well as the anxiolytic or anxiogenic properties of drugs. The apparatus
27 is grey and made with acrylic. The EPM consists of two open (30.7 x 6 x 0.5 cm) and
28 two closed arms (30.7 x 6 x 15.5 cm) connected to a common central platform (6 x 6
29 cm) and raised to a height of 38.5 cm above floor level. Anxiety was assessed by
30 analysing the percentages of open arm entries $[(\text{open}/\text{total}) \times 100]$ and time spent in
31 the open arms $[(\text{open arm time}/300) \times 100]$. The frequency of closed arm entries was
32 used to measure the locomotor activity. It is important to highlight that the same

1 experimenter (that performed all the Experiment 1 and 2) exposed the animals to the
 2 EPM. However, after placing the mouse in the EPM, the researcher left the room, and
 3 the mouse behaviour was video-recorded for a later analysis.

4 To summarise the experimental protocol, a timeline of all the experimental
 5 procedures that the mice experienced in Experiment 2 is presented in Table 1.

6

7 **4.4. Statistical Analysis**

8 In experiment 1, the data were analysed by one-way analysis of variance
 9 (ANOVA). In experiment 2, the behavioural data were analysed by either a repeated
 10 measure two-way analysis of variance (MANOVA) or three-way MANOVA to evaluate
 11 the effects of the nerve injury (*Sham* vs. CCI), presence of the snake and its exuvia,
 12 the experimental context (exposure vs. reexposure) and the interaction among these
 13 factors. For the statistical analysis of mechanical allodynia, a three-way repeated
 14 measures MANOVA was used. In all cases, significant effects of ANOVA and
 15 MANOVA were followed by Bonferroni's *post hoc* test. Values of $P \leq 0.05$ were
 16 considered statistically significant.

17

18 **Table 1:** Timeline of the experimental procedures. **Yes** indicates that this group of
 19 mice was submitted to the conditions described in the header, whereas **No** indicates
 20 the opposite. VF1 and VF2-VF6 indicate the first and second to sixth von Frey test
 21 measures.

Day Procedure Groups (n)	1 st VF1/ Sham or CCI surgery	10 th VF 1	19 th and 20 th habituation to the arena	21 st allocation to the acrylic boxes with a snake on the upper surface for 4h	22 nd VF1/ exposure to the arena with the snake and its exuvia for 10 min/ VF2-VF6	28 th VF1/ reexposure to the arena with the exuvia for 10 min/ VF2-VF6	29 th EP M for 5 min
Sham Non- threatened (9)	VF and Sham surgery	Yes	Yes	Yes, but without snake	Yes, but without snake	Yes, but without exuvia	Yes

					and exuvia		
Sham Threatened (8)	VF and Sham surgery	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CCI Non-threatened (9)	VF and CCI surgery	Yes	Yes	Yes, but without snake	Yes, but without snake and exuvia	Yes, but without exuvia	Yes
CCI Threatened (9)	VF and CCI surgery	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

1

2 **AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS**

3 J. Mendes-Gomes performed the experiments, analysed data and wrote the
4 manuscript; Paschoalin-Maurin handled and fed the snakes; L.F. Donaldson, B.M.
5 Lumb, and D.C. Blanchard interpreted data and wrote the manuscript; N.C.Coimbra
6 designed the experiments, designed the enriched polygonal arena for snakes versus
7 prey confrontations, and the current post-traumatic stress disorder apparatus,
8 interpreted data, and wrote the manuscript.

9 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

10 The authors are grateful to D.H. Elias-Filho for providing expert technical
11 assistance. D.H. Elias Filho received a technician scholarship from FAPESP (TT-2,
12 process 02/01497-1) and was the recipient of scholarships sponsored by CNPq
13 (processes 501858/2005-9, 500896/2008-9, 505461/2010-2, and 372838/2018-9) and
14 FAEPA (grants 345/2009 and 185/2010).

15

16 **FUNDING**

17 This study was supported by *Fundação de Apoio ao Ensino, Pesquisa e*
18 *Assistência do HC-FMRP-USP (FAEPA)* (grants 1291/97, 355/2000, 68/2001 and
19 15/2003), *Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP)*

1 (grants 2007/01174-1, 2012/03798-0 and 2017/11855-8), *Conselho Nacional de*
2 *Pesquisa e Desenvolvimento Tecnológico* (CNPq) (grants 483763/2010-1,
3 474853/2013-6, and 427397/2018-9) and a Pro-Rector of the University of São Paulo
4 (USP) research grant (NAP-USP-NuPNE; grant IaPQ2012-156-USP-
5 12.1.25440.01.6). J. Mendes-Gomes was supported by FAPESP (process
6 2013/13398-2). T. Paschoalin-Maurin was supported by CNPq (Sc.D. fellowship,
7 process 470119/2004-7) and CAPES (PNPD Post-Doctorate fellowship). We thank
8 the Instituto Butantan for the support of the MEDUSA Project-LNN-FMRP-USP/INeC
9 Ophidiarium. N.C. Coimbra was granted research fellowships (level 1A) from CNPq
10 (grants 301905/2010-0 and 301341/2015-0) and was a CNPq post-doctoral fellow
11 (process 200629/2005-0) in the Physiology, Anatomy and Genetics Department and
12 in the Clinical Neurology (FMRIB Centre) Department of the University of Oxford,
13 England, United Kingdom.

14

15 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

16 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest with respect to the work
17 presented herein.

18

19 **REFERENCES**

20 Almada RC, Coimbra NC (2015) Recruitment of striatonigral disinhibitory and
21 nigrotectal inhibitory GABAergic pathways during the organization of defensive
22 behavior by mice in a dangerous environment with the venomous snake *Bothrops*
23 *alternatus* (Reptilia, Viperidae). *Synapse* 69:299-313.

24 Almada RC, Roncon CM, Elias-Filho DH, Coimbra NC (2015) Endocannabinoid
25 signaling mechanisms in the substantia nigra pars reticulata modulate GABAergic
26 nigrotectal pathways in mice threatened by *urutu-cruzeiro* venomous pit viper.
27 *Neuroscience* 303:503-514.

1 American Psychiatric Association (2013) Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental
2 disorders, 5th ed., Washington, DC: Author.

3 Apfelbach R, Blanchard CD, Blanchard RJ, Hayes RA, McGregor IS (2005) The
4 effects of predator odors in mammalian prey species: a review of field and laboratory
5 studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 29:1123-1144.

6 Asmundson GJ, Bonin MF, Frombach IK, Norton GR (2000) Evidence of a disposition
7 toward fearfulness and vulnerability to posttraumatic stress in dysfunctional pain
8 patients. *Behav Res Ther* 38:801-812.

9 Baptista-de-Souza D, Nunciato AC, Pereira BC, Fachinni G, Zaniboni CR, Canto-de-
10 Souza A (2015) Mice undergoing neuropathic pain induce anxiogenic-like effects and
11 hypernociception in cagemates. *Behav Pharmacol* 26:664-672.

12 Beck JG, Clapp JD A (2011) different kind of co-morbidity: understanding
13 posttraumatic stress disorder and chronic pain. *Psychol Trauma* 3:101-108.

14 Bender K, Brown SM, Thompson SJ, Ferguson KM, Langenderfer L (2015) Multiple
15 victimizations before and after leaving home associated with PTSD, depression, and
16 substance use disorder among homeless youth. *Child Maltreat* 20:115-124.

17 Bennet GJ, Xie YK (1988) A peripheral mononeuropathy in rat that produces
18 disorders of pain sensations like those seen in man. *Pain* 33:87-107.

19 Bertaina-Anglade V, O'Connor SM, Andriambeloson E (2017) A perspective on the
20 contribution of animal models to the pharmacological treatment of posttraumatic stress
21 disorder. *Australas Psychiatry* 25:342-347.

22 Blanchard DC, Griebel G, Blanchard, RJ (2001) Mouse defensive behaviors:
23 pharmacological and behavioral assays for anxiety and panic. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*
24 25:205-218.

25 Blanchard DC, Griebel G, Pobbe R, Blanchard RJ (2011) Risk assessment as an
26 evolved threat detection and analysis process. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 35:991-998.

27 Blanchard DC, Hori K, Rodgers RJ, Hendrie CA, Blanchard RJ (1989) Attenuation of
28 defensive threat and attack in wild rats (*Rattus rattus*) by benzodiazepines.
29 *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 97:392-401.

30 Blanchard RJ, Blanchard DC (1989) Attack and defense in rodents as
31 ethoexperimental models for the study of emotion. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol*
32 *Psychiatry* 13:S3-14.

1 Blanchard RJ, Griebel G, Henrie JA, Blanchard DC (1997) Differentiation of anxiolytic
2 and panicolytic drugs by effects on rat and mouse defense test batteries. *Neurosci*
3 *Biobehav Rev* 21:783-789.

4 Blanchard RJ, Yudko EB, Rodgers RJ, Blanchard DC (1993) Defense system
5 psychopharmacology: an ethological approach to the pharmacology of fear and
6 anxiety. *Behav Brain Res* 58:155-165.

7 Boasso AM, Steenkamp MM, Nash WP, Larson JL, Litz BT (2015) The relationship
8 between course of PTSD symptoms in deployed U.S. Marines and degree of combat
9 exposure. *J Trauma Stress* 28:73-78.

10 Bolles RC, Fanselow MS (1980) A perceptual-defensive-recuperative model of fear
11 and pain. *Behav Brain Sci* 3:291-301.

12 Brunello N, Davidson JR, Deahl M, Kessler RC, Mendlewicz J, Racagni G, Shalev
13 AY, Zohar, J (2001) Posttraumatic stress disorder: diagnosis and epidemiology,
14 comorbidity and social consequences, biology and treatment. *Neuropsychobiology*
15 43:150-162.

16 Butler RK, Finn, DP (2009) Stress-induced analgesia. *Prog Neurobiol* 88:184-202.

17 Campos AC, Ferreira FR, da Silva WA Jr, Guimarães FS (2013) Predator threat
18 stress promotes long lasting anxiety-like behaviors and modulates synaptophysin and
19 CB1 receptors expression in brain areas associated with PTSD symptoms. *Neurosci*
20 *Lett* 533:34-38.

21 Carere C, Casetti R, de Acetis L, Perretta G, Cirulli F, Alleva E (1999) Behavioural
22 and nociceptive response in male and female spiny mice (*Acomyscahirinus*) upon
23 exposure to snake odour. *Behav Processes* 47(1):1-10.

24 Cohen JA, Price EO (1979) Grooming in the Norway rat: displacement activity or
25 "boundary-shift"? *Behav Neural Biol* 26:177-188. Calvo F, Almada RC, Dos Anjos-
26 Garcia T, Falconi-Sobrinho LL, Paschoalin-Maurin T, Bazaglia-de-Sousa G, Medeiros
27 P, Silva JAD, Lobão-Soares B, Coimbra NC (2019a) Panicolytic-like effect of μ_1 -opioid
28 receptor blockade in the inferior colliculus of prey threatened by *Crotalus durissus*
29 *terrificus pit vipers*. *J Psychopharmacol* 33(5):577-588.

30 Calvo F, Lobão-Soares B, de Freitas RL, Paschoalin-Maurin T, Dos Anjos-Garcia T,
31 Medeiros P, da Silva JA, Lovick TA, Coimbra NC (2019b) The endogenous opioid
32 system modulates defensive behavior evoked by *Crotalus durissus terrificus*:
33 Panicolytic-like effect of intracollicular non-selective opioid receptors blockade. *J*
34 *Psychopharmacol* 33(1):51-61.

1 Coimbra NC, Calvo F, Almada RC, de Freitas RL, Paschoalin-Maurin T, dos Anjos-
2 Garcia T, Elias-Filho DH, Ubiali WA et al. (2017a) Opioid neurotransmission
3 modulates defensive behavior and fear-induced antinociception in dangerous
4 environments. *Neuroscience* 354:178-195.

5 Coimbra NC, De Oliveira R, Freitas RL, Ribeiro SJ, Borelli KG, Pacagnella, RC,
6 Moreira JE, Da Silva LA et al. (2006) Neuroanatomical approaches of the tectum-
7 reticular pathways and immunohistochemical evidence for serotonin-positive
8 perikarya on neuronal substrates of the superior colliculus and periaqueductal gray
9 matter involved in the elaboration of the defensive behavior and fear-induced
10 analgesia. *Exp Neurol* 197:93-112.

11 Coimbra NC, Paschoalin-Maurin T, Bassi GS, Kanashiro A, Biagioni AF, Felippotti
12 TT, Elias-Filho DH, Mendes-Gomes J et al. (2017b) Critical neuropsychobiological
13 analysis of panic attack- and anticipatory anxiety-like behaviors in rodents confronted
14 with snakes in polygonal arenas and complex labyrinths: a comparison to the elevated
15 plus- and T-maze behavioral tests. *Revista Brasileira de Psiquiatria/RBP Psychiatry*
16 39:72-83.

17 Cornélio AM, Mendes-Gomes J, Fugimoto JS, Morgan MM, Nunes-de-Souza RL
18 (2011) Environmentally induced antinociception and hyperalgesia in rats and mice.
19 *Brain Res* 1415:56-62.

20 Cunha TM, Verri WA Jr, Vivancos GG, Moreira IF, Reis S, Parada CA, Cunha FQ,
21 Ferreira SH (2004) An electronic pressure-meter nociception paw test for mice. *Braz*
22 *J Med Biol Res* 37:401-407.

23 Curzon P, Rustay NR, Browman KE (2009) Cued and Contextual Fear Conditioning
24 for Rodents. In: *Methods of Behavior Analysis in Neuroscience* (Buccafusco JJ, ed),
25 chapter 2. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press/Taylor & Francis

26 Dalvi A, Rodgers RJ (1996) GABAergic influences on plus-maze behaviour in mice.
27 *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 128:380-397.

28 De Freitas RL, Salgado-Rhoner CJ, Hallak JEC, de Souza Crippa JA, Coimbra NC
29 (2013) Involvement of prelimbic medial prefrontal cortex in panic-like elaborated
30 defensive behaviour and innate fear-induced antinociception elicited by GABA_A
31 receptor blockade in the dorsomedial and ventromedial hypothalamic nuclei: role of
32 the endocannabinoid CB1 receptor. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 16:1781-1798.

33 De Freitas RL, Salgado-Rohner CJ, Biagioni AF, Medeiros P, Hallak JEC, Crippa
34 JAS, Coimbra NC (2014) NMDA and AMPA/kainate glutamatergic receptors in the

1 prelimbic medial prefrontal cortex modulate the elaborated defensive behavior and
2 innate fear-induced antinociception elicited by GABAA receptor blockade in the medial
3 hypothalamus. *Cereb Cortex* 24:1518-1528. Dell'Omo G, Alleva E (1994) Snake odor
4 alters behavior, but not pain sensitivity in mice. *Physiol Behav* 55(1):125-128.

5 Dias QM, Rossaneis AC, Fais RS, Prado WA (2013) An improved experimental
6 model for peripheral neuropathy in rats. *Braz J Med Biol Res* 46:253-256.

7 Dielenberg RA, McGregor IS (2001) Defensive behavior in rats towards predatory
8 odors: a review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 25:597-609.

9 Dos Anjos-Garcia T, Coimbra NC (2019) Opposing roles of dorsomedial
10 hypothalamic CB1 and TRPV1 receptors in anandamide signaling during the panic-
11 like response elicited in mice by Brazilian rainbow Boidae snakes.
12 *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 236(6):1863-1874.

13 Dunne-Proctor RL, Kenardy J, Sterling M (2016) The impact of posttraumatic stress
14 disorder on physiological arousal, disability and sensory pain thresholds in patients
15 with chronic whiplash. *Clin J Pain* 32:645-653.

16 Fentress JC (1988) Expressive contexts, fine structure, and central mediation of
17 rodent grooming. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 525:18-26.

18 Gibson CA (2012) Review of posttraumatic stress disorder and chronic pain: the path
19 to integrated care. *J Rehabil Dev* 49:753-776.

20 Goswami S, Rodríguez-Sierra O, Cascardi M, Paré D (2013) Animal models of post-
21 traumatic stress disorder: face validity. *Front Neurosci* 7:1-14.

22 Graeff FG (1994) Neuroanatomy and neurotransmitter regulation of defensive
23 behaviors and related emotions in mammals. *Braz J Med Biol Res* 27:811-829.

24 Gray JA, Mcnaughton N (2000) *The Neuropsychology of anxiety: an enquiry into the*
25 *functions of the septo-hippocampal system.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

26 Greenwood-Van Meerveld B, Moloney RD, Johnson AC, Vicario M (2016)
27 Mechanisms of stress-induced visceral pain: implications in irritable bowel syndrome.
28 *J Neuroendocrinol* 28.

29 Guimarães-Costa R, Guimarães-Costa MB, Pippa-Gadioli L, Weltson A, Ubiali WA,
30 Paschoalin-Maurin T, Felippotti TT, Elias-Filho DH et al. (2007) Innate defensive
31 behaviour and panic-like reactions evoked by rodents during aggressive encounters
32 with Brazilian constrictor snakes in a complex labyrinth: behavioural validation of a
33 new model to study affective and agonistic reactions in a prey versus predator
34 paradigm. *J Neurosci Meth* 165:25-37.

1 Handley SL, Mithani S (1984) Effects of alpha-adrenoceptor agonists and antagonists
2 in a maze-exploration model of fear-motivated behaviour. *Naunyn Schmiedeberg's*
3 *Arch Pharmacol* 327:1-5.

4 Hasnie FS, Wallace VC, Hefner K, Holmes A, Rice AS (2007) Mechanical and cold
5 hypersensitivity in nerve-injured C57BL/6J mice is not associated with fear-avoidance-
6 and depression-related behaviour. *Br J Anaesth* 98(6):816-822.

7 He YQ, Chen Q, Ji L, Wang ZG, Bai ZH, Stephens RL, Yang M (2013) PKC gamma
8 receptor mediates visceral nociception and hyperalgesia following exposure to PTSD-
9 like stress in the spinal cord of rats. *Mol Pain* 9:35-48.

10 Heinricher MM, Tavares I, Leith JL, Lumb BM (2009) Descending control of
11 nociception: specificity, recruitment and plasticity. *Brain Res Rev* 60:214-225.

12 Hubbard CS, Khan SA, Xu S, Cha M, Masri R, Seminowicz DA (2015) Behavioral,
13 metabolic and functional brain changes in a rat model of chronic neuropathic pain: a
14 longitudinal MRI study. *Neuroimage* 107:333-344.

15 Hubbard DT, Blanchard DC, Yang M, Markham CM, Gervacio A, Chun-I L, Blanchard
16 RJ (2004) Development of defensive behavior and conditioning to cat odor in the rat.
17 *Physiol Behav* 80:525-530.

18 Jennings EM, Okine BN, Roche M, Finn DP (2014) Stress-induced hyperalgesia.
19 *Prog Neurobiol* 121:1-18.

20 Kalueff AV, Stewart AM, Song C, Berridge KC, Graybiel AM, Fentress JC (2016)
21 Neurobiology of rodent self-grooming and its value for translational neuroscience. *Nat*
22 *Rev Neurosci* 17:45-59.

23 Kalueff AV, Tuohimaa PJ (2005) The grooming analysis algorithm discriminates
24 between different levels of anxiety in rats: potential utility for neurobehavioural stress
25 research. *J Neurosci Methods* 143:169-177.

26 Koenen KC, Lyons MJ, Goldberg J, Simpson J, Williams WM, Toomey R, Eisen SA,
27 True WR et al. (2003) A high risk twin study of combat-related PTSD comorbidity. *Twin*
28 *Res* 6:218-226.

29 Lancaster CL, Teeters JB, Gros DF, Back SE (2016) Posttraumatic stress disorder:
30 overview of evidence-based assessment and treatment. *J Clin Med* 5 pii:E105.

31 Langford DJ, Cragger SE, Shehzad Z, Smith SB, Sotocinal SG, Levenstadt JS,
32 Chanda ML, Levitin DJ, Mogil JS (2006) Social modulation of pain as evidence for
33 empathy in mice. *Science* 312(5782):1967-1970.

34 Lee B, Sur B, Cho SG, Yeom M, Shim I, Lee H, Hahm DH (2016) Ginsenoside Rb1

1 rescues anxiety-like responses in a rat model of post- traumatic stress disorder. J Nat
2 Med 70:133-144.

3 Lister RG (1987) The use of a plus-maze to measure anxiety in the mouse.
4 Psychopharmacology 92:180-185.

5 Lobão-Soares B, Walz R, Prediger RDS, Freitas RL, Calvo F, Bianchini MM, Leite
6 JP, Landemberger MC et al. (2008) Cellular Prion Protein modulates defensive
7 attention and innate fear-induced behaviour evoked by transgenic mice submitted to
8 an agonistic encounter with the tropical coral snake *Oxyrhopus guibei*. Behav Brain
9 Res 194:129-137.

10 Mackenzie L, Nalivaiko E, Beig MI, Day TA, Walker FR (2010) Ability of
11 predatorodour exposure to elicit conditioned versus sensitised post traumatic
12 stressdisorder-like behaviours, and forebrain delta FosB expression, in rats.
13 Neuroscience 169:733-742.

14 Matar MA, Cohen H, Kaplan Z, Zohar J (2006) The effect of early poststressor
15 intervention with sertraline on behavioral responses in an animal model of post-
16 traumatic stress disorder. Neuropsychopharmacology 31:2610-2618.

17 McNaughton N (2011) Fear, anxiety and their disorders: past, present and future
18 neural theories. Psychol Neurosci 4:173-181.

19 McNaughton N, Corr PJ (2004) A two-dimensional neuropsychology of defense:
20 fear/anxiety and defensive distance. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 28:285-305.

21 Medeiros P, de Freitas RL, Boccella S, Iannotta M, Belardo C, Mazzitelli M, Romano
22 R, De Gregorio D, Coimbra NC, Palazzo E, Maione S (2020) Characterization of the
23 sensory, affective, cognitive, biochemical, and neuronal alterations in a modified
24 chronic constriction injury model of neuropathic pain in mice. J Neurosci Res
25 98(2):338-352.

26 Mendes-Gomes J, Amaral VC, Nunes-De-Souza RL (2011a) Ventrolateral
27 periaqueductal gray lesion attenuates nociception but does not change anxiety-like
28 indices or fear-induced antinociception in mice. Behav Brain Res 219:248-253.

29 Mendes-Gomes J, Miguel TT, Amaral VC, Nunes-De-Souza RL (2011b)
30 Corticosterone does not change open elevated plus maze-induced antinociception in
31 mice. Horm Behav 60:408-413.

32 Mendes-Gomes J, Nunes-De-Souza RL (2005) Concurrent nociceptive stimulation
33 impairs the anxiolytic effect of midazolam injected into the periaqueductal gray in mice.
34 Brain Res 1047:97-104.

1 Mendes-Gomes J, Nunes-de-Souza RL (2009) Anxiolytic-like effects produced by
2 bilateral lesion of the periaqueductal gray in mice: Influence of concurrent nociceptive
3 stimulation. *Behav Brain Res* 203:180-187.

4 Moeller-Bertram T, Strigo IA, Simmons AN, Schilling JM, Patel P, Baker DG (2014)
5 Evidence for acute central sensitization to prolonged experimental pain in
6 posttraumatic stress disorder. *Pain Med* 15(5):762-771.

7 Möller KA, Johansson B, Berge OG (1998) Assessing mechanical allodynia in the rat
8 paw with a new electronic algometer. *J Neurosci Methods* 84:41-47.

9 Monti PM, Smith NF (1976) Residual fear of the conditioned stimulus as a function of
10 response prevention after avoidance or classical defensive conditioning in the rat. *J*
11 *Exp Psychol Gen* 105:148-162.

12 Morey RA, Dunsmoor JE, Haswell CC, Brown VM, Vora A, Weiner J, Stjepanovic D,
13 Wagner III HR et al. (2015) Fear learning circuitry is biased toward generalization of
14 fear associations in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Transl Psychiatry* 5:e700.

15 Narita M, Kaneko C, Miyoshi K, Nagumo Y, Kuzumaki N, Nakajima M, Nanjo K,
16 Matsuzawa K et al. (2006) Chronic pain induces anxiety with concomitant changes in
17 opioidergic function in the amygdala. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 31:739-750.

18 Nemeroff CB, Bremner JD, Foa EB, Mayberg HS, North CS, Stein MB (2006)
19 Posttraumatic stress disorder: a state-of-the science review. *J Psychiatr Res* 40:1-21.

20 Nunes-de-Souza RL, Canto-de-Souza A, Rodgers RJ (2002) Effects of
21 intrahippocampal infusion of WAY-100635 on plus-maze behavior in mice. Influence
22 of site of injection and prior test experience. *Brain Res* 927:87-96.

23 Nyland JE, McLean SA, Averitt DL (2015) Prior stress exposure increases pain
24 behaviors in a rat model of full thickness thermal injury. *Burns* 41:1796-1804.

25 Osborne FH, Mattingly BA, Redmon WK, Osborne JS (1975) Factors affecting the
26 measurement of classically conditioned fear in rats following exposure to escapable
27 versus inescapable signaled shock. *J Exp Psychol Anim Behav Process* 1:364-373.

28 Paschoalin-Maurin T, Dos Anjos-Garcia T, Falconi-Sobrinho LL, de Freitas RL,
29 Coimbra JPC, Laure CJ, Coimbra NC (2018) The rodent-versus-wild snake paradigm
30 as a model for studying anxiety- and panic-like behaviors: face, construct and
31 predictive validities. *Neuroscience* 369:336-349.

32 Pellow S, Chopin P, File SE, Briley M (1985) Validation of open: closed arm entries
33 in an elevated plus-maze as a measure of anxiety in the rat. *J Neurosci Meth* 14:149-
34 167.

1 Perrine SA, Eagle AL, George SA, Mulo K, Kohler RJ, Gerard J, Harutyunyan A, Hool
2 SM et al. (2016) Severe, multimodal stress exposure induces PTSD-like
3 characteristics in a mouse model of single prolonged stress. *Behav Brain Res*
4 303:228-237.

5 Pitzer C, La Porta C, Treede RD, Tappe-Theodor A (2019) Inflammatory and
6 neuropathic pain conditions do not primarily evoke anxiety-like behaviours in C57BL/6
7 mice. *Eur J Pain* 23(2):285-306.

8 Prado WA, Schiavon VF, Cunha FQ (2002) Dual effect of local application of nitric
9 oxide donors in a model of incision pain in rats. *Eur J Pharmacol* 441:57-65.

10 Puetz TW, Youngstedt SD, Herring MP (2015) Effects of pharmacotherapy on
11 combat-related PTSD, anxiety, and depression: a systematic review and meta-
12 regression analysis. *PLoS One* 10:e0126529.

13 Reeves SL, Fleming KE, Zhang I, Scimemi A (2016) M-Track: A new software for
14 automated detection of grooming trajectories in mice. *PLoS Comput Biol* 12:1-19.

15 Ribeiro-Barbosa ER, Canteras NS, Cezário AF, Blanchard RJ, Blanchard DC (2005)
16 An alternative experimental procedure for studying predator-related defensive
17 responses. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 29:1255-1263.

18 Schöner J, Heinz A, Endres M, Gertz K, Kronenberg G (2017) Post-traumatic stress
19 disorder and beyond: an overview of rodent stress models. *J Cell Mol Med* 21:2248-
20 2256.

21 Seminowicz DA, Laferriere AL, Millicamps M, Yu JS, Coderre TJ, Bushnell MC
22 (2009) MRI structural brain changes associated with sensory and emotional function
23 in a rat model of long-term neuropathic pain. *Neuroimage* 47(3):1007-1014.

24 Sharp TJ (2004) The prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder in chronic pain
25 patients. *Curr Pain Headache Rep* 8:111-115.

26 Sharp TJ, Harvey AG (2001) Chronic pain and posttraumatic stress disorder: mutual
27 maintenance? *Clin Psychol Rev* 21:857-877.

28 Sullivan SE, Joseph NF, Jamieson S, King ML, Chévere-Torres I, Fuentes I,
29 Shumyatsky GP, Brantley AF et al. (2017) Susceptibility and resilience to
30 posttraumatic stress disorder-like behaviors in inbred mice. *Biol Psychiatry* 82:924-
31 933.

32 Sipos ML, Bar-Haim Y, Abend R, Adler AB, Bliese PD (2014) Postdeployment threat-
33 related attention bias interacts with combat exposure to account for PTSD and anxiety
34 symptoms in soldiers. *Depress Anxiety* 31:124-129.

1 Smith ML, Hostetler CM, Heinricher MM, Ryabinin AE (2016) Social transfer of pain
2 in mice. *Sci Adv* 2(10):e1600855.

3 Sommer C, Lalonde A, Heckman HM, Rodriguez M, Myers RR (1995) Quantitative
4 neuropathology of a focal nerve injury causing hyperalgesia. *J Neuropathol Exp Neurol*
5 54:635-643.

6 Sorregotti T, Mendes-Gomes J, Rico JL, Rodgers RJ, Nunes-de-Souza RL (2013)
7 Ethopharmacological analysis of the open elevated plus-maze in mice. *Behav Brain*
8 *Res* 246:76-85.

9 Souza RR, Carobrez AP (2016) Acquisition and expression of fear memories are
10 distinctly modulated along the dorsolateral periaqueductal gray axis of rats exposed
11 to predator odor. *Behav Brain Res* 315:160-167.

12 Stephens DN (1986) Does the excitatory amino acid receptor antagonist 2-APH
13 exhibit anxiolytic activity? *Psychopharmacology* 90:166-169.

14 Takahashi LK, Nakashima BR, Hong H, Watanabe K (2005) The smell of danger: a
15 behavioral and neural analysis of predator odor-induced fear. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*
16 29:1157-1167.

17 Tomb DA (1994) The phenomenology of post-traumatic stress disorder. *Psychiatr*
18 *Clin North Am* 17:237-250.

19 Twardowschy A, Castiblanco-Urbina MA, Uribe-Mariño A, Biagioni AF, Salgado-
20 Rohner CJ, de Souza Crippa JA, Coimbra NC (2013) The role of 5-HT1A receptors in
21 the anti-aversive effects of cannabidiol on panic attack-like behaviors evoked in the
22 presence of the wild snake *Epicrates cenchria crassus* (Reptilia, Boidae). *J*
23 *Psychopharmacol* 27:1149-1159.

24 Uribe-Mariño A, Francisco A, Castiblanco-Urbina MA, Twardowschy A, Salgado-
25 Rohner CJ, Crippa JAS, Hallak JEC, Zuardi AW et al. (2012) Anti-aversive effects of
26 cannabidiol on innate fear-induced behaviors evoked by an ethological model of panic
27 attacks based on a prey vs the wild snake *Epicrates cenchria crassus* confrontation
28 paradigm. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 37:412-421.

29 Van Der Kolk BA (2001) The psychobiology and psychopharmacology of PTSD. *Hum*
30 *Psychopharmacol Clin Exp* 16:S49–S64.

31 Villano CL, Rosenblum A, Magura S, Fong C, Cleland C, Betzler TF (2007)
32 Prevalence and correlates of posttraumatic stress disorder and chronic severe pain in
33 psychiatric outpatients. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 44:167-178.

1 Vivancos GG, Verri WA JR, Cunha TM, Schivo IR, Parada CA, Cunha FQ, Ferreira
2 SH (2004) An electronic pressure-meter nociception paw test for rats. Braz J Med Biol
3 Res 37:391-399.

4 Zhang S, Jin X, You Z, Wang S, Lim G, Yang J, McCabe M, Li N et al. (2014)
5 Persistent nociception induces anxiety-like behavior in rodents: role of endogenous
6 neuropeptide S Pain 155:1504-1515.

7 Zhang Y, Gandhi PR, Standifer KM (2012) Increased nociceptive sensitivity and
8 nociceptin/orphanin FQ levels in a rat model of PTSD. Mol Pain 8:76-85.

9

10 **Figure Captions**

11 **Figure 1:** Frequency and duration of defensive-like behaviours in a 10-minute period
12 exhibited by naïve C57BL/6 mice (n = 7-9/group) exposed to a polygonal arena without
13 (non-threatened) or with a snake or its exuvia. Data are presented as the mean ±
14 S.E.M., and comparisons between groups were performed using Bonferroni's post hoc
15 test. ^a*P* < 0.05, mice exposed to the snake or to its exuvia vs. non-threatened mice;
16 ^b*P* < 0.05, mice exposed to the snake vs. those exposed to the exuvia.

17 **Figure 2:** Frequency and duration of defensive-like behaviours in a 10-minute period
18 exhibited by C57BL/6 mice (n = 8-9/group), with (CCI) or without (sham) sciatic nerve
19 constriction, exposed to a polygonal arena without (non-threatened) or with a snake
20 and its exuvia (threatened) and, 6 days later, reexposed to the aversive experimental
21 context, i.e., the arena without (non-threatened) or with the exuvia (threatened). Data
22 are presented as the mean ± S.E.M., and comparisons between groups were
23 performed using Bonferroni's post hoc test. ^a*P* < 0.05, sham threatened group vs.
24 sham non-threatened group during exposure; ^b*P* < 0.05, CCI threatened group vs. CCI
25 non-threatened group during exposure; ^c*P* < 0.05, sham threatened group vs. sham
26 non-threatened group during reexposure. ^d*P* < 0.05, CCI threatened group vs. CCI
27 non-threatened group during reexposure. ^e*P* < 0.001, within-groups comparison,
28 exposure vs. reexposure.

29 **Figure 3:** Frequency and duration of non-defensive-like behaviours in a 10-minute
30 period exhibited by C57BL/6 mice (n = 8-9/group), with (CCI) or without (sham) sciatic
31 nerve constriction, exposed to a rectangular arena without (non-threatened) or with a
32 snake and its exuvia (threatened) and, 6 days later, reexposed to the aversive

1 experimental context, i.e., arena without (non-threatened) or with the exuvia
2 (threatened). Data are presented as the mean \pm S.E.M., and comparisons between
3 groups were performed using Bonferroni's post hoc test. ^a $P < 0.05$, sham threatened
4 group vs. sham non-threatened group during exposure; ^b $P < 0.05$, CCI threatened
5 group vs. CCI non-threatened group during exposure; ^c $P < 0.05$, sham threatened
6 group vs. sham non-threatened group during reexposure; ^d $P < 0.05$, CCI threatened
7 group vs. CCI non-threatened group during reexposure. ^e $P \leq 0.05$, within-groups
8 comparison, exposure vs. reexposure.

9 **Figure 4:** Withdrawal thresholds to the von Frey filaments in C57BL/6 mice (n = 8-
10 9/group) before and 10 days after being submitted (CCI) or not (sham) to sciatic nerve
11 constriction. Importantly, an increase in responsivity is shown by a decrease in the
12 pressure needed to elicit a withdrawal response. Data are presented as the mean \pm
13 S.E.M., and comparisons between groups were performed using Bonferroni's post hoc
14 test. ^a $P < 0.0001$, compared to the baseline measure. ^b $P < 0.05$, compared to the sham
15 group.

16 **Figure 5:** Withdrawal thresholds to the von Frey filaments, measured at a number of
17 time intervals, in C57BL/6 mice (n = 8-9/group) submitted or not to sciatic nerve
18 constriction (CCI), exposed to the polygonal arena for snakes (without or with a snake
19 and its exuvia) (A), and 6 days later, reexposed to the experimental context i.e., arena
20 without (non-threatened) or with the exuvia (threatened) (B). Importantly, an increase
21 in responsivity is shown by a decrease in the pressure needed to elicit a withdrawal
22 response. Data are presented as the mean \pm S.E.M., and comparisons between
23 groups were performed using Bonferroni's post hoc test. ^a $P \leq 0.001$ compared to the
24 baseline measure, obtained before the confrontation to the predator; ^b $P \leq 0.01$, sham
25 threatened group vs. sham non-threatened group; ^c $P < 0.05$, CCI threatened group vs.
26 sham threatened group; ^d $P < 0.0001$, CCI non-threatened group vs. sham non-
27 threatened group.

28 **Figure 6:** Percentages of open-arm entries (A) and time (B) and frequency of closed-
29 arms entries (C) of sham and sciatic nerve constriction (CCI) mice (n = 8-9/ group)
30 exposed to the elevated plus maze (EPM) six days after exposure to a polygonal arena
31 for snakes (without or with a snake and its exuvia) and one day after reexposure to
32 the experimental context (arena without or with the exuvia). Data are presented as the

1 mean \pm S.E.M., and comparisons between groups were performed using Bonferroni's
2 post hoc test. ^a $P < 0.05$ compared to the sham non-threatened group. ^b $P < 0.05$
3 compared to the CCI non-threatened group.

4 **Figure 7:** Photographic documentation of habituation procedure (A); exposure of
5 C57BL/6 mice, in isolation inside fenestrated and transparent compartments, to the
6 *Epicrates cenchria crassus* constrictor snakes (B); and representative aversive
7 stimulus-induced unconditioned (C and D) and conditioned (E and F) fear-related
8 behavioural responses displayed by *Mus musculus* confronted with *Epicrates*
9 *chenchria crassus* in the enriched polygonal arena for snakes. Defensive immobility
10 (freezing) under an elevated escape platform (C) and inhibitory avoidance and stretch
11 attend posture after oriented escape to the burrow (D) were displayed by prey during
12 confrontation with predator. Flat back approach/interactions between prey and the
13 exuvia (moulted skin with the smell of the snake) (E) and defensive immobility
14 displayed by prey on the elevated platform (F) were showed by prey during exposure
15 to the experimental context with the exuvia, but without the predator.