

Supplementary Material related to the manuscript:

Short- and long-term social recognition memory are differentially modulated by neuronal histamine

Barbara Rani, Bruna Silva-Marques, Rob Leus, Maria Beatrice Passani, Patrizio Blandina and Gustavo Provensi

This PDF file includes:

Table S1: Critical values obtained in the statistical analysis of the raw data regarding the time spent exploring the cups during the training session (Table 1)

Table S2: Critical values obtained from the statistical analysis of the raw data regarding the Sociability index (Table 1)

Table S3: Critical values obtained in the statistical analysis of the raw data regarding the time spent exploring the cups containing the social stimuli in the retention test session (Figures 1-7)

Table S4: Critical values obtained from the statistical analysis of the raw data regarding the Discrimination index (Figures 1-7)

Table S1: Critical values obtained in the statistical analysis of the raw data regarding the time spent exploring the cups during the training session (Table 1)

Figure	n	Analysis (post hoc reported in Table 1)	Factors Analyzed	F ratios	P values
1B	6	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Genotype (<i>Hdc</i> ^{+/+} vs <i>Hdc</i> ^{-/-})	Interaction	$F(1, 20) = 0,4975$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Genotype	$F(1, 20) = 2,088e-014$
				Cups	$F(1, 20) = 89,18$
1C	6-7	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Genotype (<i>Hdc</i> ^{+/+} vs <i>Hdc</i> ^{-/-})	Interaction	$F(1, 22) = 2,964$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Genotype	$F(1, 22) = 4,493e-013$
				Cups	$F(1, 22) = 365,1$
2B	8-10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (α -FMH vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 32) = 3,234$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Treatments	$F(1, 32) = 0,0$
				Cups	$F(1, 32) = 199,9$
2C	7-9	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (α -FMH vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 28) = 10,79$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Treatments	$F(1, 28) = 1,484e-014$
				Cups	$F(1, 28) = 267,3$
3B	8-10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 32) = 7,617$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Treatments	$F(1, 32) = 0,0$
				Cups	$F(1, 32) = 180,4$
3C	7-9	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 28) = 2,965$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Treatments	$F(1, 28) = 8,807e-014$
				Cups	$F(1, 28) = 100,0$
4B	7-10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 30) = 5,947$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Treatments	$F(1, 30) = 1,690e-013$
				Cups	$F(1, 30) = 196,1$
4C	6-8	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 26) = 5,024$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Treatments	$F(1, 26) = 3,676e-013$
				Cups	$F(1, 26) = 183,0$
5B	8-10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 32) = 1,192$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Genotype	$F(1, 32) = 6,855e-014$
				Cups	$F(1, 32) = 212,8$
5C	10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 36) = 0,9587$
			Cups (Non social vs Social)	Genotype	$F(1, 36) = 0,0$
				Cups	$F(1, 36) = 110,0$

6B	10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (Donepezil+Vuf16839 vs Vehicle+VUF16839) Cups (Non social vs Social)	Interaction $F(1, 36) = 8,891$ Genotype $F(1, 36) = 9,346e-015$ Cups $F(1, 36) = 131,5$	P < 0,01 P > 0,9999 P < 0,0001
7B	7- 10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Genotype ($Hdc^{+/+}$ vs $Hdc^{-/-}$) /Treatments (Ciproxifan vs Vehicle) Cups (Non social vs Social)	Interaction $F(3, 58) = 6,379$ Groups $F(3, 58) = -1,461e-013$ Cups $F(1, 58) = 714,3$	P < 0,001 P > 0,9999 P < 0,0001
7C	6-8	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Injection (α -FMH vs Vehicle) /Treatments (Ciproxifan vs Vehicle) Cups (Non social vs Social)	Interaction $F(3, 44) = 1,498$ Groups $F(3, 44) = 3,535e-014$ Cups $F(1, 44) = 238,5$	P = 0,2282 P > 0,9999 P < 0,0001

Table S2: Critical values obtained from the statistical analysis of the raw data regarding the Sociability index (Table 1)

Figure	"n"	Analysis (post hoc reported in table 1)	t	P values
1B	6	t-Test	0.4988	P = 0,6287
1C	6-7	t-Test	1.237	P = 0,2417
2B	8-10	t-Test	1.286	P = 0,2166
2C	7-9	t-Test	1.371	P = 0,1920
3B	8-10	t-Test	2.002	P = 0,0625
3C	7-9	t-Test	1.195	P = 0,2520
4B	7-10	t-Test	1.724	P = 0,1052
4C	6-8	t-Test	1.593	P = 0,1352
5B	8-10	t-Test	0.7684	P = 0,4535
5C	10	t-Test	0.6774	P = 0,5068
6B	10	t-Test	1.883	P = 0,0759
7B	7-10	One-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	$F(3, 29) = 2,574$	P = 0,0732
7C	6-8	One-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	$F(3, 22) = 0,7486$	P = 0,5348

Table S3: Critical values obtained in the statistical analysis of the raw data regarding the time spent exploring the cups containing the social stimuli in the retention test session (Figures 1-7)

Figure	n	Analysis (post hoc reported in figures)	Factors Analyzed	F ratios	P values
1B	6	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Genotype (<i>Hdc</i> ^{+/+} vs <i>Hdc</i> ^{-/-})	Interaction	$F(1, 20) = 0,5395$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Genotype	$F(1, 20) = 4,035e-014$
				Stimuli	$F(1, 20) = 33,16$
1C	6-7	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Genotype (<i>Hdc</i> ^{+/+} vs <i>Hdc</i> ^{-/-})	Interaction	$F(1, 22) = 12,18$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Genotype	$F(1, 22) = -6,488e-015$
				Stimuli	$F(1, 22) = 6,335$
2B	8-10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (α -FMH vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 32) = 0,4536$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Treatments	$F(1, 32) = 1,348e-014$
				Cups	$F(1, 32) = 29,43$
2C	7-9	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (α -FMH vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 28) = 19,88$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Treatments	$F(1, 28) = 9,711e-014$
				Stimuli	$F(1, 28) = 14,17$
3B	8-10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 32) = 12,42$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Treatments	$F(1, 32) = 0,0$
				Stimuli	$F(1, 32) = 3,630$
3C	7-9	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 28) = 19,33$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Treatments	$F(1, 28) = 0,1120$
				Stimuli	$F(1, 28) = 18,60$
4B	7-10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 30) = 9,508$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Treatments	$F(1, 30) = -4,259e-014$
				Stimuli	$F(1, 30) = 7,725$
4C	6-8	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 26) = 61,25$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Treatments	$F(1, 26) = 1,104e-013$
				Stimuli	$F(1, 26) = 63,62$
5B	8-10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 32) = 13,76$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Genotype	$F(1, 32) = 8,032e-015$
				Cups	$F(1, 32) = 6,287$
5C	10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (VUF16839 vs Vehicle)	Interaction	$F(1, 36) = 9,248$
			Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Genotype	$F(1, 36) = 0,0$
				Stimuli	$F(1, 36) = 9,405$

6B	10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Treatments (Donepezil+VUF16839 vs Vehicle+VUF16839) Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Interaction Genotype Stimuli	F (1, 36) = 23,58 F (1, 36) = 0,0 F (1, 36) = 7,162	P < 0,0001 P > 0,9999 P < 0,05
7B	7-10	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Genotype ($Hdc^{+/+}$ vs $Hdc^{-/-}$) + Treatments (Ciproxifan vs Vehicle) Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Interaction Groups Stimuli	F (3, 56) = 10,05 F (3, 56) = 4,784e-014 F (1, 56) = 20,66	P < 0,0001 P > 0,9999 P < 0,0001
7C	6-8	two-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	Injection (α -FMH vs Vehicle) + Treatments (Ciproxifan vs Vehicle) Stimuli (Familiar vs Novel)	Interaction Groups Stimuli	F (3, 44) = 25,32 F (3, 44) = 5,769e-014 F (1, 44) = 4,571	P < 0,0001 P > 0,9999 P < 0,05

Table S4: Critical values obtained from the statistical analysis of the raw data regarding the Discrimination index (Figures 1-7)

Figure	n	Analysis (post hoc reported in figures)	t	P values
1B	6	t-Test	0.6345	P = 0,5400
1C	6-7	t-Test	2.492	P < 0,05
2B	8-10	t-Test	0.4786	P = 0,6387
2C	7-9	t-Test	4.299	P < 0,001
3B	8-10	t-Test	2.480	P < 0,05
3C	7-9	t-Test	2.732	P < 0,05
4B	7-10	t-Test	2.166	P < 0,05
4C	6-8	t-Test	5.512	P < 0,001
5B	8-10	t-Test	2.777	P < 0,001
5C	10	t-Test	2.153	P < 0,05
6B	10	t-Test	3.454	P < 0,01
7B	7-10	One-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	F (3, 29) = 4,438	P < 0,05
7C	6-8	One-way ANOVA (Bonferroni)	F (3, 22) = 12,82	P < 0,0001