Elucidating the dynamics of the neuronal stress response in driving the death of retinal ganglion cells

Madeline M. Farley, Sofia Gonzalez de Corcuera, Shufang Wang, Allison Melton, Trent A. Watkins Department of Neurosurgery, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas Supported by the Glaucoma Research Foundation and Mission Connect, a project of the TIRR Foundation

INTRODUCTION

The neuronal stress-responsive Dual Leucine-zipper Kinase emerged as an attractive drug target has neurodegenerative diseases. Inhibiting DLK is potently neuroprotective for retinal ganglion cells (RGCs) in models of glaucoma and optic nerve injury.

However, the relationship between DLK activity and neuronal Apoptosis apoptosis is poorly understood, as DLK activation does not acutely or necessarily result in neuronal loss and is a critical component of neuronal repair (e.g., axon regeneration).

To understand the dynamics of DLK signaling that are transcription factor responsible for RGC death, we have engineered a DLK whose *c-Jun. DLK knockout* activity can be controlled by a small molecule. In this pilot study, provides prolonged we have evaluated the prospects for graded or intermittent *neuroprotection* stimulation of the stress response to probe how levels, patterns, RGCs after optic nerve and context of DLK activity determine the fates of RGCs.



DESIGN & METHODS

Optic nerve crush results in retrograde DLK signaling. The normally labile DLK protein is stabilized near the site of RGC axon injury, resulting in its oligomerization. Thus activated, DLK mediates Thinjured retrograde stress signaling to the RGC nuclei, detected by IHC for the phosphorylated form the of transcription factor c-Jun. This signaling persists until the slow and steady apoptosis of the large majority of the RGCs over the subsequent weeks and months.





The engineered versions of DLK harboring either a single C-terminal DHFR destabilizing domain ("dDLK") or both C-terminal and N-terminal DHFR destabilizing domains ("ddDLK") are introduced by transient transfection in vitro to HEK293T cells (for testing and optimization) or by intravitreal AAV2-mediated transduction into young adult C57bl6 mice to RGCs in vivo (for testing effects on neuronal apoptosis and axon regeneration).

regenerative Atf3 and pro-apoptotic Puma (qPCR of retina).

TECHNICAL ADVANCES

Low background activity and superior dynamic range provided by adding a second DHFR destabilizing domain represent valuable improvements on the original dDLK design.

Destabilized DLK constructs allow for dynamic control of DLK signaling by small molecules for studies to determine the thresholds for RGC death and repair.

RGC DEATH AND AXON REGENERATION

Unregulated overexpression of DLK results in the rapid loss of RGCs.

Controlled stimulation of the neuronal stress response by TMP-mediated ddDLK activation results in upregulation of both pro-apoptotic and pro-regenerative gene expression.

Prior stimulation of the neuronal stress response by ddDLK does not appear to result in greater apoptosis of RGCs after optic nerve damage.

Stimulation of the neuronal stress response by ddDLK may facilitate improved RGC axon regeneration enabled by knockout of the tumor suppressor PTEN.

Alternative destabilizing domains & drugs. The use of destabilizing FKBP opportunities generates stimulating DLK with different time courses and dynamics based on distinct pharmacokinetic the properties of its stabilizer. the small molecule Shield1.

Improving RGC axon regeneration. Preliminary data suggest that stimulating DLK signaling improves growth of PTEN-deficient RGCs following optic nerve crush, without resulting in greater RGC apoptosis (Caspase-3). TMP was dosed one day prior to ON crush injury, and sprouting axons were assessed 3 days after crush.



This work is supported by the Glaucoma Research Foundation Shaffer Grant and by Mission Connect, a project of the TIRR Foundation. Madeline Farley is also supported by NEI Training Grant T32EY007001. Valuable support and advice provided by Matt Rasband, Preethi Somasundaram, and Mary Edgington.

Baylor Collegeof Medicine

CONCLUSIONS

NEXT STEPS





ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS