Animal models in psychedelic research - Lost in translation?

Muad Y. Abd El Hay[1,✉], **Ana Cukic**[1], **Marieke Schoelvinck**[1], **and Martha Nari-Havenith**[1]

[1]Ernst Strüngmann Institute (ESI) gGmbH of the Max Planck Society
[*]These authors contributed equally

Psychedelic substances have emerged as promising treatments for psychiatric disorders including depression, anxiety, and PTSD, with clinical trials demonstrating remarkable efficacy even in treatment-resistant patients. Yet the neurobiological mechanisms underlying these therapeutic effects remain poorly understood, and preclinical animal research—essential for elucidating circuit-level mechanisms—has yielded inconsistent results. Here we argue that this translational gap stems from a systematic disconnect between the conditions known to determine therapeutic outcomes in humans and those employed in animal research. We applied two analytical frameworks to 106 rodent psychedelic studies published between 2019 and 2024. First, we assessed adherence to welfare practices that parallel the "set and setting" factors critical to human therapy, finding that the majority of studies employ conditions known to induce stress: testing during inactive circadian phases (82%), barren housing (89%), injection-based administration (100%), and forceful handling (77%). Second, we evaluated the capacity of behavioural assays to capture experiential dynamics by scoring studies on recording duration, environmental complexity, and behavioural complexity—revealing that most studies rely on brief, constrained testing with isolated behavioural markers that fail to capture the multidimensional, temporally evolving nature of psychedelic states. Beyond these methodological gaps, we identify a third critical factor largely absent from preclinical research: the significance of individual differences and social context. Most animal studies use group-level, cross-sectional designs that cannot characterize heterogeneous treatment responses or the social mechanisms implicated in therapeutic change. We propose that improving translation requires a fundamental reorientation: from brief testing of stressed, isolated animals toward longitudinal tracking of individuals in enriched social environments using comprehensive behavioural characterization—approaches that would better model the therapeutic context in which psychedelics exert their beneficial effects in humans.

Introduction

Mental disorders such as depression and anxiety impact the lives of an ever growing number of people, often in persistent and debilitating ways. Globally, depression affects a staggering 280 million people (1). Yet despite decades of research and pharmaceutical development, nearly 40 % of all patients with depression fail to respond to available treatments (2). This situation necessitates new treatment approaches to mental disorders that go beyond conventional drug development paradigms.

Among the most promising new alternatives, psychedelic substances have emerged as potential therapeutic tools. Substances like psilocybin, LSD, and MDMA, some of which have been used in traditional practices for centuries, are the subject of 488 clinical trials to date – tendency rising (3). These trials show that psilocybin has therapeutic efficacy comparable to established antidepressants, with a notably favourable side effect profile (4). Importantly, these effects extend even to patients that were deemed 'treatment-resistant' (5), and they apply across a wide range of prominent mental disorders including anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and even addiction (6–8) – a broad applicability that is uncommon for classical treatments. Moreover, therapeutic changes are typically achieved in only one or two dosing sessions, yet produce long-lasting improvements (4).

Together, these properties position psychedelic substances as a potential 'therapeutic multitool', addressing a wide variety of mental ailments, often in a one-shot treatment. What processes allow psychedelics to trigger such substantial changes in neuronal processing in such a short time, and across vastly different mental health conditions? At a global level, psychedelic substances have been shown to disrupt ordinary brain organization through widespread desynchronization, decreasing activity in the default mode network while dissolving boundaries between typically segregated brain regions (9–11). But how are such global shifts in neuronal circuit communication produced at the circuit level, and how do they in turn translate to lasting therapeutic changes? To date, these questions remain largely unresolved, and due to their non-invasive nature, human brain recordings lack the necessary spatial or temporal resolution to tackle them directly. As such, we must study the neuronal circuit mechanisms of psychedelics in animal models. Given their potential for detailed circuit-level recordings and controlled behavioural testing, animal models are essential for drawing mechanistic links between acute shifts in neuronal circuitry triggered by psychedelics, and their long-term effects. However, psychedelic research in animal models has so far mainly succeeded in establishing receptor signaling pathways and acute neuroplasticity markers, whereas the factors that determine therapeutic outcomes in humans—including the critical role of context, the predictive significance of acute experiential quality, and the substantial heterogeneity in treatment response—have largely remained unaddressed.

In this analysis of the field, we argue that the successful translation of psychedelic research from animal models to human psychedelic therapy hinges on three factors that are well established in clinical research, but have been largely overlooked in preclinical studies: (1) The importance of set and setting (the

psychological mindset and environmental context in which psychedelics are administered). (2) The central role of subjective experiences for acute and long-term effects. (3) The significance of inter-individual differences for therapy outcomes. We will examine how current animal models address each of these factors, and propose methodological advances that could improve translation between preclinical findings and clinical outcomes.

Set and Setting

The concept of "set and setting" has been recognized as a critical determinant of subjective experiences and therapeutic outcomes in human psychedelic research. "Set" refers to the individual's mindset, expectations and emotional state, while "setting" refers to the physical and social environment in which the psychedelic experience occurs. A strong therapeutic alliance and a mental state of surrender positively influence therapeutic outcomes by encouraging deeper psychedelic experiences (12–14), while feelings of preoccupation prior to a psychedelic session as well as greater anxiety during the experience predict less favourable clinical outcomes (14, 15). Additionally, self-reports from recreational users show a strong correlation between feelings of safety during the experience and positive long-term effects (16). The importance of context in psychedelic therapy has led to the development of standardized reporting guidelines (17), as well as a set of recommendations to increase the likelihood of favorable outcomes and reduce the chances for adverse effects (18).

Given the importance of environmental, psychological and experiential factors in human psychedelic therapy, we examined whether preclinical studies account for analogous considerations in animal models. Our systematic analysis of recent psychedelic studies in animal models reveals that they are often conducted under conditions that differ substantially from those established as optimal in humans (Figure 1).

Rodents are the most commonly used animal models in translational research on psychedelics. Initial findings suggest that psychedelic episodes in rodents show context effects and subjective distortions that closely model mechanisms encountered in humans (19–22). This suggests that 'set and setting' factors are also crucial in animal models in order to capture therapeutically relevant psychedelic processes. We therefore systematically examined how psychedelic research has implemented key welfare practices by analysing the housing, handling, and experimental conditions in 106 rodent studies published from 2019-2024 (Supplementary Fig. S2).

Circadian alignment. Consistent with research in humans, research in rodents has shown that the circadian phase of testing can substantially influence certain behavioural outcomes. Locomotor activity is consistently higher during the dark (active) phase, while effects on social behaviour and cognitive performance are more task-dependent (23–25). Rodents are predominantly nocturnal animals, with peak activity occurring during the dark phase of the light/dark cycle. Yet of the 106 psychedelic studies we analyzed, only 19 explicitly reported housing rodents under a reversed light/dark cycle to enable active-phase testing, while 82 studies adhered to a standard cycle, and 5 omitting this information. This indicates that the majority of psychedelic experiments in rodents were conducted during their inactive (sleep) phase. This mismatch likely contributes to poor translation of preclinical findings by altering the animals' cognitive, emotional, and physiological state during psychedelic exposure.

Environmental enrichment. Environmental enrichment provides animals with complex physical, sensory, and social stimulation that better meets species-specific needs, thereby reducing stereotyped behaviours, improving welfare, and allowing animals to express more naturalistic behavioural repertoires. Enrichment has been shown to reveal richer phenotypes without increasing data variability (26–29), while at the same time reducing morbidity and mortality, compared to standard laboratory housing (30). Notably, environmental enrichment alters psychedelic-induced brain activity (31), and is, in fact, a prerequisite for cognitive improvements following DMT exposure in ageing mice (32). Home cage monitoring in enriched environments can thus capture temporal patterns, social behaviours, and spontaneous activities of animals that improve translational relevance (33, 34). In our analysis, only 11 of 106 studies reported providing enriched home cages, while 95 studies either explicitly stated no enrichment or did not state this information. This indicates that, in most studies, the therapeutic mechanisms of psychedelics may be severely curtailed by impoverished environments.

Communal housing. Whether rodents are housed individually or in groups has profound effects on their well-being. Social isolation is a significant stressor that produces anxiety- and depression-like behaviour, cognitive deficits including impaired memory and social cognition, and altered immune and metabolic function (30, 35, 36). As such, individual housing in psychedelic experiments is highly likely to create confounds that may mask or distort experimental effects. Group housing can reduce such adverse effects by providing species-appropriate social contact, though the magnitude of isolation effects varies with strain, sex, and duration (37). In our analysis, 65 studies housed animals in groups (2-6 per cage), while 21 reported individual housing, and 20 studies did not specify housing conditions.

Handling protocols. Handling technique and the extent of habituation to human contact profoundly impact rodent stress levels and behaviour; for example, conventional tail handling induces an anxiety-like state that changes how animals perceive and respond to rewards (38). Proper handling protocols markedly reduce stress responses and variability in behavioural tests (39–41). In our analysis, handling was reported in only 25 studies, whereas 81 studies did not provide this information.

Habituation to experimental environments. Familiarization with the test arena aims to reduce novelty-induced stress and anxiety, allowing researchers to measure experimental effects rather than stress confounds. Brief arena familiarization has been shown to increase stimulus investigation and improve habituation–dishabituation performance in mice, with effects most pronounced in more anxious animals (40). Repeated exposure to test environments reduces novelty-induced anx-



Fig. 1. Comparison of classic versus refined experimental practices in psychedelic animal research. Based on our systematic review of 106 rodent studies (2019-2024), the figure contrasts prevalent 'Classic' practices (purple) with recommended 'Refined' practices (orange) across five key parameters: circadian alignment (reversed day/night cycle), environmental enrichment, recording duration, drug application method, and handling technique. Percentages indicate the proportion of studies employing each practice. Classic practices—including testing during inactive phases (82%), barren housing (89%), injection-based administration (100%), and forceful handling (77%)—create stressed experimental conditions (depicted by anxious mouse), while refined practices—such as active-phase testing (18%), enriched environments (11%), oral administration, and gentle handling (23%)—promote natural behavioural states (depicted by calm mouse in enriched setting).

iety and improves the reliability of exploratory behaviour measures (42), thereby enhancing statistical power and reproducibility. In our analysis, familiarization to the experimental setup was included in 55 studies, while 36 did not incorporate a habituation period, and 15 studies did not mention whether habituation was performed. Given that familiarity with an environment has been shown to be a defining factor in shaping acute psychedelic responses in rodents (43), a lack of habituation may introduce substantial variability by conflating novelty-induced stress with psychedelic effects.

Drug administration. The route and method of drug administration represent an often overlooked welfare consideration that directly impacts the stress levels with which animals enter psychedelic experiences. Restraint, which is required for intraperitoneal injection, subcutaneous injection, and oral gavage, is itself a standard method to experimentally induce stress in rodents (44, 45). Evidence demonstrates that these routine administration procedures trigger substantial physiological stress responses, including elevated heart rate, increased body temperature, and raised corticosterone levels that can persist for several hours (46–48). In contrast, voluntary oral administration methods using palatable vehicles have been developed to minimize such stress, producing lower corticosterone levels and more stable cardiovascular responses (48, 49).

In our analysis, the vast majority of psychedelic studies relied on injection methods, with intraperitoneal (i.p.) administration accounting for 75% of applications, followed by subcutaneous (s.c.) at 13.8%, and oral gavage (p.o.) at 6.9% (Supplementary Fig. S3). Notably, despite the availability of voluntary oral administration methods that could minimize handling-related stress and better approximate a human clinical context, this approach appears to be entirely absent from the psychedelic literature. The predominant use of stressful administration methods raises the question: how can we expect to model the therapeutic effects of psychedelics when animals experience drug onset in a state of acute restraint-induced anxiety, precisely the condition known to predict poor outcomes in human patients?

Taken together, these findings reveal a substantial gap between the experimental conditions used in preclinical psychedelic research and the therapeutic context emphasized in human clinical trials. Given that clinical psychedelic therapy depends on creating supportive, low-anxiety contexts to achieve positive therapeutic outcomes, the widespread neglect of analogous welfare practices in preclinical animal research (including environmental enrichment, stress reduction, active-phase testing, and careful handling) may compromise our ability to model and understand the neurobiological mechanisms underlying the therapeutic effects of psychedelics.

One recent clue that the therapeutic mechanisms of psychedelics may indeed be somewhat 'lost in translation' comes from a large-scale, multi-institutional study testing the effects of psilocybin using approximately 200 mice per experiment across five independent laboratories (50). Despite strong statistical power and transparent reporting, the study failed to find replicable therapeutic effects of psilocybin 24 hours post-administration. Specifically, psilocybin neither reduced behavioural markers of anxiety or depression, nor did it boost fear extinction or social reward learning. The only replicable effects were acute, including decreased fear expression and increases in anxiety and avoidance behaviours during drug administration.

While these results may point towards a low clinical utility of psilocybin and/or a strong divergence in the effects of psilocybin on humans and rodents, another possibility is that the observed effects were strongly shaped by experimental context: Like most studies surveyed in our analysis, (50) did not include environmental enrichment, handled animals by scruffing, administered psilocybin via intraperitoneal injection, and conducted 80% of their experiments during the animals' inactive circadian phase.

Together, these aversive context factors may have had a sufficiently strong impact to counteract therapeutic mechanisms that might be engaged by psilocybin under different circumstances. This possibility also tallies with the study's finding that animals' anxiety increased consistently during drug administration - an effect one would expect to find in 'bad trips' in a human context. These possible interpretations underscore the notion that particularly in psychedelic research, welfare practices are not peripheral considerations, but rather essential experimental parameters that determine the success of preclinical studies as a translatable model of therapeutic processes triggered by psychedelics in humans.

Tracking experiential dynamics

In humans, psychedelic substances induce a multitude of subjective experiences ranging from simple sensory alterations such as visual hallucinations and audiovisual synaesthesia, to complex cognitive changes such as disembodiment or impaired cognitive control. Perhaps most significantly, psychedelics can induce strong emotional responses such as feelings of catharsis and awe, as well as spiritual or mystical experiences including feelings of unity and transcendence of space and time (51). Human studies have revealed that the subjective quality of acute psychedelic states predicts long-term therapeutic outcomes (52–54). Specifically, participants that report experiencing mystical or meaningful experiences during their sessions often achieve better long-term outcomes such as a reduction in depressive symptoms (15, 55), while participants who report aversive or anxious experiences may derive less benefit (56).

This raises a challenge for translational research: we cannot access the subjective experiences of animals through verbal report, but this does not mean that animals lack rich experiential states during psychedelic exposure. On the contrary, behavioural observations across species suggest that their subjective experiences may be noticeably altered: Cats under the influence of psychedelics grasp at the air with their paws, visually track objects not present in the environment, and pounce toward empty space (57, 58). Similarly, rhesus monkeys show "tracking" behaviour of invisible objects after hallucinogen administration (59). Most compellingly, recent work has directly demonstrated parallel visual distortions in humans and rats exposed to psilocybin using an identical behavioural paradigm (19). These converging observations indicate that animals are not merely exhibiting pharmacologically-induced motor dysfunctions, but rather appear to respond to altered perceptual states that shape how they interact with their environment.

The problem, therefore, is not that animals necessarily lack subjective experiences during psychedelic exposure, but rather that current animal studies have not managed to adequately characterize these experiential dynamics. Most preclinical psychedelic research relies on isolated behavioural markers—such as head twitches, total amount of locomotion, or brief snapshots of social interaction—measured at single time points or in highly constrained test conditions. This reductionist approach, while maximizing experimental control, may compromise translational validity (60–63). The head twitch response exemplifies this problem: while it shows remarkable predictive validity for identifying psychedelic compounds (64), it lacks face validity to any aspect of human phenomenology, as humans do not perform head twitches under psychedelics. Head twitches are reliably measurable, yet they tell us little about the quality of the animal's experiential state, for instance whether perceptual changes it may be experiencing are aversive or pleasant. The lack of valid, standardized approaches for characterizing acute experiential states has for instance made it difficult to determine whether the same compound produces anxiolytic or anxiogenic effects, with conflicting outcomes likely reflecting contextual factors that alter the animal's overall experiential state (65).

To address this gap, we propose that animal research must move beyond simple behavioural markers toward comprehensive characterisation of experiential dynamics during psychedelic exposure. While we cannot directly measure subjective experience in animals, comprehensively tracking a multitude of behavioural components — such as altered sensory processing, changes in exploration-avoidance balance, social behaviour modifications, and temporal patterns of arousal and rest — allows us to characterize what constitutes a "psychedelic state" in animals and how different qualities of this state might predict downstream outcomes(61). Following the framework proposed by Shemesh and Chen (60) for improving translational validity in psychiatric research, we identify three features that must be take into account in order to adequately capture psychedelic-induced experiential dynamics in animal models: behavioural complexity, environmental diversity and temporal dynamics (Figure 2).

Capturing behavioural complexity. Human subjective experiences are multidimensional, encompassing perceptual, emotional, cognitive, and social domains. Reducing animal behaviour to single metrics (e.g. number of head twitches) may miss the very aspects of behaviour that reflect translationally and therapeutically relevant experiential states. Advances in computational ethology—combining automated behavioural tracking, machine learning-based behavioural classification, and analysis of behavioural sequences—now enable comprehensive, multidimensional characterization of behaviour without requiring labor-intensive manual scoring (60, 61, 66). These computational approaches enable researchers to detect complex behaviours such as social approach and retreat, affiliative interactions, defensive responses, and their sequential organization. For example, rather than measuring total social interaction time, we might characterize the sequential structure of social behaviours (approach → investigation → withdrawal), the balance between affiliative and defensive

responses, the flexibility versus predictability of behavioural transitions, accompanying vocalizations, and how these patterns evolve over the course of psychedelic exposure. Recent computational approaches further demonstrate the power of behavioural characterization in extracting the complexity of underlying experiential states. For instance, machine-learning analysis of facial expressions in mice can reverse-engineer emotional states from micro-expressions invisible to human observers (67), while ultrasonic vocalization analysis reveals that superficially similar behaviours can have opposite emotional valences (68). Such comprehensive behavioural characterization can capture measurable components of experience that may more faithfully reflect the experiential dynamics involved in the therapeutic effects of psychedelics in humans (61, 66).

Providing environmental diversity. In clinical settings, patients experience psychedelics in comfortable environments that allow for diverse behaviours including rest, movement, interaction with objects or music, and social connection with therapists. In contrast, most animal studies confine subjects to barren test environments that permit only a limited behavioural repertoire. This environmental impoverishment restricts the range of behaviours animals can express, potentially masking experiential dynamics that would be evident in more naturalistic settings (62, 63). For example, in a semi-naturalistic setting called the Visible Burrow System, mice clustered into 'stress-responsive' and 'stress non-responsive' phenotypes - a distinction that did not emerge in more confined settings (69). Similarly, psilocybin's anxiolytic effects (quantified by the elevated plus maze task) only emerged when rats received repeated exposure to novel environments during the weeks following psilocybin administration (70). These findings suggest that beneficial versus detrimental effects of psychedelics - and the mechanisms that produce them - may only be tractable when animals are studied in sufficiently complex environments that enable a diverse behavioural repertoire. (60, 66).

Recording temporal dynamics. Human psychedelic experiences unfold over hours, with distinct phases including onset, peak effects, and gradual return to baseline — each associated with different experiential qualities. In contrast, the majority of animal studies measure behaviour in brief snapshots, e.g. by applying a brief open-field test. Such measurements by nature cannot reflect how behavioural states evolve across the timecourse of psychedelic exposure, whether they transition between distinct phases, and how these in turn might predict later outcomes. Moreover, fragmenting behavioural readouts e.g. by moving animals between test apparatuses or repeatedly handling them for serial testing may itself disrupt the natural evolution of psychedelic states. Long, continuous, and non-invasive behavioural monitoring throughout the psychedelic experience is essential to characterize how behavioural states evolve spontaneously over time, identify critical transition points, and detect temporal patterns that may predict therapeutic long-term effects (60, 66).

Our analysis of current psychedelic research in rodents highlights that most studies fall short of these recommendations (Figure 2). However, a small number of studies have begun to adopt more comprehensive approaches, demonstrating the feasibility and value of time-resolved recordings in enriched environments with improved behavioural characterization (71, 72). These pioneering efforts point toward a future where animal models can more faithfully capture the experiential dynamics that appear critical for therapeutic outcomes in humans.

Understanding psychedelic action in context

Individual differences in treatment response. Clinical outcomes in psychedelic therapy are characterized by substantial individual variation: while some patients experience intense mystical experiences and lasting therapeutic benefits, others experience psychologically distressing sensations and minimal therapeutic responses or even adverse effects (56). For instance, in psilocybin trials for treatment-resistant depression, therapeutic success rates typically range from 50-70% (4, 5). Multiple sources of variation could contribute to individual differences in psychedelic response, including genetic factors (73, 74), psychological factors such as personality traits (14, 75, 76), and set and setting (14, 77). Understanding this heterogeneity represents a major challenge for bringing psychedelic therapy into safe and effective clinical practice, and preclinical research can play a crucial role in tackling it. This approach is particularly promising because even mice raised under standardized conditions show substantial individual variation in behaviour and brain structure, providing a translationally valid target for individualized outcome prediction (78, 79). While perhaps surprising, this variation is readily understood when considering that early-life contingencies can generate self-reinforcing individual differences, which in turn become amplified through competitive social feedback, pushing genetically identical individuals onto divergent life trajectories (80).

Despite their ubiquity, inter-individual differences have been largely neglected by psychedelic research in animals, which has predominantly focused on group-level effects rather than tracking individual animals over time. As such, individual differences in behavioural or neural responses are rarely systematically characterized, and when observed, they are typically attributed to measurement error rather than recognized as potentially reflecting the same response heterogeneity seen in humans.

To address this gap, we must track how specific individuals behave from baseline through acute psychedelic exposure and into the weeks or months following treatment. Longitudinal designs in this vein allow us to ask central questions such as: How do baseline characteristics predict which animals will enter different acute experiential states, and how does this predict subsequent behavioural task performance? In human research, this approach has proven essential: studies tracking individuals across multiple time points have revealed that baseline brain network organization predicts treatment response (81), that changes in default mode network connectivity during acute psychedelic states correlate with symptom improvements weeks later (15, 82), and that individual differences in acute experiences mediate long-term outcomes (15). Yet in animal research, most studies employ between-subjects



Fig. 2. Mapping behavioural assays in rodent psychedelic research. Each point represents a study positioned according to its recording duration (short, long-fragmented, long-continuous), environmental complexity (standard, enriched, naturalistic), and behavioural complexity (simple, complex). Point size reflects the number of behavioural assays used within the study, and point color indicates year of publication. The pink star denotes a hypothetical aspirational direction for the field, towards continuous recordings in more naturalistic environments with complex behavioural characterization.

designs, preventing direct tracking of individual trajectories and thereby making it impossible to identify mechanisms and predictors of heterogenous treatment responses.

The social dimension of psychedelic therapy. Psychiatric disorders such as depression, anxiety, PTSD, and addiction are all essentially social in their manifestation and impact. They disrupt social relationships, are exacerbated by social stress and isolation (83, 84), and often improve with social support and connection (85). Emerging evidence suggests that psychedelic therapy may exert therapeutic effects partly through improvements in social functioning: patients report enhanced feelings of connectedness, reduced social anxiety, increased empathy, and improved relationship quality following psychedelic experiences (86). Specifically, psilocybin reduces neural responses to social exclusion (87), enhances emotional empathy and prosocial behaviour (88, 89), improves social adaptation during interpersonal feedback (90), and increases feelings of trust and closeness to others (89). What's more, one of the central predictors of psychedelic therapy outcomes is the social bond formed with the supporting therapist(s) (12, 13), further highlighting that the therapeutic benefits of psychedelics are essentially social in nature. These findings suggest that understanding psychedelic mechanisms requires studying not just isolated individuals, but individuals embedded within a social context — how they navigate social hierarchies, form affiliations, respond to social stress, and how their position within social networks shifts over time.

Despite the deeply social nature of both psychiatric disorders and psychedelic therapy, preclinical psychedelic research has largely studied individual animals in isolation. This approach overlooks the possibility that psychedelics may exert therapeutic effects partly by altering how individuals interact with others. Recent methodological advances make it feasible to address this gap: automated behavioural tracking can now characterize social interactions in groups of animals over extended periods (91–93), social network analysis can reveal how psychedelic treatment alters an individual's position within a social hierarchy (94, 95), and wireless neural recording systems enable brain activity monitoring during naturalistic social behaviours (96, 97). Such approaches could reveal whether psychedelics alter social approach-avoidance behaviours, modify responses to social stress, change patterns of affiliative interaction, or shift an individual's dominance status. Moreover, studying individuals within their social context may be essential for capturing clinically relevant pre-

dictors, such as differing social positions, or adherence to distinct behavioural phenotypes (e.g., stress-responsive versus stress-resilient) (60). Given that social and empathy deficits characterize treatment-resistant depression (84) and that improved connectedness mediates therapeutic outcomes (12, 98), animal models that fail to take social functioning into account may miss the very mechanisms most relevant to clinical translation.

Long-term persistence and temporal dynamics. One of the most remarkable features of psychedelic therapy is the persistence of therapeutic effects long after acute effects have subsided. In clinical trials, single or double dosing sessions produce symptom improvements that can last for months or even years (4, 5). This temporal profile — brief intervention, lasting change — implies that psychedelics rapidly initiate neurobiological processes that continue to unfold long after the drug has been metabolized.

Animal research has made substantial progress in identifying candidate mechanisms for these lasting effects, particularly focusing on neuroplasticity-related dynamics such as increased dendritic spine density, enhanced synaptic plasticity, and structural remodelling of cortical circuits (99–102). However, while human therapeutic effects persist for months or years, preclinical studies typically measure neuroplasticity markers over hours to days, with the longest follow-ups extending to one month (99, 103, 104). This creates a critical knowledge gap: preclinical models may capture initiating mechanisms but not the full cascade of processes sustaining long-term therapeutic benefits. Moreover, behavioural assessments in animal studies typically occur at discrete time points rather than tracking phenotypic changes longitudinally in the same individuals (103, 105), and social behaviour dynamics remain largely uncharacterized despite their documented importance in human therapeutic outcomes (106).

Long-term longitudinal designs within a social context are essential to address this gap. Such approaches would allow us to identify early neural, behavioural, and social predictors of lasting change, to characterize the temporal evolution of both individual circuit reorganization and behavioural and social shifts beyond the initial days, and to link transient pharmacological effects to sustained therapeutic mechanisms. Moreover, by combining continuous behavioural tracking of individuals within social groups with repeated neural recordings, we could directly test mechanistic hypotheses about how acute circuit perturbations translate into the persistent changes in brain function, individual behaviour, and social functioning that characterize therapeutic response in humans.

Concluding Remarks

Together, these three features (individual variation, social context, and temporal dynamics) point toward a reorientation of preclinical psychedelic research: from group-level, cross-sectional paradigms summarizing acute effects measured in isolated individuals, toward longitudinal tracking of individuals within social contexts across extended timescales. Such an approach would allow us to address the questions that matter most for clinical translation: not simply whether psychedelics produce group-average effects, but rather which individuals show therapeutic responses, how both individual behavioural phenotypes and social positions interact over time, and how the interplay between individual characteristics and social context shapes trajectories of change.

1. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). Global health data exchange (ghdx): GBD results, 2023.
2. Roger S. McIntyre, Mohammad Alsuwaidan, Bernhard T. Baune, Michael Berk, Koen Demyttenaere, Joseph F. Goldberg, Philip Gorwood, Roger Ho, Siegfried Kasper, Sidney H. Kennedy, Josefina Ly-Uson, Rodrigo B. Mansur, R. Hamish McAllister-Williams, James W. Murrough, Charles B. Nemeroff, Andrew A. Nierenberg, Joshua D. Rosenblat, Gerard Sanacora, Alan F. Schatzberg, Richard Shelton, Stephen M. Stahl, Madhukar H. Trivedi, Eduard Vieta, Maj Vinberg, Nolan Williams, Allan H. Young, and Mario Maj. Treatment-resistant depression: Definition, prevalence, detection, management, and investigational interventions. *World Psychiatry*, 22(3):394–412, October 2023. ISSN 1723-8617. doi: 10.1002/wps.21120.
3. ClinicalTrials.gov. Search results for psychedelic substances (psilocybin, LSD, DMT, MDMA) clinical trials, June 2025.
4. Robin Carhart-Harris, Bruna Giribaldi, Rosalind Watts, Michelle Baker-Jones, Ashleigh Murphy-Beiner, Roberta Murphy, Jonny Martell, Allan Blemings, David Erritzoe, and David J. Nutt. Trial of Psilocybin versus Escitalopram for Depression. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 384(15):1402–1411, April 2021. ISSN 0028-4793. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2032994.
5. Guy M. Goodwin, Scott T. Aaronson, Oscar Alvarez, Peter C. Arden, Annie Baker, James C. Bennett, Catherine Bird, Renske E. Blom, Christine Brennan, Donna Brusch, Lisa Burke, Kete Campbell-Coker, Robin Carhart-Harris, Joseph Cattell, Aster Daniel, Charles DeBattista, Boadie W. Dunlop, Katherine Eisen, David Feifel, MacKenzie Forbes, Hannah M. Haumann, David J. Hellerstein, Astrid I. Hoppe, Muhammad I. Husain, Luke A. Jelen, Jeanine Kamphuis, Julie Kawasaki, John R. Kelly, Richard E. Key, Ronit Kishon, Stephanie Knatz Peck, Gemma Knight, Martijn H.B. Koolen, Melanie Lean, Rasmus W. Licht, Jessica L. Maples-Keller, Jan Mars, Lindsey Marwood, Martin C. McElhiney, Tammy L. Miller, Arvin Mirow, Sunil Mistry, Tanja Mletzko-Crowe, Liam N. Modlin, René E. Nielsen, Elizabeth M. Nielson, Sjoerd R. Offerhaus, Veronica O'Keane, Tomáš Páleníček, David Printz, Marleen C. Rademaker, Aumer van Reemst, Frederick Reinholdt, Dimitris Repantis, James Rucker, Samuel Rudow, Simon Ruffell, A. John Rush, Robert A. Schoevers, Mathieu Seynaeve, Samantha Shao, Jair C. Soares, Metten Somers, Susan C. Stansfield, Diane Sterling, Aaron Strockis, Joyce Tsai, Lucy Visser, Mourad Wahba, Samuel Williams, Allan H. Young, Paula Ywema, Sidney Zisook, and Ekaterina Malievskaia. Single-Dose Psilocybin for a Treatment-Resistant Episode of Major Depression. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 387 (18):1637–1648, November 2022. ISSN 0028-4793. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2206443.
6. Michael P. Bogenschutz, Stephen Ross, Snehal Bhatt, Tara Baron, Alyssa A. Forcehimes, Eugene Laska, Sarah E. Mennenga, Kelley O'Donnell, Lindsey T. Owens, Samantha Podrebarac, John Rotrosen, J. Scott Tonigan, and Lindsay Worth. Percentage of Heavy Drinking Days Following Psilocybin-Assisted Psychotherapy vs Placebo in the Treatment of Adult Patients With Alcohol Use Disorder: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 79(10):953–962, October 2022. ISSN 2168-622X. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.2096.
7. Jennifer M. Mitchell, Marcela Ot'alora G., Bessel van der Kolk, Scott Shannon, Michael Bogenschutz, Yevgeniy Gelfand, Casey Paleos, Christopher R. Nicholas, Sylvestre Quevedo, Brooke Balliett, Scott Hamilton, Michael Mithoefer, Sarah Kleiman, Kelly Parker-Guilbert, Keren Tzarfaty, Charlotte Harrison, Alberdina de Boer, Rick Doblin, and Berra Yazar-Klosinski. MDMA-assisted therapy for moderate to severe PTSD: A randomized, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. *Nature Medicine*, 29(10):2473–2480, October 2023. ISSN 1546-170X. doi: 10.1038/s41591-023-02565-4.
8. Friederike Holze, Peter Gasser, Felix Müller, Manuel Strebel, and Matthias E. Liechti. LSD-assisted therapy in patients with anxiety: Open-label prospective 12-month follow-up. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 225(3):362–370, September 2024. ISSN 0007-1250, 1472-1465. doi: 10.1192/bjp.2024.99.
9. Robin L. Carhart-Harris, David Erritzoe, Tim Williams, James M. Stone, Laurence J. Reed, Alessandro Colasanti, Robin J. Tyacke, Robert Leech, Andrea L. Malizia, Kevin Murphy, Peter Hobden, John Evans, Amanda Feilding, Richard G. Wise, and David J. Nutt. Neural correlates of the psychedelic state as determined by fMRI studies with psilocybin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(6):2138–2143, February 2012. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1119598109.
10. Katrin H. Preller, Marcus Herdener, Thomas Pokorny, Amanda Planzer, Rainer Kraehenmann, Philipp Stämpfli, Matthias E. Liechti, Erich Seifritz, and Franz X. Vollenweider. The Fabric of Meaning and Subjective Effects in LSD-Induced States Depend on Serotonin 2A Receptor Activation. *Current Biology*, 27(3):451–457, February 2017. ISSN 0960-9822. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2016.12.030.
11. Joshua S. Siegel, Subha Subramanian, Demetrius Perry, Benjamin P. Kay, Evan M. Gordon, Timothy O. Laumann, T. Rick Reneau, Nicholas V. Metcalf, Ravi V. Chacko, Caterina Gratton, Christine Horan, Samuel R. Krimmel, Joshua S. Shimony, Julie A. Schweiger, Dean F. Wong, David A. Bender, Kristen M. Scheidter, Forrest I. Whiting, Jonah A. Padawer-Curry, Russell T. Shinohara, Yong Chen, Julia Moser, Essa Yacoub, Steven M. Nelson, Luca Vizioli, Damien A. Fair, Eric J. Lenze, Robin Carhart-Harris, Charles L. Raison, Marcus E. Raichle, Abraham Z. Snyder, Ginger E. Nicol, and Nico U. F. Dosenbach. Psilocybin desynchronizes the human brain. *Nature*, 632(8023):131–138, August 2024. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-07624-5.
12. Adam W. Levin, Rafaelle Lancelotta, Nathan D. Sepeda, Natalie Gukasyan, Sandeep Nayak, Theodore L. Wagener, Frederick S. Barrett, Roland R. Griffiths, and Alan K. Davis. The therapeutic alliance between study participants and intervention facilitators is associated with acute effects and clinical outcomes in a psilocybin-assisted therapy trial for major depressive disorder. *PLOS ONE*, 19(3):e0300501, March 2024. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0300501.

13. Roberta Murphy, Hannes Kettner, Rick Zeifman, Bruna Giribaldi, Laura Kartner, Jonny Martell, Tim Read, Ashleigh Murphy-Beiner, Michelle Baker-Jones, David Nutt, David Erritzoe, Rosalind Watts, and Robin Carhart-Harris. Therapeutic Alliance and Rapport Modulate Responses to Psilocybin Assisted Therapy for Depression. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 12, March 2022. ISSN 1663-9812. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2021.788155.
14. Suzanne L. Russ, R. L. Carhart-Harris, G. Maruyama, and M. S. Elliott. Replication and extension of a model predicting response to psilocybin. *Psychopharmacology*, 236(11): 3221–3230, November 2019. ISSN 1432-2072. doi: 10.1007/s00213-019-05279-z.
15. Leor Roseman, David J. Nutt, and Robin L. Carhart-Harris. Quality of Acute Psychedelic Experience Predicts Therapeutic Efficacy of Psilocybin for Treatment-Resistant Depression. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 8:974, January 2018. ISSN 1663-9812. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2017.00974.
16. Madelene Palmer and Olivia M. Maynard. Are you tripping comfortably? Investigating the relationship between harm reduction and the psychedelic experience. *Harm Reduction Journal*, 19(1):81, July 2022. ISSN 1477-7517. doi: 10.1186/s12954-022-00662-0.
17. Chloé Pronovost-Morgan, Kyle T. Greenway, and Leor Roseman. An international Delphi consensus for reporting of setting in psychedelic clinical trials. *Nature Medicine*, 31(7): 2186–2195, July 2025. ISSN 1546-170X. doi: 10.1038/s41591-025-03685-9.
18. Helena Aicher and Peter Gasser. Treatment Recommendations for Psychedelic-assisted Therapy. *Swiss Archives of Neurology, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy*, May 2024. ISSN 2297-7007. doi: 10.4414/sanp.2024.1488043038.
19. Čestmír Vejmola, Klára Šíchová, Kateřina Syrová, Lucie Janečková, Vlastimil Koudelka, Michael Tesař, Marek Nikolič, Michaela Viktorinová, Filip Tylš, Jakub Korčák, Vojtěch Viktorin, Eduard Kelemen, Tereza Nekovářová, Martin Brunovský, Jiří Horáček, Martin Kuchař, and Tomáš Páleníček. Cross-Species Evidence for Psilocin-Induced Visual Distortions: Apparent Motion Is Perceived by Both Humans and Rats. *Biological Psychiatry Global Open Science*, 5(5):100524, September 2025. ISSN 2667-1743. doi: 10.1016/j.bpsgos.2025.100524.
20. Angie M. Michaiel, Philip R.L. Parker, and Cristopher M. Niell. A Hallucinogenic Serotonin-2A Receptor Agonist Reduces Visual Response Gain and Alters Temporal Dynamics in Mouse V1. *Cell Reports*, 26(13):3475–3483.e4, March 2019. ISSN 22111247. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2019.02.104.
21. Danilo De Gregorio, Jelena Popic, Justine P. Enns, Antonio Inserra, Agnieszka Skalecka, Athanasios Markopoulos, Luca Posa, Martha Lopez-Canul, He Qianzi, Christopher K. Lafferty, Jonathan P. Britt, Stefano Comai, Argel Aguilar-Valles, Nahum Sonenberg, and Gabriella Gobbi. Lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) promotes social behavior through mTORC1 in the excitatory neurotransmission. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(5), February 2021. ISSN 0027-8424, 1091-6490. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2020705118.
22. Romain Nardou, Edward Sawyer, Young Jun Song, Makenzie Wilkinson, Yasmin Padovan-Hernandez, Júnia Lara de Deus, Noelle Wright, Carine Lama, Sehr Faltin, Loyal A. Goff, Genevieve L. Stein-O'Brien, and Gül Dölen. Psychedelics reopen the social reward learning critical period. *Nature*, pages 1–9, June 2023. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-06204-3.
23. Juliet Richetto, Marcello Polesel, and Ulrike Weber-Stadlbauer. Effects of light and dark phase testing on the investigation of behavioural paradigms in mice: Relevance for behavioural neuroscience. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior*, 178:19–29, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.pbb.2018.05.011.
24. Chi-Hui Tsao, Jonathan Flint, and Guo-Jen Huang. Influence of diurnal phase on behavioral tests of sensorimotor performance, anxiety, learning and memory in mice. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):432, January 2022. ISSN 2045-2322. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-03155-5.
25. Hanna Weber, Meike Statz, Franz Markert, Alexander Storch, and Mareike Fauser. Circadian variations influence anxiety-related behaviour, olfaction, and hedonic response in male Sprague–Dawley rats. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 471:115134, August 2024. ISSN 0166-4328. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2024.115134.
26. Jeremy D. Bailoo, Eimear Murphy, Maria Boada-Saña, Justin A. Varholick, Sara Hintze, Caroline Baussière, Kerstin C. Hahn, Christine Göpfert, Rupert Palme, Bernhard Voelkl, and Hanno Würbel. Effects of Cage Enrichment on Behavior, Welfare and Outcome Variability in Female Mice. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 12, October 2018. ISSN 1662-5153. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2018.00232.
27. Puneet Rinwa, Marie Eriksson, Ian Cotgreave, and Matilda Bäckberg. 3R-Refinement principles: Elevating rodent well-being and research quality. *Laboratory Animal Research*, 40(1):11, March 2024. ISSN 2233-7660. doi: 10.1186/s42826-024-00198-3.
28. Adriana Domínguez-Oliva, Ismael Hernández-Avalos, Antonio Bueno-Nava, Cuauhtémoc Chávez, Antonio Verduzco-Mendoza, Adriana Olmos-Hernández, Dina Villanueva-García, Alberto Avila-Luna, Patricia Mora-Medina, Julio Martínez-Burnes, Arturo Gálvez-Rosas, and Daniel Mota-Rojas. Environmental enrichment for laboratory rats and mice: Endocrine, physiological, and behavioral benefits of meeting rodents' biological needs. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*, 12, July 2025. ISSN 2297-1769. doi: 10.3389/fvets.2025.1622417.
29. Amanda C. Kentner, Amanda V. Speno, Joanne Doucette, and Ryland C. Roderick. The Contribution of Environmental Enrichment to Phenotypic Variation in Mice and Rats. *eNeuro*, 8(2), March 2021. ISSN 2373-2822. doi: 10.1523/ENEURO.0539-20.2021.
30. Jessica Cait, Alissa Cait, Reuben W. Scott, Charlotte B. Winder, and Georgia J. Mason. Conventional laboratory housing increases morbidity and mortality in research rodents: Results of a meta-analysis. *BMC Biology*, 20:15, 2022. doi: 10.1186/s12915-021-01184-0.
31. Daniel Ryskamp Rijsketic, Austen B. Casey, Daniel A. N. Barbosa, Xue Zhang, Tuuli M. Hietamies, Grecia Ramirez-Ovalle, Matthew B. Pomrenze, Casey H. Halpern, Leanne M. Williams, Robert C. Malenka, and Boris D. Heifets. UNRAVELing the synergistic effects of psilocybin and environment on brain-wide immediate early gene expression in mice. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, pages 1–10, May 2023. ISSN 1740-634X. doi: 10.1038/s41386-023-01613-4.
32. Felipe Augusto Cini, Isis Ornelas, Encarni Marcos, Livia Goto-Silva, Juliana Nascimento, Sergio Ruschi, José Salerno, Karina Karmirian, Marcelo Costa, Eduardo Sequerra, Dráulio de Araújo, Luis Fernando Tófoli, César Rennó-Costa, Daniel Martins-de-Souza, Amanda Feilding, Stevens Rehen, and Sidarta Ribeiro. D-Lysergic acid diethylamide has major potential as a cognitive enhancer. Preprint, Neuroscience, December 2019.
33. Vootele Voikar and Stefano Gaburro. Three Pillars of Automated Home-Cage Phenotyping of Mice: Novel Findings, Refinement, and Reproducibility Based on Literature and Experience. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 14, October 2020. ISSN 1662-5153. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2020.575434.
34. Hans-Peter Lipp, Sven Krackow, Emir Turkes, Seico Benner, Toshihiro Endo, and Holger Russig. IntelliCage: The development and perspectives of a mouse- and user-friendly automated behavioral test system. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 17, 2024. ISSN 1662-5153.
35. Hiroyuki Arakawa. Ethological approach to social isolation effects in behavioral studies of laboratory rodents. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 341:98–108, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.bbr.2017.12.022.
36. Jonathan P. Balcombe. Laboratory environments and rodents' behavioural needs: A review. *Laboratory Animals*, 40:217–235, 2006. doi: 10.1258/002367706777611488.
37. Jeremy D. Bailoo, Bernhard Voelkl, Justin Varholick, Janja Novak, Eimear Murphy, Marianna Rosso, Rupert Palme, and Hanno Würbel. Effects of weaning age and housing conditions on phenotypic differences in mice. *Scientific Reports*, 10:11684, 2020. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-68549-3.
38. Jasmine M. Clarkson, Dominic M. Dwyer, Paul A. Flecknell, Matthew C. Leach, and Candy Rowe. Handling method alters the hedonic value of reward in laboratory mice. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1):2448, February 2018. ISSN 2045-2322. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-20716-3.
39. Michael Marcotte, Ashley Bernardo, Nathaniel Linga, Carmina A. Pérez-Romero, Jean-Louis Guillou, Etienne Sibille, and Thomas D. Prevot. Handling Techniques to Reduce Stress in Mice. *Journal of Visualized Experiments (JoVE)*, (175):e62593, September 2021. ISSN 1940-087X. doi: 10.3791/62593.
40. Kelly Gouveia and Jane L. Hurst. Optimising reliability of mouse performance in behavioural testing: The major role of non-aversive handling. *Scientific Reports*, 7:44999, 2017. doi: 10.1038/srep44999.
41. Logan J. Bigelow, Emily K. Pope, Debra S. MacDonald, Jessica E. Rock, and Paul B. Bernard. Getting a handle on rat familiarization: The impact of handling protocols on classic tests of stress in Rattus norvegicus. *Laboratory Animals*, 57(3):259–269, June 2023. ISSN 1758-1117. doi: 10.1177/00236772221142687.
42. Oliver Sturman, Pierre-Luc Germain, and Johannes Bhoacek. Exploratory rearing: A context- and stress-sensitive behavior recorded in the open-field test. *Stress (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*, 21:443–452, 2018. doi: 10.1080/10253890.2018.1438405.
43. M Sabanovic, D Bannerman, M Walton, J Lerch, and V Vyazovskiy. Differential acute behavioral responses to (±)-DOI injected in a novel or familiar environment. In *Neuromatch Conference 3.0*, October 2020.
44. Gary B. Glavin, William P. Paré, T. Sandbak, H.-K. Bakke, and R. Murison. Restraint stress in biomedical research: An update. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 18:223–249, 1994. doi: 10.1016/0149-7634(94)90027-2.
45. Patricia Molina, Raül Andero, and Antonio Armario. Restraint or immobilization: A comparison of methodologies for restricting free movement in rodents and their potential impact on physiology and behavior. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 151:105224, 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2023.105224.
46. M K Meijer, B M Spruijt, L F M van Zutphen, and V Baumans. Effect of restraint and injection methods on heart rate and body temperature in mice. *Laboratory Animals*, 40(4):382–391, October 2006. ISSN 0023-6772, 1758-1117. doi: 10.1258/002367706778476370.
47. Patricia V Turner, Thea Brabb, Cynthia Pekow, and Mary Ann Vasbinder. Administration of Substances to Laboratory Animals: Routes of Administration and Factors to Consider. *Journal of the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science : JAALAS*, 50(5): 600–613, September 2011. ISSN 1559-6109.
48. Melanie K. Walker, Julie R. Boberg, Margaret T. Walsh, Veronica Wolf, Angela Trujillo, Matthew S. Duke, Rupert Palme, and Linda A. Felton. A less stressful alternative to oral gavage for pharmacological and toxicological studies in mice. *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology*, 260(1):65–69, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.taap.2012.01.025.
49. Boyang Zhang, Zhicheng Ji, and Hongkai Ji. Tree-based Correlation Screen and Visualization for Exploring Phenotype-Cell Type Association in Multiple Sample Single-Cell RNA-Sequencing Experiments. Preprint, Bioinformatics, October 2021.
50. Odilia D. Lu, Katrina White, Kendall Raymond, Christine Liu, Alexandra S. Klein, Nathaniel Green, Sam Vaillancourt, Austin Gallagher, Lena Shindy, Alyssa Li, Kira Wallquist, Ruoxian Li, Mila Zou, Austen B. Casey, Lindsay P. Cameron, Matthew B. Pomrenze, Vikaas Sohal, Mazen A. Kheirbek, Andrea M. Gomez, Stephan Lammel, Boris D. Heifets, and Robert Malenka. A multi-institutional investigation of psilocybin's effects on mouse behavior, April 2025.
51. David B. Yaden, Sean P. Goldy, Brandon Weiss, and Roland R. Griffiths. Clinically relevant acute subjective effects of psychedelics beyond mystical experience. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 3(9):606–621, September 2024. ISSN 2731-0574. doi: 10.1038/s44159-024-00345-6.
52. David B. Yaden and Roland R. Griffiths. The Subjective Effects of Psychedelics Are Necessary for Their Enduring Therapeutic Effects. *ACS Pharmacology & Translational Science*, 4(2):568–572, April 2021. doi: 10.1021/acsptsci.0c00194.
53. R. L. Carhart-Harris, M. Bolstridge, C. M. J. Day, J. Rucker, R. Watts, D. E. Erritzoe, M. Kaelen, B. Giribaldi, M. Bloomfield, S. Pilling, J. A. Rickard, B. Forbes, A. Feilding, D. Taylor, H. V. Curran, and D. J. Nutt. Psilocybin with psychological support for treatment-resistant depression: Six-month follow-up. *Psychopharmacology*, 235(2):399–408, February 2018. ISSN 1432-2072. doi: 10.1007/s00213-017-4771-x.
54. Ido Hartogsohn. Set and setting, psychedelics and the placebo response: An extra-pharmacological perspective on psychopharmacology. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*, 30(12):1259–1267, December 2016. ISSN 0269-8811, 1461-7285. doi: 10.1177/0269881116677852.
55. Fernanda Palhano-Fontes, Dayanna Barreto, Heloisa Onias, Katia C. Andrade, Morgana M. Novaes, Jessica A. Pessoa, Sergio A. Mota-Rolim, Flávia L. Osório, Rafael Sanches, Rafael G. dos Santos, Luís Fernando Tófoli, Gabriela de Oliveira Silveira, Mauricio Yonamine, Jordi Riba, Francisco R. Santos, Antonio A. Silva-Junior, João C. Alchieri, Nicole L. Galvão-Coelho, Bruno Lobão-Soares, Jaime E. C. Hallak, Emerson Arcoverde, João P. Maia-de-Oliveira, and Dráulio B. Araújo. Rapid antidepressant effects

of the psychedelic ayahuasca in treatment-resistant depression: A randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Psychological Medicine*, 49(4):655–663, March 2019. ISSN 0033-2917. doi: 10.1017/S0033291718001356.

56. Kwonmok Ko, Gemma Knight, James J. Rucker, and Anthony J. Cleare. Psychedelics, Mystical Experience, and Therapeutic Efficacy: A Systematic Review. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 13, July 2022. ISSN 1664-0640. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2022.917199.
57. Julia T. Apter and Carl C. Pfeiffer. The Effect of the Hallucinogenic Drugs Lsd-25 and Mescaline on the Electroretinogram. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 66(3): 508–514, 1957. ISSN 1749-6632. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.1957.tb40746.x.
58. B. L. Jacobs, M. E. Trulson, A. D. Stark, and G. R. Christoph. Comparative effects of hallucinogenic drugs on behavior of the cat. *Communications in Psychopharmacology*, 1 (3):243–254, 1977. ISSN 0145-5699.
59. R. K. Siegel, J. M. Brewster, and M. E. Jarvik. An observational study of hallucinogen-induced behavior in unrestrained Macaca mulatta. *Psychopharmacologia*, 40(3):211–223, September 1974. ISSN 1432-2072. doi: 10.1007/BF00429415.
60. Yair Shemesh and Alon Chen. A paradigm shift in translational psychiatry through rodent neuroethology. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 28(3):993–1003, March 2023. ISSN 1476-5578. doi: 10.1038/s41380-022-01913-z.
61. Sinem Gencturk and Gunes Unal. Rodent tests of depression and anxiety: Construct validity and translational relevance. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 24(2): 191–224, April 2024. ISSN 1531-135X. doi: 10.3758/s13415-024-01171-2.
62. Alex Gomez-Marin and Asif A. Ghazanfar. The Life of Behavior. *Neuron*, 104(1):25–36, October 2019. ISSN 0896-6273. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2019.09.017.
63. John W. Krakauer, Asif A. Ghazanfar, Alex Gomez-Marin, Malcolm A. MacIver, and David Poeppel. Neuroscience Needs Behavior: Correcting a Reductionist Bias. *Neuron*, 93(3): 480–490, February 2017. ISSN 0896-6273. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2016.12.041.
64. Adam L. Halberstadt, Muhammad Chatha, Adam K. Klein, Jason Wallach, and Simon D. Brandt. Correlation between the potency of hallucinogens in the mouse head-twitch response assay and their behavioral and subjective effects in other species. *Neuropharmacology*, 167:107933, May 2020. ISSN 0028-3908. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropharm.2019.107933.
65. Anna U. Odland, Jesper L. Kristensen, and Jesper T. Andreasen. Animal Behavior in Psychedelic Research. *Pharmacological Reviews*, 74(4):1176–1205, October 2022. ISSN 0031-6997, 1521-0081. doi: 10.1124/pharmrev.122.000590.
66. Ilya E. Monosov, Jan Zimmermann, Michael J. Frank, Mackenzie W. Mathis, and Justin T. Baker. Ethological computational psychiatry: Challenges and opportunities. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 86:102881, June 2024. ISSN 0959-4388. doi: 10.1016/j.conb.2024.102881.
67. Nejc Dolensek, Daniel A. Gehrlach, Alexandra S. Klein, and Nadine Gogolla. Facial expressions of emotion states and their neuronal correlates in mice. *Science*, 368(6486): 89–94, April 2020. ISSN 0036-8075, 1095-9203. doi: 10.1126/science.aaz9468.
68. Ho-Suk Mun, Tatiana V. Lipina, and John C. Roder. Ultrasonic Vocalizations in Mice During Exploratory Behavior are Context-Dependent. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 9, December 2015. ISSN 1662-5153. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00316.
69. James P. Herman and Kellie L. Tamashiro. The visible burrow system: A view from across the hall. *Physiology & Behavior*, 178:103–109, September 2017. ISSN 0031-9384. doi: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2017.01.021.
70. Meghan Hibicke, Alexus N. Landry, Hannah M. Kramer, Zoe K. Talman, and Charles D. Nichols. Psychedelics, but Not Ketamine, Produce Persistent Antidepressant-like Effects in a Rodent Experimental System for the Study of Depression. *ACS Chemical Neuroscience*, 11(6):864–871, March 2020. doi: 10.1021/acschemneuro.9b00493.
71. Daniel Ryskamp Rijsketic, Austen B. Casey, Daniel A. N. Barbosa, Xue Zhang, Tuuli M. Hietamies, Grecia Ramirez-Ovalle, Matthew Pomrenze, Casey H. Halpern, Leanne M. Williams, Robert C. Malenka, and Boris D. Heifets. UNRAVELing the synergistic effects of psilocybin and environment on brain-wide immediate early gene expression in mice, February 2023.
72. Sam Freesun Friedman and Galen Ballentine. Trajectories of sentiment in 11,816 psychoactive narratives. *Human Psychopharmacology: Clinical and Experimental*, 39(1):e2889, 2024. ISSN 1099-1077. doi: 10.1002/hup.2889.
73. Gavin P. Schmitz, Manish K. Jain, Samuel T. Slocum, and Bryan L. Roth. 5-HT2A SNPs Alter the Pharmacological Signaling of Potentially Therapeutic Psychedelics. *ACS Chemical Neuroscience*, 13(16):2386–2398, August 2022. doi: 10.1021/acschemneuro.1c00815.
74. Patrick Vizeli, Isabelle Straumann, Friederike Holze, Yasmin Schmid, Patrick C. Dolder, and Matthias E. Liechti. Genetic influence of CYP2D6 on pharmacokinetics and acute subjective effects of LSD in a pooled analysis. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1):10851, May 2021. ISSN 2045-2322. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-90343-y.
75. Jacob S. Aday, Alan K. Davis, Cayla M. Mitzkovitz, Emily K. Bloesch, and Christopher C. Davoli. Predicting Reactions to Psychedelic Drugs: A Systematic Review of States and Traits Related to Acute Drug Effects. *ACS Pharmacology & Translational Science*, 4(2): 424–435, April 2021. doi: 10.1021/acsptsci.1c00014.
76. David K. Sjöström, Emma Claesdotter-Knutsson, and Petri J. Kajonius. Personality traits explain the relationship between psychedelic use and less depression in a comparative study. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):10195, May 2024. ISSN 2045-2322. doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-60890-1.
77. Eline C. H. M. Haijen, Mendel Kaelen, Leor Roseman, Christopher Timmermann, Hannes Kettner, Suzanne Russ, David Nutt, Richard E. Daws, Adam D. G. Hampshire, Romy Lorenz, and Robin L. Carhart-Harris. Predicting Responses to Psychedelics: A Prospective Study. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 9, November 2018. ISSN 1663-9812. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2018.00897.
78. Julia Freund, Andreas M. Brandmaier, Lars Lewejohann, Imke Kirste, Mareike Kritzler, Antonio Krüger, Norbert Sachser, Ulman Lindenberger, and Gerd Kempermann. Emergence of Individuality in Genetically Identical Mice. *Science*, 340(6133):756–759, May 2013. doi: 10.1126/science.1235294.
79. Oren Forkosh, Stoyo Karamihalev, Simone Roeh, Uri Alon, Sergey Anpilov, Chadi Touma, Markus Nussbaumer, Cornelia Flachskamm, Paul M. Kaplick, Yair Shemesh, and Alon Chen. Identity domains capture individual differences from across the behavioral repertoire. *Nature Neuroscience*, 22(12):2023–2028, December 2019. ISSN 1546-1726. doi: 10.1038/s41593-019-0516-y.
80. Matthew N. Zipple, Daniel Chang Kuo, Xinmiao Meng, Tess M. Reichard, Kwynn Guess, Caleb C. Vogt, Andrew H. Moeller, and Michael J. Sheehan. Competitive social feedback amplifies the role of early life contingency in male mice. *Science*, 387(6729):81–85, January 2025. doi: 10.1126/science.adq0579.
81. Débora Copa, David Erritzoe, Bruna Giribaldi, David Nutt, Robin Carhart-Harris, and Enzo Tagliazucchi. Predicting the outcome of psilocybin treatment for depression from baseline fMRI functional connectivity. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 353:60–69, May 2024. ISSN 0165-0327. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2024.02.089.
82. Richard E. Daws, Christopher Timmermann, Bruna Giribaldi, James D. Sexton, Matthew B. Wall, David Erritzoe, Leor Roseman, David Nutt, and Robin Carhart-Harris. Increased global integration in the brain after psilocybin therapy for depression. *Nature Medicine*, 28 (4):844–851, April 2022. ISSN 1546-170X. doi: 10.1038/s41591-022-01744-z.
83. Matthias A. Reinhard, Julia Dewald-Kaufmann, Torsten Wüstenberg, Richard Musil, Barbara B. Barton, Andrea Jobst, and Frank Padberg. The vicious circle of social exclusion and psychopathology: A systematic review of experimental ostracism research in psychiatric disorders. *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, 270(5):521–532, August 2020. ISSN 1433-8491. doi: 10.1007/s00406-019-01074-1.
84. Hannah M. Kilian, Bastian Schiller, Thomas E. Schläpfer, and Markus Heinrichs. Impaired socio-affective, but intact socio-cognitive skills in patients with treatment-resistant, recurrent depression. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 153:206–212, September 2022. ISSN 0022-3956. doi: 10.1016/j.jpsychires.2022.07.025.
85. James B. Kirkbride, Deidre M. Anglin, Ian Colman, Jennifer Dykxhoorn, Peter B. Jones, Praveetha Patalay, Alexandra Pitman, Emma Soneson, Thomas Steare, Talen Wright, and Siân Lowri Griffiths. The social determinants of mental health and disorder: Evidence, prevention and recommendations. *World Psychiatry*, 23(1):58–90, 2024. ISSN 2051-5545. doi: 10.1002/wps.21160.
86. Roland R. Griffiths, Matthew W. Johnson, Michael A. Carducci, Annie Umbricht, William A. Richards, Brian D. Richards, Mary P. Cosimano, and Margaret A. Klinedinst. Psilocybin produces substantial and sustained decreases in depression and anxiety in patients with life-threatening cancer: A randomized double-blind trial. *Journal of Psychopharmacology (Oxford, England)*, 30(12):1181–1197, December 2016. ISSN 1461-7285. doi: 10.1177/0269881116675513.
87. Katrin H. Preller, Thomas Pokorny, Andreas Hock, Rainer Kraehenmann, Philipp Stämpfli, Erich Seifritz, Milan Scheidegger, and Franz X. Vollenweider. Effects of serotonin 2A/1A receptor stimulation on social exclusion processing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(18):5119–5124, May 2016. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1524187113.
88. Thomas Pokorny, Katrin H Preller, Michael Kometer, Isabel Dziobek, and Franz X Vollenweider. Effect of Psilocybin on Empathy and Moral Decision-Making. *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*, 20(9):747–757, September 2017. ISSN 1461-1457. doi: 10.1093/ijnp/pyx047.
89. Patrick C. Dolder, Yasmin Schmid, Felix Müller, Stefan Borgwardt, and Matthias E. Liechti. LSD Acutely Impairs Fear Recognition and Enhances Emotional Empathy and Sociality. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 41(11):2638–2646, October 2016. ISSN 1740-634X. doi: 10.1038/npp.2016.82.
90. Patricia Duerler, Leonhard Schilbach, Philipp Stämpfli, Franz X. Vollenweider, and Katrin H. Preller. LSD-induced increases in social adaptation to opinions similar to one's own are associated with stimulation of serotonin receptors. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1):12181, July 2020. ISSN 2045-2322. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-68899-y.
91. Gerd Kempermann, Jadna Bogado Lopes, Sara Zocher, Susan Schilling, Fanny Ehret, Alexander Garthe, Anne Karasinsky, Andreas M. Brandmaier, Ulman Lindenberger, York Winter, and Rupert W. Overall. The individuality paradigm: Automated longitudinal activity tracking of large cohorts of genetically identical mice in an enriched environment. *Neurobiology of Disease*, 175:105916, December 2022. ISSN 0969-9961. doi: 10.1016/j.nbd.2022.105916.
92. Máté Nagy, Hemal Naik, Fumihiro Kano, Nora V. Carlson, Jens C. Koblitz, Martin Wikelski, and Iain D. Couzin. SMART-BARN: Scalable multimodal arena for real-time tracking behavior of animals in large numbers. *Science Advances*, 9(35):eadf8068, September 2023. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.adf8068.
93. Masanori Yamakawa, Takahiro Ezaki, Akiyuki Watarai, Nobuyuki Kutsukake, Kyoko Miura, and Teruhiro Okuyama. Quantitative and systematic behavioral profiling reveals social complexity in eusocial naked mole-rats. *Science Advances*, 11(41):eady0481, October 2025. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.ady0481.
94. Maciej Winiarski, Anna Madecka, Anjaly Yadav, Joanna Borowska, Maria R. Wołyniak, Joanna Jędrzejewska-Szmek, Ludwika Kondrakiewicz, Lech Mankiewicz, Mayank Chaturvedi, Daniel K. Wójcik, Krzysztof Turzyński, Alicja Puścian, and Ewelina Knapska. Information sharing within a social network is key to behavioral flexibility—Lessons from mice tested under seminaturalistic conditions. *Science Advances*, 11(1):eadm7255, January 2025. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.adm7255.
95. Máté Nagy, Jacob D. Davidson, Gábor Vásárhelyi, Dániel Ábel, Enikő Kubinyi, Ahmed El Hady, and Tamás Vicsek. Long-term tracking of social structure in groups of rats. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):22857, October 2024. ISSN 2045-2322. doi: 10.1038/s41598-024-72437-5.
96. Célian Bimbard, Flóra Takács, Joana A Catarino, Julie MJ Fabre, Sukriti Gupta, Stephen C Lenzi, Maxwell D Melin, Nathanael O'Neill, Ivana Orsolic, Magdalena Robacha, James S Street, José M Gomes Teixeira, Simon Townsend, Enny H van Beest, Arthur M Zhang, Anne K Churchland, Chunyu A Duan, Kenneth D Harris, Dimitri Michael Kullmann, Gabriele Lignani, Zachary F Mainen, Troy W Margrie, Nathalie L Rochefort, Andrew Wikenheiser, Matteo Carandini, and Philip Coen. An adaptable, reusable, and light implant for chronic Neuropixels probes. *eLife*, 13:RP98522, February 2025. ISSN 2050-084X. doi: 10.7554/eLife.98522.
97. Yong Won Kwon, David B. Ahn, Young-Geun Park, Enji Kim, Dong Ha Lee, Sang-Woo Kim, Kwon-Hyung Lee, Won-Yeong Kim, Yeon-Mi Hong, Chin Su Koh, Hyun Ho Jung, Jin Woo Chang, Sang-Young Lee, and Jang-Ung Park. Power-integrated, wireless neural recording systems on the cranium using a direct printing method for deep-brain analysis. *Science Advances*, 10(14):eadn3784, April 2024. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.adn3784.
98. Richard J. Zeifman, Anne C. Wagner, Candice M. Monson, and Robin L. Carhart-Harris. How does psilocybin therapy work? An exploration of experiential avoidance as a putative

mechanism of change. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 334:100–112, August 2023. ISSN 0165-0327. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2023.04.105.

99. Ling-Xiao Shao, Clara Liao, Ian Gregg, Pasha A. Davoudian, Neil K. Savalia, Kristina Delagarza, and Alex C. Kwan. Psilocybin induces rapid and persistent growth of dendritic spines in frontal cortex in vivo. *Neuron*, 109(16):2535–2544.e4, August 2021. ISSN 08966273. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2021.06.008.
100. Mario de la Fuente Revenga, Bohan Zhu, Christopher A. Guevara, Lynette B. Naler, Justin M. Saunders, Zirui Zhou, Rudy Toneatti, Salvador Sierra, Jennifer T. Wolstenholme, Patrick M. Beardsley, George W. Huntley, Chang Lu, and Javier González-Maeso. Prolonged epigenomic and synaptic plasticity alterations following single exposure to a psychedelic in mice. *Cell Reports*, 37(3):109836, October 2021. ISSN 22111247. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2021.109836.
101. Calvin Ly, Alexandra C. Greb, Lindsay P. Cameron, Jonathan M. Wong, Eden V. Barragan, Paige C. Wilson, Kyle F. Burbach, Sina Soltanzadeh Zarandi, Alexander Sood, Michael R. Paddy, Whitney C. Duim, Megan Y. Dennis, A. Kimberley McAllister, Kassandra M. Ori-McKenney, John A. Gray, and David E. Olson. Psychedelics Promote Structural and Functional Neural Plasticity. *Cell Reports*, 23(11):3170–3182, June 2018. ISSN 22111247. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2018.05.022.
102. Clara Liao, Alisha N. Dua, Cassandra Wojtasiewicz, Conor Liston, and Alex C. Kwan. Structural neural plasticity evoked by rapid-acting antidepressant interventions. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, pages 1–14, November 2024. ISSN 1471-0048. doi: 10.1038/s41583-024-00876-0.
103. Cato M. H. De Vos, Natasha L. Mason, and Kim P. C. Kuypers. Psychedelics and neuroplasticity: A systematic review unraveling the biological underpinnings of psychedelics. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12:724606, 2021. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2021.724606.
104. Simon Zhornitsky, Henrique N. Oliva, Laura A. Jayne, Annemarie S. Allsop, Alfred P. Kaye, and Zubin Bhagwagar. Changes in synaptic markers after administration of ketamine or psychedelics: A systematic scoping review. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 14:1197890, 2023. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1197890.
105. Merima Šabanović, Alberto Lazari, Marta Blanco-Pozo, Cristiana Tisca, Mohamed Tachrount, Aurea B. Martins-Bach, Jason P. Lerch, Mark E. Walton, and David M. Bannerman. Lasting dynamic effects of the psychedelic 2,5-dimethoxy-4-iodoamphetamine ((±)-DOI) on cognitive flexibility. *Molecular psychiatry*, 29(6):1810–1823, June 2024. ISSN 1476-5578 1359-4184. doi: 10.1038/s41380-024-02439-2.
106. Jacob S. Aday, Cayla M. Mitzkovitz, Emily K. Bloesch, Christopher C. Davoli, and Alan K. Davis. Long-term effects of psychedelic drugs: A systematic review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 113:179–189, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2020.03.017.

Supplementary Methods and Figures

We comprehensively reviewed articles that report the effects of psychedelics on rodent behaviour identified by a systematic search of the literature published in the last 5 years, with a date cutoff on the 28th of January, 2025. We used the following search prompt on PubMed for an initial list of studies:

```
(psychedelics[title/abstract] OR
 psilocybin[title/abstract] OR
 "lysergic acid diethylamide"[title/abstract])
AND
(mouse[title/abstract] OR mice[title/abstract] OR
 rat[title/abstract] OR rats[title/abstract])
```

This yielded 227 results from which we removed reviews, human clinical trials, pharmacological studies not including behavioural experiments, duplicate studies (preprint and article) and corrections. Of the selected studies, 13 were unaccessible due to being behind a paywall and therefore excluded, resulting in a total of 106 studies included in the review (See Figure S1).



Fig. S1. PRISMA flow diagram of the study selection process.

Behavioural Assay Characterization. For each study, we extracted information about the behavioural assays used, including recording duration, environmental context, and behavioural complexity. To systematically compare experimental approaches across studies, we developed three scoring dimensions, each scaled from 0 to 15:

Recording Duration Score. Studies were first categorized as short (single brief test session), prolonged-fragmented (multiple test sessions across days), or long-continuous (extended continuous recording). For short recordings, scores ranged from 0-5, scaled by recording length relative to a 12-hour day. For prolonged-fragmented recordings, scores ranged from 5-10, scaled by total recording time (recording days × minutes per session). For long-continuous recordings, scores ranged from 10-15, scaled by the number of continuous recording days.

Behavioural Complexity Score. Assays were categorized as simple (measuring single behavioural metrics such as total locomotion or head twitches) or complex (measuring multiple behavioural dimensions, sequential patterns, or ethologically relevant behaviours). Simple assays received scores from 0-7.5, while complex assays received scores from 7.5-15, with further scaling based on the number of distinct behavioural measures captured.

Environmental Complexity Score. Testing environments were categorized as standard (barren test apparatus such as open field or elevated plus maze), enriched (home cage or arena with nesting material, shelters, or enrichment objects), or naturalistic (semi-natural environments approximating species-typical habitats). Standard environments received scores from 0-5, enriched environments from 5-10, and naturalistic environments from 10-15, with further scaling based on the diversity of environmental features present.

For studies reporting multiple behavioural assays, mean scores across assays were calculated to generate a single study-level score for each dimension. The three-dimensional distribution of studies was visualized using these scores, with point size representing the number of assays per study and color indicating publication year.

Fig. S2. Systematic analysis of experimental conditions in psychedelic animal studies. Literature review for all studies using rodents in psychedelic research, from 2019 till 2024. Status indicates whether studies included specific practices (yes: green, no: pink, unclear: grey).



Fig. S3. Distribution of application types used in the reviewed studies. Intraperitoneal injections (i.p.) account for 75% of the application methods, subcutaneous injections (s.c.) for 13.8%, oral gavage (p.o.) represents 6.9%, while intracranial (i.c.) and intravenous (i.v.) were used in 2.6% and 1.7% of cases, respectively.