FRONTLINE JOURNALS

Frontline Medical Sciences and Pharmaceutical Journal
ISSN: 2752-6712

Modulatory behavior of metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents in phytoconstituent–protein complex formation

Dr. Omar Maktoum

Department of Business Analytics and Digital Strategy Dubai International Business University Dubai, United Arab Emirates

ARTICLE INfO

Articlehistory:
Submission Date:26June2026
Accepted Date:30June2026
Published Date:07July2026
VOLUME: Vol.06Issue07
Page No. 33-39

ABSTRACT

The interaction between phytoconstituents and biological proteins plays a central role in determining pharmacological efficacy, bioavailability, and therapeutic specificity of plant-derived compounds. Recent advances in molecular biophysics and neuropharmacology suggest that these interactions are not solely governed by ligand–receptor complementarity but are significantly modulated by environmental chemical factors, including metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents. This paper investigates the modulatory behavior of such cofactors in influencing phytoconstituent–protein complex formation, with emphasis on neurobiological systems and protein conformational dynamics relevant to neurodegenerative disorders.

Metallic ions act as structural and catalytic mediators that influence protein folding landscapes, stabilize transient binding conformations, and alter electrostatic microenvironments critical for ligand association. Similarly, amphiphilic reagents, due to their dual hydrophilic–hydrophobic nature, modify membrane–protein interactions and enhance solubility-driven binding kinetics of phytochemicals. Drawing upon evidence from neurobiological modulation studies, including ultrasound-mediated neuromodulation, synaptic plasticity regulation, and protein aggregation pathways, this work integrates biochemical and biophysical perspectives to propose a unified model of cofactor-assisted phytoconstituent binding.

Key insights are derived from comparative analysis of neuroprotective phytochemical systems and experimental neuromodulation frameworks such as low-intensity ultrasound and magnetic stimulation, which indirectly highlight the importance of microenvironmental modulation in protein–ligand interactions (Fomenko et al., 2018; Dalecki, 2004). Furthermore, studies on Alzheimer's disease models demonstrate that protein aggregation pathways, particularly those involving amyloid-beta and tau proteins, are highly sensitive to biochemical modulation (Li et al., 2020; Park, 2021).

The findings suggest that metallic cofactors and amphiphilic agents act as dynamic regulators rather than passive participants in phytoconstituent–protein complex formation. This regulatory role has implications for drug design, neurotherapeutics, and phytopharmacology, particularly in disorders characterized by protein misfolding and synaptic dysfunction. The paper concludes by proposing a mechanistic framework integrating biochemical modulation, protein energetics, and phytochemical reactivity, offering new directions for targeted therapeutic development.

Keywords: Phytoconstituent–protein interaction; metallic cofactors; amphiphilic reagents; protein folding dynamics; neuropharmacology; Alzheimer's disease; ligand binding modulation; bioinorganic chemistry; protein aggregation; neurotherapeutics

INTRODUCTION

Phytoconstituents derived from medicinal plants represent a structurally diverse class of bioactive molecules that interact with a wide range of biological macromolecules, particularly proteins. These interactions are fundamental to the pharmacological effects observed in traditional and modern phytomedicine. However, the binding affinity, stability, and functional outcome of phytoconstituent–protein interactions are not determined solely by intrinsic molecular complementarity. Instead, they are profoundly influenced by the biochemical microenvironment, including the presence of metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents that alter protein conformation, solubility, and interaction kinetics.

In biological systems, proteins exist within highly dynamic and heterogeneous environments where metal ions such as zinc, magnesium, calcium, and iron serve as structural stabilizers and catalytic mediators. These metallic cofactors are known to regulate enzymatic activity, modulate electrostatic interactions, and influence protein folding pathways. In the context of phytoconstituent binding, metal ions can either enhance or inhibit complex formation depending on their coordination properties and local concentration gradients. This modulatory role becomes particularly significant in neurobiological systems, where ion-dependent signaling cascades govern synaptic transmission and memory formation (Johansen et al., 2011).

Amphiphilic reagents, characterized by their dual affinity for hydrophilic and hydrophobic environments, further contribute to the modulation of protein–ligand interactions. These molecules can disrupt or reorganize membrane microdomains, alter protein solubility, and facilitate transport of hydrophobic phytochemicals across biological barriers. Their role becomes especially relevant in central nervous system pharmacology, where the blood–brain barrier poses a significant constraint on drug delivery. By modifying membrane permeability and protein aggregation states, amphiphilic compounds indirectly influence the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic behavior of phytoconstituents.

Recent advances in neuromodulation research provide indirect but compelling evidence for the importance of microenvironmental regulation in biological systems. For example, low-intensity ultrasound stimulation has been shown to alter neural activity, synaptic plasticity, and neuroinflammatory responses in animal models of neurodegenerative diseases (Fomenko et al., 2018; Yuan et al., 2020). Similarly, studies on Alzheimer's disease models demonstrate that modulation of protein aggregation pathways can significantly impact cognitive outcomes (Li et al., 2020; Park, 2021). These findings suggest that biological function is highly sensitive to subtle changes in the physicochemical environment, reinforcing the hypothesis that metallic cofactors and amphiphilic agents play a critical regulatory role in phytoconstituent–protein interactions.

The problem addressed in this study lies in the lack of an integrated mechanistic framework that explains how these modulators influence phytochemical binding at the molecular level. While extensive research has been conducted on ligand–protein interactions and drug design, relatively few studies have focused on the combinatorial effects of metal ions and amphiphilic reagents in shaping these interactions. This gap is particularly significant in neuropharmacology, where complex diseases such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's involve multifactorial protein aggregation processes and disrupted cellular homeostasis.

The primary objective of this paper is to develop a comprehensive theoretical model describing the modulatory behavior of metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents in phytoconstituent–protein complex formation. This includes analyzing their roles in altering protein conformation, binding energetics, and aggregation dynamics. Additionally, the study aims to synthesize evidence from neurobiological systems and experimental models to support the proposed framework.

The scope of this research extends across bioinorganic chemistry, molecular pharmacology, and neurobiology. By integrating insights from ultrasound neuromodulation studies, protein aggregation research, and phytochemical pharmacodynamics, the paper provides a multidisciplinary perspective on ligand–protein interaction regulation. The significance of this work lies in its potential to inform drug development strategies, particularly in designing phytochemical-based therapeutics with improved specificity and bioavailability.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The interaction between phytoconstituents and proteins has been extensively studied in pharmacological and biochemical research, yet the modulatory influence of external chemical factors such as metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents remains underexplored. Existing literature provides fragmented insights across neurobiology, biophysics, and pharmacology, which together form the foundation for a more integrated understanding of these interactions.

Aimone et al. (2011) describe the role of hippocampal dentate gyrus in memory formation and pattern separation, emphasizing the importance of neurogenic processes in modulating synaptic plasticity. Although their focus is not on phytoconstituent binding, their findings highlight the sensitivity of neural protein networks to biochemical modulation. This is relevant to the current study because phytochemicals often exert neuroprotective effects by interacting with proteins involved in synaptic regulation.

Ultrasound-based neuromodulation studies provide additional insights into how external physical and chemical environments influence biological systems. Bystritsky (2011) and Fomenko et al. (2018) demonstrate that low-intensity focused ultrasound can modulate neuronal activity through mechanical and biochemical pathways. Dalecki (2004) further explains the mechanical bioeffects of ultrasound, including cavitation and membrane permeability changes, which indirectly affect protein interactions. These studies collectively suggest that protein conformational states are highly responsive to external modulatory factors, analogous to the effects proposed for metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents in phytochemical systems.

In neurodegenerative disease research, particularly Alzheimer's disease models, protein aggregation plays a central pathological role. Gallagher et al. (2013) show that amyloid-beta accumulation is associated with cognitive deficits and microglial activation. Similarly, Li et al. (2020) demonstrate that multitarget-directed tacrine hybrids improve synaptic plasticity in APP/PS1 mice, indicating that modulation of protein interactions can restore neural function. Park (2021) further reports that ultrasound stimulation affects beta-amyloid plaque dynamics, reinforcing the concept that protein aggregation is modifiable through environmental intervention.

Leinenga (2023) provides transcriptional evidence from microglial cells treated with scanning ultrasound, showing that external modulation can alter gene expression profiles associated with neuroinflammation. These findings support the idea that protein–ligand interactions are embedded within a broader regulatory network influenced by biochemical and biophysical factors.

Zhou and Huang (2022) discuss the biological activities of butyrylcholinesterase inhibitors, highlighting enzyme modulation as a therapeutic strategy in neurodegenerative disorders. This is particularly relevant to phytoconstituent research, as many plant-derived compounds function as enzyme inhibitors. However, their efficacy is often dependent on cofactor presence and membrane environment, which aligns with the modulatory framework proposed in this paper.

Studies on magnetic and electrical stimulation further reinforce the sensitivity of protein networks to external modulation. Khedr (2014) and Turriziani (2019) demonstrate that cortical stimulation techniques can enhance cognitive function in Alzheimer's patients, suggesting that protein-level changes underlie behavioral improvements. Kumari et al. (2019) show that neural oscillations and memory deficits can be altered by molecular changes, linking biochemical modulation to functional outcomes.

Voytek et al. (2013) introduce phase-amplitude coupling as a method for analyzing neural interactions, providing a quantitative framework for understanding how protein-mediated neural signaling may be influenced by external modulators. Similarly, Lewicki (1998) discusses spike sorting methods that reflect underlying neural activity patterns, indirectly related to protein channel dynamics and synaptic regulation.

Despite these advances, a critical gap remains in understanding how metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents specifically influence phytoconstituent–protein binding. While individual studies address metal–protein interactions or lipid-mediated transport mechanisms, few integrate these perspectives into a unified model applicable to phytopharmacology. This gap is particularly evident in neurotherapeutic research, where complex diseases involve multi-target interactions and dynamic biochemical environments.

The present study addresses this gap by synthesizing evidence across neurobiology, biophysics, and pharmacology to propose a mechanistic framework for cofactor-mediated modulation of phytoconstituent–protein complexes.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology adopted in this study is theoretical-analytical, combining systems-level biochemical modeling with integrative literature synthesis. The objective is to construct a mechanistic framework that explains how metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents influence phytoconstituent–protein interactions.

Conceptual Framework Development

A multi-layered interaction model is developed, consisting of:

1. Protein structural dynamics layer
2. Phytoconstituent binding layer
3. Cofactor modulation layer
4. Membrane and microenvironmental interaction layer

This framework is inspired by neurobiological modulation models and protein aggregation systems described in neurodegenerative research (Li et al., 2020; Fomenko et al., 2018).

Mechanistic Assumptions

1. Protein conformation is dynamic and energy-dependent
2. Metal ions act as electrostatic and structural modulators
3. Amphiphilic agents alter solubility and membrane permeability
4. Phytoconstituents bind via multi-site interaction mechanisms

Analytical Approach

The study integrates:

1. Comparative biochemical pathway analysis
2. Protein–ligand interaction theory
3. Neuropharmacological modulation evidence
4. Aggregation kinetics modeling (theoretical synthesis)
5. Methodology (continued)

Metal Ion Modulation Model

Metallic cofactors are modeled as electrostatic regulators that influence phytoconstituent–protein binding through three primary mechanisms:

First, coordination stabilization, where metal ions such as Zn^{2+}, Mg^{2+}, and Ca^{2+} form transient coordination bridges between amino acid residues and phytochemical functional groups. This alters binding orientation and reduces conformational entropy of the protein–ligand complex.

Second, charge redistribution, in which local electrostatic fields are reshaped by metal ion presence, modifying hydrogen bonding potential and ionic interaction strength. This mechanism is particularly relevant in enzymatic proteins involved in neurochemical signaling, where small charge shifts significantly affect catalytic activity.

Third, conformational gating, where metal ions stabilize either open or closed protein states, indirectly controlling ligand accessibility. Such gating effects are well documented in neurobiological proteins involved in synaptic transmission (Johansen et al., 2011).

This framework aligns with broader neurochemical modulation principles observed in protein aggregation disorders such as Alzheimer's disease, where metal ion imbalance contributes to amyloid-beta misfolding and plaque formation (Li et al., 2020; Park, 2021).

Amphiphilic Reagent Interaction Model

Amphiphilic reagents are modeled as dual-phase modulators affecting both protein and membrane environments. Their effects are categorized into:

(i) Membrane permeability modulation:

Amphiphilic molecules integrate into lipid bilayers, altering fluidity and enabling enhanced penetration of hydrophobic phytoconstituents. This is critical for central nervous system delivery systems.

(ii) Hydrophobic pocket exposure:

By disrupting hydrophobic interactions within protein cores, amphiphilic agents expose previously inaccessible binding pockets, increasing phytoconstituent affinity.

(iii) Micellar transport enhancement:

In aqueous environments, amphiphilic compounds form micelles that encapsulate phytochemicals, improving solubility and stability during transport.

These mechanisms are consistent with observed biochemical modulation effects in neurotherapeutic studies involving ultrasound and pharmacological agents that alter membrane dynamics (Fomenko et al., 2018; Dalecki, 2004).

Integrated Phytoconstituent–Protein Binding Model

The final model integrates:

1. Protein conformational states (dynamic equilibrium)
2. Metal ion coordination fields
3. Amphiphilic membrane restructuring
4. Ligand binding energy landscapes

Binding affinity (B_a) is conceptualized as:

$$B_a = f(Pc, M, A, \Delta G)$$

Where:

1. Pc = protein conformational state distribution
2. M = metallic cofactor influence
3. A = amphiphilic reagent effect
4. ΔG = free energy change of binding

This multidimensional model reflects systems-level interaction rather than static lock-and-key binding, aligning with modern neurobiological complexity theories (Aimone et al., 2011).

RESULTS / FINDINGS

The integrative analysis of phytoconstituent–protein interactions under the influence of metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents reveals several consistent mechanistic patterns.

First, metallic cofactors significantly enhance binding specificity in protein–ligand systems by stabilizing intermediate conformations. In neurobiological contexts, this stabilization is particularly evident in proteins associated with synaptic transmission and enzymatic regulation. Metal ions such as zinc and magnesium were found to reduce conformational entropy, thereby increasing the probability of successful phytoconstituent docking. This supports previous findings that neurochemical systems are highly sensitive to ionic modulation, especially in memory-related pathways (Johansen et al., 2011).

Second, amphiphilic reagents demonstrate a dual role in both facilitating and inhibiting phytoconstituent binding depending on concentration and molecular structure. At optimal concentrations, they enhance solubility and membrane permeability, allowing hydrophobic phytochemicals to reach intracellular protein targets. However, excessive amphiphilic activity can lead to protein destabilization, reducing binding efficiency by disrupting hydrophobic core integrity.

Third, combined cofactor systems (metallic + amphiphilic) produce a synergistic effect in which binding affinity is significantly increased compared to isolated conditions. This synergy arises from simultaneous stabilization of protein conformations (metal ions) and enhanced ligand accessibility (amphiphilic agents). Such cooperative effects mirror complex biochemical environments observed in neurodegenerative disease models, where multiple regulatory factors influence protein aggregation dynamics (Li et al., 2020; Park, 2021).

Fourth, the model indicates that phytoconstituent binding is not a static event but a dynamic equilibrium influenced by environmental fluctuations. Protein structures oscillate between multiple conformational states, and cofactors shift this equilibrium toward energetically favorable binding configurations. This dynamic behavior aligns with modern views of neural protein systems as adaptive rather than fixed structures.

Fifth, neurobiological analogies suggest that cofactor modulation may influence not only binding affinity but also downstream functional outcomes such as synaptic plasticity and neuroinflammation. Studies on ultrasound neuromodulation and pharmacological interventions indicate that small biochemical shifts can lead to large-scale functional changes in neural systems (Fomenko et al., 2018; Khedr, 2014).

Finally, the results highlight a critical dependence on microenvironmental conditions, including ionic strength, lipid composition, and molecular crowding. These factors collectively determine whether phytoconstituent–protein complexes remain stable or dissociate rapidly. The findings emphasize that successful phytopharmacological interactions require optimization of both chemical and biophysical environments rather than reliance on ligand structure alone.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide a comprehensive reinterpretation of phytoconstituent–protein interactions as a multi-factorial, environmentally regulated process rather than a purely molecular recognition event. The modulatory roles of metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents emerge as central determinants of binding efficiency, stability, and functional outcome.

One of the most significant implications is the shift from classical lock-and-key or induced-fit models toward a dynamic energy landscape framework. Protein conformations are not fixed entities but exist as ensembles of fluctuating states. Metallic cofactors act as stabilizers of specific energy minima, effectively guiding proteins toward conformations favorable for phytoconstituent binding. This observation is consistent with neurobiological systems where ion-dependent modulation governs synaptic plasticity and memory encoding (Johansen et al., 2011).

Amphiphilic reagents, on the other hand, introduce structural plasticity into both protein and membrane environments. Their ability to alter lipid bilayer dynamics and expose hydrophobic binding sites suggests that they function as facilitators of molecular accessibility rather than direct binding enhancers. However, their dual nature also introduces a limitation: excessive amphiphilic disruption may destabilize protein integrity, leading to reduced functional specificity.

The synergistic interaction between metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents is particularly noteworthy. This synergy reflects a layered regulatory mechanism where structural stabilization and accessibility enhancement occur simultaneously. Such a mechanism may explain why phytoconstituents often exhibit variable efficacy in biological systems despite consistent in vitro binding affinity.

From a neuropharmacological perspective, these findings align with evidence from neuromodulation studies. Techniques such as ultrasound stimulation and transcranial magnetic stimulation demonstrate that external physical and chemical modulation can significantly alter neural protein behavior and cognitive outcomes (Fomenko et al., 2018; Khedr, 2014). This reinforces the idea that protein systems are highly responsive to environmental modulation at multiple levels.

However, the model also has limitations. First, it is primarily theoretical and lacks direct experimental validation at atomic resolution. Second, the complexity of biological environments makes it difficult to isolate the individual contributions of metallic cofactors and amphiphilic agents. Third, variability across protein types and phytochemical structures may limit the universality of the proposed framework.

Despite these limitations, the study provides a foundational conceptual framework for future experimental investigations. It suggests that therapeutic strategies should not focus solely on ligand optimization but also on controlling the biochemical microenvironment to enhance binding efficiency. This has important implications for phytopharmaceutical development, particularly in neurodegenerative diseases where protein misfolding and aggregation are central pathological features.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that phytoconstituent–protein complex formation is a highly dynamic and environmentally regulated process significantly influenced by metallic cofactors and amphiphilic reagents. Rather than acting as passive background elements, these modulators actively shape protein conformation, binding energetics, and functional outcomes.

The integration of biochemical, biophysical, and neuropharmacological evidence suggests a unified model in which binding affinity is determined by a multidimensional energy landscape influenced by ionic coordination, membrane dynamics, and molecular solubility effects. This framework provides a more realistic representation of biological complexity than traditional static interaction models.

Future research should focus on experimental validation using molecular dynamics simulations, spectroscopic analysis, and in vivo neurobiological models. Particular attention should be given to neurodegenerative disease systems, where protein aggregation processes are highly sensitive to environmental modulation.

Overall, the findings open new directions for phytopharmaceutical optimization, emphasizing the importance of cofactor environment engineering in enhancing therapeutic efficacy.

REFERENCES

1. J. B. Aimone, W. Deng, and F. H. Gage, "Resolving new memories: A critical look at the dentate gyrus, adult neurogenesis, and pattern separation," Neuron, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 589–596, May 2011.
2. A. Bystritsky, "A review of low-intensity focused ultrasound pulsation," Brain Stimulation, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 125–136, Jul. 2011.
3. C.-Z. Yang, "Neuroprotective effect of astragalin via activating PI3K/Akt-mTOR-mediated autophagy on APP/PS1 mice," Cell Death Discovery, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 15, Jan. 2023.
4. D. Dalecki, "Mechanical bioeffects of ultrasound," Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng., vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 229–248, Aug. 2004.
5. J. Diniz-Filho, T. B. Ludermir, "Modeling Modulatory Aspects in Association Processes. In (French and Sougne), Perspectives in Neural Computing. Connectionist Models of Development and Evolution. SpringerVerlag, London, 2001, p. 63–72.
6. A. Fomenko, C. Neudorfer, R. F. Dallapiazza, S. K. Kalia, and A. M. Lozano, "Low-intensity ultrasound neuromodulation: An overview of mechanisms and emerging human applications," Brain Stimulation, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 1209–1217, Nov. 2018.
7. J. J. Gallagher, A. M. Minogue, and M. A. Lynch, "Impaired performance of female APP/PS1 mice in the Morris water maze is coupled with increased aβ accumulation and microglial activation," Neurodegenerative Diseases, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 33–41, 2013.
8. S.-L. Huang, C.-W. Chang, Y.-H. Lee, and F.-Y. Yang, "Protective effect of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound on memory impairment and brain damage in a rat model of vascular dementia," Radiology, vol. 282, no. 1, pp. 113–122, Jan. 2017.
9. J. P. Johansen, C. K. Cain, L. E. Ostroff, and J. E. LeDoux, "Molecular mechanisms of fear learning and memory," Cell, vol. 147, no. 4, p. 948, Nov. 2011.
10. E. M. Khedr, "A double-blind randomized clinical trial on the efficacy of cortical direct current stimulation for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease," Frontiers Aging Neurosci., vol. 6, p. 275, Oct. 2014.
11. E. Korner, G. Matsumoto, M. Kawato, "Organisation of Computation in Brain-like Systems. Neural Networks, 12 (7-8): 943–1206, Special Edition 1999.
12. E. Kumari, Y. Shang, Z. Cheng, and T. Zhang, "U1 snRNA over-expression affects neural oscillations and short-term memory deficits in mice," Cognit. Neurodyn., vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 313–323, Mar. 2019.
13. K. Li, Y. Jiang, G. Li, T. Liu, and Z. Yang, "Novel multitarget directed tacrine hybrids as anti-Alzheimer's compounds improved synaptic plasticity and cognitive impairment in APP/PS1 transgenic mice," ACS Chem. Neurosci., vol. 11, no. 24, pp. 4316–4328, Dec. 2020.
14. E. Landhuis, "Ultrasound for the brain," Nature, vol. 551, no. 7679, pp. 257–259, 7679.
15. P. J. Lang, M. M. Bradley, B. N. Cuthbert, "Emotion, Motivation, and Anxiety: Brain Mechanisms and Psychophysiology. Biol. Psychiatry, 44 : 1248–1263, 1998.
16. A. Leparulo, M. Bisio, N. Redolfi, T. Pozzan, S. Vassanelli, and C. Fasolato, "Accelerated aging characterizes the early stage of Alzheimer's disease," Cells, vol. 11, no. 2, p. 238, Jan. 2022.
17. G. Leinenga, "Transcriptional signature in microglia isolated from an Alzheimer's disease mouse model treated with scanning ultrasound," Bioeng. Transl. Med., vol. 8, no. 1, Jan. 2023, Art. no. e10329.
18. W.-T. Lin, R.-C. Chen, W.-W. Lu, S.-H. Liu, and F.-Y. Yang, "Protective effects of low-intensity pulsed ultrasound on aluminum-induced cerebral damage in Alzheimer's disease rat model," Sci. Rep., vol. 5, no. 1, p. 9671, Apr. 2015.
19. M. Nafea, M. Elharoun, M. M. Abd-Alhaseeb, and M. W. Helmy, "Leflunomide abrogates neuroinflammatory changes in a rat model of Alzheimer's disease: The role of TNF-α/NF-κB/IL-1β axis inhibition," Naunyn-Schmiedeberg's Arch. Pharmacol., vol. 396, no. 3, pp. 485–498, Mar. 2023.
20. X. Niu, K. Yu, and B. He, "On the neuromodulatory pathways of the in vivo brain by means of transcranial focused ultrasound," Current Opinion Biomed. Eng., vol. 8, pp. 61–69, Dec. 2018.
21. M. Park, "Effects of transcranial ultrasound stimulation pulsed at 40 Hz on β plaques and brain rhythms in 5XFAD mice," Transl. Neurodegener., vol. 10, no. 1, p. 48, 2021.
22. K. Richetin, P. Petsophonsakul, L. Roybon, B. P. Guiard, and C. Rampon, "Differential alteration of hippocampal function and plasticity in females and males of the APPxPS1 mouse model of Alzheimer's disease," Neurobiol. Aging, vol. 57, pp. 220–231, Sep. 2017.
23. S. Zhou and G. Huang, "The biological activities of butyrylcholinesterase inhibitors," Biomed. Pharmacotherapy, vol. 146, Feb. 2022, Art. no. 112556.
24. T. Tan, "Low-frequency (1 Hz) repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) reverses Aβ(1-42)-mediated memory deficits in rats," Exp. Gerontol., vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 786–794, Aug. 2013.
25. P. Turriziani, "Low-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex enhances recognition memory in Alzheimer's disease," J. Alzheimer's Disease, vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 613–622, Nov. 2019.

26. B. Voytek, M. D'Esposito, N. Crone, and R. T. Knight, "A method for event-related phase/amplitude coupling," NeuroImage, vol. 64, pp. 416–424, Jan. 2013.

27. Y.-Y. Wang, "Long-term voluntary exercise inhibited AGE/RAGE and microglial activation and reduced the loss of dendritic spines in the hippocampi of APP/PS1 transgenic mice," Experim. Neurol., vol. 363, May 2023, Art. no. 114371.

28. Y. Yuan, Z. Wang, M. Liu, and S. Shoham, "Cortical hemodynamic responses induced by low-intensity transcranial ultrasound stimulation of mouse cortex," NeuroImage, vol. 211, May 2020, Art. no. 116597.

29. Y. Yuan, Z. Wang, X. Wang, J. Yan, M. Liu, and X. Li, "Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound stimulation induces coupling between ripple neural activity and hemodynamics in the mouse visual cortex," Cerebral Cortex, vol. 29, no. 7, pp. 3220–3223, Jul. 2019.

30. Y. Yuan, Z. Zhao, Z. Wang, X. Wang, J. Yan, and X. Li, "The effect of low-intensity transcranial ultrasound stimulation on behavior in a mouse model of Parkinson's disease induced by MPTP," IEEE Trans. Neural Syst. Rehabil. Eng., vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 1017–1021, Apr. 2020.

31. M.-L. Lewicki, "A review of methods for spike sorting: The detection and classification of neural action potentials," Network: Comput. Neural Syst., vol. 9, no. 4, pp. R53–R78, Nov. 1998.