Investigation of the pathogenic agent in a *Drosophila* model of polyglutamine disease

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, March 2006

Catherine McLeod, B. Sc. (Biomed.) (Hons.)

School of Molecular and Biomedical Sciences, Discipline of Genetics

Centre for the Molecular Genetics of Development,

Adelaide University

Table of Contents

Index of Figures and Tables	V
Declaration	VII
Acknowledgements	ΙX
Abstract	ΧI
Chapter 1 – Background Literature	1
Repeat Expansion Diseases	1
Polyglutamine diseases	2
Toxicity of expanded polyglutamine	7
Mouse models of Polyglutamine Disease	7
Drosophila models of polyglutamine disease	11
Nuclear Aggregates	12
One pathogenic pathway or many?	16
Alternative hypothesis: pathogenic polyalanine	18
Untranslated repeats	20
RNA Pathogenesis	24
Animal models of untranslated repeat disorders	27
Hypothesis:	
RNA as a unifying pathogenic agent in expanded repeat diseases	28
Approach: use of the <i>Drosophila</i> eye as a model	36
Chapter 2 – Materials and Methods	39
Materials	39
Methods	42
Chapter 3 – Investigation of RNA pathogenesis	51
Introduction	51
Results	52
Discussion	65
Chapter 4 – Investigation of alternative pathogenic pathways	73
Introduction	73
A. DNA damage hypotheses	73
B. Axon transport hypothesis	80

Results	83
Discussion	91
Chapter 5 – RNA Pathogenesis Revisited	95
Introduction	95
Results	96
Discussion	113
Chapter 6 – Discussion	119
Summary of Results	119
Implications for polyglutamine pathogenesis	120
Is Drosophila an appropriate model for polyglutamine disease?	122
A Drosophila model of RNA-mediated neurodegeneration	124
Future Experiments	125
References	128

Index of Figures and Tables

Table 1.1	Polyglutamine diseases described to date	2
Table 1.2	Diseases caused by expansion of untranslated triplet repeats	21
Figure 1.1	Pathogenic thresholds for the untranslated repeat diseases	
	roughly overlap the pathogenic threshold for the polyglutamine	
	diseases	31
Figure 1.2	Appearance and structure of the <i>Drosophila</i> eye	38
Figure 1.3	Effect of polyglutamine peptide expression in the <i>Drosophila</i> eye	39
Figure 3.1	Schematic representation of repeat constructs	53
Figure 3.2	Secondary structure predictions for CAG and CAA repeats	55
Figure 3.3	Effect of expressing various repeat constructs on the external	
	appearance of the <i>Drosophila</i> eye	56
Figure 3.4	Effect of expressing expanded repeats in the <i>Drosophila</i> eye	
	driven by GMR-GAL4 varies between lines	57
Figure 3.5	Expression of (CAG) ₅₂ in the <i>Drosophila</i> eye causes loss of	
	pigment and photoreceptor neurons	58
Figure 3.6	Distribution of polyglutamine proteins in the <i>Drosophila</i> eye	59
Figure 3.7	Expression levels of translated and untranslated CAG	
	repeat transcripts	61
Figure 3.8	Effect of GCA and CTG repeat constructs on the external	
	appearance of the <i>Drosophila</i> eye	62
Figure 3.9	The GCA repeat transcript is expressed at similar levels	
	to the translated and untranslated CAG repeat transcripts	63
Figure 3.10	Polyalanine proteins cannot be detected by western blot	64
Figure 3.11	Polyleucine proteins cannot be detected by western blot	65
Figure 3.12	Potection of polyalanine and polyleucine proteins in the	
	Drosophila eye	.67
Table 4.1	Mutations in DNA repair genes tested for modification of	
	the polyglutamine eye phenotype	80
Table 4.2	Alleles of axon transport pathway components tested for	
	enhancement of polyglutamine eye phenotype	84
Figure 4.1	Mutation of genes involved in DNA repair does not visibly	
	affect the polyglutamine eye phenotype	87

Figure 4.2	Mutation of genes involved in DNA repair does not visibly	
	affect a milder polyglutamine eye phenotype	89
Figure 4.3	Mutation of genes involved in axon transport does not visibly	
	affect the polyglutamine eye phenotype	91
Figure 4.4	Severe and mild polyglutamine eye phenotypes can be	
	modified by manipulation of Hsp70 activity	92
Figure 4.5	The polyglutamine eye phenotype is not modified by	
	previously described enhancers of the ataxin-1 phenotype	93
Figure 5.1	Schematic representation of repeat constructs	96
Figure 5.2	Expression of rCUG in the <i>Drosophila</i> eye causes a rough	
	eye phenotype in two out of 14 lines	97
Figure 5.3	Effect of expressing two copies of untranslated repeat	
	transcripts in the <i>Drosophila</i> eye	99
Figure 5.4	Effect of expressing RNA repeat transcripts in the	
	Drosophila eye driven by GMR-GAL4 varies between lines	101
Figure 5.5	Read through products containing an expanded repeat	
	cannot be detected by western blot	102
Figure 5.6	Effect of expression of repeat-containing transcripts	
	on the <i>Drosophila</i> eye before and after ageing	106
Figure 5.7	Distribution of Hsp70 in the eye of <i>Drosophila</i> expressing	
	translated or untranslated repeat transcripts	109
Figure 5.8	Modulation of Hsp70 activity modifies the rCAG	
	and rCUG phenotypes	111
Figure 5.9	Expression of the apoptotic inhibitor p35 has a modest	
	effect on the rCAG and rCUG phenotypes	.112

Declaration

This work contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Catherine McLeod

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Rob Richards, for all of his great ideas and for giving me independence, as well as the occasional nudge along when I needed it. Thanks also to Louise O'Keefe, second supervisor and fly expert, for helpful discussions and advice. Thanks to Volkan Evci and Jo Milverton for doing the microinjections to generate transgenic flies. Finally, thanks to the members of the Richards lab for providing input, as well as support and a fun place to work.

Abstract

A substantial body of evidence supports the identity of polyglutamine as the pathogenic agent in a variety of human neurodegenerative diseases (some of which are clinically indistinguishable from the polyglutamine diseases) that are due to expanded repeats that cannot encode polyglutamine. As polyglutamine cannot be the pathogenic agent in these diseases, either the different disorders have distinct pathogenic pathways or some other common agent is toxic in all of the expanded repeat diseases. Recently, evidence has been presented in support of RNA as the pathogenic agent in Fragile X- associated tremor/ataxia syndrome (FXTAS), caused by expanded CGG repeats at the FRAXA locus. A Drosophila model of FXTAS, in which 90 copies of the CGG repeat are expressed in an untranslated region of RNA, exhibits both neurodegeneration and similar molecular pathology to the polyglutamine diseases. Therefore the identity of the pathogenic agent in a Drosophila model of the polyglutamine diseases was explored. This included examining the possibility that RNA mediates the disease phenotype by expression of repeat constructs including expanded CAA and CAG repeats and an untranslated CAG repeat. Alternative putative pathogenic mechanisms including polyalanine toxicity, DNA damage and axonal blockage were also examined. The results obtained support the identity of polyglutamine as the pathogenic agent in this *Drosophila* model of polyglutamine disease. However, additional preliminary results were obtained suggesting that repeat-containing RNA expressed at a sufficiently high level can exert a toxic effect. The phenotype induced by repeat-containing RNA in *Drosophila* is milder than the polyglutamine phenotype, characterised by degeneration and shows cell type-specificity. Thus, although in this *Drosophila* model, polyglutamine toxicity appears to occur in the absence of a contribution by RNA, the possibility that it contributes towards pathogenesis in the human diseases cannot be ruled out.