

Journal of Visualized Experiments

Electrophysiological Recording of the Central Nervous System Activity of 3rd-Instar *Drosophila melanogaster* --Manuscript Draft--

Article Type:	Invited Methods Article - JoVE Produced Video
Manuscript Number:	JoVE58375R1
Full Title:	Electrophysiological Recording of the Central Nervous System Activity of 3rd-Instar <i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>
Keywords:	insecticide mechanism of action; insecticide resistance; Neuroscience; Electrophysiology; neural circuit; neural signaling; Physiology; ion channel; enzyme
Corresponding Author:	Daniel Swale, PhD Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, LA UNITED STATES
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Louisiana State University
Corresponding Author E-Mail:	dswale@agcenter.lsu.edu
Order of Authors:	Daniel Swale, PhD Aaron D Gross Jeffrey R Bloomquist
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
Please indicate whether this article will be Standard Access or Open Access.	Standard Access (US\$2,400)
Please indicate the city, state/province, and country where this article will be filmed . Please do not use abbreviations.	2055 Mowry Road, Gainesville, FL, 32610-00009



Department of Entomology

404 Life Sciences Building
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Research: (225)578-1634

Extension: (225)578-2180

Fax: (225)578-2257

July 5, 2018

JoVE,

On behalf of my colleagues, Professor Jeffrey Bloomquist and Dr. Aaron Gross, we hereby resubmit our manuscript entitled "Electrophysiological Recording of the Central Nervous System Activity of 3rd-Instar *Drosophila melanogaster*" be considered for publication in the Journal of Visualized Experiments.

We have addressed nearly every one of the concerns raised by the reviewers and deem this manuscript to be a significant improvement from the initial submission.

We believe the described approach is extremely useful for a range of scientific disciplines and can assist with education of students and therefore, we believe submission of this manuscript is timely and important for advancing the field of neurophysiology and neurotoxicology.

We request this manuscript be in press by November 1st, 2018 to satisfy the timelines required for manuscript submissions that will cite this method, promotion and tenure packages, and prior to presentations within an international symposium.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniel R Swale

Jeffrey R Bloomquist

Aaron D Gross

For the latest
research-based information
on just about anything,
visit our website:
www.LSUAgCenter.com

TITLE:

Electrophysiological Recording of the Central Nervous System Activity of Third-Instar *Drosophila melanogaster*

AUTHORS AND AFFILIATIONS:

Daniel R. Swale^{1*}, Aaron Gross², Jeffrey R. Bloomquist³

¹Louisiana State University AgCenter, Department of Entomology, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

²Virginia Tech, Department of Entomology, Blacksburg, VA, USA

³University of Florida, Department of Entomology and Nematology, Emerging Pathogens Institute, Gainesville, FL, USA

Corresponding Author:

Daniel R. Swale (dswale@agcenter.lsu.edu)

Email Addresses of Co-authors:

Aaron Gross (adgross@vt.edu)

Jeffrey R. Bloomquist (jbquist@epi.ufl.edu)

KEYWORDS:

Neuroscience, electrophysiology, neural circuit, *Drosophila*, neuroethology, neural signaling, insecticide mechanism of action, insecticide resistance

SUMMARY:

This protocol describes a method to record the descending electrical activity of the *Drosophila melanogaster* central nervous system to enable the cost-efficient and convenient testing of pharmacological agents, genetic mutations of neural proteins, and/or the role of unexplored physiological pathways.

ABSTRACT:

The majority of the currently available insecticides target the nervous system and genetic mutations of invertebrate neural proteins oftentimes yield deleterious consequences, yet the current methods for recording nervous system activity of an individual animal is costly and laborious. This suction electrode preparation of the third-instar larval central nervous system of *Drosophila melanogaster*, is a tractable system for testing the physiological effects of neuroactive agents, determining the physiological role of various neural pathways to CNS activity, as well as the influence of genetic mutations to neural function. This *ex vivo* preparation requires only moderate dissecting skill and electrophysiological expertise to generate reproducible recordings of insect neuronal activity. A wide variety of chemical modulators, including peptides, can then be applied directly to the nervous system in solution with the physiological saline to measure the influence on the CNS activity. Further, genetic technologies, such as the GAL4/UAS system, can be applied independently or in tandem with pharmacological agents to determine the role of specific ion channels, transporters, or receptors to arthropod CNS function. In this context, the assays described herein are of significant interest to insecticide toxicologists, insect physiologists,

and developmental biologists for which *D. melanogaster* is an established model organism. The goal of this protocol is to describe an electrophysiological method to enable the measurement of electrogenesis of the central nervous system in the model insect, *Drosophila melanogaster*, which is useful for testing a diversity of scientific hypotheses.

INTRODUCTION:

The overall goal of this approach is to enable researchers to quickly measure the electrogenesis of the central nervous system (CNS) in the model insect, *Drosophila melanogaster*. This method is reliable, quick, and cost-efficient to perform physiological and toxicological experimentation. The CNS is essential for life and therefore, the physiological pathways critical for proper neural function have been explored extensively in an effort to understand or modify neural function. Characterization of the signaling pathways within the arthropod CNS has enabled the discovery of several chemical classes of insecticides that disrupt invertebrate neural function to induce mortality while limiting off-target consequences. Thus, the ability to measure the neural activity of insects is of significant interest to the field of insect toxicology and physiology since the nervous system is the target tissue of the majority of deployed insecticides¹. Yet, continued growth of fundamental and applied knowledge regarding the insect nervous system requires advanced neurophysiological techniques that are limited in feasibility, since current techniques are labor intensive and require a high expense, insect neural cell lines are limited, and/or there is limited access to the central synapses of most arthropods. Currently, characterization of most insect neural proteins requires the target to be cloned and heterologously expressed for subsequent drug discovery and electrophysiological recordings, as was described for insect inward rectifier potassium channels², insect ryanodine receptor³, mosquito voltage-sensitive K⁺ channels⁴, and others. To mitigate the requirement for heterologous expression and the potential for low functional expression, Bloomquist and colleagues aimed to induce a neuronal phenotype in cultured *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Sf21) cells as a novel method for insecticide discovery^{5,6}. These methods provide a valid approach for the development of new chemistry, yet they oftentimes create an insurmountable bottleneck for the characterization of pharmacological agents, identifying mechanisms of insecticide resistance, and characterization of fundamental physiological principles. Here, we describe an *ex vivo* method that enables the recording of electrical activity from a model insect that has malleable genetics⁷⁻⁹ and known expression patterns of neural complexes¹⁰⁻¹² to enable the characterization of resistance mechanisms at the level of the nerve, the mode of action of newly developed drugs, and other toxicological studies.

The fruit fly, *D. melanogaster*, is a common model organism for defining insect neural systems or insecticide mechanism of action and has been established as a well-suited model organism for the study of toxicological¹³, pharmacological^{14,15}, neurophysiological¹⁶, and pathophysiological¹⁷⁻²⁰ processes of vertebrates. *D. melanogaster* is a holometabolous insect that performs complete metamorphosis, including a larval and pupal stage before reaching the reproductive adult stage. Throughout the developmental process, the nervous system undergoes significant remodeling at different life stages, but the larval CNS will be the focus of this methodology. The fully developed larval CNS is anatomically simple with thoracic and abdominal segments that are fused and form the ventral ganglion, which represents an array of repeated and almost identical neuromeric units^{21,22}. Descending motor nerves originate from the caudal end of the subesophageal ganglia

and descend to innervate body wall muscles and visceral organs of the larvae. **Figure 1** describes the gross anatomy of the larval *Drosophila* CNS.

The *Drosophila* blood-brain barrier (BBB) develops at the end of embryogenesis and is formed by subperineurial glial cells (SPG)²¹. The SPG cells form numerous filopodia-like processes that spread out to establish a contiguous, very flat, endothelial-like sheet that covers the entire *Drosophila* CNS²³. The *Drosophila* BBB has similarities to the vertebrate BBB, which includes preserving the homeostasis of the neural microenvironment by controlling the entry of nutrients and xenobiotics into the CNS²¹. This is a prerequisite for reliable neural transmission and function, yet the protection of the CNS by the BBB restricts the permeation of synthetic drugs, most peptides, and other xenobiotics^{24,25}, which introduces potential problems when characterizing potencies of small-molecule modulators. The method uses a simple transection to disrupt this barrier and provide ready pharmacological access to the central synapses.

The greatest strength of the described methodology is the simplicity, reproducibility, and relatively high-throughput capacity inherent to this system. The protocol is relatively easy to master, the setup requires little space, and only an initial financial input is necessary which is reduced to reagents and consumables. Further, the described method is completely amendable to record the central descending nerve activity of the house fly, *Musca domestica*²⁶.

PROTOCOL:

1. Equipment and Materials

1.1. Prepare the required components (listed in Table of Materials) of the electrophysiology rig to perform suction electrode recordings of the *Drosophila* CNS.

Note: Prior to experimentation, it is necessary to construct chambers for dissection of the *Drosophila* CNS and to be used for bathing the ganglia in saline during recordings. A step-by-step outline of chamber construction is provided below.

1.2. Prepare the larval chamber.

1.2.1. Melt the black wax using a hot plate.

1.2.2. Pour 2 mL of melted wax into a chamber that has a maximum volume of 2 - 2.5 mL.

1.2.3. Let the wax cool and harden for approximately 2 h.

1.2.4. Use a razor blade to carve a hole in the hardened wax that will hold a volume of 500 μ L, which has a surface area of approximately 0.5 cm² and a depth of approximately 0.25 cm.

2. Equipment and Software Configuration

Note: The setup of the extracellular recording is briefly described below.

2.1. Prepare equipment for dissection and recording.

2.1.1. Position the tissue preparation, microscope, suction electrode, micromanipulators, light source inside the Faraday cage to reduce noise and eliminate extraneous electrical fields (**Figure 2**).

2.1.2. Connect (preferably solder) ground and positive wires onto shielded alligator clips that will be connected to the bath and microelectrode holder, respectively.

Note: Soldered and exposed wires can be covered with aluminum foil to reduce noise.

2.1.3. Connect the ground and positive wires to input 1 of the AC/DC differential amplifier.

2.1.4. Connect the *data acquisition system* to the AC/DC differential amplifier by connecting a Bayonet Neill–Concelman (BNC) cable from input 1 of the data acquisition system to the channel 1 output of the amplifier.

Note: It is recommended to incorporate a 50/60 Hz noise eliminator between the data acquisition software and the amplifier. The use of a BNC T-connector is required.

2.1.5. If desired, include an audio monitor into the setup by connecting input 1 of the audio monitor to input 1 of the data acquisition software.

2.1.6. Fill the 10 mL syringe with saline and connect it to the pressure port of the electrode holder.

Note: Ensure that no air bubbles exist between the syringe, the Ag/AgCl pellet, and the electrode opening.

2.2. Prepare the software for dissection and recording.

Note: The outline of methods for software setup is based on the acquisition/analysis software listed in the Table of Materials which will digitize the raw electrical output and convert the data to spike frequency. However, other software can be used and multiple recording conversions can be used.

2.2.1. Open the acquisition/analysis software.

2.2.2. Click on “setup” from the main toolbar and select “channel settings,” which will open a dialogue box.

2.2.3. Reduce the number of total channels to one.

2.2.4. For Channel 1, click on the “calculation” tab that will open a drop-down menu. Select “cyclic measurements,” which will open a second dialogue box.

2.2.5. Set the output to “auto scale”.

2.2.6. Change the “measurement” drop-down menu and select “frequency” to convert the electrical activity into a rate plot expressed in hertz (Hz)

2.2.7. Select the recording type from the drop-down menu on the bottom left of the dialogue box.

Note: Successful recordings can be performed with multiple different recording setups, but “general-simple threshold” is likely the easiest, since it allows for adjustment of the threshold above the background activity for each individual recording. Recordings under the setting of “Custom-Source Input” increase reproducibility of the data assuming the background activity is not different between recordings.

2.2.8. Close dialogue boxes to return to the main screen. The y-axis should be expressed in Hz and the x-axis in time.

3. Dissect and Prepare the Larval *Drosophila* CNS

Note: Methods for larval CNS dissection are clearly illustrated in Hafer and Schedl²⁷, but these previously published methods reduce the length of the descending neurons that are important for measuring spike frequency. Here, an additional method is outlined to excise the larval CNS that maintains long, intact descending neurons.

3.1. Saline preparation.

3.1.1. Prepare the dissection and recording saline to the following in mM²⁸: 157 NaCl, 3 KCl, 2 CaCl₂, 4 2-[4-(2-hydroxyethyl)piperazin-1-yl]ethanesulfonic acid (HEPES); titrate pH to 7.25.

3.2. Dissect the larval *Drosophila* CNS.

3.2.1. Identify and extract a wandering third-instar *Drosophila melanogaster* from the culture vial and place into 200 µL of saline (**Figure 3A**).

3.2.2. Grasp the mouth hooks with a pair of fine forceps and grasp the abdomen of the maggot with a second pair of forceps (**Figure 3B**).

Note: Do not apply too much pressure to the abdomen as this can result in tearing of the thin cuticular layer of the maggot.

3.2.3. Gently pull the mouth hooks and abdomen in different directions to separate the caudal end of the maggot from the head region and expose the viscera of the maggot (**Figure 3C**).

Note: The CNS will be intertwined with the trachea and digestive tract. Do not cut the CNS away from any tissue to prevent cutting the descending peripheral nerves.

3.2.4. Tease the CNS out of the digestive tract and trachea with forceps (**Figure 3D**).

3.2.5. If necessary, disrupt the blood brain barrier by manually transecting the CNS posterior to the cerebral lobes with Vannas spring scissors.

Note: This should be done based on the physiochemical properties of the chemical being used. The red line in **Figure 4A** is the suggested transection point and the transected CNS with intact descending peripheral nerve trunks shown in **Figure 4B**. The transected CNS is ready for experimentation after completion of step 3.2.5.

4. Extracellular Recording of *Drosophila* CNS.

4.1. Prepare the CNS for recording.

4.1.1. Pull a glass pipette electrode from borosilicate glass capillaries to a resistance of 5-15 m Ω .

4.1.2. Insert the transected CNS into the wax chamber that contains 200 μ L of saline. Clamp an uncoated insect pin with the alligator clip soldered to the ground wire and insert the pin into the saline to complete the circuit.

4.1.3. Using the micromanipulators, orient the electrode to the caudal end of the transected CNS. Eliminate recording of background noise by adjusting the threshold level in the acquisition/analysis software prior to contacting the peripheral nerve trunks.

4.1.4. Draw any convenient peripheral nerves into the suction electrode by applying slight negative pressure on the syringe.

Note: The baseline firing frequency is correlated to the number of neurons drawn into the electrode where more neurons oftentimes result in increased resistance of the electrode.

4.2. Begin extracellular recording of CNS descending nerve activity.

4.2.1. Start the recording on the data acquisition software and monitor the baseline firing frequency. Allow the firing rate to equilibrate for 5 min prior to collecting baseline firing rate data.

4.2.2. Discard the preparation and recording if the pattern of firing of control treatment is not a bursting pattern similar to that shown in **Figure 5A**.

Note: Altered pattern of firing suggests abnormal or unstable activity of the central pattern generator, which can alter neural function.

4.2.3. After 5 min, add 200 μ L of saline + vehicle to bring the total volume of the chamber to 400 μ L to begin recording control firing rates.

4.2.4. After baseline has been established (3-5 min), withdraw 200 μ L of saline and add 200 μ L of the experimental agent solubilized in saline.

Note: Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) is the recommended solvent for lipophilic compounds and should not exceed 0.1% v/v.

4.2.5. Apply drug concentrations in a serial manner (low to high concentrations) and record each concentration for a select period of time (determined by the investigator based on the chemical properties of the drug²⁹). Label this time point of drug application in the acquisition/analysis software by including a comment that includes the drug and the final concentration.

Note: Firing activity of the CNS will decline by approximately 10-20% after 30-50 min after the dissection and therefore, appropriate untreated controls should be performed, and drug treatments should not exceed this time period.

4.3. Analyze the data.

Note: Multiple analyses can be performed on the collected data, such as changes in action potential bursts²⁹, spike waveform amplitude and time course, and determining mean spike frequencies after drug treatment^{26,30-32}. The most common is determining the influence a drug has to the mean spike frequencies over a specified period of time, which is described below.

4.3.1. Tabulate mean spike frequencies by selecting the entire region of interest (*i.e.*, the drug treatment time period) and determine mean spike frequencies automatically through the "Datapad" located on the main toolbar of the acquisition/analysis software.

4.3.2. Determine the mean spike frequency of the CNS after drug treatment to the mean spike frequency of the vehicle control (baseline). Calculate the percent change of firing rate after drug treatment by the formula: (Treated Frequency/Baseline Frequency) \times 100.

4.3.3. Use the mean spike frequencies or percent firing of control for each concentration to construct a concentration response curve with standard graphing software.

4.3.4. Perform statistical analysis (*e.g.*, unpaired *t*-test) to determine significance between time points, concentrations, or drug treatments.

Note: There are two primary methods for generating and analyzing concentration-response curves. The first method is one concentration per individual preparation. Here, the spike rate of the single concentration is normalized to baseline spike rate for each preparation. The benefits are reduced run down of the preparation due to shortened recording time, while the pitfalls are increased dissection time because this method will consist of 5-7 individual CNS preparations per concentration, and larger error bars on the averaged data set. The second method is multiple concentrations per individual preparation. Here, the spike rate for each of the 3-5 concentrations are normalized to the same baseline spike rate. The benefits are less dissection time and less variability between replicates for drug concentrations, while the pitfalls are the requirement of a fast-acting drug and unknown impact of previous drug concentration treatments on subsequent chemical treatments.

REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS:

Spontaneous activity of the descending peripheral nerves arising from the *Drosophila* central nervous system can be recorded using extracellular suction electrodes with consistent reproducibility. Spontaneous activity of the excised and transected *Drosophila* CNS produces a cyclical pattern of bursting with 1-2 s of firing with approximately 1 s of near quiescent activity. For example, the CNS is near quiescent (1-2 Hz) for 0.5-1 s, followed by a burst (100-400 Hz) for approximately 1 s, and then returns to a near quiescent state (1-2 Hz) for 0.5-1 s (**Figure 5A**). This firing pattern is repeated every 2-3 s. The average spike discharge frequency of *Drosophila* CNS ranges from approximately 20-50 Hz over a 3-5 min period, when the threshold is set just above the baseline noise. The baseline firing frequency is correlated to the number of peripheral neurons drawn into the electrode and the seal formed between the electrode orifice and the ventral ganglia. Importantly, application of the chemical solvent DMSO at a final concentration of 0.1% does not alter the spike discharge frequency of the *Drosophila* CNS (**Figure 5A**).

This electrophysiological preparation provides a method to characterize the excitatory or depressant properties of various small molecules on the spike frequency of a well-characterized insect neural system. Propoxur, a known inhibitor of insect acetylcholinesterase (AChE), is a neuroexcitant and increased the spike discharge frequency of the transected *Drosophila* CNS in a concentration-dependent manner (**Figure 5B**). On the contrary, gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA), a known inhibitory neurotransmitter acting upon the insect GABA-mediated chloride channel, is a neurodepressant and reduced the spike discharge frequency in a concentration-dependent manner (**Figure 5C**). Mean spike discharge frequencies can be determined across the recorded time period for each concentration to enable the construction of a concentration response curve to determine the 50% effective concentration (EC_{50}) to elicit a response. Here, propoxur is shown to have an EC_{50} of 338 nM (95% confidence interval (CI): 241-474; hillslope: 1.8; r^2 : 0.77) with a concentration of 1 μ M producing maximal excitation of the *Drosophila* CNS at 300% activity of control (**Figure 5D**)²⁶. GABA is shown to have an IC_{50} of 1.1 mM (95% CI: 0.7-1.5; hillslope: 1.5; r^2 : 0.95) with maximal inhibition at 5 mM (**Figure 5E**).

Oftentimes, molecular probes of neural systems are not able to be used in physiological or toxicological assays due to their lack of proper physiochemical properties that enable penetration of the blood brain barrier. For instance, monomeric tacrine is a potent (ca. 200 nM) inhibitor of

insect AChE³³, yet does not alter the spike frequency of the intact *Drosophila* CNS (**Figure 6A**). However, disruption of the neural lamella and the blood brain barrier through transection posterior to the cerebral lobes resulted in a near immediate increase in the spike frequency of the *Drosophila* CNS after exposure to 100 μ M monomeric tacrine (**Figure 6B**). Similar data have been previously described³⁰.

FIGURE AND TABLE LEGENDS:

Figure 1: Excised CNS from third-instar *Drosophila melanogaster*. Arrows point to various anatomical structures of the CNS that correspond to the labels. The scale bar represents 250 μ m.

Figure 2: Electrophysiology setup that is used to perform extracellular recordings. (A) Faraday cage; (B) vibration table; (C) dissecting microscope; (D) AC/DC differential amplifier; (E) audio monitor; (F) noise eliminator; (G) data acquisition system; (H) computer running lab chart pro software; (I) fiberoptic cable with external illumination source; (J) micromanipulator; (K) microelectrode holder with pressure port with glass electrode and preparation wax dish.

Figure 3: Method for excising the CNS from third-instar maggots. (A) Intact maggot submerged in 200 μ L of saline. The arrow indicates the mouth hooks that are used for separation of the body wall. (B) Two pairs of forceps are placed at the middle of the maggot and on the mouth hooks to begin separation of the body wall. (C) Body wall is separated by applying slight and continuous pressure to expose the viscera. (D) CNS is clearly visible (white arrows) and is occasionally intertwined with the viscera. The scale bar represents 1000 μ m, 750 μ m, 500 μ m, and 200 μ m for panels A, B, C, and D, respectively.

Figure 4: Disruption of the blood brain barrier by transecting the CNS. (A) Intact CNS with descending nerves clearly visible at the caudal end of the ventral ganglia. The red line indicates the location of transecting the CNS to disrupt the BBB. (B) A transected CNS with the caudal end of the ventral ganglia still exposing long descending neurons. The ventral ganglia can be discarded. The scale bar represents 200 μ m for both panels.

Figure 5: Neurophysiological recordings from the CNS of third-instar larvae of *D. melanogaster*. Representative nerve discharge traces before and after exposure to (A) DMSO, (B) propoxur, and (C) GABA. Initial firing frequencies in spikes/s (Hz) for each experiment are given to the left of each trace. Concentration-response curves for propoxur (D) and GABA (E) to CNS nerve discharge of *D. melanogaster* larvae from replicated recordings (n = 3-5 concentrations per curve, with each concentration replicated at least 5 times). Arrows represent point of drug application. Data points represent mean percent increase of baseline firing rate and error bars represent standard deviation. When error bars are absent, it is because they are smaller than the size of the symbol.

Figure 6: Increased penetration of tacrine into the nervous system after transection of the CNS. Representative recordings of (A) intact and (B) transected larval CNS exposed to monomeric tacrine, which was applied at the arrow. Initial firing frequencies in spikes/s (Hz) for each experiment are given to the left of each trace.

DISCUSSION:

The details provided in the associated video and text have provided key steps in order to record the activity and spike discharge frequency of the *Drosophila* CNS *ex vivo*. The dissection efficacy is the most critical aspect of the method because short or few descending neurons will reduce the baseline firing rate that will result in large variances between replicates. However, once the dissection technique has been mastered, the data collected with this assay are highly reproducible and amendable for a wide variety of disciplines. One modification to the described method is the inclusion of an automated perfusion system that will prevent the need to manually pipette the saline and chemical solutions into the CNS chamber. Inclusion of the perfusion system will reduce disturbances of the CNS during the recordings, which occasionally occur during the application of drugs with manual pipettes.

This electrophysiological method exploits the utility of the preparation for incorporation into drug/insecticide discovery research. Furthermore, this preparation is amenable to the classroom for demonstration of fundamental concepts in neurophysiology. The method requires relatively modest financial investment and minimal preparation time while providing a robust and stable recording that can be employed to illustrate the influence of drugs to the function of fly CNS. For instance, the financial burden of the recording rig is an initial cost of approximately \$10,000 USD with minor subsequent costs (*e.g.*, saline salts, fly colony maintenance, *etc.*). Further, the time needed from CNS preparation to first recording is approximately 10 min. Although *Drosophila* are easy to maintain in culture within a laboratory or classroom, it should be noted that this suction electrode assay can also be performed using the CNS of the housefly, *Musca domestica*, and probably other muscoid fly larvae, as well. The pest status of *Musca domestica* to livestock suggests this assay could be of significant utility to research programs aiming to characterize the neuronal sensitivity of flies from different populations or to determine the potency of newly developed neurotoxicants for eventual control of infestations.

In addition to characterizing the potency of drugs, this preparation can be used to characterize the influence of genetic mutations and manipulation on the activity of the *Drosophila* nervous system. Previous work has shown that CNS-specific knockdown of the gene encoding the inward rectifier potassium (Kir) channel increased the baseline CNS firing frequency by approximately 2-fold when compared to control flies³¹. These data were combined with pharmacological data to ultimately speculate the physiological role Kir channels serve to *Drosophila* nervous system function.

Although this technique represents a powerful assay to test diverse toxicological and physiological hypotheses, limitations to the assay do exist and must be considered. For instance, the data generated through suction electrode recordings rarely provide conclusive evidence for the exact mode of action of a drug or precise physiological role for an ion channel and must be studied in tandem with more cell-based measurements, such as patch clamp electrophysiology. An additional limitation to this method is that the various receptors and ion channel sub-types do not influence the CNS spike rate in an equal manner. Therefore, it is possible that a modulation of a specific receptor or ion-channel subtype may not significantly influence the spike rate of the

excised CNS, but may indeed have a critical effect on total nervous system function and/or integration of signals.

Although limitations exist, the data collected through suction electrode recordings do provide quality proof-of-concept data and allow researchers to generate hypotheses regarding mechanisms of action that can be validated through voltage-clamp electrophysiology, biochemical analyses, or through additional pharmacological testing. For example, the latter was performed to test the hypothesis that the insect repellent, *N,N*-Diethyl-3-methylbenzamide (DEET), was inhibiting the octopaminergic system in insect CNS in an effort to describe the mechanism of toxicity to mosquitoes and flies²⁶. DEET was shown to be a neuroexcitant of housefly CNS activity and also altered the evoked excitatory postsynaptic potential at the neuromuscular junction, which are cholinergic and glutamatergic systems, respectively²⁶. These data suggested that DEET was not likely to induce toxicity through cholinergic inhibition, as was previously suggested³⁴. Recording the discharge frequency of the fly CNS after exposure to phentolamine, a known octopamine antagonist, showed a complete inhibition of the DEET-mediated neuroexcitation, but not that of propoxur, which provided significant evidence that DEET was more likely affecting the octopaminergic system than AChE²⁶. These published data sets highlight the variety of hypotheses and experimental conditions that can be investigated with this method.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

We would like to thank Ms. Rui Chen for the dissection and images of the *Drosophila* CNS shown in the figures.

DISCLOSURES:

The authors have nothing to disclose.

REFERENCES

- 1 Sparks, T. C., Nauen, R. IRAC: Mode of action classification and insecticide resistance management. *Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology*. **121**, 122-128 (2015).
- 2 Swale, D. R., *et al.* An insecticide resistance-breaking mosquitocide targeting inward rectifier potassium channels in vectors of Zika virus and malaria. *Scientific Reports*. **6**, 36954 (2016).
- 3 Troczka, B. J. *et al.* Stable expression and functional characterisation of the diamondback moth ryanodine receptor G4946E variant conferring resistance to diamide insecticides. *Scientific Reports*. **5**, 14680 (2015).
- 4 Bloomquist, J. R. *et al.* Voltage-sensitive potassium K_v2 channels as new targets for insecticides. In *Biopesticides: State of the Art and Future Opportunities*, pp. 71-81 ACS Symposium Series Vol. 1172, Washington, DC (2014).
- 5 Jenson, L. J., Bloomquist, J. R. Role of serum and ion channel block on growth and hormonally-induced differentiation of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Sf21) insect cells. *Archives of Insect Biochemistry and Physiology*. **90** (3), 131-139 (2015).

480 6 Jenson, L. J., Sun, B., Bloomquist, J. R. Voltage-sensitive potassium channels expressed
481 after 20-Hydroxyecdysone treatment of a mosquito cell line. *Insect Biochemistry and Molecular*
482 *Biology* **87**, 75-80 (2017).

483 7 Chintapalli, V. R., Wang, J. Dow, J. A. Using FlyAtlas to identify better *Drosophila*
484 *melanogaster* models of human disease. *Nature Genetics*. **39** (6), 715-720 (2007).

485 8 Duffy, J. B. GAL4 system in *Drosophila*: a fly geneticist's Swiss army knife. *Genesis*. **34** (1-
486 2), 1-15 (2002).

487 9 St Johnston, D. The art and design of genetic screens: *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Nature*
488 *Reviews Genetics* **3** (3), 176-188 (2002).

489 10 Luan, Z. Li, H. S. Inwardly rectifying potassium channels in *Drosophila*. *Sheng Li Xue Bao*.
490 **64**, (5), 515-519 (2012).

491 11 Muenzing, S. E. A. *et al.* Larvalign: Aligning gene expression patterns from the larval brain
492 of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Neuroinformatics*. **16** (1), 65-80 (2017).

493 12 Sprecher, S. G., Reichert, H. Hartenstein, V. Gene expression patterns in primary neuronal
494 clusters of the *Drosophila* embryonic brain. *Gene Expression Patterns*. **7** (5), 584-595 (2007).

495 13 Zhou, S. *et al.* A *Drosophila* model for toxicogenomics: Genetic variation in susceptibility
496 to heavy metal exposure. *PLoS Genetics*. **13** (7), e1006907 (2017).

497 14 Manev, H. Dimitrijevic, N. *Drosophila* model for *in vivo* pharmacological analgesia
498 research. *European Journal of Pharmacology*. **491** (2-3), 207-208 (2004).

499 15 Pandey, U. B. Nichols, C. D. Human disease models in *Drosophila melanogaster* and the
500 role of the fly in therapeutic drug discovery. *Pharmacological Reviews*. **63** (2), 411-436 (2011).

501 16 Hekmat-Scafe, D. S., Lundy, M. Y., Ranga, R. Tanouye, M. A. Mutations in the K⁺/Cl⁻
502 cotransporter gene *kazachoc* (*kcc*) increase seizure susceptibility in *Drosophila*. *Journal of*
503 *Neuroscience*. **26** (35), 8943-8954 (2006).

504 17 Whitworth, A. J. *et al.* Increased glutathione S-transferase activity rescues dopaminergic
505 neuron loss in a *Drosophila* model of Parkinson's disease. *Proceedings of the National Academy*
506 *of Science of the United States of America*. **102** (22), 8024-8029 (2005).

507 18 Watson, M. R., Lagow, R. D., Xu, K., Zhang, B. Bonini, N. M. A *Drosophila* model for
508 amyotrophic lateral sclerosis reveals motor neuron damage by human SOD1. *Journal of Biological*
509 *Chemistry*. **283** (36), 24972-24981 (2008).

510 19 Rajendra, T. K. *et al.* A *Drosophila melanogaster* model of spinal muscular atrophy reveals
511 a function for SMN in striated muscle. *Journal of Cell Biology*. **176** (6), 831-841 (2007).


512 20 Chan, H. Y. Bonini, N. M. *Drosophila* models of human neurodegenerative disease. *Cell*
513 *Death and Differentiation*. **7** (11), 1075-1080 (2000).


514 21 Limmer, S., Weiler, A., Volkenhoff, A., Babatz, F. Klambt, C. The *Drosophila* blood-brain
515 barrier: development and function of a glial endothelium. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. **8**, 365,
516 (2014).



517 22 Rickert, C., Kunz, T., Harris, K. L., Whittington, P. M. Technau, G. M. Morphological
518 characterization of the entire interneuron population reveals principles of neuromere
519 organization in the ventral nerve cord of *Drosophila*. *Journal of Neuroscience* **31** (44), 15870-
520 15883 (2011).


521 23 Schwabe, T., Li, X. Gaul, U. Dynamic analysis of the mesenchymal-epithelial transition of
522 blood-brain barrier forming glia in *Drosophila*. *Biology Open*. **6** (2), 232-243 (2017).


- 24 Abbott, N. J., Ronnback, L. Hansson, E. Astrocyte-endothelial interactions at the blood-
brain barrier. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. **7** (1), 41-53 (2006).
- 25 Abbott, N. J., Dolman, D. E. Patabendige, A. K. Assays to predict drug permeation across
the blood-brain barrier, and distribution to brain. *Current Drug Metabolism*. **9** (9), 901-910
(2008).
- 26 Swale, D. R., Sun, B., Tong, F. Bloomquist, J. R. Neurotoxicity and mode of action of N, N-
diethyl-meta-toluamide (DEET). *PLoS One*. **9** (8), e103713 (2014).
- 27 Hafer, N. Schedl, P. Dissection of larval CNS in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Journal of*
Visualized Experiments. (1), 85 (2006).
- 28 Bloomquist, J. R. Mode of action of atracotoxin at central and peripheral synapses of
insects. *Invertebrate Neuroscience*. **5** (1), 45-50 (2003).
- 29 Bloomquist, J. R., Roush, R. T. ffrench-Constant, R. H. Reduced neuronal sensitivity to
dieldrin and picrotoxinin in a cyclodiene-resistant strain of *Drosophila melanogaster* (Meigen).
Archives of Insect Biochemistry and Physiology. **19** (1), 17-25 (1992).
- 30 Mutunga, J. M. *et al.* Neurotoxicology of bis(n)-tacrine on *Blattella germanica* and
Drosophila melanogaster acetylcholinesterase. *Archives of Insect Biochemistry and Physiology*.
83 (4), 180-194 (2013).
- 31 Chen, R. Swale, D. R. Inwardly rectifying potassium (Kir) channels represent a critical ion
conductance pathway in the nervous systems of insects. *Scientific Reports*. **8** (1), 1617 (2018).
- 32 Francis, S. A., Taylor-Wells, J., Gross, A. D. Bloomquist, J. R. Toxicity and physiological
actions of carbonic anhydrase inhibitors to *Aedes aegypti* and *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Insects*.
8 (1), 2 (2016).
- 33 Swale, D. R. *et al.* Inhibitor profile of bis(n)-tacrine and N-methylcarbamates on
acetylcholinesterase from *Rhipicephalus (Boophilus) microplus* and *Phlebotomus papatasi*.
Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology. **106** (3), 85-92 (2013).
- 34 Corbel, V. *et al.* Evidence for inhibition of cholinesterases in insect and mammalian
nervous systems by the insect repellent deet. *BMC Biology*. **7**, 47 (2009).














Name of Material/ Equipment	Company	Catalog Number
<i>Drosophila melanogaster</i> (strain OR)	Bloomington Drosophila Stock Center	2376
Vibration isolation table	Kinetic Systems	9200 series
Faraday Cage	Kinetic Systems	N/A
Dissecting Microscope on a Boom	Nikon	SMZ800N
AC/DC differential amplifier	ADInstruments	AM3000H
audio monitor	ADInstruments	AM3300
Hum Bug Noise Eliminator	A-M Systems	726300
Data Acquisition System (PowerLab)	ADInstruments	PL3504
Lab Chart Pro Software	ADInstruments	N/A - Online Download
Fiber Optic Lights	Edmund Optics	89-740
Micromanipulator	World Precision Instruments	M325
Microelectrode Holder	World Precision Instruments	MEH715
BNC cables	World Precision Instruments	multiple based on size
Glass Capillaries	World Precision Instruments	PG52151-4
Microelectrode Puller	Sutter Instruments	P-1000
Black Wax	Carolina Biological Supply	974228
Non-coated insect pins, size #2	Bioquip	1208S2
Fince Forceps	Fine Science Tools	11254-20
Vannas Spring Scissors	Fine Science Tools	15000-03

Comments/Description

Multiple scopes can be used; boom stand is critical

The model 1700 can be used instead of the model 3000

Multiple PowerLab models can be used.

Different light sources can be used, but fiber optics are the most adaptable

Different models are acceptable

Also can use Narashige PC-100



1 Alewife Center #200
Cambridge, MA 02140
tel. 617.945.9051
www.jove.com

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

Title of Article: **Electrophysiological Recording of the Central Nervous System Activity of 3rd-Instar *Drosophila melanogaster***

Author(s): Daniel R. Swale, Aaron D. Gross, Jeffrey R. Bloomquist

Item 1 (check one box): The Author elects to have the Materials be made available (as described at <http://www.jove.com/author>) via: ☒ Standard Access ☐ Open Access

Item 2 (check one box):

- ☒ The Author is NOT a United States government employee.
- ☐ The Author is a United States government employee and the Materials were prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.
- ☐ The Author is a United States government employee but the Materials were NOT prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

1. **Defined Terms.** As used in this Article and Video License Agreement, the following terms shall have the following meanings: “**Agreement**” means this Article and Video License Agreement; “**Article**” means the article specified on the last page of this Agreement, including any associated materials such as texts, figures, tables, artwork, abstracts, or summaries contained therein; “**Author**” means the author who is a signatory to this Agreement; “**Collective Work**” means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Materials in their entirety in unmodified form, along with a number of other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole; “**CRC License**” means the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivs 3.0 Unported Agreement, the terms and conditions of which can be found at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>; “**Derivative Work**” means a work based upon the Materials or upon the Materials and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Materials may be recast, transformed, or adapted; “**Institution**” means the institution, listed on the last page of this Agreement, by which the Author was employed at the time of the creation of the Materials; “**JoVE**” means MyJoVE Corporation, a Massachusetts corporation and the publisher of *The Journal of Visualized Experiments*; “**Materials**” means the Article and / or the Video; “**Parties**” means the Author and JoVE; “**Video**” means any video(s) made by the Author, alone or in conjunction with any other parties, or by JoVE or its affiliates or agents, individually or in collaboration with the Author or any other parties, incorporating all or any portion of the Article, and in which the Author may or may not appear.

2. **Background.** The Author, who is the author of the Article, in order to ensure the dissemination and protection of the Article, desires to have the JoVE publish the Article and create and transmit videos based on the Article. In furtherance of such goals, the Parties desire to memorialize in this Agreement the respective rights of each Party in and to the Article and the Video.

3. **Grant of Rights in Article.** In consideration of JoVE agreeing to publish the Article, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Sections 4 and 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Article in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Article into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Article or other Derivative Works (including, without limitation, the Video) or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Article and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. If the “Open Access” box has been checked in **Item 1** above, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Article as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

4. Retention of Rights in Article. Notwithstanding the exclusive license granted to JoVE in **Section 3** above, the Author shall, with respect to the Article, retain the non-exclusive right to use all or part of the Article for the non-commercial purpose of giving lectures, presentations or teaching classes, and to post a copy of the Article on the Institution's website or the Author's personal website, in each case provided that a link to the Article on the JoVE website is provided and notice of JoVE's copyright in the Article is included. All non-copyright intellectual property rights in and to the Article, such as patent rights, shall remain with the Author.

5. Grant of Rights in Video – Standard Access. This **Section 5** applies if the "Standard Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above or if no box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby acknowledges and agrees that, Subject to **Section 7** below, JoVE is and shall be the sole and exclusive owner of all rights of any nature, including, without limitation, all copyrights, in and to the Video. To the extent that, by law, the Author is deemed, now or at any time in the future, to have any rights of any nature in or to the Video, the Author hereby disclaims all such rights and transfers all such rights to JoVE.

6. Grant of Rights in Video – Open Access. This **Section 6** applies only if the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Section 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Video in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Video into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Video or other Derivative Works or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Video and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. For any Video to which this Section 6 is applicable, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Video as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

7. Government Employees. If the Author is a United States government employee and the Article was prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee, as indicated in **Item 2** above, and any of the licenses or grants granted by the Author hereunder exceed the scope of the 17 U.S.C. 403, then the rights granted hereunder shall be limited to the maximum rights permitted under such

statute. In such case, all provisions contained herein that are not in conflict with such statute shall remain in full force and effect, and all provisions contained herein that do so conflict shall be deemed to be amended so as to provide to JoVE the maximum rights permissible within such statute.

8. Likeness, Privacy, Personality. The Author hereby grants JoVE the right to use the Author's name, voice, likeness, picture, photograph, image, biography and performance in any way, commercial or otherwise, in connection with the Materials and the sale, promotion and distribution thereof. The Author hereby waives any and all rights he or she may have, relating to his or her appearance in the Video or otherwise relating to the Materials, under all applicable privacy, likeness, personality or similar laws.

9. Author Warranties. The Author represents and warrants that the Article is original, that it has not been published, that the copyright interest is owned by the Author (or, if more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, by such authors collectively) and has not been assigned, licensed, or otherwise transferred to any other party. The Author represents and warrants that the author(s) listed at the top of this Agreement are the only authors of the Materials. If more than one author is listed at the top of this Agreement and if any such author has not entered into a separate Article and Video License Agreement with JoVE relating to the Materials, the Author represents and warrants that the Author has been authorized by each of the other such authors to execute this Agreement on his or her behalf and to bind him or her with respect to the terms of this Agreement as if each of them had been a party hereto as an Author. The Author warrants that the use, reproduction, distribution, public or private performance or display, and/or modification of all or any portion of the Materials does not and will not violate, infringe and/or misappropriate the patent, trademark, intellectual property or other rights of any third party. The Author represents and warrants that it has and will continue to comply with all government, institutional and other regulations, including, without limitation all institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy, and all other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, applicable to the Materials, and that all research involving human and animal subjects has been approved by the Author's relevant institutional review board.

10. JoVE Discretion. If the Author requests the assistance of JoVE in producing the Video in the Author's facility, the Author shall ensure that the presence of JoVE employees, agents or independent contractors is in accordance with the relevant regulations of the Author's institution. If more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, JoVE may, in its sole discretion, elect not take any action with respect to the Article until such time as it has received complete, executed Article and Video License Agreements from each such author. JoVE reserves the right, in its absolute and sole discretion and without giving any reason therefore, to accept or decline any work submitted to JoVE. JoVE and its employees, agents and independent contractors shall have

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

full, unfettered access to the facilities of the Author or of the Author's institution as necessary to make the Video, whether actually published or not. JoVE has sole discretion as to the method of making and publishing the Materials, including, without limitation, to all decisions regarding editing, lighting, filming, timing of publication, if any, length, quality, content and the like.

11. **Indemnification.** The Author agrees to indemnify JoVE and/or its successors and assigns from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, arising out of any breach of any warranty or other representations contained herein. The Author further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless JoVE from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, resulting from the breach by the Author of any representation or warranty contained herein or from allegations or instances of violation of intellectual property rights, damage to the Author's or the Author's institution's facilities, fraud, libel, defamation, research, equipment, experiments, property damage, personal injury, violations of institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy or other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, liabilities and other losses or damages related in any way to the submission of work to JoVE, making of videos by JoVE, or publication in JoVE or elsewhere by JoVE. The Author shall be responsible for, and shall hold JoVE harmless from, damages caused by lack of sterilization, lack of cleanliness or by contamination due to the making of a video by JoVE its employees, agents or independent contractors. All sterilization, cleanliness or decontamination procedures shall be solely the responsibility of the Author and shall be undertaken at the Author's


expense. All indemnifications provided herein shall include JoVE's attorney's fees and costs related to said losses or damages. Such indemnification and holding harmless shall include such losses or damages incurred by, or in connection with, acts or omissions of JoVE, its employees, agents or independent contractors.

12. **Fees.** To cover the cost incurred for publication, JoVE must receive payment before production and publication the Materials. Payment is due in 21 days of invoice. Should the Materials not be published due to an editorial or production decision, these funds will be returned to the Author. Withdrawal by the Author of any submitted Materials after final peer review approval will result in a US\$1,200 fee to cover pre-production expenses incurred by JoVE. If payment is not received by the completion of filming, production and publication of the Materials will be suspended until payment is received.

13. **Transfer, Governing Law.** This Agreement may be assigned by JoVE and shall inure to the benefits of any of JoVE's successors and assignees. This Agreement shall be governed and construed by the internal laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts without giving effect to any conflict of law provision thereunder. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same agreement. A signed copy of this Agreement delivered by facsimile, e-mail or other means of electronic transmission shall be deemed to have the same legal effect as delivery of an original signed copy of this Agreement.

A signed copy of this document must be sent with all new submissions. Only one Agreement required per submission.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Name:	Daniel R. Swale	
Department:	Department of Entomology	
Institution:	Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	
Article Title:	Electrophysiological Recording of the Central Nervous System Activity of 3rd-Instar <i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	
Signature:		Date: 04/26/2018

Please submit a signed and dated copy of this license by one of the following three methods:

- 1) Upload a scanned copy of the document as a pdf on the JoVE submission site;
- 2) Fax the document to +1.866.381.2236;
- 3) Mail the document to JoVE / Attn: JoVE Editorial / 1 Alewife Center #200 / Cambridge, MA 02139

For questions, please email submissions@jove.com or call +1.617.945.9051

We thank the reviewers for their time and comments regarding our manuscript submission. Our response to the reviewers' comments are in green below each individual comment.

Editorial comments:

Changes to be made by the Author(s):

1. Please take this opportunity to thoroughly proofread the manuscript to ensure that there are no spelling or grammar issues.

This has been completed

2. Please provide an email address for each author.

This has been completed

3. Please rephrase the Abstract to more clearly state the goal of the protocol.

This has been completed

4. Please remove all commercial language from your manuscript and use generic terms instead. All commercial products should be sufficiently referenced in the Table of Materials and Reagents. For example: World Precision Instruments (WPI), Item #M325, PowerLab and LabChart, ADInstruments, A-M Systems Inc. Model 1700 or Model 3000, PowerLab 4/35, AD Instruments, Narashige PC-100 or Sutter P-1000, Carolina Biological Supply, #974228, LabChart 8 (AD Instruments), etc.

This has been completed

5. Please revise the protocol to be a numbered list: step 1 followed by 1.1, followed by 1.1.1, etc.

This has been completed .

6. Lines 100-138: The Protocol should contain only action items that direct the reader to do something. Please either write the text in the imperative tense as if telling someone how to do the technique (e.g., "Do this," "Ensure that," etc.), or move the solutions, materials and equipment information to the Materials Table.

This has been completed

7. Lines 139-141, 158-167, 175-176, 201-206, 216-222, 281-283, 287-295, 301-305: Please write the text in the imperative tense. Any text that cannot be written in the imperative tense may be added as a "Note."

This has been completed

8. Lines 212-215: The Protocol should contain only action items that direct the reader to do something. Please move the discussion about the protocol to the Discussion.

This has been completed and we have reworded the protocol and clearly indicated notes for each.

9. There is a 2.75 page limit for filmable content. Please highlight 2.75 pages or less of the Protocol (including headings and spacing) that identifies the essential steps of the protocol for the video, i.e., the steps that should be visualized to tell the most cohesive story of the Protocol. Remember that non-highlighted Protocol steps will remain in the manuscript, and therefore will still be available to the reader.

This has been completed and we believe it follows a logical flow for recording.

10. Please ensure that the highlighted steps form a cohesive narrative with a logical flow from one highlighted step to the next. Please highlight complete sentences (not parts of sentences). Please ensure that the highlighted part of the step includes at least one action that is written in imperative tense.

This has been completed

11. Please reference all data and figures in the manuscript. For instance, Figure 3C is not mentioned.

Figure 3C was referenced in the text. We did not alter this.

12. As we are a methods journal, please revise the Discussion to explicitly cover the following in detail in 3-6 paragraphs with citations:

- a) Critical steps within the protocol

This has been completed by adding information regarding the dissection and the importance of the descending neurons in the first paragraph

- b) Any modifications and troubleshooting of the technique

We have referenced the potential modifications to protocol.

- c) Any limitations of the technique

We have included the limitations of this technique in the Discussion section and have described how it is necessary to pair this method with other electrophysiological methods for full validation of the data

- d) The significance with respect to existing methods

We believe the significance of this method was clearly discussed in the discussion section by showing relevance to high school classrooms, insecticide toxicology, insect physiology, mammalian disease research, and others.

e) Any future applications of the technique

We believe this has been described in the discussion section.

13. References: Please do not abbreviate journal titles.

Reviewers' comments:**Reviewer #1:**

Manuscript Summary:

The article reads very well and I feel a video of this technique would be a very valuable addition to the JoVE both for academic researchers and industry members with an interest in discovery and characterisation of novel insecticides, and investigation of resistance mechanisms. I agree that this is a neat approach based on its relatively simplicity, although there are a few potential hurdles that could be potentially quite time consuming for the inexperienced operator to get right. My minor concerns are therefore just suggestions of small details that could be added to help students avoid lost time.

Major Concerns:

None

Minor Concerns:

Relating to caveats/limitations addressed at L411-417: Some additional explanation may be warranted here to make it clear that the recorded CNS output will not necessarily be influenced equally by all subtypes of receptors that have a key role in spike propagation and synaptic transmission. Genetic manipulations which alter the CNS response to a drug may not always read through to the whole-organism activity. It is possible that a drug/toxin will target a receptor or ion-channel subtype that is not well-represented by the output of the CNS recorded in this way, but may nevertheless have a critical effect on nervous system function. An example would be a genetic manipulation that clearly alters an insecticide's effect on this CNS preparation whilst not having much effect on its overall toxicity. The technique is nevertheless useful in such situations because it can highlight the possibility of an alternative mode-of-action and inform additional experiments.

Thank you for this comment and we fully agree with the reviewers comments. However, we believe adding a section to describe potential differences between in vitro and in

vivo responses will convolute the paper and reduce readability. However, we have added a limitation to the method by describing how it is possible that the spike rate is not equally influenced by all receptors.

Relating to drug application method described L271-279: Manual pipette evacuation of 50% of bath volume could be expected to lead to considerable disturbance of the prep and introduction of noise artefacts into the recording, so it will be important to demonstrate clearly in the video how this is carried out. Is it necessary, for example, to suspend data-capture during this process? If the authors do not recommend continuous perfusion of the preparation for some reason it could be useful to explain why, because many students may instinctively try to adapt the method to continuous perfusion in order to minimise contact with the prep during recording and to allow for a simplified chamber construction step.

Thank you for this comment and we agree that this would be a positive addition to the manuscript. Therefore, we have included the use of an automated perfusion system as a modification to the protocol that is described in the discussion.

L316-317: "...when the threshold is set just above the baseline noise" suggests a threshold crossing event-detection method. It would be helpful in the video to show the positioning of the count threshold relative to the baseline activity, as this will give a good idea of the signal to noise ratio that a student should be aiming to achieve. We agree and this will be included in the video.

Relating to description of CPG activity L310-320: Firstly it would be good to refer the student to articles which explain central pattern generator (CPG) activity and its physiological significance, as this may inform or inspire the use of this method for the study/manipulation of genes that may function in these neural circuits. I would suggest the following citations:

Mulloney B, Smarandache C. Fifty Years of CPGs: Two Neuroethological Papers that Shaped the Course of Neuroscience. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*. 2010;4:45. doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2010.00045.

Pulver SR, Bayley TG, Taylor AL, Berni J, Bate M, Hedwig B. Imaging fictive locomotor patterns in larval *Drosophila*. *Neurophysiol.* 2015 Nov;114(5):2564-77. doi: 10.1152/jn.00731.2015.

Possibly also this article, although the technical content is focussed on CPG activity that would not be recorded by the author's method: Sebastian Hückesfeld, Andreas Schoofs, Philipp Schlegel, Anton Miroshnikov, Michael J. Pankratz Localization of Motor Neurons and Central Pattern Generators for Motor Patterns Underlying Feeding Behavior in *Drosophila* Larvae *PLOS One* Published: August 7, 2015 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0135011>

We agree with the reviewer that inclusion of CPG neurons and the applicability of this assay to study the function of CPG gene manipulation to neural function. However, we do not think that discussing a list of neural proteins that this assay could be relevant to is pertinent to this methods paper. Therefore, we have not included a discussion of CPG activity from the perspective of using this assay to study the fundamental role in neural function.

Observed CPG firing patterns can be more irregular or erratic than those described in the manuscript, and this may be indicative of nerve damage or a poor transection of the brain. Rhythm greatly depends on sensory input and can become variable when sensory inputs are absent or intermittently failing (Reviewed Marder et al 2005 *Curr Biol.*). Some guidelines as to how to recognise abnormal or unstable CPG activity, as a guide to which preps should be rejected, would be therefore be a very useful inclusion in the video.

We have added a section (Step 4.2.2) noting the expected pattern of CNS firing. This section reads, “Discard the preparation and recording if the pattern of firing of control treatment is not a bursting pattern similar to that shown in Figure 5A. Altered pattern of firing suggests abnormal or unstable activity of the central pattern generator, which can alter neural function.”

If the authors know of dissection/ablation procedures or particular measures that should

be undertaken in order to either preserve or eliminate these sensory inputs, or even to eliminate the CPG activity altogether, these would be very useful to include in the video. Generating statistically robust data for nicotinic receptor agents, for example, can be problematic by this method, because a combination of neuroexcitatory activity and receptor desensitisation leading to synaptic block will have contrary effects on the measured spike frequency -especially where the CPG circuit begins to fail.

Eliminating the CPG activity before testing nicotinic agents would allow for more consistent and measurable output. [Eve Marder, Dirk Bucher, David J. Schulz, Adam L. Taylor Invertebrate Central Pattern Generation Moves along Current Biology , Volume 15 , Issue 17 , R685 - R699]

We agree with this reviewer that ablation of CPG activity would increase the stability and reproducibility of the recording. Unfortunately, we are unaware of a method to consistently reduce or eliminate CPG activity and believe that this step is outside the scope of this relatively simple method outline.

328-334: Description of analysis methods: Students may be unfamiliar with PowerLab 4/35 and Labchart software so a short statement on the way spike events are recognised (e.g. threshold crossing or template matching) would be informative.

This is noted in Step 2.2.7.

There are many options for processing the data, ranging from selecting the amplitude range of events to be counted, through to selection of the time ranges over which event counts are collected and compared. In the accompanying video some detail on the steps taken from handling of the raw data to generation of the C/R curves for a drug-response would therefore be helpful to the beginner. For example, do the authors recommend that dose response curves are constructed by generating multiple-dose response data from individual preparations and then averaging this data across different recordings, or that the data for each dose be obtained from individual larvae and normalised in each case to the pretreatment spike counts? My own experience is that C/R curves from this type of data tend to be noisy and reducing error bars can

involve a lot of replicate experiments.

Thank you for this suggestion. We have added in two different potential methods for CRC generation

Typos:

L50: of several chemical classes (of) insecticides

L261: where more neurons oftentimes reults (results)

L374-375: third instar larvae of D.melanogasgter. (melanogaster)

Thank you for pointing out our oversight. These have been corrected

Reviewer #2:

Manuscript Summary:

Swale et al. report a protocol for recording activity and spike discharge frequency of the central nervous system of the model organism *Drosophila melanogaster*.

This protocol is of great interest to researchers in the field of insect toxicology and its availability may help in elucidating mode of action of new insecticidal compounds.

Methods are described accurately and figures are very clear. Manuscript is also well written, so I suggest to accept this manuscript for publication in JoVe.

Major Concerns:

None

Minor Concerns:

line 395: "modest financial investment and minimal preparation time". "modest financial investment" I think the cost is a bit underestimated by the authors, as e.g. a data acquisition system and dissecting microscope are quite expensive; "minimal preparation time": could the authors give an idea about the time needed from preparation of CNS to first recording?

Thank you for this oversight. We have added two sentences into the discussion to describe the initial and continuous financial burden of this assay.