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Abstract

Mutations in spinster, a late-endosomal/lysosomal protein have been shown to cause overgrowth of the Drosophila neuromuscular junction, coupled with impaired synaptic transmission (Sweeney and Davies, 2002). Oxidative stress is implicated in many neurodegenerative disorders; however, its effects on development are still unclear.

In this thesis, it is shown that oxidative stress is implicated in the development of the spinster phenotype; overgrowth of the NMJ is rescued by over-expression of superoxide-dismutase (SOD) and catalase, components of the anti-oxidant defence system. Overgrowth can also be caused by oxidative stress in the absence of lysosomal dysfunction; synapse overgrowth is also observed in mutants defective for protection from ROS, and animals subjected to excessive ROS.

The data shown here also indicate that spinster and oxidative stress induced overgrowth requires ASK/JNK/AP-1 signalling pathways, attenuating ASK/JNK/AP-1 activity reduces overgrowth. Genes required for autophagy (Atg1 and Atg18) are also required for overgrowth, thus it is suggested that autophagy and JNK signalling are linked in NMJ development and dysregulated JNK/AP-1 signalling is involved in the generation of the neuronal phenotype observed in spinster.

spinster and oxidative stress mutants also have impaired physiology showing reduced crawling speed and impaired synaptic transmission. AMPK is also required for spinster overgrowth, suggesting an energy deficit, supported by the presence of aberrant mitochondria.
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1. Introduction

The main aim of this investigation is to elucidate the effects of oxidative stress on synapse development. Oxidative stress can be broadly defined as an imbalance between the oxidant and reductive capacity of the cell, in favour of pro-oxidants. Oxidative stress occurs when generation of reaction oxygen species (ROS) overcome the reductive capacity of the cell (Sies, 1997). This leads to increased cellular damage and activation of the cellular stress response. This is an interesting area for research as little is currently known about how oxidative stress impinges on neuronal development. ROS are important signalling molecules throughout physiology, and are used to signal developmental changes (Vieira et al., 2011) and are important in immune responses (E.g. Tennenberg et al., 1993) and long term potentiation (Klann et al., 1998); they are also implicated in a vast number of pathologies, most notably in neurodegenerative diseases (Buhmann et al., 2004). This means that when ROS levels are increased they can act as highly potent signalling molecules leading to aberrant activation of signalling pathways, in addition to cellular damage. ROS are potent and far-reaching in their damaging effects and require close regulation, consequently there is a well-characterised stress response mounted by the cell upon detection of pathological levels of ROS.

1.1. Oxidative Stress

1.1.1. Reactive Oxygen Species

There are a number of ROS that are produced within the cell, including the principal ROS, superoxide anions (O$_2^-$), hydrogen peroxide (H$_2$O$_2$), hydroxyl radicals (OH$^-$) and hydroxyl anions (OH$^-$). Generally, ROS formation begins with the generation of superoxide anions. These are formed by the addition of an electron to molecular oxygen. They are highly unstable molecules and rapidly dismutate to form hydrogen peroxide. This reaction is catalysed by superoxide
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dismutase (SOD) (McCord and Fridovich, 1968 and 1969a and b), which allows this reaction to occur 10000x faster than in the absence of the enzyme. Hydrogen peroxide is not a radical although it is still highly reactive and in the presence of superoxide anions accepts electrons from transition metals to produce hydroxyl radicals (OH) and hydroxyl anions (OH\(^-\)), a process termed the Fenton reaction (Fe\(^{2+}\) + H\(_2\)O\(_2\) → Fe\(^{3+}\) + OH\(^-\) + OH\(^{-}\)).

Figure 1.1. The addition of electrons to oxygen
Molecular oxygen O\(_2\) is reduced to superoxide anions O\(_2\)\(^-\). Addition of a further electron in the presence of hydrogen produces hydrogen peroxide (H\(_2\)O\(_2\)). This is further reduced to form hydroxyl radicals and hydroxyl anions (OH\(^-\) and OH\(^{-}\) respectively).

1.1.2. Generation of ROS

ROS are a natural by-product of normal cellular metabolism; the most notable source is believed to be mitochondrial respiration. There are also many other sources of ROS within the cell (reviewed by Brown and Borutaite, 2011) including peroxisomes, the endoplasmic reticulum, nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide phosphate (NADPHs) (McNally et al., 2003; reviewed in Bedard et al., 2007) and xanthine oxidase (Gonzalez-Mateos et al., 2004). Some ROS are generated as a by-product but they are also produced as signalling molecules.
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1.1.2.1. Mitochondrial Generation of ROS

Mitochondria are oval shaped organelles approximately 1-2µm long and 0.5-1µm wide, with inner and outer membranes that form two compartments; firstly the intercristal space, between the outer and inner membrane, otherwise known as the intermembrane space and secondly the matrix, enclosed by the inner membrane; the matrix is also known as the intermembrane space (Palade, 1953). During mitochondrial respiration electrons are donated from electron donors such as nicotinamide adenine nucleotide (NADH) and FADH$_2$ and are transferred along the mitochondrial electron transport chain (ETC) between electron carriers, complexes I-IV, located in the inner membrane. The final electron acceptor is O$_2$, the most electronegative acceptor in the chain. Transfer of electrons along the ETC releases energy and these exergenic steps are coupled with the transport of protons into the intermembrane space to create a proton gradient. The flow of protons down the concentration gradient, back into the matrix provides the free energy for the production of ATP from ADP, through the actions of ATP synthase, otherwise known as complex V (Lehninger Chap 19)(Fig. 1.2). Electrons can leak prematurely from the electron transport chain to bind to O$_2$ to form O$_2^−$ (Fig 1.3) (Boveris and Chance, 1973).

Ordinarily, the electron carrier NADH donates electrons to complex I, NADH dehydrogenase, which transfers the electrons to the lipophilic electron shuttling molecule coenzyme Q (ubiquinone). This process is coupled to transport of H$^+$ into the intermembrane space. Coenzyme Q also receives electrons from complex II, succinate dehydrogenase, which oxidises succinate via FAD. Succinate is a Kreb’s/ citric acid cycle intermediate. This process is not coupled to the movement of H$^+$. Therefore, e− entering the ETC at this point yields less free energy. Coenzyme Q is freely diffusible within the membrane and transports electrons to complex III, coenzyme QH$_2$-cytochrome c reductase. Electron transfer is coupled to proton movement into the intermembrane space.
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Electrons are transported along the electron transport chain, protons are transported across the inner mitochondrial membrane into the intermembrane space creating a proton gradient. Protons are transported back across the membrane through complex V of the mitochondrial transport chain, ATPase, converting ADP to ATP.

At complex III electrons are transferred from coenzyme Q to cytochrome c, another electron shuttling molecule, which binds to the outer face of the inner membrane and transports electrons to complex IV, cytochrome oxidase. Complex IV, cytochrome c oxidase transfers electrons to $O_2$, which together with
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H\(^+\) results in the formation of water; once more this transfer of electron coincides with the movement of protons into the intermembrane space. The electrochemical gradient is harnessed by ATP synthase, which comprises two components F\(_0\) and F\(_1\). F\(_0\) acts as a proton channel, through which protons flow from the intermembrane space to the matrix, down the electrochemical gradient. This drives the rotation of F\(_1\) which catalyses the synthesis of ADP from ATP. This process is termed oxidative phosphorylation.

ROS are produced when electron transfer to oxygen results in the generation of superoxide anions (O\(_2^-\)). Traditionally it is reported that 1-2% oxygen molecules used in mitochondria are converted to superoxide anions (Boveris and Chance 1973), however this is most likely an overestimation as, this figure was derived from isolated mitochondria in the presence of a complex III toxin (antimycin) with saturated levels of substrate and oxygen. More recent estimations put the figure at 0.15% oxygen being converted to superoxide anions (St-Pierre et al., 2002).

ROS formation was originally identified at two points of the electron transport chain; in an unknown site of complex I and coenzyme Q at complex III (Turrens and Boveris, 1980; Turrens et al., 1985, Cadenas et al., 1977). Subsequently, more sites of ROS generation have been identified, although none are fully characterised, and the relative contribution of each site is likely to be tissue and species specific. There is evidence to support the presence of two ROS producing sites in complex I, the ubiquinone binding site and the flavin mononucleotide group (FMN) (Liu et al., 2002). Succinate linked ROS generation is inhibited by rotenone, a complex I inhibitor, suggesting ROS production actually occurs via reversed electron transfer between succinate and NAD\(^+\) to form NADH (Liu et al., 2002), however there is still much debate concerning ROS production at complex I (reviewed by Andreyev et al., 2005).
1. Introduction

Figure 1.3 The mitochondrial respiratory chain can leak electrons to create superoxide anions.
As electrons are transported along the electron transport chain, leaking can occur resulting in the formation of superoxide anions. Rotenone and paraquat are two electotoxins that increase the rate of superoxide anion formation. Rotenone acts at complex I whereas paraquat acts at complex I and complex III.

1.1.2.2. Non-mitochondrial sources of ROS

Although mitochondria are commonly accepted to be the greatest producers of ROS within the cell it has also been suggested that non-mitochondrial sources of ROS could contribute more to ROS production than previously thought, dependent on cell type (Brown and Borutaite, 2011). There are many non-mitochondrial sources of ROS, for example the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) (Liu et al., 2004; Park et al., 2010), peroxisomes, cytosolic enzymes and plasma membrane bound enzymes. In the ER the main sources of ROS are p450 (Bondy and Naderi, 1994) enzymes and ERO1 (Tu et al., 2002). Cytochrome p450 enzymes are heme-thiolate enzymes that form part of the membrane-bound microsomal monooxygenase system (MMO), located in the ER, where lipophilic substrates are oxidised (Capedevila et al., 1981; for review see Zanger et al., 2004). Superoxide anions are formed when the electrons are transferred to oxygen rather than the substrate, and it has been indicated that this route may contribute to ROS generation in vivo (Kuthan and Ullrich, 1982).
Furthermore the ER requires an oxidising environment to allow the formation of disulphide bonds (Hwang et al., 1992; reviewed Gaut and Hendershot, 1993). ERO1, a thiol oxidase enzyme catalyses the formation of disulphide bonds in the ER (Tu et al., 2002). Electrons are transferred from dithiols to molecular oxygen yielding hydrogen peroxide (Gross et al., 2006).

Peroxisomes, single membrane bound organelles, are an important site of ROS generation (Boveris et al., 1972). Peroxisomes break down long chain fatty acids, whereby β-oxidation of fatty acids occurs resulting in the shortening of fatty acids and conversion to acetyl CoA, to enter the citric acid cycle and provide energy for the cell. Therefore in the peroxisome hydrogen peroxide is produced as organic substrates are oxidised:

\[ RH_2 + O_2 \rightarrow R + H_2O_2 \]

Peroxidation of subsequent substrates occurs, through the actions of catalase, as it uses hydrogen peroxide to oxidise further substrates, in the process, turning reactive hydrogen peroxide into less harmful water:

\[ H_2O_2 + R'H_2 \rightarrow R' + H_2O \]

Excess hydrogen peroxide is broken down by catalase to produce oxygen and water (Albert et al., 2008).

Membrane-bound NADPH oxidases, such as nitric oxide synthase, catalyse the formation of superoxides. NADPH oxidases are activated through assembly in the membrane in the respiratory burst (otherwise termed oxidative burst), where superoxides are released from immune cells to kill bacteria or fungi (Bokock and Knaus, 2003).

Xanthine oxidases (XO) are another source of ROS within the cell (Gonzalez-Mateos et al., 2001). Xanthine oxidases catalyse the oxidation of hypoxanthine
to xanthine and thence to uric acid: hypoxanthine + H$_2$O + O$_2$ → xanthine + H$_2$O$_2$ and xanthine + H$_2$O + O$_2$ → uric acid + H$_2$O$_2$.

1.1.3. ROS and Iron/Transition Metals

Transition metals are essential for most forms of aerobic life, but they are also dangerous pro-oxidants, especially iron. The role of iron in oxidative stress is an important one (Missirlis et al., 2003; Kurz et al., 2008a and b) as iron is the most abundant transition metal in the body and is essential for the function of many enzymes. Iron can undergo the Fenton reaction with hydrogen peroxide to generate hydroxyl anions and hydroxyl radicals:

$$\text{Fe}^{2+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{3+} + \text{HO}^- + \text{OH}^-$$

Furthermore, iron can potentiate lipid peroxidation (Gutteridge, 1982) and catechols such as dopamine can be converted to highly reactive semiquinones (Schipper, 2004a and b). Iron concentration has been shown to increase with age in rats, humans and mice (Cook and Yu, 1998; Sohal et al., 1999; Donahue et al., 2006). Hydrogen peroxide can induce activity of heme-oxygenase-1 (HO-1) increasing degradation of heme thereby liberating more free iron, potentially inducing a vicious cycle. Therefore levels of iron are tightly regulated. Dysregulation of iron metabolism is an important contributor to Alzheimer’s Disease (AD) pathology through the generation of oxidative stress (for review see Puntarulo, 2005).

1.1.4. Oxidative Stress

Oxidative stress has been implicated in the aetiology of numerous pathologies, including many neurodegenerative disorders such as Alzheimer’s disease (Papolla et al., 1992), Parkinson’s disease (Castellani et al., 1996, Buhmann et al., 2004), Creutzfeldt–Jakob Disease (Arlt et al., 2002) and lysosomal storage disorders (Deganuto et al., 2007, Fu et al., 2010). ROS are natural by-products of many cellular processes, most notably mitochondrial respiration (Loschen et
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*al., 1971; Boveris* *et al.,* 1972). Low levels of ROS are required as cell-signalling molecules in many processes including long-term potentiation (LTP), the biological correlate of learning and memory (Bindokas *et al.,* 1996; Klann *et al.,* 1998), differentiation (Vieira *et al.,* 2011) and cytokine secretion (Kina *et al.,* 2009). ROS are involved in neutrophil recruitment and lymphocyte activation, key to the immune response (Smith and Ford, 1983; Marriott *et al.,* 2008; Reth *et al.,* 2002). ROS have also been implicated in autoimmune conditions including inflammatory bowel diseases (Leiper *et al.,* 2001). ROS are normally maintained at these low physiological levels by a system of ROS scavengers, otherwise termed anti-oxidants. The balance between the generation and neutralisation of ROS is normally tightly regulated; oxidative stress occurs when the generation of ROS overpowers the antioxidant defence system. Oxidative stress can be caused either by increased generation of ROS or impaired neutralisation of ROS. The consequences of oxidative stress comprise two main facets: random cellular damage and the activation of the cellular stress response signalling pathways. Firstly, oxidative stress involves random cellular damage as chain reactions occur causing lipid peroxidation, DNA and protein damage. Secondly, oxidative stress entails the organised cell stress response that can lead to the many different outcomes, such as proliferation, growth arrest or cell death (For review see Barnham *et al.,* 2004).

1.1.5. Oxidative Damage

ROS cause random cellular damage through chain reactions, resulting in the further formation of ROS. Oxidative damage can be defined as “the biomolecular damage caused by attack of reactive species upon the constituents on living organism” (Halliwell and Whiteman, 2004). ROS cause addition of double bonds to DNA bases, with the removal of a hydrogen atom from thymine and deoxyribose. ROS can also cause strand breaks and base and nucleotide modifications, as well as changes in DNA conformation that may cause inaccurate replications. Furthermore, ROS can alter methylation status
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Figure 1.4: Sources of ROS, primary cellular defences, and signalling responses. Reactive oxygen species (ROS) can be generated from various sources in the cytosol or mitochondria. The cell is protected from ROS by superoxide dismutase (SOD), catalase (Cat), thioredoxin reductase (TrxR), glutathione peroxidase (GPx), and Glutathione S-transferase (GST). GSH represents monomeric glutathione, and GSSG represents glutathione disulfide, GSSG is reduced to GSH by glutathione reductase (GR). The cellular response to excessive ROS, via the activation of the ASK/JNK/AP-1 pathway, is autophagy. ASK and JNK are inhibited by reduced thioredoxin and glutathione, respectively, demonstrating that their activation state is directly affected by redox status. JNK/AP-1 activation is known to regulate synaptic responses. ERK is also activated in response to oxidative stress while also known to regulate synapse development through AP-1 and autophagy gene activation. AP-1 has also been implicated in the generation and maintenance of LTP.

resulting in changed gene expression levels (Weitzman et al., 1994). ROS are known to alter protein activity in a number of ways. The presence of ROS can result in changes in oxidation state of transfer metals, vital to protein function. An example of this is aconitase, a constituent of the citric acid cycle, which
contains [Fe₄S₄]²⁺, required for catalytic activity. In the presence of superoxide anions this is converted to [Fe₄S₄]⁺, rendering it inactive (Gardner and Fridovich, 1991b). OH⁻ ions cause H⁺ abstraction, for example of tyrosine, forming tyrosyl radicals, resulting in dityrosine linkages, altering protein structure and activity. Cysteine and methionine are particularly susceptible to oxidation due to their sulphur content, resulting in disulphide cross-linking. This is reversible through the actions of reductases; a built in ROS scavenger mechanism (Berlett and Stadtman, 1997). ROS also oxidatively degrade fatty acids, they react with double bonds of unsaturated fatty acids. This is termed lipid peroxidation and results in the formation of lipid peroxyl radicals, or lipid peroxides. Formation of these species begins a chain reaction resulting in the breakdown of these peroxides resulting in the formation of end products such as 4-hydroxy-2,3-nonenal (HNE) and malondialdehyde (MDA), acrolein and F₂-isoprostanes. These breakdown products can cause further problems, by interacting with DNA (Marnett, 1999).

The initial cause of oxidative stress is often hard to determine due to the positive feedback loop, as the presence of ROS increase their generation. ROS impair mitochondrial function thereby further increasing levels of ROS. ROS also act to destabilise the lysosomal membrane, which can cause lysosomal dysfunction leading to increased ROS generation from the lysosomes, releasing iron from this iron-rich environment (Seehafer and Pearce, 2006; Terman and Brunk, 2006).

1.1.6. Reactive Nitrogen Species

Reactive nitrogen species (RNS) are also another causative component of cellular stress, the stress generated by ROS and RNS together is termed ‘nitrosative stress’ (Reviewed in Knott and Bossy-Wetzel, 2009). Nitric oxide (NO) is a biological messenger, important in neuronal transmission and inflammatory responses (Lipton et al., 1993). It is produced by nitric oxide
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synthase (NOS), which catalyses the formation of NO from arginine and NADPH (Palmer and Johns, 1998). NO acts as a good transient messenger, as it is highly reactive and only persists for a few seconds. It can react with superoxide to form peroxynitrite (ONOO\(^{-}\)). This can react with proteins that require transition metal centres, resulting in protein modification. In mammalian systems there are three NOS isoforms, neuronal nNOS, inducible iNOS and endothelial eNOS (Nelson et al., 2003). In Drosophila there is only one NOS isoform, which is expressed both in the nervous system and elsewhere. NO has been implicated in long term potentiation (Maffei et al., 2003; Hopper et al., 2006), but also in neurodegeneration (Ferrante et al., 1997), showing again how signalling pathways can become pathological in certain situations if activation is not suitably regulated. It is unclear how this signalling system is compartmentalised and controlled to prevent cellular damage.

1.1.7. Cellular Anti-oxidant Systems

In light of the damage ROS can cause it is not surprising that there is a system in place to keep ROS at low physiological levels; the cell’s anti-oxidant defence system. The cell has direct and indirect defences against oxidative stress. Direct defences combat oxidative stress through dissipating reactive oxygen species. The indirect defences constitute cellular signalling responses to increased levels of ROS. There are a number of cellular redox sensors that detect increased levels of ROS and activate intimately coupled anti-oxidant defences. The source and level of the ROS detected determine the response elicited. Drosophila are highly useful for studying these pathways as the mammalian systems are complicated and involve a certain level of redundancy, whereas the system in Drosophila is simpler and therefore easier to study though can still elucidate mechanisms conserved in mammals. Coupled with the short generation time and powerful genetic armoury this makes Drosophila a highly useful tool.
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1.1.7.1. Cellular Anti-Oxidants: Endogenous and Derived

Constitutive anti-oxidant defences are employed to maintain low levels of ROS. These comprise a battery of anti-oxidants to convert harmful reactive oxygen species into relatively harmless products. Halliwell and Gutteridge (1989) defined an anti-oxidant as “any substance that, when present at low concentrations compared with that of an oxidizable substrate, significantly delays or inhibits oxidation of that substrate”. There are a number of ways in which anti-oxidants can be categorised, for example chemical or enzymatic, hydrophilic vs. hydrophobic, whether they are synthesised de novo or absorbed from the diet/atmosphere. They can also be categorised by their method of action, these being prevention, enzymatic diversion/neutralisation, scavenging and quenching. The actions of the anti-oxidant system is complex and must be tightly regulated; as well as low levels being required to prevent harm, ROS are also important signalling molecules, and therefore levels of ROS must be closely monitored and controlled. The main anti-oxidants are superoxide dismutase, which converts superoxide anions to hydrogen peroxide and catalase, thioredoxin and glutathione, which are involved in the conversion of hydrogen peroxide to oxygen and water (Fig. 1.4).

Superoxide dismutase (SOD) is an enzyme that begins the channelling of ROS into relatively harmless products. It catalyses the conversion of superoxide anions, which are highly unstable to the more stable, but diffusible and longer-lived hydrogen peroxide (H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}) (McCord and Fridovich, 1968 and 1969). There are three main families of SOD depending on the metal ion used as a cofactor in the conversion of superoxide to hydrogen peroxide. In Drosophila there are only two SOD isoforms. SOD1, otherwise known as SOD [Cu-Zn] is predominantly cytosolic, but also found in the mitochondrial intermembrane space, the mitochondrial periplasm (Missirlis et al., 2003). It functions as a homodimer (Kirkland and Phillips, 1987). SOD2, otherwise known as SOD [Mn], acts predominantly in the mitochondria in eukaryotes. SOD2 is found as
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homotetramers in the mitochondrial matrix, where each subunit is bound to its cofactor Mn (Duttaroy et al., 1994 and 1997). In higher animals there is a third SOD orthologue, SOD3, otherwise known as EcSOD, due to its extracellular localisation. Unlike the other SOD isoforms, which are ubiquitously expressed, SOD3 shows specific-tissue localisation (Fattman et al., 2003).

Hydrogen peroxide, produced by the action of SOD, is then enzymatically degraded to, relatively harmless, oxygen (O\textsubscript{2}) and water (H\textsubscript{2}O) through the actions of catalase (May, 1901). Catalase contains an Fe\textsuperscript{3+} at its active site, as do many peroxidases. The reaction occurs in two steps that are dependent on Fe\textsuperscript{3+}. One molecule of hydrogen peroxide binds and is split apart, water is released and oxygen is bound to Fe\textsuperscript{3+} to combine with a second hydrogen peroxide molecule to form another water molecule and oxygen gas. Hydrogen peroxide can also be degraded by the thiol-reducing systems involving either thioredoxin or glutathione. Thiols are compounds that contain a carbon-bonded sulphydryl, this acts as a reducing agent, which can be reversibly oxidised and reduced (Sies, 1997). Thioredoxin is oxidised during the degradation of hydrogen peroxide and is then reduced by thioredoxin reductase, using electrons donated from NADPH. Breakdown of hydrogen peroxide using glutathione requires the actions of glutathione peroxidase (Mills, 1957). Oxidised glutathione is then reduced by glutathione reductase, to regenerate reduced glutathione, once again using NADPH as an electron donor. Glutathione S-transferases are also important in anti-oxidant defence, they catalyse the conjugation of lipophilic substrates with reduced glutathione (Sheehan et al., 2001); the conjugates are more easily excreted.

In addition to this directed enzymatically driven degradation of ROS, there are many molecules that act in a similar way to glutathione and theioredoxin, collectively termed ROS scavengers. There are many non-enzymatic ROS scavengers some obtained from the diet and some are synthesised. Examples of these include $\alpha$-tocopherol (vitamin E), ascorbic acid (vitamin C), $\beta$-carotene,
uric acid and melatonin. α-tocopherol is the most widely studied vitamin E, and is a very important lipid-soluble antioxidant. Tocopherol reacts with lipid radicals preventing the propagation of further radicals; it can then be recycled by being reduced by other anti-oxidants, such as ascorbic acid (Brigelius-Flohe and Traber, 1999). Ascorbic acid is a redox catalyst, it is oxidised by free-radicals and consequently becomes a free radical itself, however the ascorbyl radical formed is relatively stable and unreactive. Upon the loss of another electron dehydroascorbic acid is formed, both ascorbyl radical and dehydroascorbic acid can be reduced or metabolised (Reviewed in Paddayatty et al., 2003). Another antioxidant is melatonin, which cannot undergo redox cycling, and has hence been termed a terminal anti-oxidant; upon oxidation it forms stable products. There exists an orchestration to this multifaceted protection system. Expression of SOD alone would generate a burden of hydrogen peroxide. The balance of antioxidants must therefore be tightly regulated if efficient protection from oxidative stress is to be achieved. Upon increased levels of ROS these responses need to be upregulated and this is performed by cellular signalling pathways indirectly combating oxidative stress by upregulating the direct defences and can lead to a vast array of cellular outcomes, including apoptosis, proliferation, growth arrest etc.

1.1.7.2. Cellular Signalling in Response to Oxidative Stress

ROS activate the cell’s stress response mechanism, that is to say there are sensors in place to detect increased levels of ROS, which, in turn, activate the cellular stress response. These responses entail the activation of MAPK signalling pathways including extracellular signal regulated kinase (ERK), p38 mitogen activated kinase (p38MAPK) c-Jun N-terminal kinase (JNK) signalling cascades (Reviewed in Davis, 2000; Paul et al., 1997).

JNK was originally identified as a stress activated kinase (Hibi et al., 1993; Derijard et al., 1994). It forms the central point of an important signalling cascade, allowing the cell to respond to a variety of intracellular and extracellular
cues; and one that will form a main focus of this investigation. It has been shown to be activated in response to ROS and differentially been shown to both promote (Tournier et al., 2000) and prevent (Minami et al., 1999) apoptosis. JNK contains a Thr-Pro-Tyr motif, when JNK is activated it undergoes dual phosphorylation of threonine and tyrosine. This phosphorylation level is controlled by upstream kinase activity (See table 1). Directly upstream of JNK are two JNKK, hemipterous (hep)/MKK7 and MKK4 (Tournier et al., 1999). MKK7 has been implicated in oxidative stress responses in both Drosophila and mammals. Overexpression of MKK7 in Drosophila neurons confers increased resistance to paraquat toxicity (Wang et al., 2003). In addition to this, mutations in JNK or MKK7 result in increased sensitivity to paraquat, an electrototoxin used to generate oxidative stress in animal models, further indicative of their protective role. There is a further expansion in the number of molecules at the level upstream of this; there are at least 6 JNKKKs in Drosophila and mammals. Apoptosis signal regulating kinase (ASK) is a JNKKK (Drosophila orthologue also termed Pk92B) that is activated in response to oxidative stress to drive apoptosis (Wassarman et al., 1996; Kuranaga et al., 2002; Cha et al., 2005). Wallenda has been implicated in regeneration following axonal injury although a role in the oxidative stress response has not been confirmed (Xiong et al., 2010). Upstream of these many JNKKK is the JNKKKK, termed misshapen in Drosophila. The mammalian orthologues are MINK, NIK/HGK, and TNIK.

JNK activity is tightly regulated by its upstream signalling components, though the components through which specificity is maintained are not fully understood. In addition to this JNK has a vast number of targets including activator protein-1 (AP-1). This is a dileucine zipper transcription factor formed of dimers of Fos and Jun (kayak and jun-related-antigen respectively in Drosophila). Upon phosphorylation of AP-1 its activity is upregulated leading to increased transcription of targets of AP-1 such as sulfiredoxin (Wei et al., 2008b). Biochemical and genetic data both suggest that, although in mammals only Jun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Drosophila Gene</th>
<th>Mammalian Orthologue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JNKKKK</td>
<td>misshapen (msn)</td>
<td>MINK, NIK/HGK, TNIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNKKK</td>
<td>Pk92B</td>
<td>ASK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tak1</td>
<td>TAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tak12</td>
<td>TAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slipper (slpr)</td>
<td>MLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wallenda (wnd)</td>
<td>DLK, ZPK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mekk1</td>
<td>MEKK1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNK</td>
<td>hemipterous (hep)</td>
<td>M KK7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mkk4</td>
<td>M KK4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNK</td>
<td>basket (bsk)</td>
<td>JNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription Factor</td>
<td>jra</td>
<td>JUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kayak (kay)</td>
<td>FOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Components of the JNK signalling cascade**

There are a number of ways in which JNK signalling pathway activity is determined by redox state using redox regulatory proteins such as thioredoxin (Trx). Trx has redox-sensitive cysteine residues within its active centre. Reduced Trx binds to, and inhibits, ASK-1, thus limiting activation of downstream MAPKs. Oxidative stress, hence the oxidation of Trx, results in the dissociation of this complex, activating ASK-1 (Saitoh *et al*., 1998).

The activation of JNK under conditions of oxidative stress is also enhanced by reducing the interaction between JNK and glutathione S-transferase (GSTp). When reduced GSHp monomers inhibit JNK, whereas under cellular stress dimers and multimers can form, which are no longer capable of binding JNK; thus oxidative stress results in the disinhibition of JNK (Adler *et al*., 1999). Although originally identified as a stress response, JNK signalling has been shown to be crucial in learning and memory, and furthermore a role in the
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development of the nervous system (Sanyal et al., 2002 and 2003). AP-1 activity is also modified directly depending on redox potential, depending on the oxidation state of certain cysteine residues. Upon oxidation AP-1 is no longer able to bind DNA, and thus can no longer act as a transcription factor. There are, however, mechanisms in place to preserve AP-1 activity by maintaining its reduced state and thus its ability to bind DNA. Firstly, multiprotein bridging factor-1 (MBF1) prevents oxidation by interacting with the basic region of Jun and inhibiting S-cystenal cystenylation (Jindra et al., 2004). Secondly, the nuclear protein redox factor 1 (Ref-1), originally identified as DNA base pair exision repair and so-called apurinic/apyramidic endonuclease (APE-1) reduces oxidised AP-1 thus reactivating it. Ref-1 levels are changed in response to oxidative stress; reducing ROS production causes a decrease in Ref-1 levels, which is reversed by the application of hydrogen peroxide (Ando et al., 2008). Furthermore it has also been suggested that Ref-1 itself is regulated by its redox state (Walker et al., 1993).

ERK has been widely shown to be activated in response to oxidative stress (Garg and Chang, 2003; Yamane et al., 2009). Upon activation, ERK phosphorylates p66schA, at ser36. Knocking out p66schA in mice increases longevity and resistance to oxidative stress (Migliaccio et al., 1999), with ser36 being vital to the pro-apoptotic effects of pp66schA. p66schA in turn acts on downstream signalling molecules such as the phosphorylation/inactivation of Foxo3A. Hence in p66schA knock-outs, Foxo3A activity is increased leading to increased transcription of ROS scavengers (Nemoto and Finkel, 2002), and has been shown to be neuroprotective in models of motor neuron disease (Mojsilovic-Petrovic et al., 2009).

The nuclear factor eyrthroid 2-related factor 2 (NRF2)/Kelch-like ECH-associated protein 1 (KEAP-1) pathway is also involved in adaptation to oxidative stress. Nrf2 is a cap’n’collar transcription factor that regulates the transcription of a number of anti-oxidant transgenes such as heme-oxygenase I
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and periredoxin (Ishii et al., 2000) and glutathione S-transferase (Hayes et al., 2000). Activity of Nrf2 is regulated by KEAP-1, which is a cytoplasmic actin binding protein that binds Nrf2 and promotes its proteosomal degradation hence preventing translocation to the nucleus to act as a transcription factor (Motohashi and Yamamoto, 2004). ROS and electrophiles stimulate the dissociation of Nrf2 and KeAP-1 allowing Nrf2 to translocate to the nucleus to bind to the anti-oxidant response element (ARE) to promote the transcription of antioxidant stress proteins and detoxifying enzymes. Cap’n’collar transcription factors, like other bZip transcription factors function as dimers. Potential binding partners include Maf (Motohashi et al., 2002) proteins and Jun (Venugopal and Jaiswal, 1998; Jeyapaul and Jaiswal, 2000) as the ARE sequence has high homology with the AP-1 binding consensus. Putatively as a consequence of Jun/Nrf2 binding, Fos can inhibit Nrf2 directed transcription (Venugopal and Jaiswal, 1996). This indicates how complex these pathways are and how output from oxidative stress responses can be so varied depending on the relative levels of activation of various components of the signalling pathways.

1.2. Autophagy

1.2.1. What is autophagy?

Autophagy literally means self-eating, and can be described as a stress induced catabolic process through which, components of the cell can be degraded and recycled, following fusion with the lysosome. Autophagy is generally non-specific but can be selective as well for example the degradation of mitochondria known as mitophagy. Primarily, autophagy occurs to protect cells against stress, hence autophagy genes are upregulated by AP-1 and NRF2, stress response genes (Jegga et al., 2011). In addition to its primary role in the stress response, autophagy is involved in development, aging and immunity. Autophagy can promote longevity; conversely, overactivation of autophagic degradation can lead to autophagic cell death, otherwise known as type II programmed cell death.
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(PCD). Genes involved in autophagy (atg genes) were identified in a screen in yeast (Tsukada and Ohsumi, 1993; Thumm et al., 1994, Klionsky et al., 2003), and orthologues have been found and characterised in a variety of higher organisms. These studies are indicative of the conserved molecular machinery between species. There are three different types of autophagy: micro-autophagy, macro-autophagy and chaperone mediated autophagy. Henceforth autophagy will refer to macroautophagy (unless otherwise stated). Autophagy involves the formation of double-membrane vesicles around the components to undergo autophagy. These vesicles are called autophagosomes and ultimately fuse with lysosomes to allow the contents of the autophagosome to be degraded by acid hydrolases contained in the lysosome.

1.2.2. The Regulation of Autophagy

The regulation of autophagy is highly complex (Fig. 1.5), and context dependent. It occurs normally at a basal level to degrade long-lived proteins and old or superfluous organelles. Autophagy has shown to be activated in response to starvation; cellular components that are deemed unnecessary are recycled to compensate for limited nutrition (For Review see Chen and Klionsky, 2011). TOR is a major regulator of autophagy. TOR activity inhibits autophagy. TOR is a protein kinase that is activated in nutrient-rich conditions, to inhibit autophagy. When TOR is inhibited, for example through starvation or rapamycin treatment autophagy is induced. Many signalling pathways that regulate autophagy converge to control TOR. TOR, in fact, functions as part of two complexes termed TOR complex 1 and 2 (TORC1 and 2). Only TORC1 is inhibited by rapamycin and it also regulates translation through phosphorylation of S6K (RSK). One upstream regulator or TOR is Rheb. Rheb is a GTPase that binds to and activates TOR (Patel et al., 2003). Rheb activity is, in turn, controlled by the tumour sclerosis complexes 1 and 2 (TSC1/2), which act as dimer to negatively regulate Rheb (Inoki et al., 2003) (Fig. 1.5) TSC1/2 is activated by AMPK, which can directly inhibit TOR (Gwinn et al., 2008). AMPK is activated by increased
AMP:ATP (Hardie and Carling, 1997) and increased ROS (Han et al., 2010). Activity of TSC1/2 is also regulated by Akt, which is a mediator of insulin signalling that negatively regulates TSC1/2 (Potter et al., 2003). Protein Kinase A also acts to inhibit autophagy, either directly through phosphorylation of Atg8 (Cherra et al., 2010), or indirectly through phosphorylation of TOR (Mavrakis et al., 2006). S6 kinase is another protein that is regulated by TOR. S6K is increased by TOR activity, as S6K is inhibited by atg1 (Lee et al., 2007), which is inhibited by TOR. S6K decreases ERK activation. ERK however, is also able to activate autophagy (Pattingre et al., 2003), showing the complex integration of many signalling pathways involved in the regulation of autophagy. MEK/ERK signalling has also been implicated as an intermediate step between AMPK and TSC (Wang et al., 2009). As discussed earlier JNK also regulates autophagy.

**Fig. 1.5: The regulation of autophagy:** Normal arrows (→) denote direct activation; perpendicular lines denote direct inhibition (––); dashed lines denote indirect regulation.
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JNK signalling activates transcription of autophagy genes in response to oxidative stress (Wu et al., 2009). JNK also phosphorylates bcl2, which is known to bind to and thereby inhibit, beclin (atg6). Therefore, upon JNK phosphorylation Bcl2 and beclin dissociate leading to increased autophagy (Wei et al., 2008c). However, the regulation of autophagy by this pathway has also been shown to act in other ways. Jun can inhibit autophagy in mammals (Yogev and Shaulian, 2010; Yogev et al., 2010). JNK also negatively regulates FoxO dependent autophagy in neurons (Xu et al., 2011). The regulation of autophagy is normally tightly controlled due to the integration of many signalling pathways activated in response to many cellular factors and components.

1.2.3. Molecular mechanism of autophagy

A lot has been learnt about autophagy by studying an analogue of autophagy in yeast known as ‘cytoplasm to vacuole transport’ (cvt). This is how cellular components are targeted to the vacuole, the equivalent of the lysosome in yeast. The cvt pathway shows high homology to degradative autophagy (Harding et al., 1996; Scott et al., 1996). Starvation induced autophagy also occurs in yeast so the presence of both these pathways has helped to elucidate the mechanisms involved as there is a high level of conservation between both the molecules and mechanisms used in yeast and higher organisms such as Drosophila and mammals.

The process of autophagy can be broken down into phases (Klionsky, 2005):

(I) Induction and cargo selection
(II) Isolation membrane and membrane nucleation
(III) Vesicle elongation
(IV) Retrieval
(V) Vesicle docking and fusion
(VI) Vesicle breakdown and degradation
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Induction of autophagy is controlled by ATG1, ATG13 and ATG17. Only ATG1 and ATG13 are present in *Drosophila* where ATG1 and ATG13 are phosphorylated by TOR in nutrient rich environments, thus phosphorylation decreases during starvation, or TOR inactivation. However, during starvation and hence initiation of autophagy TOR no longer phosphorylates ATG1 or ATG13, and ATG13 is phosphorylated by ATG1 (Suzuki *et al.*, 2001). The precise mechanisms varies across species although the prevailing feature across all species is that autophagy is inhibited in nutrient-rich environments when TOR is activated and directly phosphorylates ATG13 (Scott *et al.*, 2000). Accordingly, TOR inactivation leading to the induction of autophagy changes the phosphorylation state of ATG13. In yeast and mammals ATG13 is hyperphosphorylated in nutrient rich conditions and therefore less phosphorylated during the induction of autophagy. Starvation increases affinity of ATG13 for ATG1. During induction of autophagy in *Drosophila* ATG1 phosphorylates ATG13, resulting in hyperphosphorylation (Kamada *et al.*, 2000). Following initiation of autophagy the phagophore, also known as the isolation membrane, engulfs the cytoplasmic material that is to undergo autophagy to form an autophagosome; whereby a double membrane is formed around the material (membrane nucleation). Mechanisms and molecular components involved in nucleation are not fully understood, however, in yeast it has been shown to involve formation of a complex between class III phosphatidylinositol kinase (PI3K)/Vps34, beclin/ATG6/Vps30, ATG14 and Vps15. Atg 7 and Atg8 are also involved (Axe *et al.*, 2008). In mammals, additional components and regulators of this complex have also been identified, but how the PI3K complex forms in *Drosophila* is unclear. This PI3K complex recruits other proteins required for autophagy and promotes their localisation to the phagophore, such as the Atg2-Atg18 complex; Atg9 is also recruited (Obara *et al.*, 2008; Stromhaug *et al.*, 2004; Xie and Klionsky, 2008). Elongation of the vesicle occurs in two ways, both using ubiquitination-like conjugation systems. The first system involves the conjugation of Atg5 and Atg12, through the catalytic activity
of Atg7, which has E1 like activity, hence activating the process. Atg10 then continues the ubiquitination-like process, catalysing the conjugation step, similar to an E2. No E3 like component has yet been identified in this system. The second elongation system involves the conjugation of Atg8 to phosphatidyl-ethanolamine (PE). Atg4 cleaves Atg8 allowing it to be activated by Atg7 (E1-like), and transferred to Atg3 (E2-like) to be conjugated to PE (Glick et al., 2010). In this manner it is effectively inserted into the autophagosomal membrane. In many degradative pathways, retrieval of selected components occurs to allow recycling. Of all the proteins involved in vesicle formation and elongation, only Atg19 and Atg8PE are present in the completed vesicle. The mechanisms of retrieval are not well understood although the retrieval at Atg9 is known to involve and Atg18, 2 and PI(3)P. The completed autophagosome then undergoes maturation by docking and fusion with the lysosome (vacuole in yeast) for vesicle breakdown and degradation. This process, as with other vesicle fusion processes involves activity of SNARE proteins (Darsow et al., 2007) and Rabs, notably Rab7 (Jager et al., 2004), members of the HOPS complex have also been implicated (Lindmo et al., 2006; Pulipparacharuvil et al., 2005). LAMP1 and LAMP2 have been shown to be required for autophagosome-lysosome fusion (Gozalez-Polo et al., 2005).

Increased lysosomal storage can result in impaired autophagic delivery to the lysosome leading to accumulation of autophagosomes, thereby identifying lysosomal storage disorders as having a block in autophagy leading to build up of polyubiquitinated proteins and dysfunctional mitochondria, the putative mediators of cell death in these disorders.
1.3. Autophagy, lysosomes and oxidative stress in neurodegenerative diseases

1.3.1. Lysosomal Storage Disorders

Lysosomal storage disorders (LSDs) are a collection of around 45 metabolic disorders, with a collective occurrence of approximately 1 in 8000 live births (Meikle et al., 1999). LSDs are characterised by enlargement and proliferation of lysosomes, with the identity of the stored material being determined by the trafficking pathway/protein that is causing the pathology. LSDs have far reaching implications, and are multi-systemic, resulting in childhood neurodegeneration and severe heart and lung problems (Futerman and van Meer, 2004).

As material is degraded it is moved to lysosomes either through autophagic or endocytic pathways. The build up that occurs naturally during aging, of things that cannot be further degraded in the lysosome is termed lipofuscin. This is otherwise known as ‘aging pigment’ and has been implicated in a number of neurodegenerative disorders, although how it impacts on neuronal function is not completely understood. Build up of a similar nature is a classical hallmark of LSDs. This lipopigment is termed ceroid, when present in pathological states (Kurz et al., 2008b).

1.3.1.1. Lysosomal storage disorders and oxidative stress

LSDs have been shown to involve oxidative stress, similar to many other neurodegenerative disorders. Lysosomes are sensitive to oxidative stress, which can enhance the formation of hydroxyl radicals leading to permeabilisation of the lysosomal membrane leading to a vicious cycle between the generation of ceroid and the generation of ROS.

Hydrogen peroxide diffuses into the lysosome, which does not contain catalase or glutathione peroxidase to break it down. Furthermore, lysosomes have a low
pH and a high concentration of iron, making them susceptible to further generation of ROS/oxidative stress due to the conditions being conducive to the Fenton Reaction:

\[ \text{Fe}^{2+} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{Fe}^{3+} + \text{HO}^+ + \text{OH}^- \]

Moreover, oxidative stress can cause peroxidation of the lysosomal membrane, and hence destabilisation. This can cause the lysosome to leak and releases the acid hydrolases into the cytosol. It has also been suggested that if lysosomal function is impaired organelles will not be adequately recycled and hence old mitochondria may build up, and hydrolases released from the lysosomes may attack the mitochondria, both though activation of phospholipases and activation of cytochrome c release, thus further adding to the generation of ROS. Lysosomal permeabilisation has been shown to induce apoptosis (Nylandsted et al., 2004) although more severe rupture may cause necrosis, showing the potential role in neurodegenerative conditions. However the importance of lysosomal function and how it is affected by ROS and oxidative stress in synaptic development is an area less well understood.

### 1.3.2. Autophagy and Neurodegeneration

Autophagy is generally considered cytoprotective, as aging cellular components are recycled (Arsham and Neufeld, 2009). It is activated through JNK signalling, which improves tolerance to oxidative stress (Wu et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2003). Increasing basal levels of autophagy in the nervous system has in fact been shown to increase longevity in addition to improved resistance to oxidative stress (Simonsen et al., 2008). Inducing autophagy through rapamycin or lithium is protective in a model of Huntington’s disease, as it upregulates the clearance of the disease causing aggregations (Sarkar et al., 2009). Inhibition of autophagy can lead to build up of old mitochondria and other damaged or old organelles and proteins. However, the situation is a complex one. In a model of ischaemia inhibiting autophagy and lysosomal function reduced neural cell death
(Kubota et al., 2010). Furthermore, inhibiting autophagy in a model of frontotemporal dementia that is caused by mutations in the endosomal sorting complex is protective against neural cell death (Lee and Gao, 2009). The role of autophagy in neurodegeneration is somewhat paradoxical because impairing autophagy can mimic LSD but can also rescue/reduce an LSD phenotype because it prevents build up of autophagosomes and lysosomes, which lead to further generation of ROS. The effects of changing levels of autophagy in neurodegeneration depends somewhat on whether autophagy leads to the build up or degradation of the primary pathological component of the disease.

1.3.3. Oxidative Stress, Ageing and Neurodegenerative Diseases

Harman proposed the ‘free radical theory’ of ageing, and pathological degeneration of a similar kind to ageing (Harman 1956), first suggesting that constitutively produced ROS interact with cellular components exhibiting a deleterious effect that results in ageing. It had already been noted for a long time that animals that have higher metabolic rates tend to have shorter lives, leading to the ‘rate of living’ hypothesis, although how metabolism and the ageing process were linked remained unknown. Long-lived cells are particularly susceptible to oxidative stress, meaning the nervous system is prone to oxidative damage. The inability of most neurons to divide means that as they die they are not replaced so neuronal death leads to neurodegeneration. Neurons have been suggested as the ‘weak link’ in defence against ROS as overexpressing SOD1 only in motor neurons significantly increases longevity (Parkes et al., 2008). Moreover, antioxidants are found at lower levels in the nervous system than other tissues (Halliwell, 1992; Halliwell, 2006). ROS have been implicated in Alzheimer’s, Parkinson’s, Huntington’s, Gaucher’s (Deganuto et al., 2007) diseases, Friedrich’s ataxia and Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. In fact amyloid-beta (Aβ), the protein involved in the pathology of AD, has been shown to interact directly with catalase (Milton, 1999) and inhibition of catalase
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worsens Aβ-toxicity (Milton, 2001). In addition NADPH oxidase production of ROS has been strongly implicated in the pathology of Alzheimer’s disease (Park et al., 2008) due to Aβ-induction of ROS generation by NADPH oxidase (McDonald et al., 1997). ROS generation can occur as a result of normal signalling pathways being hijacked pathologically, often resulting in the generation of a vicious cycle. For example, NADPH oxidase derived ROS are vital for CLIC1, a Cl-channel, activation, but Aβ induced ROS generation is dependent on CLIC1 activation (Milton et al., 2008). ROS have been clearly implicated in cognitive decline and there is a large body of research into how ROS affect neuronal function to cause cognitive decline (Dröge and Schipper, 2007; Guidi et al., 2006). However, the role of ROS in developmental pathologies has not been widely investigated, furthermore, neurodegenerative diseases as a result of pathological development is becoming an increasingly likely possibility. The role of ROS in normal physiology, as opposed to pathological states, is less well understood. Increasingly ROS are being highlighted as signalling molecules in embryonic development (Viera et al., 2011; Le Belle et al., 2011; Kim and Wong, 2009) and synaptic plasticity. ROS are important signalling molecules in long-term potentiation (LTP), the biological correlate of learning and memory (Bindokas et al., 1996; Klann et al., 1998). Hence the situation is complex; ROS are vital to learning and memory, yet also result in physiological decline with ageing.

1.3.4. Using Drosophila to study LSDs

Drosophila are very useful for studying lysosomal storage disorders, as mutations and transgenes are relatively easily produced. The powerful genetic toolbox coupled with the short generation time make the study of these disorders in Drosophila highly insightful, efficient and economical. A number of specific LSDs have been modelled in Drosophila including Juvenile Batten Disease, modelled through changing expression of the gene CLN3 (Tuxworth et al., 2009 and 2011), mucolipidosis type IV (Venkatachalam et al., 2008) and
Niemann Pick type C (Huang et al., 2005). Generally, autosomal recessive LSDs are caused by compound heterozygote mutations, meaning that the mutations in the two alleles are different (E.g. Tylki-Szymańska et al., 2007). Coupled with other genetic and epigenetic differences means that there is great variation between development and progression of symptoms. However some clinical manifestations are highly characteristic. Even though present only in more severe cases neurological/neuronopathic symptoms are common to LSD. Therefore understanding how lysosomal dysfunction impacts on neuronal development and function could help elucidate general disease mechanisms.

1.3.4.1. A model of lysosomal storage disorder: spinster

The Drosophila mutant spinster was originally identified during a screen for mating phenotypes, where the female was identified as being reluctant to mate (Yamamoto and Nakano, 1999). In addition to this phenotype it was also noted that spinster, otherwise known as benchwarmer, have reduced longevity, impaired programmed cell death, neural degeneration and accumulation of aurofluorescent pigment in the neurons; all characteristic of LSDs (Nakano et al., 2001). Subsequently it was identified in a screen for synaptic growth (Sweeney and Davis, 2002). Further support for spinster as a model of a LSD was provided when Sweeney and Davis showed that spinster is localised to the late endosome/lysosome (Sweeney and Davis, 2002). Spinster encodes a 12 transmembrane transporter that localises to the late endosome/lysosome and is expressed both pre- and post-synaptically during synapse growth and development. The neuronal phenotype of spinster is an increase in synapse size and bouton number coupled with impaired synaptic transmission (Sweeney and Davis, 2002). Mutations in spinster lead to dysregulated TGFβ that is required for the overgrowth phenotype. Ectopic nerve growth has been demonstrated in models of LSDs (March et al., 1995), and the aim of this study is to identify other pathogenically activated signalling cascades that might be involved in the generation of overgrowth phenotypes. Endocytic defects were confirmed by
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Dermaut et al., (2005), with possible tau toxicity. Both studies show multilamellar inclusions and accumulation of lysosomes (Nakano et al., 2001; Dermaut et al., 2005)

1.4. Neurotransmission

1.4.1. Action Potential

Neuronal activity was first shown to be electrical when Galvani (1791) observed contraction in the hind legs of frogs when a metal hooked attached to an iron railing was attached to the medulla (reviewed by Cowan and Kandell, 2003). Action potentials occur in excitable cells and are simply defined as when the electrical membrane potential of a cell rapidly rises and falls due to movement of ions across the membrane. These nerve impulses are termed spikes, and the temporal sequence in which these occur is termed a spike train. Voltage gated ion channels (VGICs), are channels that are shut when the cell is at resting potential (~-65mV) until threshold potential is reached (~-55mV), Na$^+$ ions flow in increasing the membrane potential, and all the VGICs open and Na$^+$ flow in until the membrane polarity is reversed, at which point the Na$^+$ channels are inactivated, and hence close. This results in Na$^+$ ions being transported out of the cell, K$^+$ channels are activated so K$^+$ floods out of the cell; this results in a negative shift, otherwise termed afterhyperpolarisation (for review see Nachmansohn, 1971; Ginsborg, 1973).

1.4.2. Synaptic Transmission

Neurons communicate with other neurons and cells through synaptic transmission. Synaptic transmission briefly entails the release of chemicals, neurotransmitters, from the pre-synaptic terminal to act on receptors on the post-synaptic terminal.

When the action potential reaches the presynaptic terminal depolarisation results in the opening of Ca$^{2+}$ channels, leading to increased Ca$^{2+}$ in the neuron.
Vesicles containing neurotransmitter are linked to calcium-sensitive proteins, upon calcium binding these proteins change protein conformation, thereby resulting in exocytosis, where the vesicle fuses with the plasma membrane releasing the neurotransmitter into the synaptic cleft. The neurotransmitter released binds to ligand gated ion channels (LGICs), resulting in an Na\(^+\) influx and K\(^+\) efflux. Due to the permeability of the membrane more Na\(^+\) moves in than K\(^+\) out, resulting in local depolarisation. Synaptic potentials are the local depolarisations, with measurable delay following synaptic input, linking the presynaptic terminal and the effects it has on the post-synaptic terminal. The synaptic potential is distinct from action potentials in that they are graded responses rather than the all-in-one action potential. The depolarisation spreads along the muscle fibre into transverse tubules, causing release of Ca\(^{2+}\) from the sarcolemma, consequently the muscle contracts (reviewed by Cowan and Kandell, 2003).

1.4.2.1. Neurotransmitter release

Clathrin coated vesicles are endocytosed and then recycled, and that each vesicular fusion is equivalent to one quantal release (Heuse and Rease, 1973 as reviewed by Cowan and Kandell, 2003). The presynaptic density is a specialised area in the presynaptic process, directly apposed to the postsynaptic density. The presynaptic density has a thicker denser membrane that the rest of the presynaptic terminal, with a presynaptic vesicular grid with pyramidal projections that extend into the synaptic processes. Between these projections vesicles align prior to release, this led to the hypothesis of ‘docking sites’, these areas are now know as ‘active zones’ (Couteaux and Pecot-Dechavassine, 1970). Boutons are swellings in the presynaptic terminal containing bundles of intermediate or neuro-filaments, these filaments can also be clustered around mitochondria and other organelles and contain active zones.
1.4.2.2. Post-synaptic responses

Neurotransmitter release is quantal in nature, this was first shown by Fatt and Katz (Fatt and Katz, 1951) established the quantal hypothesis when they observed spontaneous depolarising potentials, even in the absence of stimulation. These are termed mini EPPs (mEPPs). Drugs that enhance the action of the neurotransmitter cause prolonged potentials whereas drugs that inhibit the actions of the neurotransmitter abolish these mEPPs. Depolarising the presynaptic terminal increases the frequency of mEPPs whereas, abolishing neuronal input causes mEPPs to disappear, indicative of mEPPs being presynaptic in origin. mEPPs are Na\(^+\) dependent, but do not require Ca\(^{2+}\). They were suggested to be caused by individual quanta being released from the pre-synaptic terminal. EPPs were shown to be whole integer duplicates of mEPPs. Release of quanta is probabilistic and an action potential increases the probability of neurotransmitter release. This hypothesis was greatly supported when Palay and Palade (1955) and de Robertis and Bennett (1955) showed the presence of synaptic vesicles with the first high-quality EM of the synapse. This led to the Ca\(^{2+}\) hypothesis (Katz and Miledi 1965), they subsequently showed that APs cause Ca\(^{2+}\) conductance to increase, but neurotransmitter release does not depend on Na\(^+\) or K\(^+\) (reviewed by Cowan and Kandell, 2003).

1.5. Drosophila neuromuscular junction as a model of synapse development

1.5.1. Drosophila as a model organism

*Drosophila* melanogaster, the common fruit fly, has been used as a model for many years, since pioneering work by Thomas Hunt Morgan at Columbia University. Using *Drosophila* has elucidated many developmental and disease processes both at the cellular and molecular level. The short life cycle and high numbers of progeny make *Drosophila* a relatively cheap model animal.
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1.5.1.1. Genetic Tools

*Drosophila* are highly amenable to genetic manipulations and lend themselves to genetic investigation, as the males do not undergo recombination. Further to this, balancer chromosomes can be used to prevent recombination in females (Rubin and Lewis, 2000). Balancer chromosomes also carry markers, so mutations can be tracked. Mutations can readily generated in a number of ways such as P-elements whereby a large transposon can be inserted into the genomic DNA, impairing transcription and EMS, which produces point mutations. Transposon-mediated transformation can be used to generate transgenic flies (Takeuchi *et al.*, 2007). This allows the implementation of the Gal4/UAS system, a tissue specific expression system, whereby specific transgenes can be expressed in different tissues through the use of two different transgenic strains of *Drosophila* (Brand and Perrimon 1993). Use of this system involves the generation of two lines of flies, the driver and the responder. The driver contains a Gal4 promoter, whereby the promoter element of a gene is linked to Gal4 expression. Therefore, Gal4 is co-expressed in the same localisation as promoter to which it is linked. The responder transgenic line contains an upstream activating sequence linked to the gene to be expressed. Gal4 is a yeast transcription factor that binds to UAS and activates transcription. A more recent development in the field of *Drosophila* genetics is the introduction of RNAi lines (Dietzl *et al.*, 2007), to knock down gene expression by sequence-specific gene silencing (For review see Paddison *et al.*, 2002a and b).

1.5.2. The *Drosophila* 3rd instar larval neuromuscular junction

Each abdominal hemisegment of the larva contains 30 syncytial muscles that receive innervation by two motor neurons. The dorsal muscles receive innervation from the anterior intersegmental nerve (ISN), and the ventral from the posterior segmental nerve (SN). The transverse nerve (TN) innervates the lateral muscles of each hemisegment. Axons leave these nerves to form highly characterised NMJs at each muscle. A number of the neurons in each
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Hemisegment A3 are well characterized, muscle 6/7 in hemisegment A3 is innervated by RP3, one of the RP neurons RP1-5. RP1-5 send their axons out to the periphery through the anterior root of the anterior fascicle (Keshishian et al., 1996).

There are two broad classes of NMJ in Drosophila. Type I NMJs have short terminal branches and large boutons whereas type II NMJs have long thin branches with very many small boutons. Type I axons have thick axonal processes and the presynaptic portion of the NMJ is enveloped by the subsynaptic reticulum (SSR), a junctional membrane produced by the muscle. Type I NMJs innervate all body wall muscle and are predominantly glutamatergic and comprise 2 types of boutons, differentiated most notably by size, into type Ib (big) and type Is (small). In addition to differences in size, type Is have less SSR and are generally further away from the branch. Type II NMJs determine excitation state, and transmit octopamine and glutamate. There are generally two motor neurons of this type per hemisegment, which innervate all but 8 muscles per segment, and do not have an SSR (Broadie and Bate, 1993; Keshishian et al., 1996). This study focuses on type I NMJ development.

1.5.3. Anatomy of the larval neuromuscular junction

Prior to synaptic contact, between the synapse and the muscle, development of the two components is independent; neurons in twist mutants, which do not have body wall muscles, target correctly and presynaptic zones form normally to begin with. Synapse formation begins approximately 13 hours after egg-laying (AEL), when the growth cone of the extending axons contacts the myopodia of the developing muscle; subsequent NMJ development requires input from both the muscle and the nerve (Broadie and Bate, 1993). Varicosities develop in the presynaptic terminal, after they become confined to the synaptic area. Synaptic boutons, containing T-bars and active zones are visible three hours after the first contact. Active zones are areas of the bouton that are neurotransmitter release sites; vesicles cluster here and then fuse with the membrane during synaptic
transmission. T-bars are a morphology seen in some active zones, which are electron dense T-shaped areas thought to promote vesicle fusion. Mutations in an active zone protein bruchpilot (BRP) result in T-bars not formed, although normal apposition between the pre- and post-synaptic membrane is maintained. The absence of T-bars is accompanied by impaired synaptic transmission (Kittel et al., 2006a and b; Wagh et al., 2006), showing that this protein is vital for active zone assembly and normal synaptic transmission. Active zone clustering is dependent from feedback from the muscle. In mef2 mutants, where the myoblasts are unable to fuse, active zones do not cluster correctly, and remain evenly distributed along the presynaptic area.

Following release from the pre-synaptic terminal glutamate binds to glutamate receptors GluRs in the post-synaptic membrane. Muscular glutamate receptors in Drosophila are homologous to AMPA and kainite receptors in vertebrates (Featherstone et al., 2005; Marrus et al., 2004). They are ionotrophic receptors that is to say there are receptor-gated ion pores composed of four subunits. Currently 6 subunits have been identified in Drosophila; DGlurIIIA and B have distinct physiological properties and either is required for the localisation of DGlurIII. Receptor composition is determined by afferent input (Marrus and DiAntonio, 2005).

Release of glutamate causes receptors to cluster in the post-synaptic membrane apposed to the presynaptic processes, and without this neuronal input the second increase in glutamate receptors does not occur and they remain homogeneously expressed throughout the muscle. The need for synaptic transmission shows how dependent the two synaptic components are on each other for correct synaptic development. One hour after initial contact synaptic currents can be detected, followed by muscle contractions two hours after first contact, thus 16-17 hours AEL the first functional NMJ is formed (reviewed by Featherstone and Broadie, 2000; and Keshishian et al., 1996).
1.5.4. Development of the *Drosophila* NMJ

As with all developmental processes, growth of the synapse is dependent on the integration of many complex signalling pathways. Development is controlled through bi-directional signalling between the presynaptic nerve-terminal and the postsynaptic muscle. The larval NMJ is a dynamic system that changes throughout development. The development of the muscle and the nervous components of the NMJ occur in tandem. That is to say, expansion of the NMJ parallels the exponential muscle growth occurring during larval development. From 1\textsuperscript{st} instar to 3\textsuperscript{rd} instar the muscle grows 100x, and concurrently the presynaptic area expands as well (Atwood \textit{et al.}; 1993, Schuster \textit{et al.}, 1996a; Keshishian \textit{et al.}, 1993; Gorczyca \textit{et al.}, 1993). Muscle development, in terms of size and formation occurs relatively normally even in the absence of innervation, although receptor clustering is dependent on glutamate.

Discs-large (dlg) is an important determinant of synaptic development in *Drosophila*. It forms part of the post-synaptic density, and is involved in the clustering and stabilising of GluRIIB containing receptors (Chen and Featherstone, 2005). In type I NMJs its expression is firstly pre-synaptic and then shifts to the post-synaptic side. It is highly important in synapse development and is involved in the clustering of K+ channels (shaker) (Tejedor \textit{et al.}, 1997). Mutations in dlg have reduced formation of the SSR and an increase in bouton size and with an increase in the number of active zones per bouton (Lahey \textit{et al.}, 1994). Dlg colocalises with FasII, which is believed to aid bouton formation through a bidirectional signal between the muscle and the nerve (Thomas \textit{et al.}, 1997). Null mutants have normal synaptogenesis but then the boutons retract and the larvae die at 1\textsuperscript{st} instar. FasII regulates synaptic growth in a dose dependent manner. It is required both pre- and post-synaptically to prevent synapse elimination. In hypomorphs containing less than 10% normal FasII levels bouton number is decreased but bouton size is increased and the number of active zones per bouton is increased. *FasII*
hypomorphs with 50% normal expression have increased bouton number, with increased synaptic sprouting (Schuster et al., 1996a). In shaker and dunce mutants, which show a similar overgrowth to FasII hypomorphs, increased cAMP activity lead to a 50% decrease in FasII levels, required for this overgrowth phenotype (Schuster et al., 1996b). While FasII reduction accounts for structural changes, FasII hypomorphs do not show the hyperexcitability phenotypes. The electrophysiological changes in dunce are due to cAMP dependent increases in CREB (Davis et al., 1996). This shows how signalling pathways can diverge and converge resulting in a variety of phenotypes that share some commonality but differ in characteristics. Reduced levels of FasII have also been implicated in increased bouton number in hangover mutants (Schwenkert et al., 2008). There is no change in neuronal transmission in these mutants, again showing that mechanisms governing function do not always correlate with those determining growth.

1.5.4.1. Morphogenic Signalling

Two well characterised signalling pathways involved in synapse development are Wingless and TGFβ signalling. Wingless is secreted by the motor neuron (Packard et al., 2002), thus an anterograde signal. Signalling is mediated by the postsynaptic receptor DFrizzled2 (DFz2). Upon activation DFz2 undergoes cleavage whereby the C-terminal domain translocates to the nucleus to modify gene transcription (Mathew et al., 2005); it is as yet unknown which genes are regulated by this pathway. Concurrently during synapse development, retrograde signalling is mediated by Gbb released from the muscle (Marques, 2005). This activates TGF-β signalling, through the activation and dimerisation of a type I TGF-β receptors encoded by Thick Veins (Tkv) and saxophone (Sax) with type II TGF-β receptors, encoded by wishful thinking (Wit). Ligand binding and activation of these receptors effects the phosphorylation of MAD. Activated MAD putatively interacts with MED (Medea, a coSMAD), translocates to the
nucleus, determining gene transcription (McCabe et al., 2003; Sanyal et al., 2003).

1.5.4.2. MAPK signalling

AP-1 has previously been shown to be important in the regulation of synapse size and strength during development (Sanyal et al., 2002 and 2003). AP-1 is a transcription factor composed of homo- and hetero-dimers of Fos and Jun, basic leucine zipper proteins, that controls the transcription of numerous genes. AP-1 can be activated by Jun N-Terminal Kinase (JNK). JNK is a serine/threonine kinase, traditionally known as a stress activated protein kinase (SAPK) due to its role in the cellular stress response. The activity of this pathway is under the control of a negative feedback loop; one of the target genes of AP-1 is puckered, a phosphotase which inhibits JNK. During synapse development AP-1 positively regulates synaptic strength and size; such that increased expression of Fos and Jun in the neurons but not the muscle increases bouton number (Sanyal et al., 2002).

The importance of the AP-1 pathway in synaptic development has been highlighted by studies on a number of mutants. Highwire, an E3 ubiquitin ligase, localises to the presynaptic terminal. Loss of Highwire results in synaptic overgrowth, thus highwire is believed to restrain synaptic overgrowth through downregulation of a growth-promoting signal. Highwire is believed to bind to DFsn to suppress synaptic overgrowth (Wu et al., 2007). The overgrowth seen in highwire and DFsn can be suppressed by removing a MAPKKK known as wallenda, confirming the role of MAPK signalling in the regulation of growth. Furthermore, removing JNK or Fos also suppressed synaptic overgrowth in highwire, thus it is proposed that Highwire downregulates Wallenda consequently attenuating JNK/Fos signalling (Collins et al., 2006). Thus the model proposed is that under normal physiological conditions Highwire inhibits MAPK signalling cascades involving wallenda/JNK/Fos consequently restraining synaptic growth. In the absence of highwire this inhibition is released and the
overactivity of the JNK/Fos pathway results in synaptic overgrowth (Collins et al., 2006).

ERK has also been shown to be involved in synapse development in the control of active zone density (Wairkar et al., 2009). During synapse development ERK activity is inhibited by atg1 (unc-51). When ERK activity is disinhibited, increased activity leads to decreased functional synapse formation with synapses forming without active zones, vital for neurotransmitter release (Wairkar et al., 2009). Accordingly, with mutations in S6K where there is decreased ERK activity leading to increased bouton number as S6K negatively regulates bouton number through ERK signalling (Fischer et al., 2009). Focal adhesion kinase (Fak56) also restricts ERK signalling, suppressing NMJ growth. When this restriction is released, such as in Fak66 mutants the synapses overgrow, and have increased branching (Tsai et al., 2008). ERK can modulate synaptic growth through regulation of the adhesion molecule FasII; levels of ERK and FasII are inversely correlated (Koh et al., 2002)

1.5.4.3. Autophagy and synaptic growth

Autophagy has been implicated in the control of synapse development, due to autophagic regulation of highwire (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). Defects in autophagy lead to a build up of highwire, increasing the level of inhibition on wallenda/JNK/Fos signalling resulting in decreased synaptic growth. Accordingly, increased autophagy leads to potentiation of synaptic growth (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). Other regulators of autophagy have also been implicated in synapse development, although the data from different studies are somewhat paradoxical. Increasing Rheb activity in the nerve results in synaptic overgrowth, however increased Rheb increases TOR activity reducing induction of autophagy. Conversely expression of Rheb in the muscle causes a slight reduction in synaptic growth. Supporting the role for Rheb as a potentiator of synaptic growth, mutations in rheb have significantly smaller NMJs than wildtype (Knox et al., 2007). The finding that inhibiting TOR with rapamycin increases
bouton number is consistent between these studies. The observation that rapamycin does not inhibit Rheb-mediated synaptic growth suggests that TORC1/S6K is not involved in the generation of this overgrowth, thus they suggest overgrowth is mediated by TORC2 (Knox et al., 2007). In addition Fischer et al. (2009) found that mutations in S6K result in potentiated synaptic growth through inhibition of ERK signalling (Fischer et al., 2009), suggesting that S6K negatively regulates bouton number.

1.6. Oxidative Stress Autophagy and Synapse Development

1.6.1. Oxidative Stress and Synapse Development

In addition to its role in the stress response, JNK signalling has been shown to positively regulate synapse size and strength (Sanyal et al., 2002). Furthermore, presynaptic JNK signalling has been shown to be dysregulated in hiw mutants resulting in synapse overgrowth (Collins et al., 2006). Synapses are areas of high energy demand thus have high numbers of mitochondria making them susceptible to oxidative stress. Furthermore the fact that nerves are post-mitotic and do not generally degenerate meaning that degraded material builds up overtime, leading to the presence of ceroid in aged neurons and diseased neurons where degradation in impaired, such as lysosomal storage disorders (LSDs). Furthermore there is great commonality between the pathways that are activated in oxidative stress and those involved in synapse development. JNK has been shown to activate bouton number (Sanyal et al., 2002), and has also been shown to be activated in response to oxidative stress. Furthermore autophagy is transcriptionally activated during oxidative stress, and autophagy drives synapse growth. JNK signalling activates autophagy and hiw has been shown to be degraded by autophagy, thus resulting in increased activity of JNK signalling with defective autophagy, thus there is a feedback loop, indicative of the complexity of signalling involved in control of synapse...
development. Autophagy has recently been shown to drive synapse growth (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). Driving autophagy increases synapse size; this was shown to require JNK signalling. There is, however conflicting data on the role of regulators of autophagy in the control of synapse development. Knox et al. (2007) showed that driving Rheb activity resulted in increased bouton number, which was not inhibited by rapamycin suggesting that Rheb is controlling synapse development through other mechanisms.

Recently further indirect research into the effects of oxidative stress on synapse development has been investigated through analysis of NMJ development in a model of Parkinson’s disease caused by LRRK2 mutations, where synaptic overgrowth can be seen at the Drosophila NMJ. In addition overexpression of LRRK2 causes undergrowth of the NMJ, these phenotypes have been shown to be due to specific interactions with both the pre- and post-synaptic machinery, resulting in dysregulation of protein synthesis and perturbed microtubule formation (Lee et al., 2010b). However the investigators did not investigate if oxidative stress had a causative role in the generation of these phenotypes.

Mutations in SOD1 in a mouse model of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) have been investigated and it has been put forward that SOD1 mutations could result in problems in maturation of motor neurons and networks (Durand et al., 2006), with problems in axonal transport detectable well before the onset of symptoms (Williamson and Cleveland, 1999). Amendola et al. (2004) found motor deficits very early on, in mice only 1 week old, which could be indicative of developmental abnormalities. In addition to pathologies caused by loss of SOD1 function, overexpression of SOD1 has also been implicated in neuronal pathology (Avraham et al., 1988). In Down’s syndrome there are 3 copies of chromosome 21 present, which is where the gene for SOD1 is located. By transgenically overexpressing SOD1, it is possible to dissect which aspects of DS pathology might be caused by the increased gene dosage of SOD1, as increased SOD could lead to increased levels of hydrogen peroxide. It has been
shown that rat cells with increased SOD1 show decreased levels of neurotransmitter uptake (Elroy-Stein and Groner, 1988). Mice with elevated levels of human SOD1 were noticed to have terminal axon degeneration in the NMJ of the tongue, coupled with changes in the endplate (Avraham et al., 1988). The role of increased SOD1 is complex, highlighting the anti-oxidant paradox: Increased levels of SOD1 cause increased levels of peroxidated lipids, indicative of oxidative damage yet also increased resistance to paraquat (Elroy-Stein et al., 1986). Mutations in sod2 in Drosophila also cause reduced longevity and movement however these phenotypes affect the muscle prior to neuronal dysfunction (Godenshwege et al., 2009). In addition longevity is improved when SOD2 function is restored in the muscle but not the nerve. Conversely, reduced longevity in sod1 mutants was rescued by motor neuron expression of SOD1 (Parkes et al., 1998) and therefore it is necessary to dissect neuronal and muscular components of effects of increased ROS on synapse development and function. This demonstrates how the source of ROS is important to the generation of the phenotype it produces, not just the identity of the species and its level. sod1 mutations seem to affect neurons more whereas sod2 mutations have more severe and earlier effects in the muscle.

In a model of encephalopathy, caused by mutations in succinate dehydrogenase A (sdhA) ROS have also been shown to cause synapse loss in a study of synapse development. (Mast et al., 2008). Synapse loss is rescued by tocopherol (vitamin E, an anti-oxidant) indicative of oxidative stress having a causative role in synapse loss.

More recently Fos signalling has also been implicated in the synaptic overgrowth seen in the mutant spinster, a model of lysosomal storage disorder that shows aberrant TGFβ signalling (Bowers and Sweeney, personal communication). In addition to synaptic overgrowth spinster has an accumulation of ceroid lipopigment (lipofuscin) in lysosomes throughout the nervous system (Nakano et al., 2001), this is indicative of the generation of ROS, and used as a marker of
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oxidative stress and ageing. From this, it is postulated that spinster is suffering from oxidative stress.

1.6.2. Oxidative Stress and Synaptic Function

Components of the molecular machinery involved in synaptic transmission are affected by oxidative stress. Hydrogen peroxide has been shown to have dual action at the frog NMJ depending on the concentration. At micromolar concentrations H$_2$O$_2$, EPPs were increased but at higher concentrations EPPs were inhibited. The facilitation seen at lower concentrations was not affected by the presence of Fe$^{2+}$, a pro-oxidant species, conversely the presence of increased of Fe$^{2+}$ did increase the inhibition of transmission caused at higher concentrations, this is indicative of the involvement of hydroxyl radicals in this inhibition (Giniatullin and Giniatullin, 2003). Both evoked and spontaneous quantal release are reduced through the reactions between ROS and SNAP25, a component of the SNARE complex required for membrane fusion (Giniatullin et al., 2006). During high levels of activity in skeletal muscle ATP and ROS, generated intracellularly, can be released. Extracellular ATP has been shown to cause pre-synaptic inhibition, which can be reduced by the presence of antioxidants, such as extracellular catalase. NO was also shown to prevent synaptic transmission however, inhibiting NO production did not prevent ATP-dependent depression, whereas preventing P2 activation reduced ROS production (Giniatullin et al., 2005). The role of PKC in the effects of ROS on synaptic transmission has been shown as PKC inhibitors prevent both the facilitation and the depression caused by H$_2$O$_2$. Conversely, overactivation of PKC using PMA also prevents the facilitation but has no effect on the depression (Giniatullin and Giniatullin, 2003).

LTP is purported to be the biological correlate of learning and memory and it is a form of synaptic plasticity that is defined as 'long-lasting increase in the efficacy of synaptic transmission' (Bliss and Lomo, 1973). ROS are becoming increasingly seen as important signalling molecules in many biological
processes, with an important function in central synapses in the generation of LTP (Klann, 1998; Klann et al., 1998). The general principle of both hippocampal and spinal cord LTP are similar, repeated activity leads to increased responsiveness dependant on NMDA receptors. Application of ROS induces LTP and while NMDA receptor activity is required for the induction but not the maintenance of LTP, depleting ROS through the application of ROS scavengers inhibited both the induction and maintenance of LTP. These data suggest that high frequency stimulation of neurons leads to NMDA receptor activation resulting in increases in endogenous ROS (Lee et al., 2010a). Activation of NMDA receptors results in generation of superoxide anions (Bindokas et al., 1996) furthermore, LTP is blocked by superoxide scavengers (Klann et al., 1998). The effector of superoxide in LTP is most likely PKC, which is activated due to oxidation of a cysteine rich area, a cofactor binding area of PKC; oxidation causes zinc to be released from the zinc finger domain (Knapp and Klann, 2002), furthermore the presence of superoxide scavengers that prevent LTP accordingly prevent superoxide induced rises in PKC activity. Increasing the level of superoxide anions by the X/XO system in hippocampal slices increases PKC activity (Knapp and Klann, 2000). Superoxide induced LTP, although still dependent on increased [Ca$^{2+}$], does not require Ca$^{2+}$ influx through NMDA-Rs, superoxide anions activate type 3 ryanodine receptors and L-type Ca$^{2+}$ channels. ERK signalling is also required for superoxide induced LTP (Huddleston et al., 2008).

Conversely H$_2$O$_2$ prevents normal LTP (Pellmar et al., 1991; Auerbach and Segal 1997), the reduction in LTP caused by SOD (Halliwell et al., 1992b) may be due to the increased levels of H$_2$O$_2$, as this reduction is partially rescued by catalase, which converts H$_2$O$_2$ to water and oxygen (Knapp and Klann, 2002). Thus it seems the relative balance and localisation of action of different ROS may be the key to understanding the role of ROS in LTP. The effects of ROS on synaptic transmission are varied suggesting a high level of context dependence,
determining the signalling pathways and effectors involved. The *Drosophila* NMJ, as a glutamatergic synapse, could be highly useful to elucidate the effects of ROS on synaptic transmission and how pathogenic activation of signalling pathways involved in the control of synaptic development and function, such as JNK/AP-1 can be affected during oxidative stress. This could help to understand both developmental and neurodegenerative conditions.
1.7. Aims

- To establish whether spinster is incurring oxidative stress and determine whether oxidative stress is contributing to the synaptic overgrowth phenotype.

- Can oxidative stress cause synaptic overgrowth independently of lysosomal dysfunction?

- Are ASK/JNK/AP-1 activation and autophagy required for synaptic growth observed under conditions of oxidative stress?

- Oxidative stress is known to impair mitochondrial function. Does oxidative stress/ spinster cause an energy deficit resulting in impaired physiological output? If this is the case, are compensatory metabolic pathways induced in spinster?
2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Drosophila Husbandry and Techniques

2.1.1. Drosophila Stocks

*Drosophila* stocks used in this research were obtained from the Bloomington Stock Centre (Indiana University: [http://flystocks.bio](http://flystocks.bio)), donated from other labs or created using stocks already contained within the lab. A full list of stocks used in this investigation is shown in table 2.1.

2.1.2. Drosophila Husbandry

*Drosophila* were maintained in 25cm³ plastic vials containing 7-8ml standard yeast-sugar-agar media composed of 25g/l sugar, 3.75g/l agar, 0.125 CaCl₂, 0.125g/l FeSO₄, 0.125g/l MnCl, 0.125g/l NaCl, 2g/l potassium-sodium tetraborate, 0.0015g/l Bavistine and 0.2g/l p-hydroxybenzoic acid methyl ester (Nipagin) (Carpenter, 1950). Apple juice agar plates (16g/l agar, 40g/l sucrose and 200ml apple juice per litre) were used for egg collection, using a cage, and moved from this to instant fly food using forceps. Formula 4-24 (Carolina Biological Supplies) instant fly food was prepared by mixing equal volumes of fly food and water (containing any pharmacological agents as required) with a pinch of yeast per vial. Vials were topped with cotton wool to allow air-flow and prevent escape.

Stocks were maintained at 18°C, where they were ‘turned over’ into new vials every 4 weeks, or at 25°C, where they are turned over every week. Flies at 25°C used for experimental crosses to obtain larvae were turned over every 2-3 days to increase the number of progeny and prevent overcrowding of larvae. To allow selection of flies they were anaesthetised with CO₂ via a porous pad connected to a compressed gas cylinder (Dutscher Scientific, UK) and using a dissection microscope (Zeiss Stemi 2000 Dissection Microscope).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STOCK</th>
<th>Chromosome</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILDTYPE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w&lt;sup&gt;−1118&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wildtype (white eyes)</td>
<td>Sweeney lab stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton S</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wildtype (red eyes)</td>
<td>Sweeney lab stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCER STOCKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM6-GFP/-</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>First Chromosome Balancer</td>
<td>Sweeney lab stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CyOGFP/Sco</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Second Chromosome Balancer</td>
<td>Sweeney lab stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CyOGFP/Ilf; TM6b/MKRS</td>
<td>Second and third</td>
<td>Second and Third Chromosome Balancer</td>
<td>Sweeney lab stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CyOtubGAL80/Ilf; TM6b/MKRS</td>
<td>Second and third</td>
<td>Second and Third Chromosome Balancer with GAL80</td>
<td>Sweeney lab stock (unpublished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAL4 DRIVERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Spinster promoter: Pre- and post-synaptic driver (low level ubiquitous)</td>
<td>Nakano &lt;em&gt;et al.&lt;/em&gt; (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Myosin heavy chain promoter: Muscle specific driver</td>
<td>Corey Goodman lab stock (donation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elavGAL4/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Embryonic lethal abnormal vision promoter: Pan neuronal driver</td>
<td>Corey Goodman lab stock (donation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tubGAL4/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Tubulin promoter: Global driver</td>
<td>Lee and Luo (2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### UAS STOCKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stock Description</th>
<th>Transgenic Line</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAS-fos</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Wildtype Fos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-fos-RNAi/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>RNAi to reduce Fos expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-fos$^{DN}$</td>
<td>Second and Third</td>
<td>Impaired transcription activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-jun$^{DN}$</td>
<td>Second and Third</td>
<td>Impaired transcription activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-junRNAi/FM6-GFP</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>RNAi to reduce Jun expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-jnk$^{DN}$</td>
<td>Second and Third</td>
<td>JNK without kinase activity (K53R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-ask$^{DN}$</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>ASK without kinase activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-AMPK$^{T184D}$</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Pseudo-phosphorylated AMPK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-AMPK-RNAi(1827)</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>RNAi to reduce AMPK subunit-α expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-AMPK-RNAi(106200)</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>RNAi to reduce AMPK subunit-α expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-hSOD1</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Human SOD1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-cat</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Wildtype Catalase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-trxR1$^{CYTO}$</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Wildtype cytoplasmic thioredoxin reductase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAS-trxR1&lt;sub&gt;MITO&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Wildtype mitochondrial thioredoxin reductase</td>
<td>Fannis Missirlis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-gst&lt;sup&gt;81A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Wildtype glutathione</td>
<td>Whitworth &lt;i&gt;et al.&lt;/i&gt; (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-atg1&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Wildtype ATG1</td>
<td>Neufeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-atg1&lt;sup&gt;CG&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Wildtype ATG1</td>
<td>Neufeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-atg5-RNAi</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>RNAi to reduce atg5 expression</td>
<td>Vienna &lt;i&gt;Drosophila&lt;/i&gt; Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-spin</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Wildtype spinster</td>
<td>Sweeney lab stock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MUTANT STOCKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spin&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;/CyOGFP</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Loss of function of spinster due to P-element excision</td>
<td>Nakano &lt;i&gt;et al.&lt;/i&gt; (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;/CyOGFP</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Loss of function of spinster due to P-element excision</td>
<td>Nakano &lt;i&gt;et al.&lt;/i&gt; (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin&lt;sup&gt;∆58&lt;/sup&gt;/CyOGFP</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Loss of function of spinster</td>
<td>Bloomington Stock Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1&lt;sup&gt;n1&lt;/sup&gt;/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Loss of function of sod1 EMS point mutation</td>
<td>Parkes &lt;i&gt;et al.&lt;/i&gt; (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1&lt;sup&gt;n64&lt;/sup&gt;/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Loss of function of sod1 EMS point mutation</td>
<td>Parkes &lt;i&gt;et al.&lt;/i&gt; (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2&lt;sup&gt;DELTA&lt;/sup&gt;/CyOGFP</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Loss of function of sod2 due to P element</td>
<td>Zheng &lt;i&gt;et al.&lt;/i&gt; (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2&lt;sup&gt;∆02&lt;/sup&gt;/CyOGFP</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Loss of function of sod2 due to P element</td>
<td>Zheng &lt;i&gt;et al.&lt;/i&gt; (2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transgene</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sesB&lt;sup&gt;GED1&lt;/sup&gt;/FM7GFP</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Stress sensitive B loss of function (mitochondrial nucleotide transporter) EMS point mutation</td>
<td>Janca &lt;em&gt;et al.&lt;/em&gt; (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cat&lt;sup&gt;t&lt;/sup&gt;/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Catalase loss of function EMS point mutation</td>
<td>Mackay &lt;em&gt;et al.&lt;/em&gt; (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atg1&lt;sup&gt;DG&lt;/sup&gt;/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>ATG1 loss of function (P-element)</td>
<td>Bloomington Stock Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atg1&lt;sup&gt;PZ&lt;/sup&gt;/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>ATG1 loss of function (P-element)</td>
<td>Bloomington Stock Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atg18&lt;sup&gt;KG&lt;/sup&gt;/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>ATG18 loss of function (P-element)</td>
<td>Bloomington Stock Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puc&lt;sup&gt;E69&lt;/sup&gt;/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>puckered LACZ reporter as heterozygote (P-element)</td>
<td>Ring and Martinez Arias (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loe/TM6b</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Loss of one isoform of AMPK&lt;sub&gt;γ&lt;/sub&gt; subunit function unit</td>
<td>Deak &lt;em&gt;et al.&lt;/em&gt; (1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER TRANSGENES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transgene</th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gst-D-GFP/CyOGFP</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>GFP reporter of glutathione expression using cap'n'collar (Nrf2/KeAP-1) transcription factor</td>
<td>Skyotis and Bohmann (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2.1: *Drosophila* stocks used in this investigation

---

2.1.3. Crossing Schemes

2.1.3.1. Crosses

Crosses were set up by combining virgin females and males of the required genotypes, in the same vial. Virgin females were selected based on the well-regarded observation that females reject courtship for the first 8 hours after eclosion. Young female flies were selected in two ways: firstly, for two hours following eclosion the meconium can be seen through the abdominal cuticle, as well as being light in pigment and still having unexpanded wings; secondly, once a vial was emptied of adults, 8 hours later any females collected will be virgins. Once probable virgins were collected they were kept isolated from males and their virginity confirmed by observing that any eggs they laid did not hatch.

2.1.3.2. Balancer Chromosomes

Mutant alleles in *Drosophila* can be easily tracked through the use of balancer chromosomes. These are chromosomes that carry dominant phenotypic markers with large chromosomal insertions that prevent recombination. The balancer stocks used in this investigation were *FM6*, on the first chromosome (with or without GFP), which presents a bar eye phenotype; *CyO* (with or without GFP) on the 2\(^{nd}\) chromosome which has curly wings; *TM6b* on the 3\(^{rd}\) chromosome which has ‘humoral’ as its dominant marker in adults, which can be seen as increased hairs on the ‘shoulders’ of the adult and ‘tubby’ in larvae, a significantly shortened and fattened and *TM3* on the 3\(^{rd}\), identified by ‘stubble’, a shortening of the hairs on the thorax. When expressed in the same animal *TM3* and *TM6b* (*TM3/TM6b*) show the ‘ebony’ phenotype, a blackening of the whole fly. Markers are also used when double balancing *Drosophila* stocks, *Sco* on
the second, which can be identified by a lack of hair on the scutellum and MKRS on the third, which also shows stubble.

2.1.3.3. Recombination

To obtain a fly with two required genetic components on the same chromosome were created by allowing recombination to occur in the female. This was achieved by mating the parent stocks with each other and selecting the females that carried both genetic components. These were then crossed to the balancer stock for the relevant chromosome, and potential recombinants selected based on eye colour when possible. The presence of each mutation or transgene was then confirmed by PCR when necessary.

2.2. Immunohistochemistry and Imaging

2.2.1. Third Instar Larval Dissection

Wandering 3rd instar larvae were taken, once they had crawled out of the food and up the side of the vial, and selected based on genotype. The required larvae were transferred to a Sylgard dish (Silicone elastromere kit, Dow Corning), and dissected in either PBS or haemolymph-like buffer (HL3: (70mM NaCl, 5mM KCl, 1mM CaCl2.2H2O, 10mM NaHCO3, 5mM trehalose, 115mM sucrose and 5mM BES)) (Stewart et al., 1994). The anterior and posterior ends of the larvae were pinned down with minuten pins (Austerlitz Insect Pins 0.1mm diameter, Fine Science Tools), scissors were used to cut laterally at the posterior and dorsal end of the larvae, and a cut made up the dorsal side. The gut, fat bodies, salivary glands and internal organs were removed using forceps, and the muscle wall pinned back.

2.2.2. Larval Fixation and Immunohistochemistry

Larvae were fixed either for 7 minutes in 3.7% formaldehyde in PBS, or 2 minutes in Bouin’s solution, the pins removed and the larvae transferred to 1.5ml
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Eppendorf tubes and washed 3 times in PBS-T (0.1% Triton X-100 in PBS). Antibody incubations were carried out in the desired concentration in of antibody, see table 2.2.2.2 in PBS-T, at 4°C overnight on a rocker, or for two hours at room temperature. 3 x 5 minute washes were performed at room temperature before application of the secondary antibody, for 1 hour at room temperature, before washing 3 times for 5 minutes. Preparations were then transferred to 70% glycerol in PBS to eradicate air from the larval preparations. Following 2 hours in this solution the larvae were mounted onto microscope slides in Vectashield (Vector Laboratories). Coverslips were placed on top of the preparations and sealed with nail varnish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTIBODY</th>
<th>STAINS</th>
<th>CONC</th>
<th>HOST SPECIES</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Horseradish-peroxidase-Cy3 (HRP-Cy3)</td>
<td>Neuronal Tissue</td>
<td>1:200</td>
<td>Goat</td>
<td>Jackson Laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-synaptotagmin (Anti-SYT)</td>
<td>Synaptic Boutons</td>
<td>1:1000</td>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>Sweeney Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Bruchpilot</td>
<td>Active Zones</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank (DSHB), Iowa, US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Antibodies used in this investigation.
2.2.3. Microscopy and Analysis

2.2.3.1. Bouton Counts Normalisation to Muscle Surface Area, and Imaging

Bouton number was analysed by counting each singular spherical structure stained with anti-synaptotagmin at the NMJ, using a Leica DMLA fluorescence microscope with a 40x objective lens. Muscle surface area (MSA) was calculated by imaging hemisegment A3 with a 10x objective, in phase mode and a Leica DC500 digital camera. Images were analysed using ‘imageJ’, by measuring the length and width of the muscle in pixels. This measurement was then converted to µm using an image taken of a haemocytometer to measure the number of pixels in 1µm. The mean muscle surface area of wildtype was then used for normalisation; the bouton number being normalised was divided by its MSA and multiplied by the mean wildtype MSA. This in effect gives the number of boutons at the NMJ if it were a wildtype size (Lnenicka and Keshishian, 2000; Schuster et al., 1996a).

NMJs were imaged using a Zeiss Axioplan 2 confocal microscope (Technology Facility, Biology Department, The University of York); taking z-stacks using 63x objective (oil immersion lens). Generally, two z-stacks were needed due to the size of the NMJ, these were merged using Adobe Photoshop (Adobe Systems Uxbridge, UK)

2.2.3.2. Bouton size analysis

Confocal images were taken as described in 2.2.3.1 and opened in imageJ and measured across the widest part. The measurement was converted from pixels to µm by multiplying by the number of pixels in a µm.

2.2.3.3. Analysis of GFP Transgene Expression (Confocal)

Adult flies were dipped briefly in ethanol to reduce surface tension, and pinned dorsal side down through the abdomen. Dissections were performed in 4% paraformaldehyde/PBS and incubated in this solution with primary antibodies
overnight in the dark, washed for 3 hours then incubated in secondary antibody overnight, and mounted in Vectashield.

2.3. Adult Head Sectioning and Electron Microscopy

2.3.1. Embedding of *Drosophila* Adult Heads in Spurr’s Resin

Flies were submerged in 30% EtOH to reduce surface tension and transferred to fixative (4% PFA, 1% gluteraldehyde in 0.1M sodium phosphate buffer, pH 7.4). The proboscis and air sacs were removed as much as possible and the dissected heads transferred to glass vials containing the fixative. The remaining air sacs and cuticle were removed as much as possible by applying vacuum pressure to the vials. The preparations were transferred to 1.5ml eppendorf tubes containing 500µl fresh fixative. Submersion of the preparations was ensured by trapping them in the bottom of the tube; using a slimline cigarette filter tip (Swan) held in position with a 0.2ml PCR tube with the bottom cut off. Preparations were incubated in fixative overnight at 4°C on a 360° rotator. 3x 10 minute washes with 0.1M sodium phosphate buffer were performed to remove excess fixative from the preparations. Preparations were incubated in 250µl 1% osmium tetroxide (OsO₄) on 0.1M sodium phosphate buffer for 1 hour, and washed 3x 10 minutes in 0.1M sodium phosphate buffer and 3x 10 minute washes in distilled water. Incubations in increasing concentrations of acetone (30, 50, 70 and 90%) for 20 minutes each and 3 x 30 minute incubations in 100% acetone (dehydrated using a molecular sieve) were performed to dehydrate the preparations. The preparations were incubated in increasing concentrations of Spurr’s resin in acetone; 25, 50, 75, 90 and 3x 100% resin for 45 minutes with rotation (Spurr, 1969; 5g vinylcyclohexene dioxide, 3g diglycidyl ether of polypropylene glycol, 13g nonenyl succinic anhydride, 0.25ml 2-dimethylaminoethanol. Incubations in 100% resin were performed at 37°C to reduce viscosity. The head preparations were embedded in moulds (Silastic J Kit, Dow, USA) half-filled with resin, semi-polymerised by incubation at 70°C for
3.5-4 hours. Heads were orientated as required (dorsal end against one end of the well) and covered with un polymerised resin to fill the well, and polymerisation completed by incubation at 70°C for 24 hours. Resin blocks were left to cool and removed from the moulds once cooled.

2.3.2. Head Sectioning

Blocks were trimmed to near the preparation using a fine-bladed hacksaw. Blocks were then secured in chuck and trimmed using a razor blade to expose the cuticle. The block was then trimmed around the head to reduce cutting area, leaving a truncated pyramid containing the head. 1µm sections were cut on the microtome (Leica Ultracut UCT) using glass knives. Sections were placed on microscope slides in drops of water, dried on a hot plate at 80°C and stained (0.6 toluidine blue in 0.3% sodium carbonate) for ~5seconds, rinsed in distilled water and dried. Sections were imaged using Zeiss Axiocam HRm camera and Zeiss Axiovert 200 microscope to locate regions to section for TEM.

2.3.3. Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) and Image Analysis

Once the area to investigate using EM was reached in thick sections, thin sections (60-70nm) were made (carried out by Meg Stark, Technology Facility, York). Sections were incubated in uranyl acetate in 50% ethanol in 10 minutes and then submerged in distilled water. Sections were stained for 10 minutes in lead citrate with sodium hydroxide pellets, and then washed in distilled water. Images were taken using a TECNAI G² (version 2.18) TEM (120kV) using analySIS software.
2. Materials and Methods

2.4. Molecular Biology

2.4.1. Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) and DNA Agarose Gel Electrophoresis

2x PCR mastermix (Promega, UK) was used in a 20µl reaction volume containing (final concentrations) 1µM primers and <250ng DNA template. Primers were either designed manually or using Primer Designer, Net Primer. The melting temperature ($T_m$) calculated using NetPrimer or Primer3 software or \{4(N^\circ\text{Guanine and Cytosine})+2(N^\circ\text{of Adenine and Thymine})\}. The elongation time for a particular fragment is calculated based on the knowledge that \textit{taq} polymerase produced 1kb DNA a minute. Standard PCR cycling conditions were: initial denaturation at $94^\circ\text{C}$ for 10 minutes; cycles of $94^\circ\text{C}$ for 30secs, $T_m$ for 60secs, $72^\circ\text{C}$ for elongation; cycles were followed with a final elongation period at $72^\circ\text{C}$ for 5 minutes. Reactions were then cooled to $4^\circ\text{C}$ to prevent DNA decomposition. Analysis of PCR products was analysed using agarose gel electrophoresis. Appropriate volumes of PCR product and 6x loading dye (Promega, UK) were mixed and loaded onto a 1% agarose gel in TAE buffer (Tris-Acetate and 0.05M EDTA) with 0.1% SyberSafe and leaving to polymerise in the gel tank, once polymerised the gel is submerged in TAE. 1kb or 100kb ladder (Invitrogen or Promega) was also loaded onto the gel to allow determination of the size of the PCR product. The gel was run for 45 minutes at a potential difference of 100v. For visualisation of DNA the gel was transferred to a blue-light box and imaged.

Oligos:

SOD1_F: cattccccgtccacagac
SOD1_R: gggtcgtccgatgatgct
GAL4_F: gcagcgtaccacaacaggtccc
GAL4_R: ggccgtgactgagcgatgca
2. Materials and Methods

2.4.2. Genomic DNA extraction

Single flies were ruptured in squishing buffer (10mM Tris pH 8.2, 1mM EDTA, 25mM NaCl, 200µg/ml proteinase K) using a pipette tip, and incubated at 37°C for 1 hour, followed by a 2 minute incubation at 95°C. The preparation can be stored at -20°C until needed, when 1µl is used as DNA template for PCR.

2.4.3. Gel Extraction

DNA extraction from excised gel bands were carried out using QIAquick gel extraction kit (Qiagen) according to the manufacturer’s protocol. The gel fragment was dissolved in 3x volume of buffer QG (100mg gel ≈ 100µl buffer) at 50°C, 1 volume of isopropanal added and transferred to QIAquick spin column and centrifuged for 1 minute at 13000g to bind the DNA to the column. To remove the excess agarose the column was washed with 500µl buffer QG and then with 750µl buffer PE to remove salts. Residual ethanol was removed by centrifugation and the DNA eluted with 30µl nucleotide free water. DNA concentration and quality was determined with an ND-1000 spectrophotometer (NanoDrop; Thermo Scientific, DE, USA).

2.4.4. DNA Sequencing

DNA sequencing was used to confirm the presence of mutations in potential recombinants. The area including the mutation was amplified using PCR and the product purified through gel extraction. Sequencing reactions were sent to Technology Facility, University of York. 3-10ng/µl of PCR product and 3.2µM primer were required. Sequencing results were analysed using Chromas (Version 1.45, Conor McCarthy, Australia) and NCBI bl2seq software.
2. Materials and Methods

2.5. Biochemical Analysis

2.5.1. Bradford Assay

Protein concentration was determined by measuring absorbance at 595nm in the presence of Bradford reagent which contains Coomassie; this changes absorbance upon its binding with protein. 30μl protein solution was added to 900μl Bradford reagent (Sigma), left for 15 minutes and the absorbance recorded.

2.5.2. Quantification of Oxidative Stress

2.5.2.1. Lipid Peroxidation Assay

Levels of peroxidated lipids were analysed using Bioxytech LPO-586 (OxisResearch, Oxis International, California, USA) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Standards were made up of 0-20μM 1,1,3,3-tetramethoxypropane (TMOP), which is hydrolysed in the assay to produce standards of 0-4μM malondialdehyde (MDA) (final concentration). 30 flies of each genotype were ruptured/ homogenised (on ice) in 750μl 5mM butylated hydroxytoluene in 20mM PBS pH 7.4 and centrifuged at 3000g for 10 minutes at 4°C, using 3x 200μl aliquots of the supernatant for the assay. A Bradford assay was carried out to ensure equal protein concentrations. 650μl diluted reagent R1 (N-methyl-2-phenylindole in acetonitrile diluted with ferric iron in methanol) was added to each tube including the standards and vortexed. 150μl reagent R2 (methanesulphonic acid) was added and the preparations incubated to 45°C for 60 minutes. The samples were centrifuged (15000g for 10 minutes) and the supernatant absorbance measured at 586nm.

2.5.2.2. Quantification of \textit{gst-D-GFP} Expression (Fluorimetry)

10 flies of each genotype were ruptured/ homogenised in 100μl lysis buffer (150mM NaCl, 20mM Tris-HCl pH8.0, 2mM EDTA, 0.5% (v/v) Igepal and 1 mini
protease inhibitor cocktail tablet (Roche)). Preparations were incubated on ice for 20 minutes, centrifuged at 13000g for 10 minutes, the supernatant transferred into a new tube and centrifuged again for 10 minutes at 13000g. The supernatant was removed, 300μl PBS added and the fluorescence quantified by measuring emission at 490-600nm (following excitation at 480nm) using a Fluoromax4 (Horiba Scientific) and the accompanying software Fluorescence V3.

2.6. Physiological Analysis of Larvae

2.6.1. Crawling Speed Analysis

Larvae were selected based on genotype and transferred to HL3 saline. Larvae were transferred, using a paintbrush, to 90mm diameter petri-dishes containing agar, and left to recover on the agar plate until they started to move. Larvae were recorded for 45s (CAMERA and VirtualDub). The videos were decompressed, and analysed using ImageJ. The speed of each larval recording was calculated using median and thresh track plug-ins for ImageJ, to give the x and y changes in the video, this was then converted to a larval speed based using Excel (based on the fact that 226 frames were recorded in 45 seconds and using conversion of pixels:mm).

2.6.2. Intramuscular Recordings

Larvae were dissected in HL3 solution as described in section 2.2.1, except only the middle of the ventral sides are pulled out, using one pin in each side (rather than 2 which facilitates imaging). Glass electrodes were pulled from 1mm borsosilicate glass to form a sharp pipette (resistance 10-20mOhms) (Flaming Brown micropipette puller model P-97, Sutter Instrument Co) with the following settings: P=200, heat=240-260, pull=100, vel=100, time=132. Electrodes were loaded with 3M Potassium Acetate, and the recording taken from muscle 6/7 in hemisegment in A3. Recordings were taken in DasyLab and the resting
membrane potential calculated by subtracting the initial recording before entry into the muscle and post entry to the muscle. Mean EJPs were calculated by overlaying 5-6 EJPs and taking the mean values for each animal.
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3. Oxidative Stress Contributes to Synaptic Overgrowth in spinster, a Model of a Lysosomal Storage Disorder

3.1. Introduction

Oxidative stress, as discussed earlier is caused by an imbalance between the generation and dissipation of ROS. There is a high correlation between oxidative stress and neurodegeneration; oxidative stress is believed to be partially causative to neurodegeneration and is also a consequence of neurodegenerative disease processes (Patten et al., 2010).

Lysosomal storage disorders, as described earlier (1.3.1) are a group of 40-50 metabolic disorders caused by impaired turnover of cellular constituents, as a result of lysosomal dysfunction. Most LSDs have a neurodegenerative component amongst many other cellular and multi-systemic symptoms. However, it is unclear how lysosomal dysfunction leads to neurodegeneration but lysosomal storage disorders have recently been shown to exhibit markers of oxidative stress (Deganuto et al., 2007; Fu et al., 2010; Wei et al., 2008a; Filippon et al., 2011).

Firstly oxidative stress has been implicated in Niemann Pick type C, an autosomal recessive LSD caused by abnormal function of NPC1 or 2, which leads to the build up of unesterified cholesterol and glycosphingolipids (Zampieri et al., 2009; Fu et al., 2010). Secondly, Gaucher's disease (Deganuto et al., 2007), one of the most common LSDs, which is caused by a build up of glucocerebroside, due to defective glucocerebrosidase, has an oxidative component. Fibroblasts from patients with Gaucher's disease have impaired redox status and are sensitive to oxidative stress as they are unable to mount an appropriate response to oxidative insults. Thirdly, oxidative stress has been
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implicated in juvenile neuronal ceroid lipofuscinosis (JNCL). Mutations in CLN3, the gene known to cause JNCL, result in hypersensitivity to oxidative stress and the protein has been shown to interact with stress signalling pathways (Tuxworth et al., 2011).

In addition LSDs have been shown to cause ectopic synaptic growth (Purpura and Suzuki 1976; Walkley et al., 1985 and 1988a and b). Swainsonine is a plant-derived product that inhibits alpha-mannosidase, a lysosomal hydrolase, and can be used to model mannosidase disorders, a type of LSD (Dorling et al., 1980, Hartley et al., 1971). This model was shown to cause ectopic axon Hillock neurite outgrowth in the cortical pyramidal and multipolar cells of the amygdala in cats (Walkley et al., 1985 and 1988a and b). However, it is not known whether this ectopic growth is caused by a direct effect of lysosomal dysfunction or due to downstream signalling of the oxidative stress generated by lysosomal dysfunction.

Spinster is a protein with 12 transmembrane domains that localises to the lysosome and shows high homology to sugar transporters. Mutations in spinster provide a good model of a lysosomal storage disorder, with increased numbers of enlarged endosomal/lysosomal compartments, coupled with neurodegeneration and synaptic overgrowth (Nakano et al., 2001; Dermaut et al., 2005; Sweeney and Davis, 2002). Mutations in spinster have previously shown to cause 100% overgrowth of the neuromuscular junction (Sweeney and Davies, 2002). However, the presence of increased reactive oxygen species/oxidative stress has not been determined, nor the relationship between oxidative stress and synaptic overgrowth.

Here, increased levels of oxidative cellular damage and activation of the cellular stress response are identified in spinster. In addition, it is shown that relieving oxidative stress, through the expression of anti-oxidant transgenes, partially rescues the level of synaptic overgrowth. Moreover, another overgrowth
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phenotype, *highwire*, is rescued by expression of antioxidants suggesting that the relationship between oxidative stress and synaptic overgrowth is causative not just correlative.

3.2. Results

3.2.1. *spin* carries an oxidative stress burden

Increased levels of reactive oxygen species lead to a number of forms of oxidative damage. One of the most common markers of oxidative stress is increased levels of peroxidated lipids. This can be determined by measuring the levels of certain aldehydes, such as malondialdehyde (MDA), that are the end products of lipid peroxidation. The *spinster* mutants previously indentified as having synaptic overgrowth (Sweeney and Davies, 2002) are transheterozygotes (the allelic combination *spin*^4/*spin*^5) that rarely survive to adulthood. Consequently for analysis of lipid peroxidation levels, where a large number of flies are needed, transheterozygotes of *spin*^Δ58/*spin*^4 and *spin*^Δ58/*spin*^5 were used, an allelic combination that survives regularly to adulthood, but with a shortened lifespan (Nakano et al., 2001; Dermaut et al., 2005). In *spinster* mutants the level of peroxidated lipid end product is increased by 83% compared to wildtype (p<0.001, ANOVA) (Fig. 3.1) whereas the level of peroxidated lipids is significantly reduced by expression of the human form of superoxide dismutase (UAS*hSOD1*), the enzyme that converts highly reactive superoxide anions to hydrogen peroxide, under the control of *spin*GAL4 (p<0.001, ANOVA). This suggests that *spinster* mutants incur increased levels of oxidative damage that are reduced by increasing the level of anti-oxidant defence. Expression of this transgene in a non-mutant background did not change the levels of peroxidated lipids, suggesting that any increase in
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Figure 3.1 spinster mutants have increased levels of peroxidated lipids. This is reduced by expressing an antioxidant transgene. (A) Two different spinster mutant combinations both have significantly increased levels of peroxidated lipids compared to wildtype flies. Levels are increased from 0.65±0.033µM TMOP to 1.1±0.07µM and 0.94±0.01µM TMOP in spin^5/spin^-Δ58 and spin^5/spin^-Δ58 respectively (p<0.05, ANOVA). (B) Wildtype flies show a mean level of MDA equivalent to 0.34±0.02µM TMOP. In spinster mutants (spin^5/spin^-Δ58) the level of peroxidated lipid end product increases by 83% to 0.64±0.1µM (p<0.05, ANOVA). Expression of UAShSOD1 under the control of spinGAL4 reduces the level of peroxidated lipids to 0.44±0.01µM significantly reduced compared to spinster (p<0.001, Student’s t-test). It is no longer statistically different to wildtype (p>0.05, Student’s t-test and ANOVA). Expression of this transgene in a non-mutant background did not cause any change in the levels of peroxidated lipids compared to wildtype: 0.31±0.03µM TMOP (p>0.05, ANOVA and Student’s t-test).

hydrogen peroxide levels caused by increased SOD1 activity was maintained within normal limits by the actions of other anti-oxidant enzymes, that break down hydrogen peroxide. The level of damage incurred suggests that ROS are increased in spinster and cause cellular damage due to insufficient levels of antioxidants to deal with the increased levels of ROS. In addition, augmented
ROS levels activate the cellular stress response, leading to increased transcription of anti-oxidants such as glutathione S-transferase-D (gst-D). Transcription of this gene is regulated by KeAP-1/Nrf2 signalling (Sykiotis and Bohmann, 2008). Nrf2 is a cap’n’collar transcription factor that regulates the transcription of a number of anti-oxidant transgenes such as heme-oxygenase I, peroxiredoxin (Ishii et al., 2000) and glutathione S-transferases (Hayes et al., 2000). Activity of Nrf2 is regulated by KEAP-1, a cytoplasmic actin binding protein that binds Nrf2 and promotes its proteosomal degradation hence preventing translocation to the nucleus to act as a transcription factor (Motohashi and Yamamoto, 2004). ROS and electrophiles stimulate the dissociation of Nrf2 and KeAP-1 allowing Nrf2 to translocate to the nucleus to bind to the anti-oxidant response element (ARE) to promote the transcription of antioxidant stress proteins and detoxifying enzymes. Therefore, upon oxidative stress gstD is upregulated and, by means of a reporter construct gstD-GFP, whereby the gstD promoter is fused to a GFP open reading frame, levels of gst-D-GFP can be monitored. Hence, when the breakdown of Nrf2 is decreased by reduced activity of KEAP-1, less Nrf2 is broken down and the increased Nrf2 translocates to the nucleus where it binds to the ARE increasing transcription. In this way, it also binds to the promoter fused to GFP and can therefore identify increased activation of the cellular stress response.

Here, fluorimetry and confocal imaging were used to investigate increased transcription of this transgene in spinster. Five day old flies were used and the level of GFP analysed. The genotypes tested were gst-D-GFP in a wildtype background (gst-D-GFP/+), which was compared to gst-D-GFP levels in spinster (spin5, gst-D-GFP/ spin5). The levels of GFP are significantly increased in spinster compared to wildtype (p<0.001, ANOVA). This was shown by both fluorimetry and confocal microscopy (Fig. 3.2A and B respectively). A different spinster mutant combination was also investigated; (spin5, gst-D-GFP/ spin4)
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Figure 3.2: The oxidative stress response is activated in spinster. (A) spin mutants (spin⁵/spin⁵⁵⁸) have increased levels of gst-D-GFP (p<0.001, Student’s t-test) indicating activation of the stress response. Increased GFP is shown through fluorimetry, the graph shows emission at the peak amplitude of GFP emission, error bars show SEM (n=3). (B) Increased GFP can also be seen in z-stacks of adult heads (neuropil shown in magenta). (C) A different spinster mutant combination spin⁷/spin⁵ also caused significant upregulation of gst-D-GFP. Expression of spin under the control of spinGAL4 rescues this phenotype.

which is also shown to have significantly increased levels of GFP (Fig. 3.2C). The presence of this phenotype in two different spinster genotypes suggests it is caused by spinster mutations directly and not by other mutations that have arisen in the spinster lines.

To confirm that this phenotype is caused by loss of function in spinster, and not by background mutations, expression of a wildtype spinster cDNA under the
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UAS-mediated control of spinGAL4 was used. This completely rescues the increased levels of gst-D-GFP in a spinster mutant background demonstrating that the increased level of gst-D-GFP is in fact caused by loss of spinster. Although the level of ROS has not been directly assayed in spinster, taken together, the data suggest that ROS are present in spinster, since both main facets of oxidative stress have been demonstrated. The presence of increased cellular damage and activation of the cellular stress response demonstrates an imbalance between the generation and breakdown of ROS, indicative of oxidative stress. However this association does not indicate the direction of causation with respect to the phenotypes seen in spinster. To test this, the next step is to determine whether relieving oxidative stress rescues the neuromuscular junction phenotypes previously identified in spinster.

3.2.2. Neuromuscular junction morphology is perturbed in spinster

Mutations in spinster cause an increase in bouton number as identified by Sweeney and Davies (2002) indicating a synaptic overgrowth. Some of the mutant allele combinations used in this study were different to those published. It was therefore necessary to confirm that these less severe combinations also cause overgrowth of the neuromuscular junction. Sweeney and Davis used 7 different allelic combinations and all showed a significant overgrowth. Both mutant combinations that are viable through to adulthood show a significant increase in bouton number (Fig. 3.3A). The muscle surface area of the larvae is not significantly affected by these mutations (Fig. 3.3B). Consequently, a similar trend can be seen in bouton number prior to and following normalisation (Fig. 3.3C). The normalisation step is carried out as increases in
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Figure 3.3. spinster has increased bouton number with no change in muscle surface area. (A) Bouton numbers are wildtype of 85±3.3 (n=16) to 124±9.0 (n=8), 117±7.7 (n=21) and 152±5.1 (n=32) for the mutant combinations spin⁴/spin⁴Δ⁵⁸, spin⁴/spin⁴Δ⁵⁸ and spin⁴/spin⁴ respectively (p<0.001; ANOVA). (B) The surface area of muscle 6/7 in segment A3 is 80801±2265µm², and in spinster mutations it is 82068±4538, 74129±1635 and 76580±2716µm² for the combinations spin⁴/spin⁴Δ⁵⁸, spin⁴/spin⁴Δ⁵⁸ and spin⁴/spin⁴ respectively (p>0.05; ANOVA). (C) When normalised to muscle surface area the bouton number for spin⁴/spin⁴Δ⁵⁸, spin⁴/spin⁴Δ⁵⁸ and spin⁴/spin⁴ is 126±13.4, 129±9.5 and 166±7.8 respectively. (D) Representative images of wildtype and spinster NMJs at muscle 6/7 segment A3. Nerves shown in magenta through α-HRP staining. Synaptic boutons visualised in green by α-synaptotagmin staining. Scale bar = 20µm.

bouton number during synaptic growth are proportional to muscle surface area (Schuster et al., 1996a). The trend seen is as expected: spin⁴/spin⁴Δ⁵⁸ and
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spin<sup>5</sup>/spin<sup>Δ58</sup> both show increased bouton number compared to wildtype but less of an overgrowth than the more severe mutant combination spin<sup>4</sup>/spin<sup>5</sup>.

The remainder of the analysis of neuromuscular junction analysis was carried out in spin<sup>4</sup>/spin<sup>5</sup>, the most severe overgrowth phenotype and the genotype most extensively described in Sweeney and Davis (2002).

The branch number was also analysed in spinster mutants and is significantly increased in spin<sup>4</sup>/spin<sup>5</sup> compared to wildtype (p<0.001; ANOVA) (Fig. 3.4A). This is consistent with many other overgrowth phenotypes where branching tends to increase with bouton number showing spinster growth is consistent with a normal pattern of growth.

![Graph showing branch number](image)

**Figure 3.4** Spinster mutants have increased branch number proportional to increase in bouton number. (A) Wildtype larvae have a mean branch number of 5.31±0.44 (n=16). This is significantly increased in spinster to 10.82±1.33 (n=11; p<0.001 Student’s t-test). (B) When normalised to bouton number there is no significant difference between branch number in wildtype and spinster, which has a mean normalised branch number of 6.05±0.74 (n=11; p>>0.05 Student’s t-test). (C) When normalised to account for muscle surface area and bouton number when spinster has a mean branch number of 5.54±0.68 (n=11; p>>0.05 Student’s t-test).
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Figure 3.5 *spinster* has reduced mean bouton width and a greater proportion of smaller boutons. (A) Mean bouton width in wildtype and *spinster* is 2.6±0.06 (n=468) and 2.35±0.04 (n=873) (p<0.001, Student’s t-test) respectively. (B) Bouton size in *spinster* is also displayed as % boutons at each µm width, the distribution of bouton size is significantly different, with *spinster* showing a higher proportion of smaller boutons. (p<0.001, Kolmogorov-Smirnov). (C) Cumulative % bouton numbers at each µm width in wildtype and *spinster* showing the difference in distribution.

Branch number increases proportionately with bouton number as when branch number is normalised to wildtype bouton number there is no significant change between *spinster* and wildtype (Fig. 3.4B). As in *spinster* there is no significant change in muscle surface area the same trend is seen when muscle surface area is accounted for (Fig. 3.4C).

During analysis of bouton number in a variety of phenotypes a difference in bouton size was indicated. Another overgrowth phenotype *highwire* (*hiw*) has been shown to have significantly reduced bouton size in comparison to wildtype (Collins *et al.*, 2006). Mutations in *spinster* results in reduced mean bouton width compared to wildtype (Fig. 3.5A). However, due to the presence of different bouton populations at muscle 6/7 it is useful to look at the proportion of smaller boutons, (type1s) and larger boutons (type1b), although classification of these based on size varies greatly in different studies. They are clearly defined by innervation and morphology but for the purposes of this study size was investigated in µm increments to establish the distribution on bouton width. Bouton size was found to exhibit a different distribution of width between wildtype and *spinster* (p<0.001; Kolmogorov-Smirnoff) with a greater proportion of smaller boutons in *spinster* mutants (Fig. 3.5B and C). Nonetheless, the spinster mutants have consistently overgrown synapses compared to wildtype.

3.2.3. Relieving oxidative stress reduces overgrowth of the neuromuscular junction in *spinster*

Increased levels of oxidative damage and activation of the cellular stress response in *spinster* are indicative of increased levels of ROS. Normally ROS
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are maintained at physiological levels through a tightly regulated balance between their generation and a complex system of anti-oxidants. Given the indication that spinster is carrying an oxidative stress burden, it is proposed that such oxidative stress might be a causative factor in the generation of overgrowth at the neuromuscular junction. To test this hypothesis anti-oxidant transgenes were expressed under the control of spinGAL4. Thus, transgenes were expressed concurrently pre- and post-synaptically, in the nerve and muscle. Expression of the anti-oxidant transgene UAS\textit{trx}^{\text{CYTO}} relieves oxidative stress and prevents the increase in branch number seen in spinster, showing that oxidative stress causes increased branching in spinster (Fig. 3.6).

Bouton number was investigated through the expression of four different antioxidant transgenes, UAS\textit{hSOD1}, UAS\textit{cat}, UAS\textit{trxR}^{\text{CYTO}} and UAS\textit{trxR}^{\text{MITO}}. These were expressed concurrently pre- and post-synaptically and all significantly rescue synaptic overgrowth (Fig. 3.7; p<0.001, ANOVA).

Expression of UAS\textit{hSOD1} will promote the generation of hydrogen peroxide from superoxide anions. This is the cytoplasmic and mitochondrial periplasm form of the enzyme (Missirlis \textit{et al.}, 2003). The other three anti-oxidant transgenes are involved in the conversion of hydrogen peroxide to water and oxygen, or neutralisation of other ROS, not superoxide anions; only SOD acts on superoxide produce hydrogen peroxide. Catalase acts directly to convert hydrogen peroxide to water (May, 1901), whereas thioredoxin reductase (TrxR) acts to reduce oxidised thioredoxin, allowing it to be used again in the breakdown of hydrogen peroxide. This process is coupled to the oxidation and
3. Oxidative Stress Contributes to Synaptic Overgrowth in spinster, a Model of a Lysosomal Storage Disorder

**Figure 3.6** *spinster* has increased branching due to oxidative stress. The mean number of branches per neuromuscular junction was increased from 4.54 (n=11) in wildtype to 10.8 (n=11) in *spinster* (Fig. 3.4). Expressing the anti-oxidant transgene UASTrx\textsuperscript{CYTO} significantly reduces branch number to 4.4±0.35 (n=12, p<0.001, ANOVA) back to wildtype levels. Expression of this transgene in a wildtype background does not cause any significant change in branch number 4.07±0.29 (p>>0.05 compared to wildtype, ANOVA).
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Figure 3.7 Relieving the oxidative stress burden in spinster through expressing anti-oxidant transgenes reduces synaptic overgrowth. Expression of UASHOD1, UAScat, UAStrx_CYTO, UAStrx_MITO, did not cause any significant change in bouton number in a wildtype background, with bouton numbers of 90±4.1 (n=24), 76±4.6 (n=18), 78±2.9 (n=10) and 80±3.3 (n=16). Expression of these transgenes in spinster resulted in a reduction of bouton number from spinster with a bouton number of 152 (n=32). Bouton number is significantly reduced to 110±3.7 (n=46) by the expression of UASHOD1, to 103±5.9 (n=17) by UAScat, 113±8.3 (n=10) by UAStrx_CYTO and to 103±6.8 by UAStrx_MITO (p<0.001; ANOVA) respectively. Representative images of NMJs at muscle 6/7 segment A3 with nerves shown in magenta through α-HRP staining. Synaptic boutons visualised in green by α-synaptotagmin staining. Scale bars denote 20µm.

reduction of NADPH (Holmgren, 1989). Two UAStrx-R transgenes were used in this experiment; one that acts in the cytoplasm and one in the mitochondria (Missirlis et al., 2002).

The similar effects of different anti-oxidants suggests that it is the level of oxidative stress that is significant in causing the overgrowth rather than the cellular localisation, or the proportion of superoxide anions in relation to hydrogen peroxide. This assumption is arrived at because it is immaterial to the level of rescue afforded, which ROS are acted upon; all the anti-oxidant enzymes expressed increase the breakdown of ROS and rescue synaptic overgrowth. These data also indicate that the sub-cellular localisation of the anti-oxidant is of no consequence to the level of rescue provided, since expressing cytoplasmic or mitochondrial anti-oxidant transgenes afforded the same level of rescue, although as overexpression was used there may also be expression outside its normal localisation. Unfortunately, this could not be further confirmed by comparing the effects of expression of UASSod2 in spinster as it was not possible to recombine this transgene with the spinster mutants, suggesting they are close together on the 2nd chromosome. Although reducing oxidative stress rescues branch number and bouton number it is not known whether bouton size is also rescued by expression of these transgenes.
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**Figure 3.8 Expression of UAS*hsOD1* reduces synaptic overgrowth in spinster when expressed in either the nerve the muscle or both.** Expression of UAS*hsOD1* under the control of *елаVGAL4, MHCGAL4, spinGAL4* and *tubGAL4* in a wildtype background did not cause any change in bouton number from wildtype, 85±3.3 (n=16) to 79±4.0 (n=16), 83±6.4 (n=15), 90±4.1 (n=24) and 81±3.2 (n=8), respectively. Expression of *hsOD1*, under control of these GAL4 drivers significantly rescues synaptic overgrowth. Expression in the nerve reduces bouton number to 106±8.0 (n=14), in the muscle 103±3.2 (n=14). As already shown concurrent expression in the nerve and muscle, by *spinGAL4*, reduces bouton number to 110±3.7 (n=46) *tubGAL4* driven expression of UAS*hsOD1* in *spinster* rescued bouton number to 115±6.0 (n=22).

Having established that relieving the oxidative burden pre- and postsynaptically, through the *spinGAL4* driver, rescues synaptic overgrowth it was decided to determine whether input from the pre- and post-synaptic compartments alone can rescue bouton number. As spin cDNA expression is required both in the nerve and the muscle to fully rescue overgrowth in the *spinster* mutant. This will elucidate whether oxidative stress and resultant signalling from both the nerve and the muscle contributes to synaptic overgrowth in *spinster*. To do this UAS*hsOD1* was expressed either pre- or post-
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synaptically by elaVGAL4 or MHCGAL4 respectively. UASHSOD1 was also expressed at high levels globally under the control of tubGAL4. Expression of UASHSOD1 under the control of elaVGAL4, MHCGAL4, spinGAL4 and tubGAL4 in a wildtype background did not change in bouton number from wildtype (Fig. 3.8). However, expression of hSOD1, under control of these GAL4 drivers significantly rescues synaptic overgrowth in a spinster mutant background. Expression in the nerve, muscle or both concurrently provided the same level of rescue. Global high level expression also afforded a similar level of rescue. This suggests that there is a limit to the level of rescue hSOD1 can provide, possibly due the breakdown of hydrogen peroxide becoming the rate-limiting step in the anti-oxidant pathway. These data are consistent with Sweeney and Davis (2002), who showed that spinster induced overgrowth is caused by contribution from both the pre- and post- synaptic compartments of the neuromuscular junction.

3.2.4. Oxidative stress contributes to overgrowth in highwire

Highwire is an E3 ubiquitin ligase that regulates the development of the neuromuscular junction by limiting JNK signalling (Collins et al., 2006). Mutations in hiw result in overactivation of this pathway leading to Fos-dependent synaptic overgrowth. This occurs as highwire is required for the ubiquitination, and hence breakdown, of wallenda, a JNKKK. In highwire mutants, the level of wallenda is left unchecked and is increased leading to heightened activity in the downstream pathway. Depleting wallenda, JNK or Fos signalling in highwire mutants prevents this overgrowth, as the increased activity in this pathway is impeded. It is interesting to note that Jun was not involved suggesting that, as postulated, Fos can act independently of Jun in Drosophila (Perkins et al., 1990, O'Shea et al., 1992). Highwire is regulated by autophagy, suggesting one mechanism through which autophagy promotes synapse growth.
3. Oxidative Stress Contributes to Synaptic Overgrowth in spinster, a Model of a Lysosomal Storage Disorder
3. Oxidative Stress Contributes to Synaptic Overgrowth in spinster, a Model of a Lysosomal Storage Disorder

Figure 3.9 Expression of UAShSOD1 rescues synaptic overgrowth in highwire.
Wildtype males have a mean bouton number of 74±3.2 (n=12). hiw mutants have a bouton number of 146±5.7 (n=20). hSOD1 did not cause any change in bouton number in a wildtype background; elaVGAL4, MHCGAL4 and spinGAL4 driving hSOD1 having bouton numbers of 71±2.6 (n=25), 72±3.6 (n=12), and 71±2.9 (n=21) respectively. When these transgenes were expressed in hiw mutants a significant rescue of bouton number was seen. Neuronal expression of hSOD1 affords complete rescue of NMJ overgrowth to 75±9.5 (n=15), whereas expression of hSOD1 under control of MHCGAL4 and spinGAL4 both reduced bouton number to 108±7.0 (n=21) and 108±6.0 (n=25) respectively. Representative images of NMJs at muscle 6/7 segment A3 with nerves shown in magenta through α-HRP staining. Synaptic boutons visualised in green by α-synaptotagmin staining. Scale bars denote 20μm.

(Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). In addition, JNK has been shown to activate autophagy transcriptionally (Wu et al., 2009) so the cyclical nature of this pathway is evident. Mutations in degradative pathways have been implicated in a number of neurodegenerative disorders and have been cited as a source of ROS. One of the genetic determinants of Parkinson’s disease is parkin an E3 ubiquitin ligase, however it is now known whether the loss of ubiquitination that causes PD with this mutation, furthermore parkin is involved in regulation of JNK signalling (Cha et al., 2005). It was therefore decided to investigate whether oxidative stress causes any of the overgrowth seen in hiw. As oxidative stress can lead to the increased activity of JNK signalling and could contribute to synaptic overgrowth. The anti-oxidant transgenes UAScat and UAShSOD1 were expressed in the nerve using elaVGAL4, in the muscle using MHCGAL4 and concurrently in the nerve and muscle using spinGAL4 (Fig. 3.9 and 10). Analysis of NMJs in hiw was carried out in males, which are approximately 10% smaller than females and consequently have a lower number of boutons. As in the females, any expression ofUAShSOD1, whether in the nerves, muscles or both did not cause any change in bouton number in a wildtype background. However, when these transgenes were expressed in hiw mutants a significant rescue of bouton number was seen. Neuronal expression of hSOD1 affords complete rescue of NMJ overgrowth whereas expression of hSOD1 under
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**Figure 3.10** Reducing oxidative stress through expression of UAScat fails to rescue synaptic overgrowth in \( \text{highwire} \). UAScat did not cause any change in bouton number in a wildtype background. \( \text{elaVGAL4} \), \( \text{MHCGAL4} \) and \( \text{spinGAL4} \) driving UAScat having bouton numbers of 95±10 (n=12), 83±6.3 (n=15), and 67±4.3 (n=19) respectively. Expression of UAScat pre-synaptically in \( \text{highwire} \) caused a bouton number of 133±6.5 (n=16). Expression in the muscle did not significantly affect bouton number 162±24.1 (n=16), and expression concurrently in the muscle and nerve under control of \( \text{spinGAL4} \) resulted in a bouton number of 125±4.7 (n=16). These are not significantly different to bouton numbers in \( \text{highwire} \) (p>0.05, ANOVA).

Control of \( \text{MHCGAL4} \) and \( \text{spinGAL4} \) both significantly reduced bouton number, but only a partial rescue, not back to wildtype levels (Fig. 3.9). Previously \( \text{highwire} \) overgrowth was thought to be controlled entirely through the pre-synaptic compartment. This is somewhat inconsistent with the data shown here, although ROS can diffuse freely between cells and it therefore non-autonomous, unlike activity in some signalling pathways. The same GAL4 drivers were used to ascertain the effects of increasing levels of catalase using UAScat. Once again (Fig. 3.10), similar to the females, expression of UAScat pre- (elaV) or
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post (MHC) synaptically or both (spin) does not cause any significant change in bouton number in wildtype males. Expression of UAScat in these tissues did not cause any significant change in bouton number in highwire (p>0.05 ANOVA). The observation that increasing the breakdown of hydrogen peroxide does not alter alleviate highwire induced overgrowth, suggests that the level of hydrogen peroxide is not contributing to the overgrowth phenotype. However, relieving the superoxide burden completely rescues the overgrowth phenotype suggesting that a misregulated component in the highwire mutants is sensitive to activation by superoxide specifically rather than other ROS.

3.3. Discussion

Mutations in spinster have been shown to cause aberrant carbohydrate storage in the lysosomes and accumulation of multilamellar membrane components. Endocytic defects and neurodegeneration are also observed (Dermaut et al., 2005). Oxidative stress has been implicated in a number of neurodegenerative conditions including a number of lysosomal storage disorders, so it was investigated whether spinster is carrying an oxidative stress burden. The data here demonstrate that mutations in spinster, a transmembrane lysosomal protein, result in oxidative stress. Increased levels of peroxidated lipids and increased transcription of gst-D-GFP show that spinster incurs oxidative damage and activation of the cellular stress response. Increased levels of malondialdehyde were found in the blood of mucopolysaccharidosis type II patients, and this was found to be reduced following 6 months of enzyme replacement therapy (Fillipon et al., 2011), again suggesting the causative role of lysosomal dysfunction in the generation of oxidative stress. This is likely to be a result of the presence of lipofuscin, which is caused by and goes on to cause oxidative stress and is a common characteristic of LSDs (Yamamoto et al., 1999).
In addition to the presence of oxidative stress the morphology of the neuromuscular junction was also analysed, and it is found that spinster mutants have increased branch number, coupled to increased bouton number. Bouton size shows a different distribution in spinster compared to wildtype. There are more smaller boutons in spinster compared to wildtype; this is akin to but not as severe as the bouton size phenotype seen in highwire mutants. Having shown the presence of oxidative stress in spinster the question of whether oxidative stress is causative to the synaptic overgrowth phenotype remained. The regulation of synapse growth is a complex process involving the integration of many signalling pathways that act both anterogradely and retrogradely, thus signalling between the nerve and the muscle and the reverse is required for normal development (For review see Collins and DiAntonio, 2007). By expressing an anti-oxidant transgene UAS-hSOD1 the level of oxidative damage in spinster is reduced suggesting that ROS is impinging upon one of these growth pathways.

All the anti-oxidants transgenes when expressed pre- and post-synaptically using spinGAL4 in spinster mutants cause a significant reduction in bouton number, but none provide a full rescue. These data suggest that there is a only certain level of rescue that can be obtained by reducing oxidative stress; there are other causative factors in spinster that are contributing to the overgrowth and further relieving oxidative stress is unable to combat these other causative factors. For this to be confirmed a number of anti-oxidants would have to be expressed concurrently both pre- and post synaptically. To deal with the level of oxidative stress a number of different anti-oxidant might need to be expressed together to effectively convert superoxide anions to hydrogen peroxide and then degraded further to water and oxygen. For example expressing SOD will increase the levels of hydrogen peroxide while dissipating the superoxide anions. Conversely, all the other anti-oxidant transgenes expressed work by converting hydrogen peroxide to water and oxygen. However it has not been
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investigated whether the change in bouton size is rescued by relieving the oxidative burden.

Mutations in spinster have previously been shown to cause overgrowth of the Drosophila neuromuscular junction due to dysregulation of TGFβ signalling (Sweeney and Davies, 2002). The data shown here is consistent with TGF-beta being permissive for synapse growth. Tissue specific expression of spinster cDNA showed that spinster is required both pre- and post- synaptically for normal synaptic development, there is 50% synaptic overgrowth contributed from each compartment (Sweeney and Davies, 2002). Here, it is shown that pre- or post- synaptic expression of UASHSOD1 afford a similar level of rescue, which is the same as obtained by concurrent expression pre- and post-synaptically with spinGAL4 or tubGAL4. Once again a battery of anti-oxidants may be required to fully rescue this severe overgrowth phenotype, alternatively full rescue of overgrowth might not be possible with anti-oxidants alone due to the persistent increased presence of signalling molecules, normally down-regulated through lysosomal systems.

The involvement of oxidative stress in generating overgrowth of the neuromuscular junction was also investigated in highwire; differential involvement was found in spinster and highwire. Reducing oxidative stress through the expression of UASHSOD1 reduces synaptic overgrowth most efficiently when expressed pre-synaptically in highwire. Conversely there is no difference between the level of rescue seen in spinster between pre- and post-synaptic expression of UASHSOD1. This is in keeping with published data that highwire and its downstream effector wallenda is expressed in the nerve (Wan et al., 2000) and that depleting presynaptic signalling is sufficient to rescue synaptic overgrowth (Collins et al., 2006), whereas in spinster mutants pre- and post-synaptic expression of UASspin was required to rescue the overgrowth phenotype (Sweeney and Davies, 2002). However post-synaptic involvement in
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highwire-induced overgrowth been investigated, although there is an electrophysiological phenotype in highwire mutants (Wan et al., 2000).

The data here also suggest that superoxide anions and hydrogen peroxide contribute to synaptic overgrowth in spinster but only superoxide anions contribute to overgrowth in highwire as overexpression of catalase to breakdown hydrogen peroxide did not change highwire-induced overgrowth. Although dendritogenesis and synaptogenesis have previously been identified in models of lysosomal storage disorders, the causes of increased synapse formation had not previously been identified. The data shown here clearly indicate that oxidative stress is having a causative role in increased synaptic growth in spinster, a model of a lysosomal storage disorder.
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4.1. Introduction

In chapter 3, it was shown that *spinster* is carrying an oxidative burden leading to increased oxidative damage and activation of stress response pathways. It was also observed that expressing antioxidant transgenes could prevent synaptic overgrowth in both *spinster* and *highwire*. This suggests that oxidative stress is causative of the synaptic overgrowth phenotype seen in these mutants. Due to these effects of oxidative stress on synapse development in these mutants it is postulated that oxidative stress can cause synaptic overgrowth. Consequently, to test this hypothesis it was investigated whether it is possible to recapitulate this overgrowth phenotype through the generation of oxidative stress independent of the lysosomal dysfunction arising in *spinster*. This would allow dissection of this phenotype and could elucidate what is caused as a result of oxidative stress and what is a direct result of lysosomal dysfunction. The effects of oxidative stress on synapse development were investigated by inducing oxidative stress in the developing larvae in a number of ways. Firstly, larvae were exposed to toxins known to cause oxidative stress, namely paraquat and rotenone. Secondly, mutations known to cause oxidative stress were used, there being two ways in which mutations can generate oxidative stress. Stress can be induced either by increasing the generation of ROS such as *sesB* or by reducing the animals capacity to breakdown ROS, through mutations in the antioxidant defence system, such as *sod1*.

Mutations in *spinster* were also shown to cause other changes in synaptic morphology, such as increased branch number and increased proportion of smaller boutons. To determine whether oxidative stress or other aspects of
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*spinster* induce these changes these phenotypes were investigated in animals carrying an oxidative burden.

### 4.2. Results

#### 4.2.1. Oxidative stress alters bouton number and muscle surface area

**4.2.1.1. Paraquat causes overgrowth of the neuromuscular junction**

Paraquat is an electrototoxin that impairs mitochondrial function and undergoes redox cycling within the cell (Bus *et al.*, 1976a and b). Exposure to this toxin has been known to cause Parkinson’s disease in farm workers exposed to this pesticide (Tanner *et al.*, 2011). It is also commonly used to cause oxidative stress in experimental systems. Paraquat undergoes redox cycling in the cell and also impairs mitochondrial function through acting at complex I or complex III (Fukushima *et al.*, 1994 and 2002; Richardson *et al.*, 2005; Ramachandiran *et al.*, 2007). By feeding larvae paraquat through the larval stages of development, paraquat is seen to cause no change in bouton number, at 1mM, 5mM or 10mM, prior to muscle normalisation (Fig. 4.1A). Lower concentrations of paraquat do not cause any change in muscle surface. However, 10mM paraquat causes a significant reduction in muscle surface area (Fig. 4.1B). Given the observation that muscle size and bouton number share a proportional relationship (Schuster *et al.*, 1996a; Lnenicka and Keshishian, 2000) it is common to normalise bouton number to muscle surface area. Consequently, when bouton number is normalised to account for these changes in muscle surface area 1mM and 5mM do not cause any change in bouton number whereas 10mM paraquat causes a significant increase in bouton number relative to muscle surface area (Fig 4.1C), suggesting that oxidative stress, as a result of paraquat exposure, causes synaptic overgrowth.
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**Figure 4.1** Paraquat causes synaptic overgrowth relative to muscle surface area.  
(A) On instant food in the absence of paraquat wildtype larvae have a mean bouton number of 78±2.1 (n=28). When fed on 1, 5 and 10mM paraquat this is not significantly changed with mean bouton numbers of 80±3.5 (n=24), 77±3.5 (n=21) and 80±6.6 (n=41) (p>0.05, ANOVA).  
(B) On instant food wildtype larvae have a mean muscle surface area of 72313±2837 µm$^2$. 1mM and 5mM paraquat cause no change with muscle surface areas of 73162±2665 µm$^2$ and 78917±2120 µm$^2$ respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA). 10mM paraquat caused a significant reduction in muscle surface area to 52003±2922 µm$^2$. (p<0.001, ANOVA).  
(C) When normalised to muscle surface area 1 and 5mM paraquat do not cause any change in bouton number; 82±5.3 and 72±4.3 respectively (p>0.05 ANOVA). 10mM causes a significant increase in normalised bouton number to 114±8.3 (p<0.001).  
(D) Representative images of wildtype NMJs at muscle 6/7 segment A3 in normal instant food and in 10mM paraquat. Nerves shown in magenta through α-HRP staining. Synaptic boutons visualised in green by α-synaptotagmin staining. Scale bar = 20 µm  
(E) Representative images of muscles showing length and width (red lines).
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Figure 4.2. Rotenone reduces synaptic growth with no change in muscle surface area. (A) 0.01mM and 0.1mM Rotenone did not cause any change in bouton number; 70±5.01 (n=14), 70±5.69 (n=12) no significantly different from wildtype: 78±2.1 (n=28), (p>0.05, ANOVA). 0.5mM and 1mM rotenone cause a significant reduction in bouton number with 57±3.74 (n=13) and 61±4.04 (n=13), (p<0.05, ANOVA). (B) 0.01mM, 0.1mM, 0.5mM and 1mM rotenone have muscle surface areas of 77142±2994µm², 75513±4880µm², 68243±3700µm² and 78154±4262µm², respectively. (C) Following normalisation the bouton numbers shown the same trend as prior to normalisation as the muscle surface areas were not significantly altered; 67±4.92, 69±6.43, 61±8.2 and 60±7.7 for 0.01, 0.1, 0.5 and 1mM rotenone. Normalised bouton numbers in larvae exposed to 0.5 and 1mM rotenone were significantly reduced compared to wildtype (p<0.05). (D) Representative images of wildtype NMJs without rotenone and in 1mM rotenone at muscle 6/7 segment A3. Nerves shown in magenta through α-HRP staining. Synaptic boutons visualised in green by α-synaptotagmin staining Scale bar = 20µm. (E) Representative images of muscles showing length and width (red lines).

4.2.1.2. Rotenone causes undergrowth of the neuromuscular junction

Rotenone is also known to cause oxidative stress and is commonly used as a model of Parkinson’s disease (Betarbet *et al*., 2000; Sherer *et al*., 2003). It impairs mitochondrial complex I function (Sherer *et al*., 2003). Low doses of rotenone (0.01mM, 0.1mM) did not cause any change in bouton number, however, higher doses of rotenone do cause changes at the neuromuscular
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junction. 0.5mM and 1mM rotenone cause a significant reduction in bouton number \( p<0.05, \text{ANOVA} \) (Fig. 4.2A). No change in muscle surface area is seen at any concentration of rotenone \( p>0.05, \text{ANOVA} \) (Fig. 4.2B). Following normalisation, a similar pattern of changes in bouton number persists as prior to normalisation; higher concentrations of rotenone cause a significant reduction in bouton number, even relative to muscle surface area (FIG. 4.2C).

4.2.1.3. Mutations that increase generation of ROS or reduce protection from oxidative stress tend to cause overgrowth of the neuromuscular junction

In addition to the effects of environmental causes of oxidative stress, the effects of oxidative stress on synapse development were investigated further through the use of mutations that cause oxidative stress. Three mutants in the antioxidant defence system were analysed: *sod1*, *sod2* and *cat*. Additionally, two mutants known to cause hypersensitivity to oxidative stress, through increased generation of ROS were analysed: *succinate dehydrogenase B* (*sdhB*) and *stress sensitive B* (*sesB*). SdhB is a component of complex II of the mitochondrial respiratory chain, mutations in this protein result in hypersensitivity to ROS and reduced longevity (Walker *et al*., 2006). *sesB* encodes a mitochondrial adenosine nucleotide transporter. Mutations in this gene cause increased sensitivity to oxidative stress and increased bouton number (Trotta *et al*., 2004). The morphology of the neuromuscular junction in these mutants was examined and it was found that *sdhB* causes a reduction in bouton number prior to normalisation Mutations in *sesB* cause an increase in bouton number \( p<0.05, \text{ANOVA} \). Mutations in the anti-oxidant defence system were also analysed. *cat* mutants, which have a reduced capacity to break down hydrogen peroxide, and thus are prone to oxidative stress have a normal bouton number prior to
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**Figure 4.3.** Mutations that cause oxidative stress tend to cause synaptic overgrowth. (A) *sdhB* has a significant reduction in bouton number 59±4.4 (n=16), (p<0.05, ANOVA) whereas *sesB* has an overgrowth 109±4.0 (n=13), (p<0.05, ANOVA). *cat* does not cause any change in bouton number 83±4.8 (n=17), (p>0.05, ANOVA). *sod1* and *sod2* have significantly increased bouton numbers of 108±4.9 (n=33, p<0.001, ANOVA) and 107±5.9 (n=17, p<0.05, ANOVA) (B) All the mutations cause a significant reduction in muscle surface area, *sdhB*, *sesB*, *cat*, *sod1* and *sod2* have muscle surface areas of 67668±3238 µm², 63699±2222 µm², 63334±3229 µm², 59272±2744 µm² and 61909±3000 µm² respectively. (*p<0.05, **p<0.01 and ***p<0.001, ANOVA). (C) Following normalisation to muscle surface area *sdhB* and *cat* show no significant change in bouton number (p>0.05, ANOVA), *sesB* has a significant increase in normalised bouton number 107±5.9 (p<0.01, ANOVA) and *sod1* and *sod2* have an even greater increase in normalised bouton number 156±9.6 and 147±11.6.
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respectively. (D) Representative images of wildtype and oxidative stress mutants at muscle 6/7 segment A3. Nerves shown in magenta through α-HRP staining. Synaptic boutons visualised in green by α-synaptotagmin staining. (E) Representative images of muscles showing length and width (red lines).

normalisation. Conversely, mutations in superoxide dismutase, the enzyme that catalyses the conversion of superoxide anions to hydrogen peroxide, cause synaptic overgrowth. Both forms of the enzyme, *sod1* and *sod2*, cytoplasmic and mitochondrial have significantly increased bouton number (*p*<0.001 and *p*<0.01 ANOVA, respectively) (Fig. 4.3A). All of the mutations investigated cause a significant reduction in muscle surface area, with varying significances (Fig. 4.3B). Due to the changes in muscle surface area, bouton number was normalised for muscle surface area, as the relationship between muscle size and bouton number is well documented (Schuster *et al.*, 1996a). When muscle surface area is accounted for there is no change in normalised bouton number in *sdhB* and it is statistically similar to wildtype (*p*>0.05, ANOVA). *sesB* has an increased normalised bouton number compared to wildtype (*p*<0.01, ANOVA). Mutations in the anti-oxidant defence system also had different effects on bouton number. *cat* did not cause a significant difference in normalised bouton number (*p*>0.05, ANOVA). Whereas, *sod1* and *sod2* cause a significant increase in bouton number proportional to muscle surface area (Fig. 4.3C). However, when statistical analysis is performed without *sod* mutants the overgrowth seen in *cat* relative to muscle surface areas is significant (*p*<0.05, ANOVA).

4.2.2. Oxidative stress causes changes in synaptic branching

Synapse growth is most normally quantified in terms of addition of boutons. However branching is also used as a common read-out of neuromuscular junction development. Mutations in *spinster* were shown to have increased branching in proportion to increased bouton number (Fig. 3.4) so branching was
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Figure 4.4. 10mM paraquat causes an increase in branch number. (A) Wildtype NMJs have a mean branch number of 4.38 ± 0.42 (n=8). This is significantly increased in paraquat to 6.17 ± 0.6 (n=6) (p<0.05, Student’s t-test). (B) When normalised to bouton number 10mM paraquat has a mean branch no of 6.01 ± 0.6 (n=6; p<0.05, Student’s t-test). (C) When normalised to normalised bouton number and therefore accounting for muscle surface area, there is no change in branch number between no paraquat and 10mM paraquat: 4.22 ± 0.4 (p>0.05 Student’s t-test).

Figure 4.5. Mutations in sod1 and sod2 cause different effects in branch number. (A) sod1 causes an increase in branch number from 5.3 ± 0.44 (n=16) to 7.25 ± 0.92 (n=7) (p<0.05, ANOVA). Conversely, mutations in sod2 caused a significant reduction in branch number to 3.5 ± 0.32 (n=17) (p<0.05, ANOVA). (B) When normalised to bouton number sod1 mutants have statistically similar branch number to wildtype 5.66 ± 0.5 (n=16; p>0.05, ANOVA) and sod2 mutants have significantly reduced branch number relative to bouton number of 2.76 ± 0.3 (n=17; p<0.001, ANOVA). (C) When taking into account muscle surface area and bouton number both sod1 and sod2 have significantly reduced branch numbers of 3.92 ± 0.3 (n=16; p<0.05, ANOVA) and 2.01 ± 0.2 (n=17; p<0.001, ANOVA).
investigated in the overgrowth phenotypes identified above. 10mM paraquat causes an increase in branching (Fig. 4.4A). When normalised to bouton number, 10mM paraquat also causes a significant increase in branch number (Fig. 4.4B) as raw bouton number is not increased by 10mM paraquat. However, when normalised to take account of muscle surface area there is no significant difference between no paraquat and 10mM paraquat (Fig. 4.4C). This suggests that the change in branching has more to do with muscle surface area than bouton number in paraquat fed animals. Mutations in sod also caused changes in branch number. sod1 causes a significant increase in the number of branches whereas sod2 causes a significant reduction in the number of branches (Fig. 4.5A). When normalised for bouton number sod1 shows similar branching in proportion to bouton number, whereas the reduction seen in sod2 is made more severe when accounting for bouton number (Fig. 4.5B). Having taken account for muscle surface area by comparing branch number to normalised bouton number both sod1 and sod2 have a significant reduction in branch number (Fig. 4.5C). This suggests once again that ROS cause different effects depending on the cellular source of the ROS. This is because sod1 would presumably lead to predominantly cytoplasmic derived ROS whereas sod2 is more likely to lead to mitochondrial derived increases in ROS, thus differing effects can be seen on NMJ morphology depending on the source of the ROS. Although this does not entirely fit with paraquat, which purportedly acts to increase ROS generation by increasing superoxide generation by the mitochondria and leads to an increase in branch number, akin to that seen in sod1. However, the possibility of paraquat acting cytoplasmically as well cannot be overlooked.

4.2.3. Oxidative stress causes changes in bouton size

10mM paraquat causes a significant reduction in mean bouton size (Fig. 4.6A). However what can also be important is the proportion of type Ib and type Is boutons at the NMJ. Even though each type of bouton is clearly defined by their
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innervation then are more loosely defined by their size however the range considered to be type Ib as compared to Is varies somewhat between studies. Therefore to compare bouton size the width of boutons in 1 \( \mu \text{m} \) increments was analysed. Paraquat exposure results in increased proportion of smaller boutons compared to larger boutons (Fig. 4.6B). There are more boutons sized 0-2 \( \mu \text{m} \) than in wildtype (Fig. 4.6B). The distribution of bouton size in paraquat fed animals is different to wildtype animals on normal food, with a higher proportion of smaller boutons in paraquat fed animals than in controls (p<0.001, Kolmogorov-Smirnov). *sod1* mutants have significantly reduced mean bouton size compared to wildtype (p<0.001, ANOVA) whereas *sod2* mutants have the same mean bouton width as wildtype (Fig. 4.7A). As mentioned for previous genotypes and phenotypes, it is not just the mean bouton width that is important to analyse but the frequency of different sized boutons and hence the distribution width. Both *sod1* and *sod2* mutants show different distributions of bouton size compared to wildtype. *sod1* mutants have more boutons sized 0-3 \( \mu \text{m} \), than in wildtype, whereas *sod2* mutants have an increased proportion of boutons sized 3-4 \( \mu \text{m} \) (Fig. 4.7B). When plotted as cumulative percentages In addition when compared to each other *sod1* and *sod2* also show different distributions of bouton size (p<0.001, Kolmogorov-Smirnov) (Fig. 4.7C). *sod1* seems to cause a similar change in distribution to paraquat, with an increase in the proportion of smaller boutons (p<0.001, Kolmogorov-Smirnov). However, as mentioned earlier, *sod1* would probably result in predominantly cytoplasmic oxidative stress, where as paraquat has been suggested to be mainly mitochondrial oxidative stress. Conversely, mitochondrial increases in superoxide caused by *sod2* mutations causes different effects. This suggests that oxidative stress does not uniformly alter bouton size, and depends exactly on the form of the insult incurred, but does not correlate well with differential effects of mitochondrial and cytoplasmic sources of ROS.
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**Figure 4.6. Paraquat causes changes in bouton size.** Bouton widths were taken from 7 NMJs for each condition (A) Paraquat causes a significant reduction in mean bouton width from 2.82±0.068µm (n=557) to 2.41±0.052µm (n=607) (p<0.001, Student’s *t*-test). (B) This shows the % of boutons in at each µm width, showing the increased proportion of smaller boutons in 10mM paraquat; this difference distribution is significant (p<0.001, Kolmogorov-Smirnov). (C) This shows the cumulative percentage of boutons in each µm width.
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**Figure 4.7. Mutations in sod cause changes in bouton size.** Bouton widths were taken from 5 NMJs for wildtype and sod2, and 6 NMJs for sod1 (A) sod1 has a significantly reduced mean bouton width compared to wildtype; reduced from 2.62±0.064µm (n=468) in wildtype to 2.2±0.042µm (n=610) (p<0.001, ANOVA). sod2 mutants have a mean bouton width of 2.65±0.053 µm, not statistically different to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA). (B) This shows the % of boutons in at each µm width, showing the increased proportion of smaller boutons in sod1; this difference distribution is significant (p<0.001, Kolmogorov-Smirnov). sod2 mutants also show a difference in the distribution of bouton sizes (p<0.001, Kolmogorov-Smirnov) with an increased proportion of medium-sized boutons. (C) This shows the cumulative percentage of boutons in each µm width.
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4.2.4. Growth of the neuromuscular junction in animals carrying an oxidative burden is reduced by expressed anti-oxidant transgenes.

The data above show that bouton number is significantly increased in proportion to muscle surface area in a number of conditions of oxidative stress introduced by a number of different methods. This is highly suggestive of oxidative stress driving synaptic growth. To confirm this, oxidative stress was relieved through the expression of anti-oxidant transgenes to see if this prevented the growth seen in these conditions. This was further to the results seen in the previous chapter where expression of anti-oxidant transgenes reduced the growth seen in *spinster* and *highwire* mutants.

4.2.4.1. Paraquat induced growth is reduced by expression of *hSOD1* concurrently pre- and post-synaptically

To establish whether the overgrowth caused by paraquat is due to oxidative stress, or other cellular effects of paraquat, an anti-oxidant transgene was expressed to reduce oxidative stress levels. *UAShSOD1* was expressed under the control of *spinGAL4*, so it was expressed concurrently pre- and post-synaptically. Expression of *spinGAL4>UAShSOD1* causes no change in bouton number (Fig. 4.8A) or muscle surface area (Fig. 4.8B) in the absence of paraquat. However, this transgene in the presence of 10mM paraquat causes a significant reduction in bouton number (Fig. 4.8A). This is significantly different from wildtype in the presence and absence of paraquat and the expression of the transgene in the absence of paraquat (p<0.001, ANOVA). No difference in muscle surface area is observed between wildtype and *UAShSOD1/+;spinGAL4/+* in the presence of 10mM paraquat (Fig. 4.8B). This suggests that oxidative stress is not involved in the reduced muscle surface area caused by paraquat. Accordingly, normalised bouton number is rescued back to
Figure 4.8. Paraquat induced synaptic growth, but not reduced muscle surface area, is rescued by antioxidants. (A) Expression of UAShSOD1 under control of spinGAL4 did not cause any change in bouton number 76±5.6 (n=21) compared to wildtype. However expression of this transgene combination in animals fed 10mM paraquat caused a significant reduction in bouton number 57±2.6 (n=41) compared to wildtype both with and without paraquat (p<0.001). (B) Expression of this transgene combination does not rescue the reduced muscle surface area caused by 10mM paraquat; with muscle surface areas of 52003±2922µm² in wildtype and 59332±1937µm² in spinGAL4>UAShSOD1 both fed on 10mM paraquat. Expression of spinGAL4>UAShSOD1 on normal food did not alter muscle surface area; 75308±3996µm² compared to 72313±2837µm² in wildtype. (C) Following normalisation, spinGAL4>UAShSOD1 doesn’t cause any change in bouton number 74±4.1 compared to wildtype 78±2.14. Expression of hSOD1 in 10mM paraquat prevents the increase in...
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normalised bouton number seen in wildtype, with a bouton number of 72±4.1 in the transgenic larvae (p<0.001 ANOVA compared to wildtype 10mM). (D) Representative images of wildtype and \textit{spin}GAL4>UAS\textit{SOD1} NMJs at muscle 6/7 segment A3 in normal instant food and in 10mM paraquat. Nerves shown in magenta through α-HRP staining. Synaptic boutons visualised in green by α-synaptotagmin staining. Scale Bar = 20\textmu m. (E) Representative images of muscles showing length and width (red lines).

wildtype levels by the expression of this antioxidant transgene; this is not statistically different to wildtype in the absence of paraquat and \textit{UAS\textit{SOD1}/+; spin\textit{GAL4}/+} in the absence of paraquat (p>>0.05, ANOVA), and significantly different to wildtype with 10mM paraquat (p<0.001, ANOVA) (Fig. 4.8C).

4.2.4.2. \textit{sod} mutant induced growth is rescued by expression of antioxidant transgenes

Increased bouton number in \textit{sod1} mutants is rescued by expressing either \textit{hSOD1} or \textit{cat} pre- and post-synaptically both in terms of raw bouton number (Fig. 4.9A) and normalised bouton number (Fig. 4.9C) (p<0.001, compared to \textit{sod1} and p>>0.05 compared to wildtype, ANOVA). Expression of these transgenes did not cause any difference to bouton number (Fig. 4.9A) or muscle surface area in the wildtype (Fig. 4.9B). Expression of these transgenes significantly rescues the reduction in muscle surface area seen in \textit{sod1} mutants (Fig. 4.9B). Expression of these transgenes also rescues the increased branching seen in \textit{sod1} mutants (Fig. 4.10).

\textit{sod2} induced overgrowth is rescued by expression of \textit{UASTrxR1\textit{CYTO}}, both in terms of raw bouton number (Fig. 4.11A) and when normalised to muscle surface area (Fig. 4.11C). In contrast to the data shown for \textit{sod1} expression of an antioxidant did not rescue muscle surface area (Fig. 4.11B). As shown earlier (Fig. 4.5), \textit{sod2} mutants have significantly reduced branching. With \textit{spinGAL4/UASTrxR1\textit{CYTO}} the branch number is no longer significantly different from wildtype, this could be interpreted as a partial rescue (Fig. 4.12).
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Figure 4.9. Synaptic overgrowth and reduced muscle surface area in sod1 mutants is rescued by antioxidants. (A) *spinGAL4>UAScat* and *spinGAL4>UASHSOD1* have bouton numbers statistically similar to wildtype; 90±4.12 (n=24) and 76±4.6 (n=18) (p>0.05, ANOVA) respectively. Expression of these antioxidant transgenes in a sod1 background fully rescues bouton number back to wildtype levels with expression of *hSOD1* and *cat* reducing bouton number to 75±5 (n=17) and 66±2.14 (n=16) respectively (p<0.001, ANOVA compared to sod1 and p>0.05 compared to wildtype). (B) Expression of *hSOD1* and *cat* did not cause any change to muscle surface area in wildtype background; 85387±2237µm² and 75369±2744µm² respectively. Expression of these transgenes in sod1 transheterozygotes rescues muscle surface area back to wildtype level; 79112±3990µm² and 74703±1805µm² for *hSOD1* and *cat* respectively (**p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ANOVA compared to sod1*
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Transheterozygotes and p>0.05, ANOVA compared to wildtype). (C) Following normalisation expression of the anti-oxidants transgenes *hSOD1* and *cat* does not cause any change in bouton number; 85±3.32 and 88±8.67. Expression of these transgenes in *sod1* transheterozygotes significantly reduces bouton number from 156±9.95 to 79±5.85 and 72±1.81 for *hSOD1* and *cat* respectively (p<0.001, ANOVA, compared to *sod1* mutants and p>0.05 ANOVA compared to wildtype).

![Figure 4.10](image)

**Figure 4.10. Change in branch number in *sod1* mutants is rescued by antioxidants** (A) *spinGAL4>UAScat* and *spinGAL4>UAShSOD1* have branch numbers statistically similar to wildtype; 4.9±0.44 (n=16) and 4.7±0.38 (n=15) (p>0.05, ANOVA) respectively. *sod1* mutants have increased branching with a mean of 7.2±0.64 (n=16) (p<0.05, ANOVA). Expression of these anti-oxidant transgenes in a *sod1* background fully rescues branch number back to wildtype levels with expression of *hSOD1* and *cat* reducing branch number to 5±0.49 (n=12) and 4.75±0.31 (n=16) respectively (p<0.05, p<0.01 ANOVA compared to *sod1* and p>0.05 compared to wildtype).
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Figure 4.11. Synaptic overgrowth, but not reduced muscle surface area, in *sod2* mutants is rescued by antioxidants. (A) *spinGAL4>UASTxR<sub>CYTO</sub>* doesn’t cause any change in bouton 78±8.01 (n=10) in a reduction in bouton number from 107±5.59 (n=17) to 82±5.31 (n=24) (p<0.01); this rescue is significantly similar to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA). (B) *spinGAL4>UASTxR<sub>CYTO</sub>* doesn’t affect muscle surface area; 81684±2755 compared to wildtype 80801±2265µm² (p>0.05, ANOVA). *sod2* mutations result in decreased muscle surface area; 61909±3000µm² (p<0.001, ANOVA). This is not affected by *TrxR<sub>CYTO</sub>* expression; 69271±2378µm² (p>0.05, ANOVA compared to *sod2* transheterozygotes). (C) Following normalisation *spinGAL4>UASTxR<sub>CYTO</sub>* has a bouton number of 78±7.93, similar to wildtype 85±3.32 (p>0.05, ANOVA). Expression of *TrxR<sub>CYTO</sub>* in *sod2* mutants reduced bouton number from 147±11.6 to 97±6.39 (p<0.001, ANOVA), this is not significantly different to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA).
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4.3. Discussion

The general trend of the data above is that oxidative stress causes an increase in bouton number coupled with a decrease in muscle surface area. Paraquat
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causes overgrowth of the synapse, which is rescued by expressing UAS-\(hSOD1\) pre- and post-synaptically. This however does not rescue muscle surface area, suggesting that oxidative stress is the causative factor in synapse overgrowth whereas the reduction in muscle surface area is not relieved at all by expression of this transgene suggesting that it is an energy deficit, or some other cellular effect of the paraquat that results in the significant reduction of muscle surface area. Alternatively, the level of anti-oxidant expression was not sufficient to rescue this phenotype, or the cells were suffering from increased levels of hydrogen peroxide, due to increased SOD activity. Expression using a stronger promoter such as *tubulinGAL4* or expression of a battery of antioxidants could answer these questions. However, this was not investigated in this study as synaptic overgrowth is the focus of this investigation and this was fully rescued by expression of *spinGAL4*\(\rightarrow\)UAS\(hSOD1\).

All the mutations investigated that cause oxidative stress cause a significant reduction in muscle surface. However rotenone did not cause any reduction in muscle size. This could be due to a number of reasons, such as the dose of rotenone not causing the threshold level of oxidative stress required to result in impaired muscle development. It would be interesting to analyse the comparative levels of oxidative stress in the conditions studied here and investigate the correlation between oxidative damage, activation of stress response and synaptic phenotypes. Not all the mutations cause changes in bouton number, relative to the muscle surface area. This, taken together with the data shown above that rotenone, in fact, causes a significant decrease in normalised bouton number; suggest that oxidative stress does not always cause synaptic overgrowth. This shows that the effects of oxidative stress can vary greatly and depend on the level, source and species of ROS involved. There could be a number of reasons for the differential effects observed. Firstly activation of different cellular signalling pathways could cause the different effects. Another reason for rotenone causing synaptic undergrowth could be
4. Oxidative Stress Causes Overgrowth of the *Drosophila* Neuromuscular Junction through the effects of rotenone on microtubule formation. Rotenone impairs the formation and generation of microtubule networks (Brinkley et al., 1974; Srivastava and Panda, 2007). Autophagy and many other cellular processes depend on normal microtubule function/form. Autophagy has been shown to drive synapse growth (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009), and normal synaptic formation can be impaired by cytoskeletal disruption (Koch et al., 2008) hence this could explain the effects of rotenone on synapse development.

*sod1* and *sod2* mutants show very similar muscle surface area and bouton number however the other phenotypes investigated differ greatly. As discussed earlier, *sod1* is predominantly cytoplasmic but also expressed in the inner mitochondrial membrane, whereas *sod2* is expressed in the mitochondria. This suggests that the bouton number and muscle surface area are determined by the general presence of oxidative stress in these mutants, while the bouton size and branch number may be determined by the origin of the oxidative stress. This could indicate that different pathways are involved in the generation of certain neuromuscular junction phenotypes. However mutations that are known to cause oxidative stress do not always cause synaptic overgrowth, *sdhB* and *cat* both cause oxidative stress but without any significant synaptic overgrowth, in fact *sdhB* shows a significant undergrowth prior to normalisation. The role of *cat* requires more investigation as it does cause a significant increase in bouton number relative to muscle surface area, when statistical analysis is carried out without *sod*. The consistent phenotype is the reduction in muscle surface area, but conclusions can also be drawn that oxidative stress can cause synaptic overgrowth as suggested by the data that show the effects of relieving oxidative stress in these mutations.

Mutations in SOD would lead to increased level of superoxide anions, and it is somewhat counter-intuitive that overgrowth in both *sod1* and *sod2* can be rescued by expressing anti-oxidants that catalyse the conversion of hydrogen
peroxide. However, this does suggest that it is the overall level of oxidative stress that drives synaptic growth. This however is somewhat paradoxical because as discussed earlier not all cases of increased ROS lead to synaptic overgrowth suggesting specificity dependent on ROS species and source. It might be significant to note that expressing predominantly cytoplasmic antioxidants in primarily mitochondrial forms of oxidative stress (paraquat and sod2) rescues bouton number but not muscle surface area. Perhaps indicative of the signalling caused by oxidative stress leading to increased bouton addition, whereas reduced muscle size could be due to energy deficit and metabolic defects caused by mitochondrial dysfunction, or due to differential activation of signalling pathways in response to cytoplasmic and mitochondrial derived ROS.
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5.1. Introduction

JNK/AP-1 signalling is activated in response to oxidative stress (Klintworth et al., 2007, Wang et al., 2003); in fact JNK was originally identified as a stress activated protein kinase (SAPK). In addition this pathway has been seen to regulate synaptic development (Sanyal et al., 2002 and 2003). Increased neuronal expression of Fos and Jun together as AP-1 increases bouton number, whereas depleting activity of either one in the neuron has been shown to reduce bouton number and synaptic strength (Sanyal et al., 2002). Furthermore, neuronal expression of wallenda, a JNKKK, and its downstream effectors, JNK and Fos are necessary for synaptic overgrowth in highwire (Collins et al., 2006). Given the commonality in the pathways involved in synaptic development and the oxidative stress response it was investigated whether JNK/AP-1 signalling is upregulated in spinster and other conditions involving oxidative stress and whether this is causing the synaptic overgrowth seen to be caused by oxidative stress. More recently, activation of autophagy has been shown to drive NMJ expansion (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). Increased neuronal expression of Atg1, involved in the initiation of autophagy, drives synapse overgrowth, and neuronal expression of Atg1 rescues the reduction in bouton number seen in atg1 mutants (Wairkar et al., 2009; Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). Autophagy mutants are believed to cause a reduction in bouton number due to accumulation of highwire. As discussed earlier Highwire, is an E3 ubiquitin ligase that is involved in the breakdown of wallenda, a JNKKK (Collins et al., 2006). Thus when autophagy is defective highwire builds up so there is an elevated level of
breakdown of wallenda leading to reduced activity in the downstream signalling pathway. This in turn reduces JNK signalling. Accordingly, with increased neuronal expression of atg1 there is an increased level of synaptic growth, as more highwire is broken down, disinhibiting wallenda and downstream signalling, promoting synaptic growth. Hence, wallenda and JNK are required for synaptic overgrowth in the presence of increased autophagy (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). This suggests that wallenda and JNK are acting downstream of both autophagy and highwire to promote synapse growth. This is supported by the observation that autophagy is not required for highwire induced overgrowth, as mutations in autophagy do not prevent the highwire overgrowth phenotype. Although this is indicative of autophagy being upstream of JNK signalling, oxidative stress activates autophagy through JNK signalling (Wu et al., 2009). Autophagy is activated in response to oxidative stress to protect the cell by degradation of damaged proteins, lipids and organelles (Li et al., 2006; Ogata et al., 2006; Arsham and Neufeld, 2009). Oxidative stress can also activate autophagic cell death (Higgins et al., 2011; Chen et al., 2008; Cheng et al., 2009). This suggests that oxidative stress could be activating JNK signaling leading to synaptic overgrowth and it was reasoned that activation of autophagy would be critical to the process of synaptic overgrowth induced by oxidative stress. It is possible that activation of these pathways is cyclical as autophagy is known to act upstream of JNK signalling but also be activated by JNK signalling. Moreover, JNK activity directly regulates autophagy through regulation of Beclin; otherwise known as atg6 (Park et al., 2009) and JNK regulates FoxO dependent autophagy (Pattingre et al., 2006).
5.2. Results

5.2.1. Oxidative stress and spinster overgrowth share the same genetic pathway; spinster and sod1 induced overgrowth act synergistically

Firstly, it was determined whether spinster and sod1-induced overgrowth were acting through the same genetic/signalling pathway. This was done analyzing heterozygote mutations of sod1 and spin. Heterozygotes of two spinster mutants, spin^4/+ and spin^5/+ have bouton numbers similar to wildtype.

![Figure 5.1: Mutations in sod1 and spin act synergistically to cause synaptic overgrowth.](image)

Larvae carrying heterozygous mutations for both sod1 and spin are significantly overgrown compared to the heterozygous mutations alone. Wildtype, sod1n1/+; sod1n64/+; spin4/+ and spin5/+ are not statistically significantly different (p>>0.05) with bouton numbers of 103±4.4 (n=18), 92±4.3 (n=92), 91±6.5 (n=12) and 94±4.1 (n=31) respectively. In all combinations, mutants of spin and sod1 are overgrown compared to wildtype or the constituent heterozygotes alone (p<0.001 ANOVA).

Similarly, sod1 mutant heterozygotes (sod1^{n1}/+ and sod1^{n64}+) do not lead to significant overgrowth (ANOVA p>0.05). However, combining these mutations in
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a single animal by removing one functional copy of spinster and one copy of sod1 so that each larva only has one wildtype copy and one mutant copy of each gene generates a significant increase in bouton number when compared to relevant heterozygotes (ANOVA p<0.001). Animals carrying heterozygous mutations in both sod1 and spinster have a synaptic overgrowth that resembles the spin or sod1 full mutant phenotypes suggesting a shared genetic pathway (Fig. 5.1). Having established that spinster and sod1 act synergistically, with mutations in both causing a certain threshold to be reached at which synaptic overgrowth occurs, the next step was to determine which signalling pathways are activated in spinster and oxidative stress to contribute to synapse overgrowth.

5.2.2. JNK signalling is upregulated in spinster

JNK/AP-1 is a pathway widely known to be activated by oxidative stress (Wang et al., 2003); it is also a known regulator of synaptic growth (Sanyal et al., 2002). To test whether the JNK signalling pathway has been activated in spinster a puckered LacZ enhancer trap was used. Activation of the AP-1 pathway is known to directly transcriptionally activate puckered, a phosphatase inhibitor of JNK that mediates a feedback loop to regulate JNK signalling (Martin-Blanco et al., 1998). Larval muscles in spinster were examined for the activation of the AP-1 pathway using the pucE69 enhancer trap by comparing β-galactosidase (β-gal) expression to ascertain the relative activation of JNK/AP-1 signalling.
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Figure 5.2: puckered is upregulated in spinster: Expression of puc\textsuperscript{LacZ}, an enhancer trap reporter of JNK/AP-1 activation, is increased in the muscle in spin compared with wildtype, nerves shown in magenta, LacZ in green. Scale bar = 40µm.

Greatly increased expression of β-gal is seen in spinster compared to wildtype this was observed by immunofluorescence (keeping the settings the same for both genotypes) indicating an activation of the AP-1 pathway in muscles of spinster (Fig. 5.2). Having established that JNK/AP-1 signalling is upregulated in spinster the next line of investigation was to establish whether over activity of this pathway is causative in the generation of synapse overgrowth in spinster.

5.2.3. Components of AP-1 modify synapse development

To establish how AP-1 regulates synapse growth and the GAL4/UAS system was used to overexpress Jun and Fos either separately or together as AP-1 in the nerve, muscle or both. The presynaptic functions of Fos and JNK are relatively well documented. It has previously been shown that neuronal overexpression, of both Jun and Fos leads to increased growth (Sanyal et al., 2002), and depletion of either through expression of a dominant negative reduces bouton number, suggesting they are acting as a heterodimer. Overexpression of AP-1 in the muscle was not shown to increase bouton number (Sanyal et al., 2003). However, only Fos is implicated in highwire-
induced overgrowth, suggesting that Fos is able to act as a homodimer in a model of synapse overgrowth (Collins et al., 2006).

The data shown here (Fig. 5.3) are somewhat at odds with this previously published data. Fig. 5.3 shows that expression of Jun or Fos in the neuron or the muscle alone does not alter bouton number significantly compared to wildtype, in agreement with Sanyal et al. (2002). However, expression of Jun simultaneously in the nerve and muscle with spinGAL4 causes a 26% increase in bouton number (p<0.05, ANOVA). This is the only significant difference when all the values shown in the graph are compared using ANOVA. However, more differences can be seen when comparing only one driver or one UAS construct. When expression of UASFos under control of the MHCGAL4, elaVGAL4 and spinGAL4 are compared alone, simultaneous expression of Fos in the muscle and nerve results in a significant reduction in bouton number (p<0.05, ANOVA). Expression of Fos and Jun, together as AP-1, does not cause any change in bouton number with any of these GAL4 drivers. This is at odds with the published data but correlates with Jun providing an overgrowth and Fos an undergrowth with spinGAL4. Expression of these transgenes in any combination does not significantly affect muscle surface area (Fig. 5.3B). However, when normalised for muscle surface area there is a slight change in the level of significance of overgrowth caused by overexpression of Jun. Following normalisation, neuronal expression still does not significantly affect bouton number, however both muscular and simultaneous expression in the nerve and muscle cause a significant overgrowth (p<0.05, ANOVA). Expression of Fos or AP-1 controlled by these three drivers does not significantly affect normalised bouton number (Fig. 5.3C).
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Figure 5.3: Fos and Jun can alter synapse growth. (A) Neuronal or muscular overexpression of JUN does not alter bouton number; 98±6.8 (n=12) and 107±10.2 (n=14). Concurrent expression with spinGAL4 causes significant overgrowth 111±4.1 (n=19) (p<0.05, ANOVA). Neuronal or muscular expression of FOS did not cause any change in bouton number, 78±5.7 (n=15) and 98±5.2 (n=14). Expression pre- and post-synaptically causes a reduction in bouton number to 69±2.9 (n=21, p<0.05, ANOVA). Expression of AP-1 in either the muscle or the nerve or both causes no change in bouton number, 84±5.9 (n=17). (B) Expression of any of these transgenes causes no change in muscle surface area (p>>0.05, ANOVA). (C) Following normalisation for muscle surface area, neuronal expression did not significantly change bouton number: 98±9.0 (n=12) whereas MHCGAL4>JUN or spinGAL4>JUN have significantly increased bouton numbers of 114±10.1 (n=14) and 112±5.3 (n=19), respectively. Expression of FOS pre- or post-synaptically or both causes no change in normalised bouton number: 83±7.1 (n=15), 95±7.6 (n=14) and 68±3.4 (n=21) respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA). Expression of FOS and JUN together also causes no
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change in normalised bouton number when expressed pre- or post-synaptically or both with normalised bouton numbers of 85±5.5 (n=17), 83±6.5 (n=18) and 94±9.2 (n=15) (p>0.05, ANOVA).

5.2.4. Reducing JNK/AP-1 signalling rescues spinster induced overgrowth

Once again the GAL4/UAS system was employed, this time to dissect the signalling pathway involved in the generation of synaptic overgrowth. Dominant negative transgenes for components of ASK/JNK/AP-1 signalling were expressed simultaneously pre- and post- synaptically (using spinGAL4). These dominant negative transgenes act to reduce normal activity through competing with the endogenously produced protein. The ASK dominant negative transgene is UAS-ask$^{K618M}$ and is kinase dead and can therefore not activate its downstream signalling partners through phosphorylation (Kuranaga et al., 2002). UAS-jnk$^{K53R}$ is also a kinase dead form of the enzyme (Madhani et al., 1997; Weber et al., 2000). The Jun and Fos dominant negatives act in a different manner. Jun and Fos are B-Zip domain transcription factors, this family of TFs act as dimers and they contain a B-Zip domain that comprises a sequence specific DNA binding domain and a leucine zipper domain that is needed for the dimerisation of two DNA binding domains. The dominant negative transgenes of Jun and Fos, originally known as Jbz and Fbz respectively, only contain a bZIP fragment which means they act in a dominant negative fashion as they are able to bind DNA but unable to initiate transcription (Bohmann et al., 1994; Eresh et al., 1997).

As discussed earlier, ASK is a JNKKK that has been identified for its role in the stress response, however it has not previously been identified as having a role in synapse development. The role of ASK in the synaptic phenotypes identified was investigated due to its important role in regulating the stress response.
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Figure 5.4: ASK/JNK/AP-1 signalling is required for spinster overgrowth.

Expression of spinGAL4>UASjunDN or UASjnkDN in a wildtype background did not cause any change in bouton number compared to wildtype with bouton numbers of 64±3.24 (n=18) and 75±3.31 (n=23). spinGAL4>UASfosDN or UASaskDN cause a significant reduction in bouton number from 85 in wildtype to 56±2.3 (n=18) and 60±4.18 (n=15) respectively. Expression of junDN in a spinster background does not rescue overgrowth with a bouton number of 148±7.19 (n=22), not significantly different to spinster 152±5.1 (n=32) (p>0.05, ANOVA). Expression of fosDN reduces spinster-induced overgrowth to 74±1.92 (n=19) (p<0.001, ANOVA) back to wildtype levels (p>0.05, ANOVA, compared to wildtype). Whereas jnkDN and askDN only partially rescue bouton number to 117±5.79 (n=16) and 128±6.37 (n=16) (p<0.001 and 0.05, ANOVA) respectively, both significantly different to wildtype (p<0.001, ANOVA). Bouton counts of spinster with junDN and fosDN carried out by Kate Gow.

ASK, JNK, Fos and Jun dominant negative transgenes were expressed in spinster to establish which components of this signalling cascade are involved in the generation of synaptic overgrowth in spinster. As a control the dominant negative transgenes were expressed in a wildtype background. Expression of junDN and jnkDN did not significantly affect bouton number, whereas expression
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of $fos^{DN}$ or $ask^{DN}$ result in reduced bouton number. This is the first time that ASK has been suggested to have a role in synapse development in *Drosophila*.

The data here show that synaptic overgrowth in *spinster* is significantly reduced by depleting Fos, JNK and ASK signalling while reducing Jun activity did not reduce overgrowth. Reducing JNK or ASK signalling only provided a partial rescue, with the bouton numbers still significantly different to wildtype (Fig.5.4).

Conversely, reducing Fos signalling in *spinster* mutants gives a bouton number not statistically different to wildtype; a full rescue. To reaffirm these results JNK/Fos signalling was depleted in a different manner, namely, by expressing RNAi lines to reduce transcription of the target genes (Fig. 5.5). In a wildtype background expression of FosRNAi does not reduce bouton number like expression of the dominant negative transgene does. Depleting JNK signalling through expression of RNAi in a wildtype background showed a significant reduction in bouton number, disparate to the effect of reducing signalling with the dominant negative. Expressing FosRNAi and JNKRNAi in a *spinster* mutant background similarly reduced bouton number consistent with the reduction observed using the dominant negative constructs. However the rescue observed with UASfosRNAi was not as strong as the rescue with UASfos$^{DN}$, suggesting that the reduction in the level of Fos signalling is not as much with RNAi. This is supported by the observation above that $Fos^{DN}$ causes a significant reduction in bouton number where as FosRNAi does not. This would be expected as it is well known that some RNAi constructs deplete their cognate targets with variable preference (Dietzl *et al.*, 2007) and reduction of target mRNA is rarely total.
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Figure 5.5: JNK/Fos signalling is required for spinster-induced overgrowth. spinGAL4>UASfosRNAi causes no change in bouton number 82±4.24 (n=17). Expression of jnkRNAi causes a significant reduction in bouton number to 65±3.44 (n=22). Expression of these transgenes in spinster causes a reduction in bouton number from 152±5.06 to 119±3.81 (n=16) and 121±3.45 (n=19) (p<0.001, ANOVA).

5.2.5. Fos is required both pre- and post- synaptically for spinster induced overgrowth

As discussed earlier, expression of fosDN simultaneously pre- and post-synaptically under the control of spinGAL4 provides a full rescue of spinster-induced overgrowth. Expression either pre- or post-synaptically using either elaVGAL4 or MHCGAL4 respectively affords partial rescue, with a bouton number between that of the mutant and simultaneous expression (Fig. 5.6). This
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suggests that signalling is required both from the muscle and the nerve and that overactivation of Fos signalling in both leads to overgrowth seen in spinster.

Fig. 5.6: Fos signalling is required pre- and post- synaptically for spinster induced synapse overgrowth. Expression of fos\textsuperscript{DN} pre-synaptically and post-synaptically causes no change in bouton number in a wildtype background 68±3.3 (n=20) and 79±3.68 (n=22). Expression in spinster reduces synaptic overgrowth to 113±9.49 (n=9) and 120±8.42 (n=11) respectively (p<0.001, ANOVA). Bouton counts in spinster with dominant negative transgenes performed by Kate Bowers

5.2.6. JNK signalling is upregulated by paraquat

The transgene puc\textsuperscript{E69} was used to investigate puckered transcript levels in paraquat fed animals. There is an upregulation compared to wildtype; indicative
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of increased JNK/AP-1 activity (Fig. 5.7). This suggests that similar pathways are involved in the generation of synaptic growth caused in paraquat, as those shown to be involved in *spinster* induced overgrowth.

*Figure 5.7: puckered is upregulated in paraquat-fed animals:* Expression of $puc^{LacZ}$, an enhancer trap reporter of JNK/AP-1 activation, is increased in the muscle paraquat fed animals compared with controls, nerves shown in magenta, LacZ in green. Scale bar = 40µm.
5.2.7. Reducing ASK/JNK/AP-1 signalling reduces paraquat induced overgrowth

The same transgenes used in the spinster experiments were also used to dissect the signalling pathways involved in synaptic growth in paraquat fed animals. All components of the signalling pathway investigated, jun, fos, JNK and ASK, were found to be required for the synaptic growth induced by this treatment.

In the absence of paraquat, prior to normalisation fosDN and askDN cause a significant reduction in bouton number expressed simultaneously pre- and post-synaptically under the control of spinGAL4. This indicates that Fos and ASK are important in normal synaptic development. Depleting Jun or JNK signalling in the absence of paraquat does not alter bouton number (Fig. 5.8A). Expression of any of these transgenes doesn’t alter muscle surface area in the absence of paraquat (Fig. 5.8B). Following normalisation only spinGAL4>UASaskDN has a significantly reduced bouton number in the absence of paraquat. (Fig. 5.8C).

In the presence of 10mM paraquat, prior to normalisation for muscle surface area, depletion of Jun or Fos significantly reduces bouton number. Expression of jnkDN or askDN with exposure to 10mM paraquat results in a bouton number not significantly different to wildtype in the presence of 10mM paraquat (Fig. 5.8A). spinGAL4>UASjunDN partially rescues the reduction in muscle surface area caused by 10mM paraquat, so that it is significantly different to the muscle surface area of wildtype in 10mM paraquat. However, the muscle surface areas of spinGAL4>UASjnkDN and UASaskDN in 10mM paraquat are not significantly reduced compared to wildtype (Fig. 5.8B). Having accounted for changes in muscle surface area through normalisation expression of all any of these transgenes significantly rescues paraquat induced growth, so it is not significantly different to wildtype in the absence of paraquat (Fig. 5.8C).
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This data is recapitulated through expression of *jnkRNAi*. Expression of this transgene causes no reduction in bouton number or muscle surface (Fig. 5.9A and B) area but does reduce paraquat-induced growth (p<0.01, ANOVA) back to wildtype levels (p>0.05, ANOVA) (Fig. 5.9C). The above data clearly show that ASK, JNK/AP-1 signalling is required for paraquat-induced growth. The involvement is similar to that seen in *spinster*, in that ASK/JNK/AP-1 are required for both *spinster* and paraquat-induced growth. However, there is differential involvement of Fos and Jun; depletion of Jun signalling does not prevent synaptic overgrowth in *spinster* whereas Jun is required for paraquat induced growth.
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Figure 5.8: ASK/JNK/AP-1 signalling is required for paraquat-induced growth. (A) Prior to normalisation spinGAL4>UASfosDN and spinGAL4>UASaskDN cause a significant reduction in bouton number with mean bouton numbers of 55±2.7 (n=13) (p<0.05, ANOVA) and 54±3.64 (n=19) (p<0.001, ANOVA). spinGAL4>UASjunDN and spinGAL4>UASjnkDN cause no change in bouton number 70±6.2 (n=20) and 80±3.64 (n=19). As shown earlier 10mM paraquat causes no change in bouton number: 74±4.1 (n=21). spinGAL4>UASjunDN and spinGAL4>UASfosDN cause a significant reduction in bouton number in 10mM paraquat: 56±1.93 (n=55) (p<0.001) and 59±3.23 (n=19) (p<0.05) respectively. spinGAL4>UASjnkDN and spinGAL4>UASaskDN don't cause any change in bouton number in 10mM paraquat 64±3.92 (n=17) and 73±8.29 (n=20) respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA).

(B) Expression of junDN, fosDN, jnkDN and askDN doesn’t cause any change in muscle surface area: 66897±3089 µm², 62919±4114 µm², 78220±3408 µm² and µm² 81124±2992µm² respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA). As stated earlier 10mM paraquat causes a significant reduction in muscle surface area. Expression of junDN, causes a significant increase in muscle surface area in 10mM paraquat to 64243±1950µm² (p<0.05). This is not significantly different to wildtype in the absence of paraquat (p>0.05, ANOVA). fosDN, jnkDN and askDN cause no significant change in muscle surface area compared to wildtype in 10mM paraquat: 57525±2346 µm², 64027±4759 µm², 61032±2433µm² respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA). Only spinGAL4>UASfosDN in 10mM paraquat has a muscle surface area significantly different to wildtype in the absence of paraquat (p<0.05, ANOVA).

(C) Change in normalised bouton number; 77±6.05, 56±5.77 and 75±3.59 respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA). spinGAL4>UASaskDN causes a significant reduction in normalised bouton number 48±3.2 (n=19) (p<0.001, ANOVA). The overgrowth caused by 10mM paraquat is significantly reduced by expression of junDN to 65±2.64 (p<0.001, ANOVA), by fosDN to 75±5.26 (p<0.001, ANOVA), by jnkDN to 76±4.49 (p<0.001, ANOVA) and by askDN to 86±5.4 (p<0.01, ANOVA). These are not significantly different to wildtype in the absence of paraquat (p>0.05, ANOVA).
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Figure 5.9: JNK signalling is required for paraquat-induced overgrowth.
(A) Expression of jnkRNAi causes no change in bouton number either in the absence or presence of paraquat with bouton numbers of 70±3.20 (n=21) and 64±3.73 (n=19) (p>0.05, ANOVA). (B) Expression of jnkRNAi causes no change in muscle surface area in the absence of paraquat: 78429±2837µm²; not significantly different to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA). jnkRNAi does not rescue muscle surface area compared to wildtype in 10mM paraquat (p>0.05, ANOVA). (C) spinGAL4>UASjnkRNAi causes no change in normalised bouton number 66±4.2 compared to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA). Expression of jnkRNAi significantly reduces overgrowth in 10mM paraquat (p<0.05, ANOVA), this is not significantly different to wildtype in the absence of paraquat (p>0.05, ANOVA).
5.2.8. Reducing JNK/AP-1 signalling in sod1 mutants reduces synaptic overgrowth

Prior to normalisation spinGAL4>UASjunDN or UASFosDN causes a significant reduction in bouton number compared to wildtype (p<0.01 and 0.001, ANOVA, respectively). Expression of junDN does not cause any change in bouton number in a sod1 mutant background, whereas fosDN reduces bouton number in sod1 (p<0.001, ANOVA) so that it is not significantly different to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA) (Fig. 5.10A). That is to say only depleting Fos signalling not Jun rescues the increase in bouton number. Expression of both these transgenes in sod1 significantly rescues muscle surface area (p<0.001, ANOVA) (Fig. 5.10B). As a result of this change in muscle surface area, when normalised for muscle surface area bouton number in sod1 mutants is significantly reduced by expression of junDN and fully rescued back to wildtype levels by expression of fosDN (Fig. 5.10C). Changes in branch number seen in sod1 are also rescued by expression of junDN and fosDN under the control of spinGAL4. Depleting Jun signalling does rescue as much as depleting Fos signalling, following a similar pattern to the rescue in bouton number.

In sod2 mutants, junDN, fosDN and jnkDN significantly rescue bouton number prior to normalisation (p<0.001, 0.001 and 0.01, respectively ANOVA) (Fig. 5.12A). junDN does not rescue muscle surface area whereas fosDN completely rescues muscle surface area and jnkDN does not have a muscle surface area significantly different to sod2 however, it is no longer significantly different to wildtype muscle surface area (Fig. 5.12B). In terms of normalised bouton number, expression of any of these transgenes significantly rescues normalised bouton number back to wildtype levels (Fig. 5.12C). Expression of any of these transgenes rescues the
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Figure 5.10. AP-1 signalling is required for sod1-induced overgrowth.

(A) Prior to normalisation spinGAL4>UASjun\textsuperscript{DN} spinGAL4>UASfos\textsuperscript{DN} and cause a significant reduction in bouton number with mean bouton numbers of 64±3.24 (n=18) (p<0.05, ANOVA) and 56±2.29 (n=18) (p<0.001, ANOVA) respectively. Expression of jun\textsuperscript{DN} in a sod1 background does not rescue bouton number 104±3.69 (n=18), (p>0.05 compared to sod1; p<0.01 compared to wildtype, ANOVA) whereas fos\textsuperscript{DN} expression significantly reduces sod1 overgrowth to 59±3.7 (n=21), back to wildtype levels (p<0.001 compared to sod1; p>0.05 compared to wildtype). (B) Expression of jun\textsuperscript{DN} or fos\textsuperscript{DN} doesn’t cause any change in muscle surface area: 73243±3578 and 75297±3820µm\textsuperscript{2} respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA). As stated earlier sod1 mutants show a significant reduction in muscle surface area. Expression of jun\textsuperscript{DN} or fos\textsuperscript{DN} causes a significant increase in muscle surface area in sod1 mutants to 69466±2060 and 71978±2063µm\textsuperscript{2} (p<0.01, ANOVA). These are not significantly different to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA). (C) Following normalisation, expression of jun\textsuperscript{DN} or fos\textsuperscript{DN} does not cause any change in normalised bouton number; 76±7.02 and 65±6.25 respectively. Expression of these transgenes in a sod1 mutant background causes a significant reduction in normalised bouton number 122±3.88 (p<0.05, ANOVA) and 67±4.62 (p<0.001) respectively. fos\textsuperscript{DN} expression in a sod1 background is not significantly different to wildtype bouton number (p>0.05), where as jun\textsuperscript{DN} in a sod1 background is still significantly different to wildtype (p<0.05, ANOVA).
Figure 5.11. AP-1 signalling is required for changes in branching in sod1 mutants. Expression of Jun$^{dn}$ and Fos$^{dn}$ caused no change in branch number both having branch numbers of 4.9±0.31 and 4.9±0.44 and (n=13 and 14 respectively, p>0.05, ANOVA). Expression of these transgenes in a sod1 background significantly reduces branch number to 6±0.26 (n=18, p<0.05, ANOVA) and 4.20±.36 (n=19, p<0.001) respectively. These are not significantly different to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA).
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Figure 5.12: JNK/AP-1 signalling is required for sod2-induced overgrowth.

(A) As shown previously, prior to normalisation spinGAL4>UASjunDN spinGAL4>UASfosDN and cause a significant reduction in bouton number with mean bouton numbers of 64±3.24 (n=18) (p<0.05, ANOVA) and 56±2.29 (n=18) (p<0.001, ANOVA) respectively spinGAL4>UASjnkDN causes no change in bouton number 75±3.31 (n=23) (p>0.05, ANOVA). Expression of these transgenes, junDN, fosDN or jnkDN in a sod2 mutant background significantly reduces overgrowth to 72±3.77 (n=20) (p<0.001, ANOVA), 65±4.25 (n=23) (p<0.001, ANOVA) and 84±4.28 (n=19) (p<0.01, ANOVA). (B) Expression of junDN, fosDN or jnkDN doesn't cause any change in muscle surface area: 73243±3578, 75297±3820 and 76823±2153 μm² respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA). As stated earlier sod2 mutants show a significant reduction in muscle surface area. Expression of junDN in a sod2 background did not significantly change surface area of the mutant 59037±3609 μm² whereas fosDN causes a significant increase in muscle surface area in sod2 mutants to 76877±2881 μm² (p<0.01, ANOVA compared to sod2). Expression of jnkDN in a sod2 background resulted in a muscle surface area of 73878±2423 μm² (p>0.05, ANOVA; compared to both wildtype and sod2). (C) Following normalisation, expression of junDN or fosDN does not cause any change in normalised bouton number; 76±7.02 and 65±6.25 respectively. Expression of these transgenes in a sod1 mutant background causes a significant reduction in normalised bouton number 122±3.88 (p<0.05, ANOVA) and 67±4.62 (p<0.001) respectively. fosDN expression in a sod1 background is not significantly different to wildtype bouton number (p>0.05), whereas junDN in a sod1 background is still significantly different to wildtype (p<0.05, ANOVA).

reduction in branch number seen in sod2 mutants, so that they are not significantly different to wildtype (Fig. 5.13).

The data above show that there is slightly different pathway activation depending on the source or specific level of increased superoxide, as there is different involvement of AP-1 seen in sod1 and sod2 mutants. There is different involvement in the generation of both bouton number and muscle surface area as well as branch number. However this could be due to the effects of oxidative stress other than oxidative stress induced signalling, such as energy deficits.

Having established that sod mutants have Fos dependent overgrowth, in a fashion similar to spinster it was investigated whether Fos signalling was required from both the nerve and muscle, as with spinster (Fig. 5.6). To test this Fos signalling was depleted in either the nerve or the muscle using elavGAL4 or
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MHCGAL4 to drive UASfos\textsuperscript{DN}. Reducing Fos signalling in either the nerve or the muscle was enough to completely rescue sod2-induced overgrowth (Fig. 5.14A). This is at odds with the data seen in spinster where depletion of Fos is required both in the nerve and the muscle, i.e. under the control of spinGAL4 for

![Graph showing branch number changes](image)

**Figure 5.13:** Changes in branch number in sod2 mutants require JNK/AP-1 signalling. As shown above spinGAL4>UASjun\textsuperscript{DN} or fos\textsuperscript{DN} does not change branch number, nor does spinGAL4>UASjnk\textsuperscript{DN}, with a branch number of 4.9±0.55 (n=10). The reduction of branch number in sod2 mutants to 3.5±0.24 (n=17, p<0.05, ANOVA) is rescued by the expression of jun\textsuperscript{DN}, fos\textsuperscript{DN} and jnk\textsuperscript{DN} have branch numbers of 5.2±0.44 (n=10), 4.8±0.43 (n=14) and 4.8±0.40 (n=13) so that it is no longer significantly different to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA).
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Fos signalling is required either from the muscle or the nerve for sod2 induced overgrowth. (A) Expression of fos\textsuperscript{DN} in the nerve with elaVGAL4 causes no change in bouton number to 74±6.4 (n=17) but reduced sod2 bouton number to 73±4.2 (n=27). Expression in the muscle with MHCGAL4>UASfos\textsuperscript{DN} causes no change in bouton number 77±3.3 (n=17) but rescues sod2 induced overgrowth to 78±4.5 (n=20) (B) As shown sod2 has reduced muscle surface area expression of fos\textsuperscript{DN} in either the nerve or the muscle causes no change in muscle surface area with 77640±2888\,\mu m\textsuperscript{2} and 82593±17712\,\mu m\textsuperscript{2} respectively. Expression of these transgenes in a sod2 mutant background results in muscle surface areas of 79692±2919\,\mu m\textsuperscript{2} and 81371±3621\,\mu m\textsuperscript{2}, respectively, all statistically similar to wildtype (p>>.05, ANOVA) and significantly different to sod2 (p<0.05, ANOVA). (C) When normalised to account for muscle surface area neuronal depletion of Fos signalling results in a bouton number of 78±6.9, and in sod2 77±4.9. Muscular expression of UASfos\textsuperscript{DN} has a normalised bouton number of 76±3.1 whereas in sod2 with muscular expression of UASfos\textsuperscript{DN} has a normalised bouton number of 81±6.4, all statistically similar to wildtype (p>>0.05, ANOVA) and statistically different to sod2 (p>0.05, ANOVA)

full suppression of overgrowth. However, the sod2 overgrowth is not as severe as the overgrowth seen in spinster suggesting that Fos overactivation might not be as great therefore reducing signalling in only one synaptic compartment is enough to reduce synaptic overgrowth. Intriguingly, expression of fos\textsuperscript{DN} in either the muscle or the nerve or both fully reverses the reduction in muscle surface area seen in sod2 mutants (Fig. 5.14B).

5.2.9. Autophagy gene function affects synapse development

Autophagy has previously been shown to regulate synapse development. Increasing levels of Rheb, one of the controllers of autophagy, in the neuron was shown to increase bouton number and EJP amplitude. Mutations in Rheb showed the opposite phenotype with decreased bouton number and EJPs (Knox et al., 2007). Rheb acts upstream of TOR, which inhibits autophagy. Consequently, increased Rheb activity is proposed to decrease autophagy, through activation of TOR. However, inhibition of TOR through exposure to rapamycin does not prevent overgrowth. In addition, later studies have shown
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Figure 5.15: Changing levels of autophagy alters synaptic size. (A) Mutations in atg1 and atg18 cause significant reductions in bouton number: 60±3.2 (n=19, p<0.01, ANOVA) and 54±4.0 (n=28, p<0.001, ANOVA). Depleting atg5 in the muscle or the nerve with UASatg5RNAI does not cause a significant change in bouton number; 81±4.7 (n=17) and 98±6.0 (n=16) respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA). Driving atg1CG in the nerve or muscle doesn’t change bouton number significantly with bouton numbers of 81±4.7 (n=17) and 70±4.4 (n=17). Driving atg168 in the nerve causes a significant reduction in bouton number to 59±2.9 (n=29, p<0.001, ANOVA). Expression in the muscle causes no change in bouton number 72±4.7 (n=14, p>0.05, ANOVA). (B) atg1 mutants have statistically normal muscle surface area, 86857±3659 (n=19, p>0.05, ANOVA) mutants have significantly reduced muscle surface area 67737±2439 (n=28, p<0.05, ANOVA), other manipulations of atg genes shown here cause no change in muscle surface area. (C) When normalised for muscle surface area, atg1 have
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significantly reduced bouton number 59±5.8 (n=19), when atg18 is normalised there is no significant change in bouton number 68±6.3 (n=28). Atg5RNAi in either the nerve or the muscle causes no change in normalised bouton number 78±4.8 (n=17) and 87±6.6 (n=17) (p>0.05, ANOVA). Driving atg1 activity in the nerve or muscle causes no change in bouton number with UASATG1CG 81±5.5 (n=17) and 67±5.0 (n=18), Using UASATG168 expression in the nerve causes a reduction in normalised bouton number, 51±4.3 (n=17, p<0.01, ANOVA), whereas expression in the muscle does not significantly alter bouton number 74±5.9 (n=14).

that rapamycin exposure results in increased bouton number (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). This is consistent with the increase in bouton number caused by rapamycin as seen by Knox et al. (2007). However the mechanism suggested by Shen and Ganetzky (2009), whereby autophagy drives synapse growth is somewhat incompatible with other published data. As increased Rheb would lead to a decrease in autophagy but still leads to increased bouton number. Autophagy gene regulation of bouton number and how this compares to the previous data published was investigated. As, although driving Rheb in the muscle was shown to cause a slight reduction in bouton number the effect of driving atg1 in the muscle has not been fully investigated. This is because in the first study driving atg1 in muscle (Wairkar et al., 2009) did not show any change in NMJ morphology. However, neuronal expression of this construct did not provide full rescue of the atg1 mutant phenotype (Wairkar et al., 2009), suggesting that it is not expressing highly enough to rescue the phenotype seen. Using a different UASatg1 construct Shen and Ganetzky fully rescue the atg1 mutant phenotype with neuronal expression of this transgene. This suggests that their transgene is expressing more efficiently. It is this transgene that affords overgrowth when expressed neuronally in a wildtype background. However, this transgene has not been expressed in the muscle to determine any effects that this might have. The data in this area is, therefore, incomplete. It was investigated whether altered levels of autophagy in either the nerve, the muscle or both can impact on synapse development. Autophagy is occurring
globally in all cells. To this end, bouton number was compared between atg mutants that would presumably be defective for autophagy both pre- and post-synaptically. Autophagy function was also manipulated by employing a UAS-atg5-RNAi expression to allow comparison between mutants and RNAi depletion with UAS-Atg1 expression, using two independently generated transgenes.

The data shown here (Fig. 5.15A) agree with published data that mutations in the autophagy genes atg1 and atg18 (Wairkar et al., 2007; Shen and Ganetzky, 2009) show a significant deficit in synaptic growth, shown here by a reduction in bouton number compared to wildtype. atg1 mutants show no significant change in muscle surface area, however atg18 mutants have a significantly reduced muscle surface area (Fig. 5.15B). Consequently, when normalised for muscle surface area (Schuster et al., 1996a), only atg1 has significant undergrowth compared to wildtype (Fig. 5.15C). Depleting atg5 activity in either the nerve or the muscle using elaVGal4 or MHCGAL4, respectively to drive UASatg5RNAi, did not significantly affect bouton number, muscle surface area or normalised bouton number (Fig. 5.15A,B and C respectively). Overexpression of UASatg1\(^+\) has previously been shown to drive autophagy (Scott et al., 2007; Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). The data shown here show contrary results to those published, where increased autophagy caused increased bouton numbers. Over-expression of atg1\(^CG\) in the nerve or the muscle causes no change in bouton number. However, expression of UASatg1\(^68\) in the nerve with elaVGal4 results in a significant reduction in bouton number whereas expression in the muscle with MHCGAL4 results in a bouton number statistically similar to wildtype. This trend is the same following normalisation (Fig. 5.15C) for muscle surface area as there is no change in muscle surface area (Fig. 5.15B).

5.2.10. Autophagy is required for spinster induced overgrowth

When introduced into a spinster mutant background, mutations in atg1 or atg18 rescue synapse overgrowth resulting in a significant reduction in bouton number.
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Heterozygous combinations of \textit{atg1} and \textit{atg18} similarly restrict synaptic growth in \textit{spinster} mutants (Fig. 5.16). Although a general decrease in branching in the \textit{atg1} mutant combination (not quantified) was observed, the data demonstrate that an \textit{atg} mutation can restrain \textit{spinster} synapse overgrowth. In agreement with Shen and Ganetzky (2009) the data here suggest that autophagy functions to regulate synaptic growth and that this process is critical to synaptic overgrowth induced by oxidative stress.

5.2.11. Autophagy is required pre- and post- synaptically for \textit{spinster} induced overgrowth

As shown earlier, functional autophagy is required for \textit{spinster}-induced overgrowth. However, previously autophagy has only been shown to be involved presynaptically in synaptic development. To confirm this tissue specific inhibition of autophagy was used. Reducing autophagy through expression of UAS\textit{atg5RNAi} in the nerve, using \textit{ela VGAL4}, or in the muscle, using \textit{MHC GAL4} does not alter bouton number. However, expression of these transgenes in a \textit{spinster} background reduces overgrowth significantly and equally (Fig. 5.17). This is the first time autophagy genes acting post-synaptically have been implicated in synaptic development.

5.2.12. Autophagy is required for paraquat induced overgrowth

Importantly, feeding of paraquat to \textit{atg1} mutants failed to induce the expected synaptic overgrowth. Even prior to normalisation \textit{atg1} mutants show a significant reduction in bouton number in 10mM paraquat (Fig. 5.18A). \textit{atg1} mutants have a significantly increased muscle surface area but presence of this mutation in
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Figure 5.16: 

(A) Autophagy is required for spin-induced synapse overgrowth. Mutants for autophagy genes Atg1 (atg1$^{PZ}$/atg1$^{DG}$) and Atg18 (atg18$^{KG}$/Df) and animals heterozygous for both alleles (atg1$^{PZ}$/atg18$^{KG}$) have a reduction in bouton number to 59±5.8 (n=19), 54±4.0 (n=28) and 68±6.3 (n=28). These mutations also reduce spin-induced overgrowth, to 72±4.9 (n=28), 75±6.7 (n=16) and 76±5.8 (n=15) respectively (p>>0.05 compared to wildtype and atg1$^{PZ}$/atg1$^{DG}$ ANOVA and p<0.001 compared to spin).

(B) Representative images of NMJs at muscle 6/7 nerves shown in magenta with anti-HRP and boutons shown in green with anti-synaptotagmin. Scale bar =20µm
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Figure 5.17: Autophagy genes are required both in the nerve and the muscle for spinster-induced overgrowth. Expression of atg5IR in the nerve or muscle partially rescues bouton number in spinster to 127±5.57 (n=16) and 126±6.51 (n=16) respectively (p<0.001 ANOVA).
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Figure 5.18: paraquat induced overgrowth requires autophagy genes. Mutations in \textit{atg1} prevent paraquat-induced overgrowth. (A) \textit{Atg1} mutants have significantly reduced bouton number compared to wildtype both in the absence and presence of 10mM paraquat. In the absence of paraquat \textit{atg1} mutants have a bouton number of 60±3.2 (n=19, p<0.01, ANOVA). With 10mM paraquat these mutants have a bouton number of 35±1.8 (n=19, p<0.001, ANOVA compared to both wildtype with and without paraquat) (B) Paraquat induced reduction in muscle surface area still occurs in \textit{atg1} mutants. There is no difference in muscle surface area in wildtype and \textit{atg1} mutants in 10mM paraquat; 52003±2922 (n=21) and 46302±2580 (n=19) (p>0.05, ANOVA). Both are significantly reduced compared to wildtype without paraquat (p<0.001, ANOVA) (C) Mutations in \textit{atg1} prevent paraquat induced increases in normalised bouton number. When normalised to muscle surface area \textit{atg1} mutants in paraquat have a bouton number of 54±1.4 (n=19) significantly different to wildtype on 10mM paraquat (p<0.001, ANOVA).
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10mM paraquat does not rescue muscle surface area (Fig. 5.18B). *atg1* mutants have a decreased normalised bouton number and also rescue overgrowth caused by 10mM paraquat (Fig. 5.18C).

5.3. Discussion

5.3.1. ASK/JNK signalling is required for oxidative stress induced overgrowth

The synergy seen between *spinster* and *sod1* heterozygotes to induce synapse overgrowth suggests a common signalling pathway. As JNK is known to be activated in response to oxidative stress this pathway was investigated for increased activity and found to be upregulated in both *spinster* and paraquat fed animals, as shown by increased expression of a *puckered* reporter. Depleting ASK and JNK signalling both rescue *spinster* and paraquat induced overgrowth. Activation of ASK occurs through the dissociation of thioredoxin under conditions of oxidative stress (Saitoh *et al.*, 1998) whereupon ASK is known to then activate JNK (Chen *et al.*, 2002; Cha *et al.*, 2005). JNK is also activated by oxidative stress as its activity is increased when glutathione is oxidized preventing its binding and inhibiting JNK. Thus in oxidative stress, the activity of this signalling pathway is upregulated both by direct activation and increased downstream activity due to phosphorylation. ASK has not been previously identified in having a role in synapse development. Here ASK is identified as having a role in normal synaptic development and the overgrowth caused by *spinster* and paraquat exposure (Fig. 5.4 and 8 respectively) suggesting a role for ASK in the regulation of synaptic growth which may define responses to different cellular sources of oxidative stress. JNK has been shown to drive synapse development (Sanyal *et al.*, 2002) and is required for overgrowth in *highwire* mutants (Collins *et al.*, 2006) and in the presence of increased autophagy (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). Here it is now shown that *spinster* (Fig.
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5.4), sod2 (Fig. 5.12) and paraquat (Fig. 5.8) induced overgrowth are all-dependent on functioning JNK. This was shown both by using a dominant negative transgene in all three conditions and confirmed using RNAi knockdown in spinster and paraquat treatment (Fig. 5.5 and 5.9 respectively). It remains to be investigated whether JNK is involved in sod1-induced overgrowth. However, even in the absence of this data it is clear that JNK activity is required for oxidative stress induced increases in bouton number.

5.3.2. Fos/Jun involvement in synaptic growth is context dependent

The requirement for Fos and Jun activity for overgrowth is found to be different between spin mutants, paraquat treated animals and sod mutants. This suggests differential activation of components of the AP-1 components in each condition. Depleting Jun signalling pre- and post- synaptically using spinGAL4>UASjunDN does not affect spinster induced overgrowth (Fig. 5.4), however paraquat, sod1 and sod2 overgrowth are all rescued by depleting Jun signalling. It is interesting to note that sod1 overgrowth is only rescued by junDN following normalisation, and then only partially compared to the full rescue seen with expression of fosDN. In addition the rescue in branching seen by depleting Jun and Fos in sod1 is more significant with Jun than Fos (Fig. 5.11). Where as the reduction in branching and the increase in bouton number seen in sod2 is rescued by to the same extent by depleting Jun, Fos or JNK signalling. This is suggestive of differences between the relative levels of signalling of Jun and Fos depending on the source/type of ROS. Although in mammals only Jun can homodimerise, in Drosophila, Fos can also homodimerise and is known to act independently of Jun in synapse overgrowth in hiw mutants and conditions of cytoskeletal disruption (Collins et al., 2006; Massaro et al., 2009). Jun and Fos can also dimerise with other signalling components, such as Smad and Nrf2. Smads are important proteins in synapse development (Dudu et al., 2006;
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McCabe et al., 2004; Rawson et al., 2003; Sweeney and Davis, 2002); they are activated by phosphorylation in response to TGFβ signalling. In other contexts, Smad and AP-1 proteins are known to physically interact (Liberati et al., 1999) and this signalling is known to converge at AP-1 sites to determine transcription activation (Zhang et al., 1998; Liberati et al., 1999). This links two important developmental pathways, AP-1 and TGFβ (Wong et al., 1999). This provides an attractive explanation for the potentiation of synapse growth by AP-1 at the Drosophila NMJ. Only Fos, not Jun, has been implicated in the overgrowth seen in highwire although it is unknown as to whether Fos is homodimerising or acting with other binding partners. The mutations and treatments used in this study to produce oxidative stress lead to ROS generation from different subcellular sources. It is postulated that spinster and sod1 produce ROS predominantly from non-mitochondrial compartments while paraquat treatment and sod2 would generate ROS primarily from the mitochondria. spinster, paraquat and sod induced oxidative stress produce synapse growth via activation of JNK. However downstream of JNK there is differential involvement of Fos and Jun. The data shown here suggest that Fos is important for responses to both mitochondrial and non mitochondrial sources of ROS whereas Jun appears to be involved in the generation of overgrowth from predominantly mitochondrial sources of ROS. However, this distinction is currently only a hypothesis as it is hard to distinguish between different sources of ROS. Additionally, it is not known whether different abundances of RO species in each of the models used in this study. It is suggested that superoxide is the most potent activator of autophagic responses (Chen et al., 2009) and this would be consistent with much of the data presented here. In spinster the source of ROS is probably predominantly non-mitochondrial, putatively deriving more from the lysosomes. However, mitochondrial recycling might be impaired leading to build up of old dysfunctional mitochondria resulting in increased levels of ROS being produced from the electron transport chain. In a similar manner, sod1 is traditionally
thought of as the cytoplasmic form of SOD, however it is also expressed in the periplasm of the mitochondria, thus higher levels of ROS could also be derived from the mitochondria in this model. Activation of differential signalling modules by different sources and species of oxidative stress is therefore an attractive avenue of investigation for the future.

5.3.3. Autophagy and Synapse Development

Oxidative stress is a potent activator of autophagy. Recent work has shown that autophagy genes are directly activated by oxidative stress in a JNK dependent manner (Wu et al., 2009). Activation of autophagy has been shown to drive synapse growth in Drosophila (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009) and the data in this study support this proposal. However, in the Shen and Ganetzky model, JNK was suggested to be downstream of activation of autophagy. This was proposed because the overgrowth in highwire mutants is not affected by mutations in autophagy genes. Autophagic downregulation of hiw protein (and subsequent activation of the JNKKK wallenda) has been proposed as a mechanism to regulate synaptic growth (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). These data seem to be somewhat at odds with the observation that oxidative stress leads to upregulation of autophagy through the activation of JNK. Consistent with the findings of Wairkar (2007) and Shen and Ganetzky (2009) atg1 and atg18 function are required for oxidative stress and spinster induced synapse overgrowth. The experiments carried out to date are not targeted enough to suggest whether autophagy is acting upstream or downstream of JNK signalling in this instance. However, the findings here are different to Shen and Ganetzky (2009) insofar as overexpressing atg1 in the nerve does not cause synaptic overgrowth. In fact, it results in significant undergrowth. This leads to the suggestion that dysregulation of autophagy at the NMJ, whether up or down in the absence of oxidative stress results can result in synaptic undergrowth. Conversely, in the presence of oxidative stress and functioning autophagy there
is an increase in growth. It is also possible that there is a distinct output of ASK/JNK/AP-1 activity other than autophagy that leads to overgrowth. However as soon as autophagy is impaired there is an even greater undergrowth caused by the build up of highwire leading to inhibition of JNK signalling and hence fewer boutons. However, it has been shown that spinster overgrowth is due to loss of spinster in both the pre- and post- synaptic compartments, as shown by full rescue requiring transgene expression in both of these compartments. This is different to highwire, which was shown to be expressed only pre-synaptically. However highwire overgrowth has not been shown to be rescued by only presynaptic expression of wildtype highwire, as it was not possible to make a rescue construct at the time of the original paper (Wan et al., 2000) although localisation data suggests that highwire is expressed presynaptically only.

5.3.4. Muscular and Neuronal Input

The hiw protein and its target wallenda (wnd) are both found presynaptically (Collins et al., 2006) while JNK/AP-1 signalling and autophagy are contributing to synapse overgrowth in both the muscle and nerve. Furthermore, spinster overgrowth requires pre- and post-synaptic expression of the rescue construct to reverse the overgrowth, showing a clear role for the muscle in this phenotype. The observations of muscular involvement in spinster and sod2 suggest a novel muscle derived JNK/AP-1 signal contributing to synapse growth that is likely to be independent of direct hiw/wnd regulation. Taken together, data from this study suggest that the highly conserved JNK/AP-1 signalling pathway, a well-known mediator of synaptic growth and function, acting both in the muscle and the nerve, can be activated by oxidative stress to induce synaptic overgrowth. In addition, autophagy is also required for spinster and oxidative stress induced growth, however it is now known whether this is upstream or downstream of JNK signalling in these conditions. Many neurodegenerative disorders generate an oxidative stress burden in affected neurons. Investigating the effects of
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oxidative stress on synaptic development and function, as well as identifying signalling pathways, in such a disease context provides a potentially important insight into the pathology of a number of neurodegenerative diseases.
6. Spinster and Oxidative Stress Mutants have Impaired Physiology

6.1. Introduction

The Drosophila larval NMJ is an ideal system for studying synapse plasticity and morphological development in normal and diseased states. This preparation is also amenable to physiological analysis allowing a description of synaptic output to be generated in disease models. It is relatively straightforward to measure physiological output for the larval NMJ in a number of ways for example, larval crawling, muscle contraction and using recording electrodes in the muscle to measure synaptic transmission directly. The nervous system requires a great deal of energy, and therefore neuronal cells have high levels of mitochondria, making them more susceptible to oxidative stress. Moreover, neurons are long-lived cells that do not generally regenerate so old mitochondria can build up when degradation is impaired. In addition, ROS have been shown to affect synaptic transmission by a number of possible mechanisms (See 1.6.2). There are therefore, a number of aspects that remain to be investigated in spinster and sod mutants, such as the effects of these mutations on physiological output, and whether there is an energy deficit in spinster.

Synaptic overgrowth has been previously shown to be coupled to hyperexcitability, for example in shaker mutants, there is increased transmitter release at the NMJ (Ganetkzy and Wu, 1983; Wu et al., 1983). Synaptic transmission defects have been previously observed in highwire and spinster mutants and in the preceding chapters synaptic overgrowth in these mutants have been shown to be partly due to oxidative stress. The next line of investigation was how oxidative stress affects physiological output and whether this is related to synaptic overgrowth.
Oxidative stress induces autophagy and autophagy is required for synaptic overgrowth. Another effect of oxidative stress is inefficiency in the electron coupling in mitochondria. This has the potential to reduce ATP production efficiency. A drop in ATP production is known to activate AMPK, a conserved pathway known to be activated when AMP:ATP ratio rises, inducing autophagy and metabolic pathways to generate more cellular energy. Decreased mitochondrial function leads to activation of a number of cell signalling pathways that can converge at a number of points, for example to regulate cell cycle transition (Owusu-Ansah et al., 2008). In this case, increased ROS leads to the activation of ASK/JNK/Foxo ultimately arresting transition through the cell cycle. Concurrently reduced mitochondrial function results in increased AMP:ATP leading to the activation of AMPK, which leads to the activation of p53, again ultimately inhibiting cell cycle transition. This shows how loss of mitochondrial function generates activation of two distinct pathways that both have the same physiological output. Based on this it was postulated that the AMPK pathway could be responding to metabolic deficit and contributing to synaptic overgrowth, in a parallel to JNK/AP-1 signalling. It has been well documented that autophagy is activated in response to starvation and energy deprivation through AMPK. Consequently, it was investigated whether AMPK could be another upstream regulator of autophagy during synapse development. The previous data on this are conflicting as Knox et al., (2007), suggested that autophagy negatively regulates synapse size as a downstream effector of Rheb, as opposed to autophagy positively regulating synapse development as shown by Shen and Ganetzky (2009). By driving Rheb in the motor neuron there is an increase in bouton number. Rheb activates TOR, which in turn inhibits autophagy through interactions with atg1. Therefore by increasing Rheb, TOR activity is increased reducing the level of autophagy. However, the mechanism put forward is somewhat unclear. Rapamycin causes an increase in bouton number, through inhibition of TOR leading to an increase in autophagy, somewhat at odds with the putative mechanism that Rheb decreases autophagy leading to overgrowth.
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(Knox et al., 2007). Given the contradictory published data and the controversial results regarding increasing autophagy seen in the previous chapter the role AMPK in synapse development was investigated. This could potentially highlight how autophagy is regulated in spinster.

The previous results chapters have shown that oxidative stress can contribute to synaptic growth, through activation of JNK signalling and autophagy. However, how this affects synaptic function has not been determined. Spinster has been shown to have overgrown synapses coupled with impaired synaptic transmission (Sweeney and Davies, 2002). Quantal size, determined by measuring mini excitatory junction potentials (mEJPs) was shown to be normal. This means that the synaptic response to the release of neurotransmitter from a single synaptic vesicle was normal. However, quantal content, the number of effective vesicles released in response to a nerve impulse is reduced by 50% in spinster, as quantified by measuring the EJP and dividing it by the mEJP. This shows that fewer vesicles are released in response to an action potential. Mutations in highwire that cause synaptic overgrowth that is partially rescued by reducing ROS also cause physiological deficits. In addition to the reduced EJP amplitude and quantal content, highwire also displays reduced quantal size (Wan et al., 2000). Quantal size is generally considered a measure of postsynaptic sensitivity to neurotransmitter rather than due to any change in the amount of neurotransmitter released in a single vesicle.

The effects of sod mutations on synaptic transmission at the Drosophila larva neuromuscular junction have not yet been investigated. Mutations in sod2 result in reduced climbing ability in adults and the effects of mutations in sod2 have been investigated at the giant fibre system (Godenschwege et al., 2009). It was shown that amplitude of response to stimulation declined following eclosion but was completely rescued by muscular expression of UASsod2, suggesting that sod2 is required in the muscle for normal performance of the NMJ. Motor neuron output remained the same even after movement had ceased. However neuronal
output declined significantly compared to wildtype. Central circuitry was impaired but not as much as the defects seen at the NMJ, and changes in central circuitry occurred later. This suggests that muscle dysfunction is contributing more to the whole-organism phenotypes, such as impaired climbing, than neuronal dysfunction; neuronal dysfunction is severe but occurs later than muscle dysfunction. Hence neuronal function in adults is significantly impaired as a result of mutations in sod2. However, the effects of sod1 or sod2 mutations on synaptic transmission at the Drosophila larva NMJ are as yet unknown. Given that oxidative stress induces synapse overgrowth, the effects of oxidative stress on synaptic physiology were studied, by examining crawling behaviour and synaptic transmission.

As well as investigating the effects of these mutations in physiological output the effects of other upstream regulators of autophagy and metabolism on synaptic size in spinster were examined. Previous data in the Sweeney laboratory has shown that AMPK is involved in synaptic growth in spinster. Mutations in löchrig (löe), an isoform of the gamma-subunit of AMPK (Tschäpe et al., 2002), prevent spinster-induced overgrowth. This mutation affects one isoform of one of the regulatory subunits of AMPK, which is involved in the regulation of autophagy. AMPK is known to be protective against neurodegeneration (Spasić et al., 2008); in fact mutations in löe cause neurodegeneration (Tschäpe et al., 2002). AMPK has a wide variety of effectors, generally stimulating lipid carbohydrate and protein metabolism to provide fuel to rectify the energy deficit. AMPK can also putatively inhibit protein synthesis through activation of certain PI3 Kinases. AMPK can differentially affect cell growth and apoptosis depending on the level of activation and effectors involved (Reviewed in Jansen et al., 2009).
6.2. Results

6.2.1. Mutations with overgrown larval NMJs have impaired physiology

*Drosophila* larvae move around their environment in search of food or to escape predators by crawling (Mueller *et al.*, 2005). Larval crawling is a rhythmical, cyclic set of movements. The muscles of the larvae contract peristaltically, as muscle contractions propagate from one end of the body to another, and as this occurs the larva is able to move along the surface (Wang *et al.*, 1997). This is a complex physiological process involving central and peripheral synapses and effective muscle contraction (Song *et al.*, 2007). It involves central control and appropriate communication between the CNS, PNS and muscles. Crawling speed is therefore used as an indicator of physiological function. Mutations in *spinster*, *highwire*, *sod1* and *sod2* all cause significantly reduced crawling speeds compared to wildtype. All mutants are reduced to a similar extent; with *sod2* showing slightly further reduced crawling speed (Fig. 6.1). In addition to this, *sdhB* mutants were also investigated but only two larvae could be recorded crawling as such as a very high percentage of these larvae do not crawl. The reduction on crawling speed does not correlate with the level of overgrowth seen in these mutants. Due to the role of oxidative stress in *spinster* induced overgrowth it was examine whether this physiological phenotype is caused by oxidative stress. *spinster* has been shown to carry an oxidative stress burden, and the overgrowth phenotype is rescued by expression of antioxidant transgenes. *highwire* and *sod1* overgrowth is also reduced by expression of antioxidant transgenes. Since relieving oxidative stress reduces synaptic growth phenotypes in these mutants it was investigated whether expressing antioxidant transgenes reduces the crawling (physiological) phenotype, seen consistently in these mutants.
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**Figure 6.1: Mutations in spinster, highwire, sod1 and sod2 result in reduced crawling speed.** Wildtype larvae have a crawling speed of 0.90±0.06mm/s (n=15), this is significantly reduced to 0.60±0.06mm/s (n=19) in spinster (p<0.05, ANOVA). The crawling speed of highwire mutants is 0.58±0.07mm/s (n=16), significantly reduced relative to wildtype (p<0.01, ANOVA). Mutations in SOD also cause significant reduction in crawling speed to 0.61±0.07mm/s (n=20, p<0.05, ANOVA) and 0.41±0.05mm/s (n=21, p<0.001, ANOVA) for sod1 and sod2, the cytoplasmic and mitochondrial forms, respectively.

---

**6.2.2. Reduction in spinster crawling speed is not rescued through expression of anti-oxidants**

Expression of spinGAL4>UASHOD1 does not significantly affect crawling speed, whereas expression of UAScat pre- and post-synaptically caused a significant reduction in crawling speed. This seems an anomalous result and is at odds with data from the Elliott lab (York) who find that global and higher levels
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of overexpression of cat using actGAL4>UAScat has a normal crawling speed, not statistically different to wildtype (Vincent et al., 2012). However, even when repeated, in case contaminated food had caused any problems, spinGAL4>UAScat had significantly reduced crawling speed; the result was the same. Expression of cat pre- and post synaptically results in a reduction in crawling speed that is actually reduced to a level comparable to spinster. Expression of hSOD1 did not rescue the reduction in crawling speed seen in spinster suggesting that it is not only the level of oxidative stress causing the reduction in crawling speed, or the reduction in oxidative stress afforded by spinGAL4>UASHSOD1 is not sufficient to restore physiological function. Expression of spinGAL4>UAScat in a spinster background further reduces crawling speed (Fig. 6.2). Expression of these antioxidants both showed an ameliorative effect on bouton number in spinster suggesting that the effects of ROS on growth are different from those affecting physiological function depending on the ROS species present.

6.2.3. Reduction in highwire crawling speed is not rescued by expression of hSOD1 pre- and post-synaptically

As discussed earlier, expression of hSOD1 pre- and post-synaptically does not significantly affect crawling speed. Nor does it rescue the reduction in crawling speed seen in highwire mutants. This suggests that the reduction of crawling speed in highwire is either not caused by increased levels of reactive oxygen species or caused by more ROS than are dissipated by spinGAL4>UASHSOD1 (Fig. 6.3).

6.2.4. Reduction in crawling speed in sod1 mutants is not rescued by expression of hSOD1

The reduction in crawling speed seen in sod1 mutants is not ameliorated by spinGAL4>UASHSOD1. Expression of hSOD1 fully rescued the increase in
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Figure 6.2 Reducing ROS in spinster does not rescue crawling speed. As shown earlier spinster causes a reduction in crawling speed from 0.90±0.06 mm/s (n=15) for wildtype to 0.61±0.06 mm/s (n=19) (p<0.01, ANOVA). Expression if hSOD1 doesn’t change crawling speed, 1.1±0.07 mm/s (n=10, p<<0.05, ANOVA), whereas spinGAL4>UAScat has a significantly reduced crawling speed of 0.54±0.06 (n=17, p<0.001, ANOVA). Expression of these transgenes in spinster does not significantly rescue crawling speed with speeds of 0.65±0.05 mm/s (n=21) and 0.34±0.02 mm/s (n=5).
Figure 6.3: Reducing ROS in *highwire* does not rescue crawling speed. As shown earlier *highwire* causes a reduction in crawling speed from 0.90±0.06 mm/s (n=15) for wildtype to 0.58±0.07 mm/s (n=16, p<0.01, ANOVA). Expression of *hSOD1* does not change crawling speed, 1.1±0.07 mm/s (n=10, p<0.05, ANOVA), and expression of *hSOD1* in *highwire* does not significantly rescue crawling speed 0.80±0.07 mm/s (n=18) compared to *highwire* however, it is no longer significantly different to wildtype (p>0.05, ANOVA).
Figure 6.4: Reducing ROS in sod1 does not rescue crawling speed. As shown earlier sod1 causes a reduction in crawling speed from 0.90±0.06mm/s (n=15) for wildtype to 0.61±0.07mm/s (n=20, p<0.01, ANOVA). Expression of hSOD1 doesn't change crawling speed, 1.1±0.07mm/s (n=10, p<<0.05, ANOVA), and expression of hSOD1 in sod1 does not significantly rescue crawling speed 0.63±0.06mm/s (n=19) (p>>0.05, ANOVA).

bouton number and reduction in muscle surface area caused by mutations in sod1. This suggests that the physiological deficit incurred requires greater levels of hSOD1 than is required to rescue the changes in form caused by these mutations (Fig. 6.4). Other studies in the Sweeney lab have shown that expression of UAShSOD1 by the promoter spinGAL4 only rescue viability by 80% (Radhika Sreedhar-Ashwin, Sweeney lab, personal communication). Another possibility is that because sod1 mutants are semi-viable there is a chance that homozygous sod1 mutants have mated in the stock. These flies have high levels of DNA damage due to increased ROS and therefore the
possibility of a second site mutation is high. However it must not be overlooked that sod1 is highly expressed therefore spinGAL4 might not provide high enough expression to combat the reduction caused by the mutation.

The observation that the reduction in crawling speed seen in spinster, highwire and sod1 mutants is not rescued by expression of antioxidants suggests that it is not oxidative stress causing this phenotype. However this phenotype is so consistent between the mutants analysed that it is likely to be an effect induced by oxidative stress such as mitochondrial dysfunction which can be caused by oxidative stress and go on to cause further oxidative stress as a vicious cycle ensues.

6.2.5. The effects of sod1, sod2 and spinster on synaptic transmission

As discussed earlier crawling is, physiologically, a complex process, involving complex nerve circuit pathways and muscle contraction. To establish how synaptic transmission itself is affected by mutations in spinster and sod to determine if impaired crawling correlates with impaired synaptic transmission at the neuromuscular junction, electrophysiological recordings were carried out. Previous data has shown that spinster has impaired synaptic transmission, with normal response to neurotransmitter from a single vesicle but with a reduced number of vesicles released in response to an elicited action potential. The Drosophila larval neuromuscular junction is a highly useful and well-established model for studying synaptic transmission and thus can be used effectively to study the effects of oxidative stress on synaptic transmission. By inserting microelectrodes into Drosophila muscle a lot can be learnt about the functioning of the neuromuscular junction in different conditions to allow deficits in synaptic transmission to be pinpointed. sod and spinster mutants were examined for synaptic transmission deficits. The first electrophysiological aspect investigated was resting membrane potential. Resting membrane potential is determined by
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Figure 6.5: spinster has a normal resting membrane potential, sod1 and sod2 have increased resting membrane potentials. Wildtype muscles have a resting membrane potential of -57.39±2.59mV (n=31). The resting membrane potential in spinster is not significantly different -54.98±2.26mV (n=21). sod1 and sod2 have significantly increased resting membrane potentials of -41.32±1.64mV (n=16) and -45.42±1.73mV (n=18) respectively (p<0.01, ANOVA).

The difference between intracellular and extracellular ion concentrations. The Nernst and Goldman equations are used to calculate the potential difference between these components, this takes into account the relative concentrations of the different ions present. If the resting membrane potential is perturbed this suggests that ionic balance is impaired and thus normal excitability might be compromised. In agreement with previously published data spinster mutants show no change in resting membrane potential (Sweeney and Davies, 2002). sod1 and sod2 mutants both show increased resting membrane potentials suggesting abnormal electrochemical gradients between the intracellular and...
extracellular components (Fig. 6.5). The activity of the Na⁺/K⁺ pump could be impaired due to reduced levels of ATP, resulting in less sodium being pumped out leading to an increased resting membrane potential. An alternative reason for this could be that K⁺ leak out of the cell through non-gated channels leading to less K⁺ in the cell, increasing the resting membrane potential. As discussed earlier the EJP is the response of the muscle to an action potential in the nerve resulting in neurotransmitter being released from the nerve terminal. Changes in EJP result in impaired synaptic transmission and hence measuring EJPs can give insight into neuronal functioning. Spontaneous EJPs in wildtype spinster, sod1 and sod2 were measured and the mean amplitude was only shown to be
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different in sod1 mutants (Fig. 6.6), where it was shown to be increased suggesting that either more neurotransmitter is released in response to an action potential in the nerve or the muscle is eliciting increased response to the normal level of neurotransmitter released. This suggests that spinster and sod2 mutants are showing a normal response to neurotransmitter release from the pre-synaptic terminal. This is at odds with previous spinster data (Sweeney and Davies, 2002), which showed a 50% reduction in EJP amplitude. However the methods of electrophysiological analysis were different, and the method used here might be less sensitive and therefore overlook changes in EJP detected in the published data, as here spontaneous EJPs rather than evoked EJPs were recorded.

The amplitude of EJPs is dependent on the resting membrane potential (RMP). Generally speaking, the higher the RMP the smaller the EJP. Therefore, to take into account the changes in RMP seen in sod mutants the residual was calculated, based on what the EJP would be expected to be in wildtype for any given RMP. The difference between expected and actual EJPs is not significantly different to wildtype in spinster and sod2 suggesting that EJPs are only altered in sod1 (Fig. 6.7).
Figure 6.7: *spinster* and *sod2* have normal EJPs for the resting membrane potential, whereas *sod1* have a higher EJP amplitude than expected. (A) EJP amplitude is shown plotted against resting membrane potential, showing that EJP amplitude declines as the resting membrane potential decreases. (B) When compared to the trend line for wildtype and calculating the residual only *sod1* has a significantly different EJP to expected based on resting membrane potential.
6.2.6. Normal and aberrant mitochondria are seen to be present in the *spinster* mutant.

We performed transmission electron microscopy (TEM) on the laminar area behind the optic lobe in 5-day-old adult flies. This area was chosen as it is neuronal and has a high level of mitochondria present. Normal mitochondria can be seen in both wildtype and *spinster* (Fig. 6.8 A-F). Normal mitochondrial morphology can be seen both in wildtype and *spinster* with regular outer and inner membrane morphology. However, there are also a number of damaged mitochondria only seen in *spinster* (Fig. 6.8 G-I). Multiple aberrant mitochondria were seen in every animal of *spinster* and none were seen in wildtype. In this damaged mitochondria the inner membrane is irregular and denser. In addition a mitochondrion that was unable to undergo mitophagy and became surrounded by many layers of membrane was also seen in *spinster*. This suggests that in addition to the build up of endosomes and lysosomes seen in *spinster* (Sweeney and Davis, 2002; Dermaut *et al.*, 2005) that were present, mitochondrial recycling may be impaired. Mitochondrial impairment suggests that there could be an energy deficit in *spinster*, as mitochondrial respiration is impaired so energy is not produced efficiently leading to increased ROS generation. To test whether *spinster* is incurring an energy deficit HPLC was used to test the ratio of AMP:ADP:ATP, however the results of this were inconclusive. A mitochondrial function assay by investigating oxygen consumption using a Clarke electrode was carried out. However, it was not possible to optimise this technique within the time available, although this experiment would be highly informative and would elucidate the status of mitochondrial function and metabolism in *spinster*. 
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Figure 6.8: Aberrant mitochondria are present in spinster. Most mitochondria present in spinster show normal morphology. However there are also a number of diseased mitochondria (G and H) and examples of impaired mitophagy (I) that are not seen in wildtype.
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6.2.7. AMPK is required for spinster induced overgrowth

Previous work has shown that mutations in subunit $\gamma$ of AMPK prevent spinster-induced overgrowth (Sean Sweeney, personal communication). This is one of the regulatory subunits of AMPK. Therefore it was examined whether AMPK is involved in synapse development and confirm its role in spinster. To do this RNAi transgenes to AMPK subunit $\alpha$, the catalytic subunit of AMPK were expressed. Reducing AMPK activity pre- and post-synaptically using either of the RNAi transgenes causes a reduction in bouton number in a wildtype background with one transgene (106200) but not the other (1827). In a spinster mutant background expression of either transgene reduces synaptic overgrowth. Reducing AMPK levels did cause a significant reduction in muscle surface area in with 106200 but not 1827. Nonetheless, reduction of AMPK function in a spinster mutant background reduced synapse growth significantly prior to any normalisation procedure. When these transgenes are expressed in spinster, muscle surface area is the same as wildtype, hence normalised bouton number shows the same reduction in overgrowth as prior to normalisation. This suggests that AMPK may be partly responsible for the reduction in muscle surface area.
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Figure 6.9: Spinster induced overgrowth requires AMPK. (A) Expression of AMPK-RNAi106200 in a wildtype background causes a significant reduction in bouton number 61±4.0 (n=14) (p<0.001, when compared to wildtype and other transgene control and p<0.05, when compared to all means in the graph, ANOVA) no significant change in bouton number is seen with AMPK-RNAi1827 74±4.6 (n=16). spinster induced overgrowth is significantly reduced from 152±4.74 (n=32) to 109±6.2 (n=19) and 105±6.52 (n=19) (p<0.001, ANOVA). (B) Only UASAMPKRNAi106200 causes a significant change in muscle surface area, reducing it to 59153±2289, AMPKRNAi1827 has a MSA of 706687µm². In spinster these transgenes cause MSAs of
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82971±3443µm² and 79495±1919µm² (p>0.05, ANOVA) (C) Following normalisation to muscle surface area UASAMPKRNAi significantly rescues spinster induced overgrowth from 165±7.5 (n=32) to 111±10(n=19) and 108±6.8 (n=19). The transgene controls have normalised bouton numbers of 86±7.45 (n=14) and 88±8.8 (n=16) (p>0.05, ANOVA).

6.2.8. Increased activation of AMPK is required pre- and post-synaptically to drive synapse growth

Having shown that AMPK is required for spinster-induced it was postulated that AMPK activity could drive synapse overgrowth. To determine the role of AMPK in synapse development a pseudo-phosphorylated AMPK transgene, UASAMPK\textsuperscript{T184D}, which simulates activated AMPK (Mirouse \textit{et al.}, 2007) was expressed. When this is expressed pre-synaptically with \textit{elav}GAL4 there is no change in bouton number compared to wildtype, nor is there any statistically significant change in bouton number when AMPK activity is increased in the muscle (Fig. 6.10A). However it must be noted that when expression in only the nerve or the muscle is compared to wildtype using ANOVA, bouton number is significantly reduced compared to wildtype with neuronal expression of AMPK-P. Conversely, increased activity of AMPK in the muscle causes a significant increase in bouton number. The increased bouton number seen with \textit{spinGAL4} obscures these significances when included in statistical analysis. When expressed
Figure 6.10: Increased AMPK activity pre- and post-synaptically results in synaptic overgrowth. (A) Driving pseudo-phosphorylated AMPK in either the nerve or the muscle does not significantly change bouton number with means of 64±4.4 (n=16) and 107±7.1 (n=17). Concurrent expression with spinGAL4 causes a significant increase in bouton number to 114±4.6 (n=35) (p<0.05, ANOVA). (B) Expression of this transgene in either the nerve muscle or both does not significantly affect muscle surface.
area with mean muscle surface areas of 85443±2265µm² (n=16), 86061±3989µm² (n=17) and 77872±1933µm². (C) When normalised to muscle surface area expression in either the nerve or the muscle does not significantly alter normalised bouton number with bouton numbers of 63±5.4 and 107±9.9 respectively (p>0.05, ANOVA). Concurrent expression under the control of spinGAL4 results in significantly increased bouton number 121±5.6 (p<0.001, ANOVA).

simultaneously in the nerve and the muscle using spinGAL4, there is a significant increase in bouton number, when all conditions are compared by ANOVA. Expression of this transgene, pre- or post synaptically or simultaneously does not change muscle surface area, consequently when normalised, there is only a significant change in bouton number when AMPK-P is expressed simultaneously pre- and post- synaptically (Fig. 6.10C). The change caused by only neuronal or muscular expression is still not significant when normalised even when compared in the absence of simultaneous expression.

6.2.9. AMPK activity is required for crawling

Using löe mutations and the RNAi and pseudo-phosphorylated AMPK transgenes, the effects of AMPK activity levels on crawling speed were investigated (Fig. 6.11). Mutations in löe cause no change in larval crawling speed; the crawling speed is not statistically different to wildtype. löe is a mutation that causes neurodegeneration (Tschäpe et al., 2002). It is a mutation in one isoform of the γ-subunit of AMPK, one of the regulatory subunits of AMPK. Reducing AMPK levels through expression of AMPK RNAi to the α-subunit of AMPK, which is the catalytic subunit causes a significant reduction in crawling speed. This suggests that under normal conditions activity of AMPK is required for normal physiological output. Expression of pseudo-phosphorylated AMPK causes no change in crawling speed.
Figure 6.11: AMPK is involved in determining crawling speed. Mutations in loë do not affect crawling speed, 1.03±0.07 (n=25). Depleting AMPK through expression of AMPK RNAi results in a significant reduction in crawling speed to 0.42±0.1 (n=16, p<0.01, ANOVA) and 0.51±0.05 (n=16, p<0.05, ANOVA) for the two different transgenes. Pseudo-active AMPK causes no change in crawling speed relative to wildtype 0.92±0.08 (n=21, p>>0.05, ANOVA).
6. Discussion

6.3.1. Mutations causing oxidative stress can impair motor function

All the mutations investigated in this study, spinster, hiw, sod1 and sod2 have impaired crawling speed compared to wildtype. It was postulated that if oxidative stress were causing this deficit expression of anti-oxidant transgenes would rescue this phenotype. However, reducing oxidative stress in any of these mutants did not rescue the reduction in crawling speed. Expression of these transgenes did however rescue synaptic overgrowth. This suggests that the mechanisms through which these mutations cause synaptic overgrowth are distinct from those that cause impaired motor function. It could be that function is more sensitive to oxidative stress than form, in so far as relieving oxidative stress enough to prevent overgrowth still leaves a high enough level of ROS to impair motor function. The driver used, spinGAL4, expresses pre- and post-synaptically as well as in the central nervous system, but at relatively low levels compared to other global drivers such as actinGAL4 and tubulinGAL4, therefore using these drivers might still afford a rescue of the reduction of crawling speed seen in these mutants.

It is worth noting that tubGAL4 does not afford any greater rescue of bouton number in spinster than spinGAL4. This suggests that although reducing oxidative stress with spinGAL4>UASHSOD1 provides the maximum level of rescue seen with any driver in spinster bouton number there is still a significant reduction in motor function. In hiw mutants spinGAL4>UASHSOD1 does not rescue the crawling speed even though it significantly rescues the increase in bouton number seen in hiw mutants, in a similar fashion to that seen in spinster mutants. This supports the theory that function might be more sensitive to oxidative stress than synaptic morphology, or there is a defect other than oxidative stress present in spinster and highwire that is leading to the decline in
motor output seen. Based on the observation that $\text{spinGAL4}>\text{UASHSOD1}$ in $\text{sod1}$ mutants fully rescues synaptic overgrowth yet does not rescue the deficit in motor function, it seems more likely that oxidative stress is not reduced enough to rescue synaptic function and thus supports the hypothesis that crawling speed is more sensitive to oxidative stress than synaptic function, rather than being caused by something else present in $\text{spinster}$, $\text{highwire}$ and $\text{sod1}$. It is however, possible that build up of protein in these mutants, causing something other than oxidative stress, is the cause of the reduction seen in crawling speed, as mutations in $\text{sod1}$ have been postulated to cause disease through aggregation of mutant $\text{sod1}$ rather than reduction in antioxidant capacity (Vijayvergiya et al., 2005). This remains to be investigated through using stronger drivers and a variety of anti-oxidants, and investigating other mutations that cause oxidative stress. It can however be seen that level of overgrowth is not directly correlated with reduction in crawling speed. It is also interesting to note that overgrowth does not necessarily result in impaired crawling, as $\text{spinGAL4}>\text{UASAMPK}^{T184D}$ has significantly increased bouton number yet normal crawling speed. This is also supported by studies into overgrowth mutants that show hyperactivity and overgrowth (Budnik et al., 1990). The data here suggest that mutations that have oxidative stress induced changes in synaptic morphology show the general phenotype of impaired crawling speed, indicative of impaired synaptic function. This is supported by the electrophysiological data in $\text{sod1}$ and $\text{sod2}$. Although, rescues have not been performed to determine whether the changes in synaptic transmission phenotypes seen in these mutants are caused by oxidative stress. Synaptic transmission does not seem to be significantly impaired in $\text{spinster}$, at odds with previously published data, but this is likely to be due to differences between spontaneous EJPs investigated here and evoked EJPs in the published data. Studies carried out in collaboration with the Sweeney lab by the Robinson Lab in Plymouth have shown that $\text{spinster}$ has normal EJPs, similar to the data shown in this study, but they have also found fatigue phenotype during repeated
6. Spinster and Oxidative Stress Mutants have Impaired Physiology

stimulation, potentially due to an inability to recycle synaptic vesicles at a rate suitable to sustain normal synaptic transmission (Iain Robinson, personal communication; Milton et al., 2011), this phenotype was rescued by relieving oxidative stress through expression of hSOD1 with the promoter spinGAL4. This ‘fatigue phenotype’ is consistent with other studies on mutants defective for endocytosis (Koh et al., 2004; Marie et al., 2004). A drosophila model of Parkinson’s disease, caused by mutations in pink1 also fails to maintain normal synaptic transmission during intense activity (Morais et al., 2009). This does not explain why both sod1 and sod2 mutants show different phenotypes to spinster. Consequently, it is hard to determine which physiological phenotypes are caused by oxidative stress in spinster as sod mutations causes a significant increase in RMP that is not seen in spinster. This suggests that oxidative stress in sod mutations causes effects that are not seen in spinster, suggesting that something in spinster allows it to maintain its resting membrane potential despite the presence of oxidative stress. The other phenotypes seen in spinster, such as lipid peroxidation and increase in bouton number are rescued by expressing hSOD1 suggesting that superoxide is contributing to these phenotypes. Therefore it may seem counterintuitive that mutations in sod1 do not recapitulate this phenotype. However, there are other cellular defects in spinster that are unlikely to be present in either of the sod mutants. The decreased lysosomal degradation seen in spinster could lead to the prolonged and increased presence of cellular components that would otherwise be broken down during the cellular stress response to protect the cell from oxidative stress. This could also be the reason that spinster does not show a decrease in muscle surface area seen in all other cases of oxidative stress investigated.

Mutations in both sod1 and sod2 could directly affect mitochondrial function and the impaired mitochondria in spinster could be responsible for impaired crawling speed. Mitochondrial morphology in sod mutants would be an interesting avenue for future research. sod2 mutations cause mitochondrial damage in muscles
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(Godenschwege et al., 2009). Defective mitochondria could result in reduced ATP production, leading to increased AMP:ATP activating AMPK.

6.3.2. Increased AMPK activity can cause synaptic overgrowth and is required for spinster induced overgrowth

Due to the potential metabolic deficit in sod mutants and spinster, a signalling pathway likely to be activated by defective ATP production was investigated. AMPK has not as yet been directly implicated in synaptic growth and in this study it is shown that AMPK positively regulates bouton number and furthermore that it is required for spinster induced overgrowth. Previous data surrounding the role of upstream regulators of autophagy have been somewhat contradictory. However, it is clearly shown that the regulatory subunits of AMPK are required for spinster-induced overgrowth in addition to the catalytic subunits. This is somewhat at odds with the findings that Rheb drives synapse growth as increased AMPK would increase tuberous sclerosis complex activity and therefore increase the inhibition of Rheb. Therefore the data displayed here support more the findings of Shen and Ganetzky (2009) as increased inhibition could lead to increased autophagy, which they find to produce an overgrowth. However AMPK has a number of potential effectors and therefore any phenotype caused by increased AMPK does not necessarily depend on autophagy. Nonetheless, for the first time, AMPK has been implicated in regulation of synaptic growth response, suggesting that energetic status is important for correct synaptic growth responses.
7. Discussion and Future Research

7.1. Introduction

The aims this investigation were to answer the following:

1. Do mutations in *spinster* cause oxidative stress and is oxidative stress contributing to the synaptic overgrowth phenotype?

2. Can oxidative stress cause synaptic overgrowth independently of lysosomal dysfunction?

3. Are ASK/JNK/AP-1 activation and autophagy required for synaptic growth observed under conditions of oxidative stress?

4. Oxidative stress is known to impair mitochondrial function. Does oxidative stress/ *spinster* cause an energy deficit resulting in impaired physiological output? If this is the case, are compensatory metabolic pathways induced in spinster?

The purpose of this chapter is to establish which of these aims have been fulfilled giving an overarching view of the data generated in this thesis and suggest future research questions that have arisen as a result of this study.

7.2. *spinster* as a model of a lysosomal storage disorder

Lysosomal storage disorders are characterised by impaired lysosomal degradation of cellular components, leading to accumulation of undegraded material in the lysosomal system (For review see Futerman and van Meer, 2004). A number of LSDs have been shown to have oxidative stress (Deganuto *et al.*, 2007; Fu *et al.*, 2010; Fillipon *et al.*, 2011), potentially due to the build up of lipofuscin. Lipofuscin is undegraded material that builds up during aging and pathological impairment of degradative pathways, as in lysosomal storage disorders. Lipofuscin potentiates the generation of ROS, thus further increasing
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oxidative stress. Lysosomes are rich in transition metals in a low pH and
dysregulation in LSD produces an environment conducive for Fenton reactions
generating ROS (Kurz et al., 2007, Kurz et al. 2008a and b). Oxidative stress
induces autophagy (Higgins et al., 2011; Chen et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2009)
contributing further to lysosomal build-up of undegraded material. A positively
reinforcing cycle ensues: impaired lysosomal degradation increases oxidative
stress and induces autophagy coupled with impaired autophagic clearance this
results in build up of autophagosomes and autophagolysosomes. Oxidative
stress, presence of lipofuscin and dysregulated autophagy (Settembre et al.,
2009; Fu et al., 2010) and mitochondrial aberrations are identified cellular
hallmarks of LSD; excessive dendritogenesis and synaptogenesis are also
observed (Walkley et al., 1985 and 1988a and b; March et al., 1995). Here
spinster is confirmed as a model of LSD, as suggested by Dermaut et al., 2005;
Sweeney and Davis, 2002; Nakano et al., 2001, as spinster is a late
endosomal/lyososomal protein and mutations in spinster result in enlarged late
endosomes/lysosomes, increased oxidative damage and activation of the
oxidative stress response, increased synaptogenesis and mitochondrial
aberrations.

7.2.1. Oxidative stress causes synaptic overgrowth

The data shown in the previous chapters show that oxidative stress causes
growth of the Drosophila neuromuscular junction and is a contributory factor in
the overgrowth seen in spinster loss of function mutants, a model of a
neurodegenerative LSD. This suggests spinster lysosomal dysfunction
generates oxidative stress as seen in known LSDs (Fu et al., 2010). Oxidative
stress is common in LSDs due to the pathological presence of undegraded
material. Synapses are areas of high energy demand; hence they are rich in
mitochondria, the greatest generators of ROS, making them susceptible to
oxidative stress. Moreover, nerves are generally postmitotic and do not readily
regenerate, thus they are predisposed to the accumulation of lipofuscin. The
majority of the synaptic overgrowth in *spinster* is rescued by reducing the oxidative stress burden. The data in this study are supported by the observation that oxidative stress generated independently of lysosomal dysfunction promotes synapse growth. A number of mutations identified by hyperexcitability phenotypes, due to mutations in potassium channels involved in terminating release from the presynaptic terminal, also cause synaptic overgrowth: *shaker (sh)*, *ether a go-go (eag)* and *hyperkinetic (hk)* (Budnik *et al.*, 1990). These, and another hyperexcitable mutant, *quiver*, were subsequently found to be hypersensitive to oxidative stress (Wang *et al.*, 2000). It would be interesting to see if this overgrowth is rescued by expressing antioxidants. Excitability determines neuronal morphology as electrical activity regulates plasticity, but how this happens in these mutants is unknown; it could be that increased synaptic activity leads to oxidative stress leading to overgrowth. It would be interesting to differentiate between function and morphology in these mutants to determine if oxidative stress is causing the overgrowth, secondary to the primary cause of hyperexcitability. Another known cause of overgrowth is impaired downregulation of signalling molecules due to defective degradation pathways as seen in *spinster* and *ema* (Sweeney and Davies, 2002; Kim *et al.*, 2010). As shown in this study, *spinster* overgrowth is also caused by oxidative stress as well as increased TGFβ signalling. It is possible that mutations in *ema* cause oxidative stress as a result of enlarged endosomal compartments, resulting in oxidative stress derived overgrowth. It is interesting to note that in this study the level of increase in raw bouton number seen in *spinster* and *ema* cannot be obtained purely through induction of oxidative stress, in the absence of lysosomal dysfunction. This suggests that defective endosomal downregulation of TGFβ signalling and oxidative stress contribute to overgrowth in *spinster* whereas in *sod* mutants and paraquat fed animals TGFβ downregulation by the endosomal system is unimpeded thereby limiting the level of overgrowth.
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Even though the general trend of the data in this study is that oxidative stress contributes to synaptic growth, this is clearly not always the case. Rotenone is also thought to generate elevated levels of superoxide, through inhibition of complex I of the mitochondrial respiratory chain. However, rotenone can impair microtubule formation (Brinkley et al., 1974; Srivastava and Panda, 2007), which could impede autophagy, which is shown to be required for synaptic growth or overgrowth. This could be determined by looking at microtubule morphology in rotenone-fed animals compared to controls. It would also be interesting to determine the level of oxidative stress incurred by rotenone exposure for example using a lipid peroxidation assay or looking at expression of gst-D-GFP. Furthermore sdhB mutants do not show synaptic overgrowth, even though increased ROS generation has been demonstrated (Walker et al., 2006). Interestingly though mutations in sdhA, which also cause oxidative stress, result in oxidative stress dependent synapse loss in the Drosophila eye. Taken together these findings suggest that oxidative stress can contribute to synaptic overgrowth at the Drosophila neuromuscular junction, but can also lead to the generation of other phenotypes, depending on the source and level of ROS.

7.2.1.1. Is oxidative stress induced synaptic morphology ROS specific or source specific?

In terms of bouton number it is hard to determine any clear conclusions about the role of different ROS in the generation of overgrowth phenotypes. With respect to spinster the same level of rescue was achieved regardless of the type of antioxidant present. This suggests that it does not matter whether it is superoxide anions or hydrogen peroxide or other ROS that specifically cause synaptic overgrowth. However, mutations in catalase, which would decrease the breakdown of hydrogen peroxide, did not result in overgrowth whereas mutations in sod1 and sod2 and paraquat exposure, which increase levels of superoxide, did cause overgrowth. This might suggest that superoxide potentiates synaptic growth. However when the vast overgrowth in sod is
removed from statistical analysis cat overgrowth is significant. sod is the only enzyme that can catalyse the conversion of superoxide anions to hydrogen peroxide whereas with catalase other enzymes could be compensating for the loss of cat. It was attempted to investigate the importance of different ROS using mutations in other proteins involved in the conversion of superoxide ions to hydrogen peroxide, such as thioredoxin reductase (TrxR), however these are not viable to 3rd instar as homozygotes or transheterozygotes in the conditions used in this study, even using apple juice agar plates and yeast mix. It might be possible to use animals lacking one copy of catalase and one copy of TrxR. Another alternative is to feed larvae hydrogen peroxide; this is currently being investigated in the Sweeney lab. It is hard to determine the proportionate levels of different ROS in living tissue with the current reporters available and therefore difficult at present to dissect which ROS are responsible for the generation of overgrowth phenotypes.

Mutations in sod1 and sod2 have differential effects on branching and bouton size, this could suggest that the source of ROS is important in determining these phenotypes. Superoxide anions are short lived molecules, so these phenotypes could reflect the differential effects of ROS damage leading to diverse phenotypes. spinster, sod1 and paraquat all cause an increase in small boutons compared to wildtype whereas sod2 results in increased medium sized boutons. It can also be seen that sod2 is the only condition of oxidative stress that results in a decrease in branching, suggesting that something is different in this condition that is common to the other three, although it remains to be investigated what this might be, as it is probably not as simple as mitochondrial vs. cytoplasmic oxidative stress as paraquat causes predominantly mitochondrial generation of ROS.

Another observation from this study is that sod2 and paraquat induced reductions in muscle surface area are not rescued by expression of hSOD1 and trx CYTO respectively. This could be due to mitochondrial dysfunction still being
impaired as both these antioxidants are cytoplasmic. Further tests need to be carried out with other antioxidants to confirm the specific effects of oxidative stress on bouton number and muscle surface area. sod1 reduction in muscle surface area is partially rescued by cat expression, suggesting that it is not a type of ROS that cause a decrease in muscle surface area but the general presence of oxidative stress.

7.3. ASK/JNK/AP-1 signalling is required for oxidative stress induced synaptic overgrowth

The synergistic effect on bouton number seen in heterozygotes of spin and sod1 are indicative of a threshold at which overgrowth is induced indicating these mutations affect a common pathway generating overgrowth. An important suggestion that can be made as a result is that trafficking defects previously suggested to cause overgrowth through continued expression/disinhibition of signalling pathways of growth signals (Sweeney and Davis, 2002; Kim et al., 2010; Korolchuk et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2007) may not be the only mechanism through which lysosomal dysfunction causes synapse overgrowth; oxidative stress may contribute to the activation of synaptic growth pathways. The ‘pathogenic signalling cascade’ driving synapse growth in LSD has yet to be identified. The data here support the proposal that oxidative stress and the activation of JNK/AP-1, in spin mutants and other cases of oxidative stress, promotes the generation of synaptic overgrowth.

7.3.1. AP-1 activity is differentially required for oxidative stress induced growth

The requirement for Fos and Jun activity for oxidative stress induced synaptic growth is found to be different among spin, paraquat-fed, sod1 and sod2 mutants treated animals. This suggests differential activation of components of AP-1 in each condition. In Drosophila, Fos can homodimerise and is known to
act independently of Jun in synapse overgrowth in hiw mutants and conditions of cytoskeletal disruption (Collins et al., 2006; Masaro et al., 2009). In sod2 mutants and paraquat treatment oxidative stress is generated predominantly in mitochondria, and under these conditions a role for Jun in synapse growth is identified. Jun is not implicated in synapse overgrowth in spinster and in sod1 depleting Jun signalling affords only a partial rescue. This potentially suggests a context dependent role for Jun in the regulation of synaptic growth, which may indicate divergent responses to different cellular sources of oxidative stress. That is to say Jun has a greater role when mitochondrial oxidative stress (Fig. 7.1) is implicated which could suggest than Jun has a role in signalling an energy deficit arising from mitochondrial dysfunction.

7.3.2. Fos is required both in the nerve and the muscle for synaptic overgrowth in spinster and sod2

AP-1 signalling has previously only been studied acting pre-synaptically at the Drosophila neuromuscular junction, as its role in highwire is presynaptic as highwire is only expressed in the nerve (Collins et al., 2000), and Sanyal (2003) only investigated AP-1 activity in the nerve. Here a novel role has been identified for Fos acting in the muscle during synaptic development.

7.3.2.1. AP-1 and muscle surface area

Expression of ASK/JNK/AP-1 dominant negative in paraquat fed animals did not alter the reduction in muscle surface area caused by paraquat. Expression of junDN and fosDN in sod1 rescue muscle surface area, however junDN in sod2 does not rescue muscle surface area whereas fosDN fully rescues muscle surface area. This could suggest a role for AP-1 signalling in determining muscle size.
7.4. Autophagy is required for synaptic overgrowth

7.4.1. Autophagy is required for synaptic overgrowth

Oxidative stress is a potent activator of autophagy. Furthermore, autophagy genes are required for spinster and paraquat-induced synaptic overgrowth, suggesting that autophagy promotes synaptic overgrowth in these phenotypes. However, the cellular process of autophagy at the neuromuscular junction during development has not been confirmed in this study, but genetically removing or reducing autophagy function implicates autophagy in overgrowth. The levels of autophagy in spinster were also investigated through the use of GFP-tagged atg constructs. Again however, the expression was not high enough to detect in the larvae even with tubGAL4 and α-GFP antibodies to amplify the signal. What might be possible in future studies is to analyse autophagy levels looking at these transgenes in the eye, or salivary glands where they have been used previously as a proxy for neuronal tissue.

Activation of autophagy has been shown to promote synapse growth in Drosophila via degradation of an upstream inhibitor of the JNK signaling pathway (Collins et al., 2006). Autophagic downregulation of hiw protein has been proposed as a mechanism to regulate synaptic growth (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009). The major identified transcriptional output of the JNK/AP-1 pathway is anti-oxidant and autophagic responses (Wu et al., 2009; Jegga et al., 2011). Autophagy and oxidative stress may directly contribute to the regulation of synapse growth mechanisms. The function of the cell adhesion protein DE-cadherin is sensitive to oxidative stress (DeGennaro et al., 2011) though the generality of this finding has yet to be defined. Autophagy has been observed to selectively phagocytose receptor proteins from an identified synapse (Rowland et al., 2006; Bamber and Rowland, 2006) suggesting a mechanism where autophagy can directly regulate the function and growth of the synapse independently of highwire degradation.
7.4.2. Autophagy is required in the muscle for spinster overgrowth

This is a novel finding as previously autophagy has only been implicated in synapse development in the presynaptic compartment. The hiw protein and its target wallenda (wnd) are both found presynaptically (Collins et al., 2006) while in spinster autophagy activity contributes to synapse overgrowth in both the muscle and nerve (Fig. 7.1). This observation suggests a novel muscle derived JNK/AP-1/autophagy signal contributing to synapse growth that is likely to be independent of direct hiw/wnd regulation. A future line of investigation would be to look at the role of TOR in synaptic development.

7.4.3. It is not known whether JNK is upstream of or downstream of autophagy in spinster and paraquat induced overgrowth

As discussed above JNK can act upstream of autophagy, whereby activation of JNK transcriptionally activates autophagy (Wu et al., 2009). In addition autophagy was shown to be upstream of JNK signalling in highwire mutants, as highwire mutants still show synaptic overgrowth with impaired autophagy. However spin induced overgrowth is dependent on autophagy. It is hard to determine whether JNK is upstream of downstream of autophagy in spinster as qPCR comparing atg1 and atg18 transcripts in spinster with and without JNK activity were not informative, as the levels varied greatly even in wildtype. Investigating TOR in these contexts might elucidate the signalling involved in the regulation of autophagy. However many of these signalling cascades are cyclical, for example ROS activated Foxo and JNK are activated by TOR-induced accumulation of ROS, this then leads to upregulation of sestrin, which acts as a negative feedback inhibitor to TOR (Lee et al., 2010). As shown in figure 7.1 JNK signalling is activated by ROS and is required for increases in bouton number but JNK can act both upstream (Wu et al., 2009) or downstream
of autophagy (Shen and Ganetzky, 2009) and where it is acting in spinster and oxidative stress to cause synaptic overgrowth remains to be seen. This means that genetic and biochemical analysis in tandem could identify the mechanisms involved.

7.5. AMPK is implicated in synaptic growth

7.5.1. AMPK can drive synaptic overgrowth

Increased AMPK activity is required both in the nerve and the muscle to create a significant overgrowth, relative to muscle surface area. However it is likely that most of this overgrowth is due to activity in the muscle as expression in the muscle causes a significant overgrowth prior to normalisation. This suggests that the role of the muscle in synaptic overgrowth has been somewhat overlooked and requires further investigation. In addition AMPK was also required for overgrowth in spinster. It is as yet unknown whether AMPK derived overgrowth is dependent on autophagy as although AMPK activity is known to activate autophagy, it also has many other downstream effectors. To analyse the effectors of AMPK it is necessary to analyse AMPK induced overgrowth when genetically reducing autophagy, through mutations or expression of RNAi transgenes.

7.5.2. AMPK is required for spinster induced overgrowth

Given that the overgrowth caused by increased activation of AMPK requires activation both in the nerve and the muscle for significant overgrowth, though in all likelihood a great proportion of this overgrowth is caused by the muscle, and that autophagy is also required both pre- and post- synaptically for spinster overgrowth, it will be important to establish where at the synapse AMPK is required in for growth in spinster. This could be done through expression of RNAi transgenes, not only to knock down the regulatory subunits but also the catalytic subunit, pre and post-synaptically. The level of activation of AMPK in
spinster was investigated using an antibody specific to phosphorylated AMPK (P-AMPK); unfortunately the affinity of the antibody to Drosophila P-AMPK was not sufficient to allow analysis. However the involvement of AMPK in spinster overgrowth is indicative of AMPK activation in spinster. Although it is not known whether this is through regulation of autophagy or through other mechanisms (Fig. 7.1)

**Fig. 7.1: Summary diagram of regulation of bouton number:** ASK/JNK/Fos signalling is activated by ROS and leads to increased bouton numbers. Jun is also involved when ROS are a result of paraquat or mutations in sod2 suggesting mitochondrial ROS generations. AMPK and autophagy are also required in for synaptic overgrowth. Autophagy genes and Fos are required both pre- and post-synaptically for overgrowth.
7.5.3. Mitochondrial defects in spinster

A large number of neurodegenerative disorders have been shown to have mitochondrial aberrations. For example, some genetic forms of Parkinson’s disease are caused by mutations affecting mitochondrial networks, such as Pink1 and parkin (Clark et al., 2006, Morais et al., 2009). In addition to this some LSDs have mitochondrial aberrations. G\textsubscript{M1}-gangliosidosis leads to decreased levels of the mitochondrial enzyme cytochrome c-oxidase and morphologically abnormal mitochondria (Takamura et al., 2008). Furthermore, astrocytes extracted from mice with this defect showed increased sensitivity to oxidative stress that was reversed by increasing ATP, suggestive of an energy deficit.

Another LSD, mucolipidosis type IV, results in mitochondrial fragmentation, putatively due to impaired recycling of mitochondria through the autophagolysosomal pathway as the mitochondrial defect was recapitulated through inhibition of autophagy (Jennings et al., 2006). The role of AMPK and oxidative stress in spinster suggests that spinster might be metabolically impaired, due to oxidative stress-mediated disruption of energy metabolism, resulting in reduced ATP. spinster appears to have impaired autophagosomal degradation of mitochondria, and previous studies have shown that spinster has increased levels of autophagolysosomes following starvation (Rong et al., 2011).

The presence of morphologically abnormal mitochondria in spinster could suggest defective recycling of mitochondria, common to a number of LSDs and other neurodegenerative diseases. It is necessary to establish when during development mitochondrial aberrations become apparent as the mitochondria shown here are from adult flies. It is also necessary to determine whether these morphologically abnormal mitochondria result in defective mitochondrial function leading to an energy deficit as seen in the mouse model of G\textsubscript{M1}-gangliosidosis (Takamura et al., 2008).
7.6. Physiological output is more sensitive to oxidative stress than morphology of the neuromuscular junction

Generally increased activity is believed to promote synapse growth. This is seen in mutants with heightened neuronal activity such as shaker, a voltage-gated potassium channel. Mutations in shaker combined with other mutations that cause enhanced neuronal activity, such as ether-a-go-go (eag) and hyperkinetic (Hk) have an increase in bouton number (Budnik et al., 1990). Reducing neuronal excitability in animals expressing these mutations, by introducing mutations in no action potential (nap, a sodium channel defect) rescues these phenotypes. Increased levels of cAMP cause synaptic overgrowth in dunce mutants; mutations in dunce reduce the breakdown of cAMP. This increase in synaptic growth is reduced by the mutant rutabaga, which is a mutation in adenylate cyclase, and hence impedes the production of cAMP (Zhong and Wu 1991a and b; Zhong et al., 1992). Taken together these data suggest that hyperexcitability or increased synaptic activity positively correlates with increased bouton number. However, spinster has been shown to impair synaptic function (Sweeney and Davies, 2002; Dermaut et al., 2005), with reduced quantal content and normal quantal size. Conversely, highwire mutants have both decreased quantal content and decreased quantal size (Wan et al., 2000). Other overgrowth mutants such as hangover show no change in electrophysiology showing that the relationship between bouton number and synapse strength is a complex one. It is interesting to note that hyperexcitability mutants show increased sensitivity to oxidative stress (Humphreys et al., 1996, Wang et al., 2000). While this does not conclusively show that they have oxidative stress the relationship is an interesting one and may hinge upon energetic demand and resultant mitochondrial stress.

The impaired crawling speed seen in spinster is not rescued through the expression of anti-oxidant transgenes suggesting that either oxidative stress is still at a high enough level to cause physiological dysfunction or the cause of
physiological impairment is distinct from oxidative stress. It must be noted that reducing oxidative stress does not afford a full rescue of overgrowth in spinster. However, other mutants investigated whose morphology was completely rescued by expression of antioxidants also showed impaired physiological output, shown by decreased crawling speed and this was not rescued by expression of antioxidants. This suggests that physiological output is more sensitive to oxidative stress than bouton number.

7.7. Summary

The key results and conclusions from this study can be summarised as follows:

1. *spinster* is carrying an oxidative stress burden that contributes to synaptic overgrowth.

2. Oxidative stress, independent of lysosomal dysfunction can cause overgrowth of the neuromuscular junction.

3. ASK/JNK/AP-1 signalling is required for spinster and oxidative stress induced overgrowth.

4. Autophagy genes are required for *spinster* and oxidative stress induced overgrowth.

5. Fos and autophagy are required both in the muscle and the nerve in *spinster* overgrowth.

6. *spinster* and oxidative stress result in physiological impairment.

7. *spinster* have aberrant mitochondria.

8. AMPK is required for *spinster* overgrowth suggestive of an energy deficit and AMPK can drive synapse growth.
## Appendix 1: Bouton Numbers and MSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype and Conditions</th>
<th>Raw Bouton No±SEM</th>
<th>MSA±SEM (µm²)</th>
<th>Normalised Bouton Number</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atg18^{KG}/Df</td>
<td>54±3.9</td>
<td>6773±2439</td>
<td>68±6.3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atg1^{PZ}/atg1^{DG}</td>
<td>60±3.2</td>
<td>86857±3659</td>
<td>59±5.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atg1^{PZ}/atg1^{DG} (10mM paraquat)</td>
<td>35±1.8</td>
<td>46302±2580</td>
<td>54±1.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt; UASAMPK^{T184D}</td>
<td>64±3.3</td>
<td>85443±3989</td>
<td>63±5.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt; UASatg5RNAi</td>
<td>81±4.7</td>
<td>84374±1453</td>
<td>81±5.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt; UASfos^{DN}</td>
<td>68±3.3</td>
<td>80069±2277</td>
<td>94±9.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt;UASAP-1</td>
<td>84±5.9</td>
<td>92288±4110</td>
<td>51±4.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt;UASATG1^{68}</td>
<td>60±3.0</td>
<td>82515±2447</td>
<td>81±5.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt;UASATG1^{CG}</td>
<td>81±4.7</td>
<td>82515±2447</td>
<td>81±5.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt;UAScat (male)</td>
<td>78±5.7</td>
<td>78603±3610</td>
<td>83±7.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt;UASFOS</td>
<td>79±4.0</td>
<td>92288±4110</td>
<td>51±4.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt;UAShSOD1</td>
<td>71±2.6</td>
<td>82515±2447</td>
<td>81±5.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt;UAShSOD1 (male)</td>
<td>71±2.6</td>
<td>82515±2447</td>
<td>81±5.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaVGAL4&gt;UASJUN</td>
<td>98±6.8</td>
<td>84382±4108</td>
<td>98±9.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiw with elaVGAL4&gt;UAScat (male)</td>
<td>134±6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiw with elaVGAL4&gt;UAShSOD1 (male)</td>
<td>75±9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiw with MHCGAL4&gt;UAScat (male)</td>
<td>162±24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiw with MHCGAL4&gt;UAShSOD1 (male)</td>
<td>108±7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiw with spinGAL4&gt;UASCat (male)</td>
<td>125±4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiw with spinGAL4&gt;UASHSOD1 (male)</td>
<td>108±5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiw (male)</td>
<td>146±5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt; UASatg5RNAi</td>
<td>98±5.7</td>
<td>92440±3104</td>
<td>87±6.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt; UASfos^{DN}</td>
<td>79±3.7</td>
<td>85443±3231</td>
<td>107±5.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt;UASAMPK^{T184D}</td>
<td>107±7.1</td>
<td>84034±1800</td>
<td>83±6.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt;UASAP-1</td>
<td>86±6.7</td>
<td>84034±1800</td>
<td>83±6.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genotype and Conditions</td>
<td>Raw Bouton No±SEM</td>
<td>MSA±SEM (µm²)</td>
<td>Normalised Bouton Number</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt;UASATG1\textsuperscript{68}</td>
<td>72±4.7</td>
<td>80151±3015</td>
<td>74±5.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt;UASATG1\textsuperscript{CG}</td>
<td>70±4.4</td>
<td>89057±3623</td>
<td>67±5.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt;UAScat (male)</td>
<td>72±3.6</td>
<td>76584±3738</td>
<td>114±10.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt;UASFOS</td>
<td>98±5.2</td>
<td>85714±3490</td>
<td>95±7.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt;UASHSOD1</td>
<td>83±6.4</td>
<td>78550±3655</td>
<td>103±4.42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt;UASHSOD1 (male)</td>
<td>72±3.6</td>
<td>74703±1805</td>
<td>72±1.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHCGAL4&gt;UASJUN</td>
<td>107±10.2</td>
<td>76584±3738</td>
<td>114±10.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sdhB/sdhB</td>
<td>59±4.4</td>
<td>67668±3238</td>
<td>76±8.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sesB/sesB</td>
<td>109±4.0</td>
<td>63699±2222</td>
<td>139±4.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1\textsuperscript{11}/+</td>
<td>100±3.2</td>
<td>78550±3655</td>
<td>103±4.42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1\textsuperscript{11}/sod1\textsuperscript{164}</td>
<td>107±4.8</td>
<td>60421±4218</td>
<td>147±6.31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1\textsuperscript{11}/sod1\textsuperscript{164} with spinGAL4&gt; UAScat</td>
<td>66±2.1</td>
<td>74703±1805</td>
<td>72±1.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1\textsuperscript{11}/sod1\textsuperscript{164} with spinGAL4&gt; UASfos\textsuperscript{DN}</td>
<td>59±3.70</td>
<td>71978±2063</td>
<td>67±4.62</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1\textsuperscript{11}/sod1\textsuperscript{164} with spinGAL4&gt; UASjnk\textsuperscript{DN}</td>
<td>75±5.0</td>
<td>79112±3990</td>
<td>79±5.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1\textsuperscript{11}/sod1\textsuperscript{164} with spinGAL4&gt; UASjun\textsuperscript{DN}</td>
<td>104±3.69</td>
<td>69466±2060</td>
<td>122±3.88</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1\textsuperscript{164}/+</td>
<td>87±5.72</td>
<td>76112±2544</td>
<td>92±4.31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2\textsuperscript{delta}/sod2\textsuperscript{delta02}</td>
<td>107±4.9</td>
<td>62477±3136</td>
<td>146±10.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2\textsuperscript{delta}/sod2\textsuperscript{delta02} spin\textsuperscript{5} with spinGAL4&gt; UASfos\textsuperscript{DN}</td>
<td>65±4.25</td>
<td>76877±2881</td>
<td>70±5.98</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2\textsuperscript{delta}/sod2\textsuperscript{delta02} spin\textsuperscript{5} with spinGAL4&gt; UASjnk\textsuperscript{DN}</td>
<td>84±4.28</td>
<td>73878±2423</td>
<td>94±6.30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2\textsuperscript{delta}/sod2\textsuperscript{delta02} spin\textsuperscript{5} with spinGAL4&gt; UASjun\textsuperscript{DN}</td>
<td>72±3.77</td>
<td>59037±3609</td>
<td>102±5.51</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2\textsuperscript{delta}/sod2\textsuperscript{delta02} with elaVGAL4&gt;UASfos\textsuperscript{DN}</td>
<td>73±4.2</td>
<td>79692±2919</td>
<td>77±4.9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2\textsuperscript{delta}/sod2\textsuperscript{delta02} with MHC GAL4&gt;UASfos\textsuperscript{DN}</td>
<td>78±4.5</td>
<td>81371±3621</td>
<td>81±6.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2\textsuperscript{delta}/sod2\textsuperscript{delta02} with spinGAL4&gt;UASTrx\textsuperscript{CYTO}</td>
<td>82±5.3</td>
<td>69273±2378</td>
<td>97±6.4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin\textsuperscript{4}/+</td>
<td>93±4.00</td>
<td>80008±2321</td>
<td>94±4.10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genotype and Conditions</td>
<td>Raw Bouton No±SEM</td>
<td>MSA±SEM (µm²)</td>
<td>Normalised Bouton Number</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/+; sod1nt⁴/+</td>
<td>114±4.39</td>
<td>72512±4565</td>
<td>127±5.47</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/+; sod1n⁶⁴/+</td>
<td>116±7.3</td>
<td>71662±6982</td>
<td>131±8.03</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵₅⁸</td>
<td>117±7.7</td>
<td>74129±1635</td>
<td>129±9.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵</td>
<td>152±4.33</td>
<td>76580±2716</td>
<td>165±10.3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with atg1⁸KG/atg1DG</td>
<td>76±5.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with atg1⁸KG/Df</td>
<td>75±6.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with atg1²⁴/atg1DG</td>
<td>72±4.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with elavGAL4&gt;UASatg5RNAi</td>
<td>127±5.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with elavGAL4&gt;UASHsSOD1</td>
<td>106±7.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with elavGAL4&gt;UASFos⁰DN</td>
<td>113±9.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with MHCGAL4&gt; UASatg5RNAi</td>
<td>126±6.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with MHCGAL4&gt; UASFos⁰DN</td>
<td>120±8.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with MHCGAL4&gt; UASHsSOD1</td>
<td>103±3.166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with spinGAL4&gt; UASAMPK-RNAi¹⁰⁶²</td>
<td>109±6.2</td>
<td>82971±3443</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with spinGAL4&gt; UASAMPK-RNAi¹⁹²⁷</td>
<td>105±6.52</td>
<td>79595±1919</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with spinGAL4&gt; UASask⁰DN</td>
<td>128±6.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with spinGAL4&gt; UAScat</td>
<td>103±5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with spinGAL4&gt; UASFos⁰DN</td>
<td>74±1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with spinGAL4&gt; UASFos⁰RNAi</td>
<td>119±3.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin⁴/spin⁵ with spinGAL4&gt; UASHsSOD1</td>
<td>110±3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genotype and Conditions</td>
<td>Raw Bouton Number ±SEM</td>
<td>MSA±SEM (µm²)</td>
<td>Normalised Bouton Number</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin4/spin5 with spinGAL4&gt;UASjnkDN</td>
<td>117±5.79</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin4/spin5 with spinGAL4&gt;UASjnkRNAi</td>
<td>121±3.45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin4/spin5 with spinGAL4&gt;UASjunDN</td>
<td>148±7.19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin4/spin5 with spinGAL4&gt;UASStrxCYTO</td>
<td>113±8.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin4/spin5 with spinGAL4&gt;UASStrxMITO</td>
<td>103±6.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin4/spin5 with tubGAL4&gt;UASsHOD1</td>
<td>115±6.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin5/+</td>
<td>85±3.66</td>
<td>75229±2665</td>
<td>91±6.49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin5/+; sod1nt/+</td>
<td>121±3.89</td>
<td>75440±2355</td>
<td>130±6.29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin5/+; sod1n64/+</td>
<td>137±3.87</td>
<td>78594±2157</td>
<td>141±6.14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin5/spin558</td>
<td>124±9.0</td>
<td>82067±4538</td>
<td>126±13.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UASsHOD1 (10mM paraquat)</td>
<td>57±2.64</td>
<td>59332±1937</td>
<td>72±4.07</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UASsHOD1 (instant food)</td>
<td>76±5.56</td>
<td>75308±3996</td>
<td>74±4.13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UASAMPK-RNAi1062</td>
<td>61±4.0</td>
<td>70669±3618</td>
<td>86±7.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UASAMPK-RNAi1827</td>
<td>74±4.6</td>
<td>76581±2552</td>
<td>88±8.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UAS AMPK184D</td>
<td>114±4.6</td>
<td>77872±1933</td>
<td>121±5.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UASfospRNAi</td>
<td>82±4.24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UASjnkRNAi</td>
<td>65±3.44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UASjnkRNAi (10mM paraquat)</td>
<td>64±3.7</td>
<td>49061±1688</td>
<td>94±5.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UASjnkRNAi (instant food)</td>
<td>70±3.2</td>
<td>78429±2319</td>
<td>66±4.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4-&gt;UASAP-1</td>
<td>60±4.18</td>
<td>79476±4102</td>
<td>61±4.66</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UASaskDN (10mM paraquat)</td>
<td>86±7.80</td>
<td>59207±5602</td>
<td>86±7.81</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genotype and Conditions</td>
<td>Raw Bouton No±SEM</td>
<td>MSA±SEM (µm²)</td>
<td>Normalised Bouton Number</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UASaskDN</td>
<td>54±3.64</td>
<td>81124±2338</td>
<td>63±4.45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(instant food)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UAScat</td>
<td>76±4.6</td>
<td>75369±4901</td>
<td>88±8.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UAScat (male)</td>
<td>67±4.3</td>
<td>75369±4901</td>
<td>88±8.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UASFOS</td>
<td>69±2.9</td>
<td>82460±2595</td>
<td>68±3.4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UASFos^DN</td>
<td>56±2.29</td>
<td>75297±3820</td>
<td>65±6.25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10mM paraquat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UASFos^DN</td>
<td>58±2.23</td>
<td>57525±2346</td>
<td>75±5.26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(instant food)</td>
<td>55±2.70</td>
<td>62919±4115</td>
<td>56±5.77</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Branch Number and Normalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Branch No±SEM</th>
<th>Branch No Normalised to Bouton No±SEM</th>
<th>Branch No Normalised to MSA±SEM</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UAShSOD1</td>
<td>4.86±0.44</td>
<td>5.66±0.50</td>
<td>3.92±1.74</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UAScat</td>
<td>4.47±0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1n1/sod1n64</td>
<td>7.19±0.64</td>
<td>2.76±0.26</td>
<td>2.01±1.35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2delta/sod2delta02</td>
<td>3.47±0.32</td>
<td>6.05±0.75</td>
<td>5.54±1.96</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin4/spin5</td>
<td>10.82±1.33</td>
<td>5.31±0.44</td>
<td>5.31±0.44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildtype</td>
<td>5.31±0.44</td>
<td>5.31±0.44</td>
<td>5.31±0.44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildtype (Instant Food)</td>
<td>4.38±1.19</td>
<td>4.38±1.19</td>
<td>4.38±1.19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildtype 10mM Paraquat</td>
<td>6.17±0.60</td>
<td>6.01±0.59</td>
<td>4.22±0.41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spinGAL4&gt;UASStrxCYTO</td>
<td>4.08±0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1n1/sod1n64 with spinGAL4&gt;UAShSOD1</td>
<td>5.00±0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod1n1/sod1n64 with spinGAL4&gt;UAScat</td>
<td>4.75±0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2delta/sod2delta02 with spinGAL4&gt;UASStrxCYTO</td>
<td>4.55±0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin4/spin5 with spinGAL4&gt;UASStrxCYTO</td>
<td>4.41±0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix 3: Bouton Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Mean Bouton Width (µm)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No NMJs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sod1n1/sod1n64</td>
<td>2.202±0.042</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sod2delta/sod2delta02</td>
<td>2.646±0.053</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spin4/spin5</td>
<td>2.350±0.040</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildtype</td>
<td>2.616±0.064</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildtype (Instant Food)</td>
<td>2.82±0.068</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildtype 10mM paraquat</td>
<td>2.41±0.052</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acetyl CoA</td>
<td>Acetyl coenzyme A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Alzheimer’s Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Adenosine Disphosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEL</td>
<td>After Egg Laying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (Lou Gehrig's Disease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPA</td>
<td>Alpha-Amino-3-Hydroxy-5-Methyl-4-Isoxazole Propionic Acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPK</td>
<td>Adenosine Monophosphate-Activated Protein Kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Action Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-1</td>
<td>Activator Protein-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE-1</td>
<td>Apurinic/apyramidal endonuclease-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>Apoptosis Signal Regulating Kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG</td>
<td>Autophagy Related Gene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>Adenosine Triphosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aβ</td>
<td>Beta-amyloid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bcl-2</td>
<td>B-cell lymphoma 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRP</td>
<td>Bruchpilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bZIP</td>
<td>Basic Leucine Zipper Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cAMP</td>
<td>Cyclic Adenosine Monophosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Catalase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIC1</td>
<td>Chloride Intracellular Channel Protein 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLN</td>
<td>Ceroid Lipofuscinosis, Neuronal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREB</td>
<td>cAMP Responsive Element Binding (protein)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvt</td>
<td>Cytoplasm to Vacuole Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CyO</td>
<td>CurlyO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYTO</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFz2</td>
<td>DFrizzled2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dlg</td>
<td>Discs-large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>Deoxyribose Nucleic Acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAV</td>
<td>Embryonic Lethal Abnormal Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Electron Microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Ethyl Methane Sulfonate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>Excitatory Post-synaptic Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Endoplasmic Reticulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERK</td>
<td>Extracellular Signal Regulated Kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>Electron Transport Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EtOH</td>
<td>Ethanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FADH\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>flavin adenine dinucleotide (hydroquinone form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FasII</td>
<td>Fasciclin II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM6</td>
<td>First Chromosome Marker (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbb</td>
<td>Glass Bottom Boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFP</td>
<td>Green Fluorescent Protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GluR</td>
<td>Glutamate Receptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPx</td>
<td>Glutathione Peroxidase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSH</td>
<td>Glutathione (monomeric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSSG</td>
<td>Glutathione Disulphide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST</td>
<td>Glutathione Transferase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTP</td>
<td>Guanosine-5'-triphosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTPases</td>
<td>small guanosine triphosphatases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>Hydrogen Peroxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hep</td>
<td>Hemipterous (M KK7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiw</td>
<td>Highwire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL3</td>
<td>Hemolymph-like Buffer 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNE</td>
<td>4-hydroxy-2,3-nonenal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO-1</td>
<td>Heme-oxygenase-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPS</td>
<td>homotypic fusion and protein sorting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>Horseradish Peroxidase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISN</td>
<td>Intersegmental Nerve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNK</td>
<td>c-Jun N-terminal Kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kb</td>
<td>kilo base pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEAP-1</td>
<td>Kelch-like ECH-associated protein 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMP</td>
<td>Lysosomal-associated Membrane Protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGIC</td>
<td>Ligand Gated Ion Channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loe</td>
<td>Lochrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRRK2</td>
<td>Leucine Rich Repeat Kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>Lysosomal Storage Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Long Term Potentiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPK</td>
<td>Mitogen-Activated Protein Kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBF1</td>
<td>Multiprotein Bridging Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA</td>
<td>Malondialdehyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Medea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mef2</td>
<td>Myocyte Enhancer Factor-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mEPP</td>
<td>Mini Excitatory Post-synaptic Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHC</td>
<td>Myosin Heavy Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITO</td>
<td>Mitochondrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKK</td>
<td>Mitogen-Activated Protein Kinase Kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKRS</td>
<td>Stubble Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Muscle Surface Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADH</td>
<td>Nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADPH</td>
<td>Nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide phosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCL</td>
<td>Neuronal Ceroid Lipofuscinosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMDA</td>
<td>N-Methyl-D-Aspartate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMJ</td>
<td>Neuromuscular Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Nitric Oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOS</td>
<td>Nitric Oxide Synthase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>Niemann Pick Type C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nrf2</td>
<td>Nuclear factor (erythroid-derived 2)-like 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_2^-$</td>
<td>Superoxide Anions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Hydroxyl Radicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH$^-$</td>
<td>Hydroxyl Anions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONOO$^-$</td>
<td>Peroxynitrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>Phosphate Buffered Saline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS-T</td>
<td>Phosphate Buffered Saline-Triton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>Programmed Cell Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>Polymerase Chain Reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Parkinson’s Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI3K</td>
<td>Phosphoinositide 3-kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKA</td>
<td>Protein Kinase A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKC</td>
<td>Protein Kinase C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMA</td>
<td>Phorbol 12-myristate 13-acetate (PKC Activator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puc</td>
<td>Puckered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref-1</td>
<td>Redox Factor-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA(i)</td>
<td>(Interfering) Ribose Nucleic Acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNS</td>
<td>Reactive Nitrogen Species</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

ROS     Reactive Oxygen Species
RSK     Ribosomal S6 Kinase
S6K     S6 Kinase
SAPK    Stress Activated Protein Kinase
Sax     Saxophone
Sbh     Succinate Dehydrogenase
Sco     Scutella
SesB    Stress Sensitive B
SN      Segmental Nerve
SNAP25  N-ethylmaleimide-sensitive factor attachment protein-25
SNARE   NAP (Soluble NSF Attachment Protein) Receptor
SOD     Superoxide Dismutase
spin    Spinster
SSB     Subsynaptic Reticulum
TGFβ    Transforming Growth Factor β
Tkv     Thick Veins
TM6     Third Chromosome Marker
TMOP    1,1,3,3-tetramethoxypropane
TN      Transverse Nerve
TOR     Target of Rapamycin
TORC    Target of Rapamycin Complex
Trx     Thioredoxin
TrxR    Thioredoxin Reductase
TSC     Tuberous Sclerosis Complex
TUB     Tubulin
UAS     Upstream Activating Sequence
Unc-51  Uncoordinated-51
VGIC    Voltage Gated Ion Channels
VPS     Vacuolar Protein Sorting
Wnd     Wallenda
XO      Xanthine Oxidase
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