The KH domains of FMRP differentially regulate neuronal granule formation,

dynamics, and function in *Drosophila*

Emily L. Starke[1] and Scott A. Barbee[1,2,*]

[1]Department of Biological Sciences, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, 80210,

USA [2]Molecular and Cellular Biophysics Program, University of Denver, Denver,

Colorado, 80210, USA

*Correspondence: scott.barbee@du.edu

ABSTRACT

Fragile X Syndrome (FXS) is the most prevalent cause of inherited mental deficiency and is the most common monogenetic cause of autism spectral disorder (ASD). Here, we demonstrate that disease-causing missense mutations in the conserved K homology (KH) RNA binding domains (RBDs) of FMRP cause defects in its ability to form RNA transport granules in neurons. Using molecular, genetic, and imaging approaches in the *Drosophila* FXS model system, we show that the KH1 and KH2 domains of FMRP regulate distinct aspects of neuronal FMRP granule formation, dynamics, and transport. Furthermore, mutations in both KH domains disrupt translational repression in cells and the localization of known FMRP target mRNAs in neurons. These results suggest that the KH domains play an essential role in neuronal FMRP granule formation and function which may be linked to the molecular pathogenesis of FXS.

KEYWORDS

Drosophila, Fragile X Syndrome, FMRP, KH domain, RNA granules, RNA localization, translational regulation, phase separation

INTRODUCTION

Fragile X Syndrome (FXS) is the most common cause of inherited intellectual disability in humans (Santoro et al., 2012). Typically, FXS is caused by epigenetic silencing of the *FMR1* gene due to a long CGG repeat expansion in the 5'UTR, resulting in hypermethylation of the *FMR1* locus and subsequent transcriptional silencing (Pieretti et al., 1991). This results in loss of expression of the encoded Fragile X Mental Retardation Protein (FMRP), an evolutionarily conserved RNA-binding protein (RBP) that binds to many mRNAs in the mammalian brain. FMRP is best characterized as a translational repressor (Richter and Zhao, 2021). In this role, FMRP associates with diverse ribonucleoprotein particles (RNPs) including RNA transport granules, P-bodies (PBs), and stress granules (SGs) (Lai et al., 2020). In neurons, FMRP-containing RNA transport granules (hereafter called "FMRP granules") are actively transported in both axons and dendrites (Antar et al., 2005; Antar et al., 2006; Dictenberg et al., 2008; Li et al., 2009). These granules carry translationally repressed mRNAs to synapses where they are derepressed in response to synaptic activity. Local translation of critical mRNAs at synapses is essential for long-term synaptic plasticity and is defective in FXS.

The role of FMRP in translation and mRNA transport in the context of neurons remains enigmatic. In the soma, FMRP binds to translationally repressed target mRNAs and associated RBPs. These RNPs merge and are remodeled to allow for rapid, motor-dependent transport within neurites (El Fatimy et al., 2016). FMRP granules belong to a diverse class of membraneless organelles (MLOs) that form through liquid-liquid phase separation (LLSP) (Banani et al., 2017). This process is driven by weak, multivalent interactions between protein and RNA components (Mittag and Parker, 2018; Van Treeck

and Parker, 2018). Weak interactions allow MLOs to be highly dynamic and to rapidly

assemble and disassemble in response to local signals. In the case of FMRP,

posttranslational modification of its C-terminal intrinsically disordered region (IDR) can

reversibly control its phase separation *in vitro,* a process that correlates with translational

repression (Tsang et al., 2019). This is an attractive model to explain how FMRP granules

might assemble, deliver translationally repressed mRNAs to the synapse, and then

regulate their local translation in response to activity. However, it is unclear whether the

IDR acts alone or together with structured RBDs to regulate FMRP granules *in vivo*.

Although the most common cause of FXS is loss-of-function, advances in gene

sequencing have led to the discovery of FXS-causing missense mutations in the *FMR1*

gene (Suhl and Warren, 2015). Two mutations located in structured N-terminal RBDs of

FMRP and have been functionally characterized (De Boulle et al., 1993; Feng et al., 1997;

Myrick et al., 2015a; Myrick et al., 2015b; Prieto et al., 2021; Zang et al., 2009). The

Gly266Glu (G266E) and Ile304Asn (I304N) mutations are in K-homology domains (KH1

and KH2 respectively) which bind to "kissing-complex" tertiary motifs or distinct sequence

elements (GACR, ACUK, and WGGA) within target mRNAs (Ascano et al., 2012; Darnell

et al., 2005; Ray et al., 2013). The latter are ubiquitous sequences in mammalian

transcripts (Suhl et al., 2014). The analysis of these mutations has begun to uncover

novel functions for *FMR1*. For example, both the G266E and I304N disrupt the ability of

FMRP to bind to specific target mRNAs and to associate with polysomes suggesting that

the KH domains are important for translational regulation (Myrick et al., 2014; Zang *et al.*,

2009). However, the precise role these domains play in FMRP granule formation,

dynamics, and function in the context of neurons remains unknown.

Studying FMRP function in mammals is genetically complicated due to the presence of two autosomal paralogs, FXR1P and FXR2P, which have some functional redundancy with FMRP (Agulhon et al., 1999; Wan et al., 2000; Zhang et al., 1995). In contrast, *Drosophila* has a single *dFmr1* gene and the dFMRP protein shares significant sequence identity with mammalian FMRP, particularly within the RBDs (Wan *et al.*, 2000). *Drosophila* FMRP granules are also compositionally like those observed in mammalian neurons(Barbee et al., 2006; Cougot et al., 2008). Importantly, *Drosophila* has proven to be an excellent model system in which to study FXS because *dFmr1* mutants recapitulate many FXS phenotypes (Drozd et al., 2018). Here, we have introduced analogous mutations into the KH1 and KH2 domains of dFMRP (G269E and I307N respectively) and examined FMRP granules in *Drosophila* Schneider (S2) cells and primary neurons. Analysis of these mutants has revealed distinct differences in the requirement for KH1 and KH2 in the formation and dynamics of FMRP granules. Interestingly, both FXS-causing KH mutations result in FMRP granules that are significantly more dynamic. This is in opposition to mutations in other RBPs that drive the formation of solid-like aggregates associated with neurodegenerative disorders. Finally, the KH mutations differentially impact the function of FMRP in translational repression and RNA transport. Our findings provide new biological insight into the normal function of FMRP in cells and neurons and into the specific molecular and cellular processes that are dysregulated in FXS.

RESULTS

The KH domains are required to form FMRP granules in cells

The C-terminal IDR of mammalian FMRP is necessary and sufficient to drive the

formation of phase-separated liquid droplets *in vitro* (Tsang *et al.*, 2019). However, the

dependency of the IDR in FMRP granule formation in cells has yet to be elucidated. To

address this, we first developed dFMRP deletion and mutant transgenes (Figure 1A).

Unless otherwise noted, EGFP was fused to the N-terminus to visualize granules.

Overexpression of GFP-tagged wild-type dFMRP (WT-FMRP) in *Drosophila* larval motor

neurons (MNs) replicated published results with untagged dFMRP indicating that GFP

does not significantly interfere with protein function (Figure S1) (Zhang et al., 2001).

The C-terminus of dFMRP is predicted to be disordered, indicating it may play an

important role in promoting LLPS (Figure 1A). We first transfected *Drosophila* S2R+ cells

with WT-dFMRP, dFMRP$_{\Delta IDR}$ (ΔIDR), and dFMRP$_{IDR}$ (IDR) (Figure 1B-C). As shown

previously, 98% of cells transfected with WT-FMRP form numerous small round granules

(Figure 1C-D) (Gareau et al., 2013a; Gareau et al., 2013b). We found that the IDR alone

was sufficient to induce FMRP granules in 65% of transfected cells (Figure 1C-D). These

granules were morphologically like WT-FMRP albeit less numerous (Figure 1E-F).

Interestingly, the structured N-terminal domain of dFMRP (ΔIDR) was also sufficient to

induce granule formation in 26% of cells (Figure 1C-D). These granules were less

abundant, and many had an amorphic (non-circular) morphology (Figure 1E-F). This

suggests that, unlike human FMRP *in vitro*, the C-terminal IDR of dFMRP is not essential

for FMRP granule formation in cells (Tsang *et al.*, 2019).

We speculated that the N-terminal KH1 and KH2 domains may act cooperatively

with the IDR to regulate FMRP granule formation. Fusing the KH domains to the IDR

(KH+IDR) significantly increased the number of cells containing granules (Figure 1D).

Figure 1. The KH domains and IDR interact to regulate FMRP granule formation

Figure 1: The KH domains and IDR interact to regulate FMRP granule formation
(A) Schematic of dFMRP showing each of the main RBDs in light blue boxes and IDR indicated by grey and white stripes (top). IDR mutants denote amino acid deletions with lines. Both KH1 and KH2 domains are fused to the IDR in the KH+IDR mutant. Disorder plot aligned with the wild-type dFMRP protein show that the C-terminus is entirely disordered as predicted by IUPRED2 and ANCHOR2 [72]. (B) Western blot analysis of EGFP (GFP) and α-tubulin (loading control) protein levels in transfected cells. (C) Representative images of GFP-FMRP mutant granule phenotypes in transfected S2R+ cells. Scale bar = 2μm. (D) Percentage of transfected cells forming GFP-FMRP granules. Data are presented as mean ± S.E. of three independent experiments (approximately 100 cells per experiment; one-way ANOVA). (E) Quantification of the number of granules counted within a cell, which was normalized to cell area in μm^2 (mean ± SE; n=15 cells; Brown-Forsyth test). (F) Quantification of the two major morphological phenotypes observed in IDR mutants (n=100 cells). In D and E, * p<0.05; **** p<0.0001.

These foci were morphologically indistinct from WT-FMRP granules although the number

of KH+IDR granules per cell did not increase significantly (Figure 1C and 1E-F). These

data indicate that the propensity to form granules is enhanced by addition of the KH

domains to the IDR. However, our results also suggest that additional elements in the N-

terminus are likely to be involved in the control of FMRP granule formation.

FXS-causing mutations in the KH domains disrupt granule formation

We next wanted to explore the contribution of the KH domains in FMRP granule

formation. The G266E and I304N missense mutations in KH1 and KH2 of hsFMRP are

predicted to disrupt the proper folding of each RBD and to disrupt functions of FMRP

including mRNA-binding, AMPA receptor trafficking, and polysome association (Darnell

et al., 2005; Myrick *et al.*, 2014; Valverde et al., 2007). To address this, we made

analogous point mutations in the KH domains of dFMRP (G269E and I307N), hereafter

referred to as KH1* and KH2* (Figure 2A). In contrast to WT-FMRP, overexpression of

the GFP-tagged KH1* and KH2* transgenes in larval MNs did not inhibit axon terminal

growth at the neuromuscular junction (NMJ) (Figure S1) (Zhang *et al.*, 2001).

We transfected S2R+ cells with GFP-tagged constructs to determine the impact

these mutations had on FMRP granule formation. Interestingly, we observed a > 2-fold

decrease in the ability of cells expressing GFP-tagged KH1* to form granules relative to

WT-FMRP, while KH2* had no effect (Figure 2C-D). This decrease cannot be explained

by a difference in the expression levels of GFP-KH1* (Figure 2B). We also found that the

number of granules per cell was significantly reduced by both mutations, although,

granules were about twice as abundant in KH2* than KH1* (Figure 2E). Many KH2*

Figure 2: The KH domains are differentially required to regulate FMRP granule formation

Figure 2: The KH domains differentially regulate FMRP granule formation

(A) Schematic representation of dFMRP variants used in this study. Arrowheads indicate where analogous FXS-causing point mutations were made in dFMRP. Deletion of the KH1 and KH2 domains is annotated with a break in FMRP sequence. (B) Western blot analysis of EGFP (GFP), FMRP, and α-tubulin protein levels in transfected cells. α-tubulin was used as a loading control (*= 100 kDa, **= 90 kDa, ***= 30 kDa, ****= 80 kDa, *****= 60 kDa). (C) Representative images of cells transiently transfected with the indicated GFP-tagged FMRP constructs. Scale bar = 2 μm. (D) Percentage of transfected cells forming GFP-FMRP granules. Data are presented as mean ± S.E. (approximately 100 cells per three experiments; one-way ANOVA). (E) Quantification of the number of granules per cell, which was normalized to cell area in μm² (mean ± SE; n=15 cells each; Brown-Forsyth test). (F) Quantification of the two major morphological phenotypes observed (n=100 cells each). In D and E, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p<0.0001.

granules also had an unusual, often large, amorphic structure while both WT-FMRP and

KH1* granules were generally small and round (Figure 2C and 2F). These results suggest

that both the KH1 and KH2 mutants alter normal FMRP granule formation. They also

suggest that each KH domain control a different aspect of this process.

To examine the collective contribution of both domains, we made a G269E/I307N

double mutant (KH1*KH2*) (Figure 2A). Most cells transfected with these constructs were

able to form granules (Figure 2C-D). As with the individual KH mutants, transfected cells

contained fewer granules per cell (Figure 2E). Interestingly, most KH1*KH2* granules that

formed in cells were large and round indicating that they are different from those

containing WT-FMRP, KH1*, or KH2* (Figure 2C and 2F). Morphologically these were

like a published mutant where both KH domains have been deleted (ΔKH) (Gareau *et al.*,

2013a; Gareau *et al.*, 2013b). Together, these data suggest that the KH domains work

together to restrict the size and shape of FMRP granules. However, we cannot rule out

that the disruption of both KH domains is changing overall protein structure which is

causing the formation of aggregates containing GFP-ΔKH and GFP-KH1*KH2* protein.

FXS-causing mutations in the KH domains alter the dynamics of FMRP granules

A defining feature of phase separated RNPs in cells is the ability of components to

rapidly shuttle between granules and the cytosol. The driving force underlying this

process is multivalent interactions between protein and RNA components (Shin and

Brangwynne, 2017). To examine whether the G269E and I307N mutations influenced

dFMRP dynamics, we first conducted Fluorescence Recovery After Photobleaching

(FRAP) experiments in S2R+ cells. The fluorescent signal of GFP-tagged WT-FMRP

recovered to 82% with a $t_{1/2}$ of 21.9s, in agreement with published results (Figure 3C-D)

(Gareau *et al.*, 2013b). We found that the exchangeable pool of KH1* and KH2* was like

WT-FMRP (Figure 3C). However, KH1* and KH2* granules recovered more rapidly ($t_{1/2}$ =

4.3 and 13.1s) suggesting these foci are much more dynamic than WT-FMRP (Figure 3A-

B and 3D). Collectively, these data indicate that the individual KH mutations decrease the

stability of FMRP in the mobile fraction. Finally, we examined the effect of removing or

disrupting both KH domains. Compared to single mutants, KH1*KH2* significantly

reduced dFMRP in the mobile fraction to 66% suggesting a large shift of FMRP into the

non-dynamic immobile fraction (Figure 3C). Similar results were observed with the ΔKH

mutant, however, recovery time of FMRP in the mobile fraction was significantly increased

($t_{1/2}$ = 98.7s) (Figure 3D). These results further suggest that disruption of both the KH

domains may lead to the strengthening of interactions or protein aggregation.

FXS-causing mutations alter the liquid-like properties of stress granules

In addition to neuronal granules (NGs), FMRP is a component of both SGs and

PBs in neurons (Lai *et al.*, 2020). Precisely how FMRP interacts with different populations

of granules has yet to be elucidated. We hypothesized that mutations in the KH domains

might disrupt the association of FMRP with these RNP populations. To study interactions

with SGs, we co-transfected S2R+ cells with GFP-tagged FMRP constructs and mCherry-

tagged Rasputin (Rin), the fly ortholog of G3BP1, a conserved marker for and modulator

of SG assembly (Tourriere et al., 2003). In concordance with previous studies,

overexpression of Rin induced SG formation in ~20% of unstressed transfected cells

(Figure 4A and 4D) (Tourriere *et al.*, 2003). Interestingly, we found that these Rin-positive

Figure 3: FXS-causing point mutants alter FMRP-granules dynamics in S2R+ cells

Figure 3: FXS-causing mutants alter FMRP granule dynamics in S2R+ cells
(A) Representative time-lapse FRAP images of FMRP-mutants pre- and post-bleaching. Scale bar in whole cell image = 5μm. Scale bar in zoomed-in granule image = 0.5μm. (B) Fluorescence recovery curves of FMRP-mutants over 120 seconds. Data points are mean ± SE. (C) Mobile fraction of FMRP mutant granules (mean ± SE; Brown-Forsyth test; ***p<0.001). a.u.=arbitrary units. (D) Quantification of the average time in $\log_{10}$ (seconds), for granules to recover to half their final intensity ($t_{1/2}$). For B, C, and D n=17-21 granules.

Figure 4: FXS-causing mutations alter stress granule dynamics and P-body asssociation

Figure 4: FXS-causing mutations alter SG dynamics and PB association
Representative images of S2R+ cells transfected with GFP-FMRP mutants (green) and Rin-mCherry (magenta) that are either not treated (A) or treated (B) with 0.5mM sodium arsenite for 45 minutes. Scale bars = 2μm. (C) Representative images of the localization of transiently transfected GFP-FMRP mutants immunostained against GFP (green) and HPat (magenta). Scale bar = 2μm. Percent of unstressed (D) or arsenite stressed (E) transfected cells forming Rin-positive SGs with or without 10% 1,6-HD treatment. Comparisons are made to WT-FMRP in each subcategory (mean ± SE; ~100 cells in triplicate; one-way ANOVA). (F) Average Pearson's correlation coefficient between FMRP-mutants and the stress granule marker, Rin, in arsenite treated cells (mean ± SE of 8-10 cells; Brown-Forsyth test). Percentage of unstressed (G) or arsenite stressed (H) transfected cells forming FMRP granules with or without 10% 1,6-HD compared to WT-FMRP (mean ± SE; ~100 cells in triplicate; one-way ANOVA). (I) Average Pearson's correlation coefficient between FMRP-mutants and HPat (mean ± SE of 12-13 cells; one-way ANOVA). In all graphs: * $p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$, ****$p<0.0001$.

granules always contained GFP-tagged FMRP and GFP-KH1* always colocalized with

Rin (Figure 4A). They were also resistant to treatment with 1,6-hexanediol (1,6-HD), an

aliphatic alcohol believed to interfere with weak protein-protein (π-π) and protein-RNA (π-

cation) interactions required to form liquid-like MLOs (Kroschwald et al., 2017) (Figure

4D). As expected, arsenite-induced stress triggered the formation of cytoplasmic SGs

(Figure 4B and 4E). Surprisingly, co-transfection with GFP-KH1* or GFP-KH2*

significantly reduced the number of cells that formed Rin-positive SGs (Figure 4E; left).

Moreover, the SGs that formed in cells co-transfected with KH mutants were more

resistant to 1,6-HD treatment then with WT-FMRP (Figure 4E; right). Together, this

suggests that the liquid-like nature of SGs is partially disrupted by the KH mutations.

Mammalian FMRP also accumulates in SGs under conditions of arsenite stress

(Kim et al., 2006). In concordance with these results, all GFP-tagged dFMRP constructs

colocalized strongly with Rin in stressed cells (Figure 4F). The number of cells containing

KH mutant granules also increased in stressed cells but those with KH1* and KH1*KH2*

were still significantly lower than WT-FMRP (Figure 4G-H; left). As with Rin, all KH mutant

granules in stressed cells were significantly more resistant to 1,6-HD compared to WT-

FMRP (Figure 4H; right). In the case of the KH1* and KH2* mutants, this was not likely

due to the persistence of pre-existing FMRP granules because these nearly disappear in

unstressed cells (Figure 4G; right). This further suggest that the liquid-like nature of SGs

has been disrupted by the single KH mutants. The presence of KH1*KH2* and ΔKH

granules in unstressed cells and their resistance to 1,6-HD treatment provides a third line

of evidence suggesting that these mutations are causing FMRP to aggregate.

The KH1 domain is required for the localization of FMRP to P-bodies

In addition to SGs, FMRP has been shown to colocalize with PB proteins in fly and mammalian neurons (Barbee *et al.*, 2006; Cougot *et al.*, 2008). Thus, we were next interested in determining if the KH mutants affected the ability of FMRP to interact with HPat/Pat1p, a highly conserved PB protein that colocalizes with FMRP in *Drosophila* neurons (Coller and Parker, 2005; Pradhan et al., 2012). To address this, we co-transfected S2R+ cells with GFP-tagged FMRP constructs and immunostained against HPat (Figure 4C). As expected, WT-FMRP overlapped moderately with HPat-positive granules (Figure 4I). In comparison, colocalization was significantly reduced in KH1* and most punctate GFP-KH1* failed to colocalize with punctate HPat (Figure 4C and 4I). Taken together, these data suggest that the KH1 domain is required for the association of FMRP with PBs. In contrast, KH1*KH2* and ΔKH caused the formation of larger granules that strongly colocalized with HPat, suggesting that PB proteins are recruited to these structures (Figure 4C and 4I). Based on these results and its propensity to form solid-like aggregates, we excluded ΔKH from subsequent analyses in neurons.

The KH1 domain is required for FMRP granule formation in primary neurons

FMRP granules are important for the regulated trafficking of FMRP and specific RNA cargos in axons and dendrites (Antar et al., 2004; Antar *et al.*, 2005; Antar *et al.*, 2006; Davidovic et al., 2007; Dictenberg *et al.*, 2008; El Fatimy *et al.*, 2016). Based on our results in S2R+ cells, we asked if either of the KH domains played a role in the assembly or dynamics of FMRP granules in neurons. We generated inducible GFP-tagged dFMRP transgenic lines. First, we examined fly viability in a *dFmr1^{Δ50M}/dFmr1^{Δ113}*

(Δ50/Δ113) loss-of-function genetic background when transgenes were expressed in

larval motor neurons (*C380-Gal4, cha-Gal80* driver). As described, we found that the

Δ50/Δ113 allele combination was viable (Morales et al., 2002). Surprisingly, motor

neuron-specific expression of the GFP-KH1* and KH1*KH2* transgenes caused

embryonic lethality in Δ50/Δ113 mutant flies (data not shown). As a result, we conducted

all experiments below in a Δ50/+ heterozygous background.

We next examined FMRP granules in 4-day old primary motor neuron cultures

from dissociated larval ventral ganglia. All cells expressing WT-FMRP formed generally

small, round granules in the soma (Figure 5A-B). In contrast, only 88% of cells expressing

KH2* formed granules and, like what we observed in S2R+ cells, they were less

numerous and sometimes formed amorphous structures (Figure 5A-B). Strikingly, GFP-

KH1* and KH1*KH2* formed few granules in the soma of only 2% and 10% of neurons

(respectively) suggesting that the KH1 domain is required to form FMRP granules *in vivo*

(Figure 5A-B). The level of expression of each KH mutant was similar, indicating that this

result was not likely due to reduced protein concentrations (Figure 5C). Both WT-FMRP

and KH2* granules were also found in neurites (Figure 5D). However, there were

significantly fewer GFP-KH2* granules outside of the soma (Figure 5D-E). Moreover,

fewer mutant granules were found in distal regions of neurites (Figure 5F). Together,

these data suggest that the KH2 domain is required for FMRP granule transport.

The KH2 domain is required for FMRP granule trafficking in neurites

We next asked if the KH mutations caused defects in the transport of FMRP

granules. As GFP-KH1* and KH1*KH2* do not form any granules in neurites (Figure 5A),

Figure 5: FXS-causing mutations in FMRP disrupt NG formation and dynamics in primary MNs.

Figure 5: FXS-causing mutations disrupt NG formation and trafficking in neurons
(A) Representative images of major granule phenotype in primary neuron cell bodies. Expression of the indicated transgene was driven by *C380-Gal4, cha-gal80*. Scale bar = 2μm. (B) Percent of GFP-positive motor neurons forming FMRP granules in the *dFmr1^{Δ50}/+* background. Average is shown above respective bar (mean ± SE; 20 cells per triplicate, one-way ANOVA). (C) Western blot analysis of EGFP (top), FMRP (middle), and α-tubulin (bottom) expression under the *C380-Gal4, cha-gal80* selective motor neuron driver in the larval CNS. (D) Representative images of *WT, Δ50/+* and *KH2*, Δ50/+* primary MNs. Scale bar = 10μm. (E) Quantification of the average number of NGs within neurites of primary MNs (mean ± SE; 17-18 MNs, unpaired t test). (F) Percentage of neuritic granules that are distal (≥10 μm) from the MN cell body (mean ± SE; 17-18 MNs, unpaired t test). Pie charts representing the fraction of neuritic granules that remain stationary (static/oscillatory) or move in the anterograde or retrograde direction (relative to the cell body) in *WT, Δ50/+* (G) or *KH2*, Δ50/+* (H) primary neurons. Percentages are annotated in the legend for each chart (n= total granules in 17 MNs). (I) Time-lapse images and kymographs illustrating NG movements within neurites of WT (left panel) and KH2* (right panel) NGs. Images are oriented with the cell body on the left. Each granule is annotated with a colored arrowhead which corresponds with the traces in the kymograph. Scale bar = 2 μm. (J) Comparison of anterograde and retrograde velocities of motile WT-FMRP and KH2* NGs in neurites (mean ± SE; 46-75 granules per category; two-way ANOVA). (K) Average total displacement (μm) of all motile WT and KH2* NGs (mean ± SE; unpaired t test). In all graphs: * p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p<0.0001.

we focused on *KH2*,Δ50/+* compared to *WT-FMRP,Δ50/+.* Consistent with recent

findings of GFP-tagged FMRP in hippocampal neuron dendrites, the majority of neuritic

WT-FMRP granules were stationary (Figure 5G) (El Fatimy *et al.*, 2016). Although, the

number of mobile granules in KH2 mutants was not significantly different, slightly more

KH2* granules were transported in the anterograde direction and the velocity of transport

was significantly increased (Figure 5H-J). Despite this increase in net velocity, total

granule displacement was not significantly altered (Figure 5K). These data, in conjunction

with the reduction in the number of FMRP granules found in distal neurites (Figure 5D-F),

suggest that the KH2 mutant granules have significant transport defects.

The KH2 domain regulates the dynamics of FMRP in neuronal granules

We next performed FRAP analysis in primary *Drosophila* motor neurons, looking

at somatic and neuritic granules as two separate populations (Figure 6A-D). In agreement

with published results, the mobile fraction of WT-FMRP was significantly lower in both the

soma and neurites (33% and 35% respectively) of cultured neurons than in S2R+ cells

(82%) suggesting that a larger proportion of WT-FMRP in NGs is found within the non-

dynamic, immobile fraction (Figure 6E and 3C) (Estes et al., 2008; Gareau *et al.*, 2013b).

While the size of the immobile fraction of NGs in both compartments was similar, the

recovery time of WT-FMRP in the mobile pool was about 2-fold slower in neuritic granules

($t_{1/2}$ = 75s) than in those found in the soma ($t_{1/2}$ = 37s) (Figure 6E-F). Additionally, both

had slower recovery times than what we saw in S2R+ cells (Figure 3C-D). Together, these

data suggest that wild-type FMRP granules in neurons are less dynamic than those that

form in S2R+ cells. There were two observations with GFP-KH2* granules that support

Figure 6: FXS-causing mutations in FMRP disrupt NG dynamics in primary MNs.

Figure 6: FXS-causing mutations in FMRP disrupt NG dynamics in neurons
(A) Representative FRAP time lapse images of somatic NGs pre- and post-bleaching event. Scale bar in whole cell images = 2 μm. Scale bar in zoomed-in granule images = 1 μm. (B) Fluorescence recovery curves of somatic NGs over 200 seconds (mean ± SE; n ≥ 9 granules). (C) Representative FRAP time-lapse images of neuritic NGs pre- and post-bleaching event. Neurites are outlined in green in the pre-bleach image, arrow heads point to the bleached granule. Scale bar = 1μm. (D) Fluorescence recovery curves of neuritic NGs showing fluorescence intensity relative to the initial pre-bleach intensity over 200 seconds (mean ± SE; n ≥ 13 granules). (E) Quantification of the average mobile fractions of somatic (left) or neuritic (right) mobile fraction of WT and KH2* NGs. a.u.=arbitrary units; p < 0.0001. (F) Quantification of the fluorescence half-time ($t_{1/2}$) of somatic or neuritic WT and KH2* NGs in seconds. For E and F n ≥ 9 granules.

the conclusion that this mutation alters FMRP granule dynamics in neurons. First, the

amount of KH2* found in the mobile fraction was significantly smaller in both somatic and

neuritic NGs (Figure 6E). Second, the recovery time of KH2* in the mobile fraction was

reduced ($t_{1/2}$ = 5s) (Figure 6F). These data further indicate that the composition and

dynamics of FMRP granules have been significantly altered by the KH2 mutation and

suggest that the KH domains are required to stabilize FMRP granules in neurons. Based

on these data, we propose that the disruption of this stability is contributing directly to the

transport defects seen in KH2* granules (Figure 5D-K).

The KH domains are essential for the translational repression activity of FMRP

We next wanted to examine the role of the KH domains in regulating the

translational repression activity of dFMRP. Both KH1* and KH2* have been shown to

disrupt the association of mammalian FMRP with polysomes suggesting that the KH

domains are important for translational repression (Darnell *et al.*, 2005; Feng *et al.*, 1997;

Myrick *et al.*, 2014; Zang *et al.*, 2009). Moreover, the KH domains of dFMRP bind directly

to the 80S ribosome and can block elongation *in vitro* (Chen et al., 2014). To further

examine the role of the KH domains in translational control, we used a λN-based tethering

assay in S2 cells, where the 3'UTRs of known dFMRP target mRNAs were fused to the

3' end of a firefly luciferase reporter, or FLuc (Figure 7A). To eliminate RNA binding as a

mechanism, we first tethered λN-tagged FMRP constructs directly to the reporter via a

5X tandem BoxB sequence that was inserted into the heterologous *SV40* 3'UTR. The

WT-FMRP and KH2* constructs were both able to repress translation (Figure 7B). In

Figure 7: FXS-causing mutations in FMRP affect FMRP functinon in translation and transport

Figure 7: FXS-causing mutations disrupt translation and RNA transport

(A) Diagram of the FLuc reporters used in this study fused to the *SV40 3'UTR* containing the 5xBoxB sequence or to the 3'UTR's of known mRNA targets of dFMRP. Luciferase assays of (B) λN:HA-tethered FMRP-mutants repression of the 5xBoxB FLuc reporter or the untethered FMRP-mutants repression of FLuc fused to the (C) *pickpocket (ppk)*, (D) *fmr1*, (E) *chickadee (chic)* or (F) *camkii* 3'UTR. FLuc/RLuc ratios were normalized to empty vector ratios. Graph shows repression of the FLuc reporter by empty vector or FXS-causing point mutants compared to *pAc5.1-λNHA:FMRP (B) or pAc5.1-FMRP (C-F)* (mean ± SE; one-way ANOVA). Representative images of *camkii* (G) or *chic* (H) mRNA smFISH in primary MNs. Yellow arrowheads in images are distinguishing transcripts found in neurites. Scale bars = 10µm. Quantification of the average number of *camkii* (I) or *chic* (J) transcripts in neurites of each of the FMRP mutants (mean ± SE of 11-25 MNs; unpaired t test). In all graphs: * p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p<0.0001.

contrast, the ability of KH1* to repress reporter expression was significantly disrupted,

suggesting that the KH1 domain is required for repression activity.

Next, we determined whether untethered dFMRP could repress the translation of

Fluc by binding to the 3'UTRs of known targets mRNAs and if either of the KH domains

were required for this to occur. We replaced the *SV40* 3'UTR containing the BoxB repeats

with the 3'UTRs from mRNAs encoding for: 1) the degenerin/epithelial sodium channel

(DEG/ENaC) family member, *pickpocket* (*ppk*); 2) the Ca^{2+}/calmodulin-dependent protein

kinase II, *camkii*; 3) the profilin ortholog, *chickadee (chic)*; and 4) its own mRNA, *fmr1*

(Reeve et al., 2005; Sudhakaran et al., 2014; Xu et al., 2004; Zhang *et al.*, 2001) (Figure

7A). As with the BoxB reporter, the KH1 domain was required to regulate repression of

the *ppk*, *chic,* and *fmr1* reporters as repression was ameliorated in KH1* and KH1*KH2*

(Figure 7B-E). The efficiency of repression of each of these reporters by WT-FMRP and

KH2* was variable, likely due to differences in the ability of these proteins to interact with

or bind to the 3'UTR. In contrast, the *camkii* reporter was different in that repression is

slightly but significantly derepressed by KH2* and KH1*KH2* indicating that the KH2

domain is required for repression (Figure 7F). Collectively, these data indicate that FXS-

causing mutations in the KH1 and KH2 domains can differentially regulate translational

repression. The derepression of translation in KH1* correlates with defects in its ability to

form FMRP granules in cells and neurons (Figure 2 and 5).

The KH domains are required for the transport of FMRP target RNAs

NGs are specialized MLOs within neurons that serve to transport translationally

silent mRNAs between the soma and axonal or dendritic compartments (Formicola et al.,

2019). Therefore, we next asked if *KH1*,Δ50/+* or *KH2*,Δ50/+* neurons had defects in

mRNA localization. To address this, we used single-molecule fluorescence *in situ*

hybridization (smFISH) to quantify transcripts in the soma and neurites. We focused on

two mRNA targets of dFMRP in flies, *chic* and *camkii*, both of which have been shown to

interact with dFMRP-containing NGs in primary motor neurons (Barbee *et al.*, 2006; Estes

et al., 2008). Their translational repression is also regulated by the KH1 and KH2 domains

(Figure 7E-F). We find that there are significantly more *camkii* and *chic* transcripts in *WT-*

FMRP,Δ50/+ neurites compared to controls suggesting that dFMRP promotes the

transport of both mRNAs to neurites (Figure 7G-J). The percentage of *chic* transcripts

found in neurites is significantly reduced in both KH1* and KH2*. In contrast, localization

of *camkii* is not affected by either mutation. Taken together, these data suggest that the

chic and *camkii* mRNAs are differentially localized to neurites through a KH domain-

dependent and independent mechanism (respectively).

DISCUSSION

FMRP has been implicated in a growing number of biological processes in neurons

ranging from the control of translation and RNA transport to the regulation of RNA editing,

splicing, genome stability, and ion channel function (Davis and Broadie, 2017). Because

the vast majority of FXS cases are caused by loss of FMRP expression, it has been

difficult to determine which of these functions are involved in FXS pathophysiology. In

contrast, the study of disease-causing missense mutations in FMRP has allowed for the

isolation of specific protein functions that may be contributing to FXS phenotypes (Suhl

and Warren, 2015). Here, we provide multiple lines of evidence that FXS-causing

mutations in the KH domains differentially affect FMRP granule assembly, dynamics, and

function in *Drosophila* neurons. First, an FXS-causing missense mutation in the KH1

domain disrupts the ability of FMRP to form granules in primary neuron cell culture (Figure

5A-B). In contrast, KH2 mutants form granules in the soma but their transport to distal

neurites is reduced (Figure 5D-F). Second, we find that KH2* significantly decreases the

amount and stability of FMRP found in the mobile fraction of neuronal FMRP granules

(Figure 6E-F). Third, the KH domains are differentially required to regulate the translation

of reporters for known target mRNAs (Figure 7B-F). Finally, both KH domains promote

the localization of specific target mRNAs to neurites (Figure 7G-J). Translational

repression and RNA transport are processes that have been directly attributed to FMRP-

containing RNA granules in neurons (Richter and Zhao, 2021).

The disordered C-terminus of mammalian FMRP is necessary and sufficient to

drive the formation of phase-separated droplets *in vitro* (Tsang *et al.*, 2019). Furthermore,

phosphorylation patterns of amino acids in this region control the propensity to phase

separate in the presence of RNA and to regulate rates of deadenylation and translation

within these condensates (Kim et al., 2019). Collectively, these data suggest that

regulation of FMRP phase separation might be a simple mechanism to allow for the

delivery of translationally repressed mRNAs to synapses and to control their local

translation in response to activity. Through our analysis of *Drosophila* FMRP granules in

cells, we show that the C-terminal IDR is sufficient to regulate granule formation (Figure

1D). However, granule formation is significantly enhanced by the addition of the

structured KH domains (Figure 1D). This is consistent with current models suggesting

that MLO formation *in vivo* is driven by multivalent interactions between protein and RNA

components (Mittag and Parker, 2018; Van Treeck and Parker, 2018). Increased valency

provides a scaffold of *cis*-acting binding sites that allow for interactions with multiple *trans*-

acting partners, allowing interacting molecules to compartmentalize within the cell

(Banani et al., 2016; Li et al., 2012). Published findings also show that different types of

NGs are generally more stable than other types of MLOs (Chae et al., 2010; Cougot *et*

al., 2008; Formicola *et al.*, 2019; Gopal et al., 2017; Vijayakumar et al., 2019). In support

of this, we find that WT-FMRP granules are significantly less dynamic in primary neurons

than in S2R+ cells (Figure 3 and 7). This stability is likely to be necessary so that FMRP

granules can resist the shear stress associated with active transport.

While the precise RNA binding sites are a source of debate, the KH domains

clearly bind with different specificity and/or affinity to target mRNAs (Athar and Joseph,

2020). Therefore, the simplest explanation for the role of the KH domains in regulating

FMRP granule formation and dynamics is that they are increasing valency through

interactions with RNA. Why does the KH1 mutation have a more significant impact on

FMRP granules? It is possible that the KH1 domain is contributing disproportionately

strong (or numerous) interactions with mRNAs which is shifting the critical concentration

needed for granule formation. Interactions occurring via KH1 could be shifting the

concentration threshold required to promote FMRP granule formation. For example,

multivalent interactions between RNA and proteins such as hnRNPA1 and FUS, influence

LLPS by shifting the phase boundary and requiring lower protein concentrations to initiate

demixing (Molliex et al., 2015; Schwartz et al., 2013; Tsang *et al.*, 2019).

Our analysis of KH domain function also reveals a link between FMRP granule

formation and translational repression in neurons. A significant fraction of mammalian and

Drosophila FMRP interacts with polysomes and this association is disrupted by the

G266E and I304N mutations (Feng *et al.*, 1997; Ishizuka et al., 2002; Myrick *et al.*, 2014;

Zang *et al.*, 2009). One mechanism by which FMRP blocks translation is by interacting

with stalled polysomes (Darnell et al., 2011). More specifically, the KH domains of dFMRP

interact directly with the peptidyl site of ribosomes (Chen *et al.*, 2014). This suggests a

mechanism by which FMRP stalls translational elongation by sterically inhibiting tRNA

entry. The non-disease associated KH1 mutant (I244N) and KH2* (I307N) both disrupt

binding affinity, with the I244N mutation having a stronger effect (Chen *et al.*, 2014).

Interestingly, analysis of FMRP granules in mouse brain homogenates by electron

microscopy found that FMRP and ribosomes both localize to a subset of neuronal RNA

transport granules (El Fatimy *et al.*, 2016). These data led the authors to propose that

FMRP granules form from stalled polysomes. A prediction from this model is that

disruption of FMRP-ribosome association would negatively impact the formation of a

subset of FMRP granules. Our data provide support for this model as we show that KH1*

and KH2* both disrupt FMRP granules, with the KH1 mutant having a stronger effect

(Figure 2C-D and 5A-B). We also demonstrate that the KH1 domain is required to repress

the translation of most translational reporters tested, including when FMRP was directly

tethered to a heterologous 3'UTR (Figure 7B-E). Additional studies would be required to

determine if there is a direct connection between polysomes, ribosome stalling, and

FMRP granule formation in *Drosophila* neurons. This would also help to clarify whether

FMRP granules are a cause or consequence of translational repression.

In cultured mouse neurons, the specificity of FMRP for mRNAs targeted for

transport to neurites is conferred by interactions between its C-terminal RGG domain and

G-quadraplex sequences within the 3'UTRs of localized mRNAs (Goering et al., 2020).

This study also found that the FXS-causing KH2 mutant (I304N) which disrupts ribosome

association retained the ability to promote the localization of G-quadraplex-containing

transcripts to neurites. In contrast, we show that both the KH1 and KH2 mutants fail to

promote the localization of *chic* (but not *camkii*) to neurites in cultured *Drosophila* neurons

(Figure 7G-J). The long *chic* 3'UTR (but not *camkii*) contains G-rich sequences predicted

to fold into quadraplexes (data not shown) suggesting that localization of these fly mRNAs

may be regulated by a G-quadraplex-independent mechanism. This might be due to our

limited sample size as mouse studies focused on a global analysis of mRNA localization

(Goering *et al.*, 2020). Alternatively, the control of mRNA transport by *Drosophila* FMRP

may be mechanistically different. The RGG domain found in dFMRP is not highly

conserved and it fails to bind with high affinity to the *sc1* RNA, a G-quadraplex-containing

target for human FMRP (Darnell et al., 2009). Unlike in mouse studies, we also observe

both transcript- and KH domain-specific coupling of translational repression and mRNA

localization in *Drosophila* neurons (Figure 7) (Darnell *et al.*, 2009). It is possible that this

represents a *bona fide* difference between fly and mammalian FMRP.

The role of FMRP granules in the transport and translation of target mRNAs in

neurons is complex because their organization, dynamics, and function are regulated by

multivalent interactions involving both structured and unstructured protein domains. Our

data support a model where FMRP granules are metastable, solid-like, MLOs. This is a

state that is likely necessary to allow for their active transport in neurites without the loss

of RNA and protein components. We demonstrate that the KH1 and KH2 domains are

required to maintain FMRP granule integrity in both S2R+ cells and neurons. FXS-causing

mutations disrupt this equilibrium, leading to the formation of MLOs that are unstable.

This is distinctly different from disease-causing mutations in IDR-containing RBPs that

have been linked to neurodegenerative disease such as TDP-43, FUS, or hnRNP-A1,

which lead to the formation of metastable, then stable, pathological inclusions (Molliex *et*

al., 2015; Patel et al., 2015). That said, our studies have revealed novel granule

phenotypes associated with FXS-causing KH mutations. First, both KH mutations disrupt

the sensitivity of SGs to 1,6-HD, suggesting that their biophysical properties have been

altered (Figure 4D-H). KH1* has a more significant impact on this phenotype than KH2*.

Second, MN-specific genetic "rescue" experiments with KH1* causes lethality in an

otherwise viable *dFmr1* loss-of-function background suggesting that G266E may be an

uncharacterized gain-of-function mutation (data not shown). Finally, the KH1 mutation

also nearly abolishes FMRP granule formation in neurons. These results may explain why

the G226E mutation causes such a severe form of FXS (Myrick *et al.*, 2014).

METHODS

Fly stocks and husbandry

In all experiments, both male and female flies were used. All lines were incubated

at 25°C with 12-hour light/dark cycles and 60% humidity on standard Bloomington

medium. Fly lines used and made in this study are listed in Table S1. Plasmid constructs

for the generation of transgenic lines were constructed as described below. All transgenes

were injected into fly strain 24485 for *PhiC31*-mediated integration into the same site on

chromosome III. All transgenes were recombined with the *dFmr1$^{\Delta50M}$* null allele.

Cell culture

S2 and S2R+ cells were maintained at 24°C with ambient humidity in a dark

incubator in M3+BPYE media. S2-DRSC cells were used for luciferase reporter assay

experiments. S2R+ cells were used for imaging experiments due to their higher

propensity to adhere to and flatten out on poly-D-lysine coated cover slips. Cells and

media recipes were obtained from the *Drosophila* Genomics Resource Center (DGRC).

Primary motor neurons were cultured from wandering 3rd instar larvae using a protocol

adapted from Barbee et al. 2006. For each genotype, ventral ganglia from ten third instar

larvae were dissected, dissociated, and then grown in complete M3+BPYE media

(M3+BPYE supplemented with 50 µg/mL insulin) for 3 to 5 days prior to imaging.

Cloning and site directed mutagenesis

The backbone vector for all S2 cell culture plasmids is a modification of pAc5.1

(ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) which drives expression from the fly actin 5C

gene. For imaging of FMRP, the coding region of the *FMR1-RD* cDNA (LD09557; DGRC)

was PCR amplified and cloned downstream of EGFP in the pAc5.1B-EGFP vector (a gift

from Elisa Izaurralde; Addgene plasmid #21181) using the *HindIII* and *EcoRI* restriction

sites to make pAcB5.1-EGFP-FMRP. The pAc5.1:EGFP-FMRP-IDR, pAc5.1:EGFP-

FMRP-ΔIDR, pAc5.1:EGFP-FMRP-KH:IDR and pAc5.1:EGFP-FMRP-ΔKH plasmids

were all constructed by PCR amplification of the indicated sequence followed by cloning

into pAc5.1B-EGFP. Primer sequences and restriction sites are listed and described in

Table S2. The *Drosophila* G269E and I307N mutations were generated using the Q5 Site-

Directed Mutagenesis Kit (New England Biolabs, Ipswitch, MA). Mutagenesis primers

were designed using the "substitution" feature in NEBaseChanger v1.2.9 (New England

Biolabs). Mutagenesis occurs at nucleotide 805-807 (GGA→ GAA) and nucleotide 868-

870 (ATC→ AAC) in the KH1 and KH2 domain, respectively. Each mutation was

introduced directly into the pAc5.1B:EGFP-FMRP vector. The KH1*KH2* double mutant

was created by introducing both mutations sequentially (KH1* followed by KH2*).

Plasmids for the generation of transgenic fly lines were all constructed as follows.

The EGFP-FMRP sequence for WT-FMRP and each mutant construct were PCR

amplified from their respective pAc5.1 vector using primer sequences listed and

described in Table S2. Products were then cloned directionally into the 5'-*KpnI* and 3'-

XbaI sites of pUAST-attB. Transgenic flies were generated as described above.

To construct the pAc5.1-Rin-mCherry plasmid, we first generated a pAc5.1B-MCS-

(Gly$_4$Ser)$_3$-mCherry plasmid. The Rin cDNA was obtained by reverse-transcriptase PCR

from RNA extracted from wild-type (*CantonS*) adult flies. Total RNA was extracted using

the Direct-zol RNA kit (Zymo Research, Irivne, CA) and cDNA was generated using the

RNA to cDNA EcoDry™ Premix Oligo dT kit (Takara Bio USA, Moutain View, CA). Rin

was PCR amplified using primers listed and described in Table S2 and cloned into the

HindIII and *EcoRI* restriction sites of pAc5.1-MCS-(Gly$_4$Ser)$_3$-mCherry to generate the

final pAc5.1:Rin-(Gly$_4$Ser)$_3$-mCherry vector.

To construct plasmids for the tethered FLuc reporter assays, the wild-type dFMR1

and KH1*, KH2*, or KH1*KH2* mutants were PCR amplified from their respective

pAc5.1B-EGFP vector and cloned into the *HindIII* and *EcoRI* sites of the pAc5.1-

lambdaN-HA vector (a gift from Elisa Izaurralde; Addgene plasmid #21302) (Behm-

Ansmant et al., 2006). For the untethered reporter assays, the indicated dFMR1

constructs were cloned into the MCS of pAc5.1B lacking the lambdaN-HA tag. The BoxB

reporter was pAc5.1C-Fluc-Stop-5BoxB (a gift from Elisa Izaurralde; Addgene plasmid

#21301) (Behm-Ansmant *et al.*, 2006). To construct the *camkii* and *Fmr1* reporters, the

SV40 3'UTR and the 5xBoxB sequence was removed by digesting pAc5.1C-Fluc-Stop-

5BoxB with *EcoRI* and *XhoI*. The long 3'UTR isoform of *camkii* and *Fmr1* were amplified

by RT-PCR (as described for Rin) using primers listed and described in Table S2. The

3'UTRs were then cloned into the cut plasmid via Gibson Assembly using the Gibson

Assembly Master Mix (New England Biolabs). The 3'UTRs of *ppk* and *chic* were amplified

by RT-PCR, cloned into pENTR D-TOPO, and into the pAc5.1-FLuc2 [dPolyA] RfA

destination vector as we have previously described (Nesler et al., 2013).

S2 cell transfections

DNA transfections were performed with the Effectene Transfection Reagent kit

(Qiagen). Transient transfections were performed following the manufacturer's protocols.

For fluorescence experiments, DNA constructs were transfected into S2R+ cells in 12-

well plates. Cells were transfected with 0.5 µg of each construct except for pAc5.1B-

EGFP:FMRP:KH1* in which 0.75 µg of DNA was used. Transfected cells were grown for

~ 72 hours before imaging. For luciferase assays, S2-DRSC cells in 24-well plates were

transfected with 0.025 µg of the FLuc reporter plasmid, 0.1 µg of the *Renilla* luciferase

(RLuc) transfection control plasmid, and 0.25 µg of either the pAc5.1/pAc5.1-λN control

vector or the pAc5.1:FMRP/pAc5.1-λN:FMRP wild-type or mutant constructs. Transfected

cells were grown for ~ 72 hours prior to analysis in luciferase experiments.

S2 cell imaging and granule analysis

S2R+ cells were transferred to poly-D lysine coated #1.5 cover glass bottom dishes

(Cellvis, Mountain View, CA) within two hours of imaging. In all experiments, images were

obtained using an Olympus FV3000 scanning confocal microscope with a 100x (NA 1.4)

objective digitally zoomed to 2.95x (the optimal setting per the Fluoview software). To

quantify the number of granules formed by each construct, 15 cells were analyzed in a

single experiment. The single z-plane where the nucleus took up the largest cell area was

imaged. Punctate areas of fluorescence intensity above background were considered to

be granules and were quantified using the Cell Counter plugin in ImageJ2/FIJI. For each

image, cell diameter (through the longest axis in the same z-plane) and granule number

were collected. From this, the number of granules per cell area (μm^2) was recorded. To

count the number of transfected cells able to form granules, ~ 100 cells per FMRP

construct were manually identified at the microscope. The total number of cells that

formed granules out of all EGFP-expressing cells were quantified. Cells were scanned in

z to make sure that granules in all planes were identified. The number of cells that formed

granules was divided by total number of transfected cells for three separate experiments.

To compare the propensity of the different mutants to form circular granules, ~ 100

granule forming transfected cells were identified at the microscope. The number of cells

forming circular and amorphic (non-circular) granules were counted. In most cases, cells

that formed amorphous granules also contained circular granules, however, cells that

formed any number of amorphous granules were categorized as amorphic.

Fluorescence Recovery After Photobleaching (FRAP) experiments

For all FRAP experiments, 17-21 EGFP positive granules were imaged using an

Olympus FV3000 scanning confocal microscope with a 100x (NA 1.4) objective digitally

zoomed to 2.95x (optimal settings). Granules selected for FRAP analysis generally fit into

the "spherical" category. Granules selected for analysis in primary neurons were clearly

in the cell body or neuritic compartments. In all cases, granules were photobleached with

the lowest laser intensity necessary to completely bleach the granule, ranging from 2.44-

10% 488nm laser power for 500-1,000 milliseconds. Two pre-FRAP images were

collected and images were captured every 1.0878 seconds pre and post bleaching for a

total of 200 frames (~ 218 s). For image analysis, images were initially processed in

ImageJ2/FIJI) and analyzed essentially as described (Cheney et al., 2017). A ROI was

manually traced in each FRAP movie for 1) the bleached granule, 2) an unbleached

granule and 3) diffuse cytoplasmic staining for background. As necessary, the ROI was

moved if/when granules moved in x/y out of the initially set ROI. If a granule clearly

dropped out of the focal plane, it was excluded from analysis. The mean fluorescent

intensity was obtained for each frame. The following was calculated: 1) Photobleach

Correction Value (PCV), in which the average intensity of the pre-bleach unbleached

granule was divided by the value for each subsequent unbleached granule, 2) Corrected

Average Intensity (CAI), where the bleached granules mean intensity was multiplied by

the PCV, 3) Background Corrected Fluorescence Intensity (BCFI), where the CAI was

subtracted by the average intensity of the background ROI, and 4) the Final Corrected

Value (FCV) which was calculated by dividing each BCFI by the initial BCFI value and

multiplying by 100 to get a normalized fluorescence intensity profile. The FCVs from each

movie were then analyzed a one-phase association, nonlinear fit in Graphpad Prism to

calculate the fluorescence recovery curve, mobile fraction, and half-life.

Immunocytochemistry

599   S2R+ cells were transferred to poly-D lysine coated #1.0 cover glass bottom dishes

(Cellvis) and allowed to settle for ~ 20 minutes. Cells were then fixed with 4% PFA for 10

minutes followed by a 5-minute incubation in ice cold methanol. Cells were washed three

times for 5 minutes in PBS, permeabilized in PBST for 10 minutes, and then blocked in

PBST with 2% BSA and 5% normal goat serum for 30 minutes. Cells were then incubated

with primary antibodies overnight at 4°C, washed three times for 5 minutes in PBS, and

then incubated for 1 hour in secondary antibodies at room temperature. Finally, cells were

washed with PBS and then mounted in DAPI-Fluoromount-G Clear Mounting Media

(ThermoFisher Scientific). EGFP:FMRP constructs were visualized by GFP fluorescence.

For HPat, rabbit anti-HPat (1:1,500) (Pradhan *et al.*, 2012) primary and goat anti-rabbit

Alexa-567 (1:500) secondary antibodies were used.

Arsenite and 1,6-hexanediol treatment

612   For SG experiments, cells were co-transfected with the indicated pAc5.1B:EGFP-

FMRP construct and pAc5.1-Rin-mCherry. About 72 h post transfection, cells were

treated with 0.5mM sodium arsenite in M3+BPYE media for 45 minutes to induce SG

formation. Non-stressed cells went through the same procedure but were incubated in

media that did not contain sodium arsenite. For colocalization analysis, cells were

immediately fixed in 4% PFA for 10 minutes, incubated with ice cold methanol for 5

minutes and then washed 3 times for 5 minutes in PBS. Preparations were then mounted

on coverslips as described above. FMRP and Rin were visualized by imaging GFP and

mCherry fluorescence respectively. For the analysis of granules with treated with 1,6-HD,

cells were co-transfected with pAc5.1:EGFP-FMRP constructs and pAc5.1-Rin-mCherry.

Cells were subjected to arsenite stress (or not stressed) as described above. Following

the 45-minute incubation (+/- sodium arsenite), cells were treated with M3+BPYE media

(+/- sodium arsenite) containing 10% 1,6-HD. Approximately 100 live transfected cells

were analyzed for the presence or absence of FMRP or Rin granules, in triplicate.

Colocalization analysis

To determine the degree to which FMRP mutants colocalized with SGs or PBs,

12-13 images were analyzed in ImageJ2/FIJI using the JACoP plugin (Bolte and

Cordelieres, 2006). Images were cropped to the smallest area possible to eliminate

colocalization outside of the cell of interest and images for FMRP/HPat were background

subtracted to a rolling ball radius of 50 pixels to account for the higher degree of HPat

background staining. In JACoP, Pearson's coefficient results were recorded for analysis.

Western blotting

For the detection of EGFP-FMRP construct levels in S2R+ cells, transfected cells

were harvested at three days post-transection from a 6-well plate. Cells were scraped

and resuspended by pipetting up and down and 1.5 mL of cells were spun down at 1,000x

G for 5 minutes at 4°C. Cells were then resuspended in 400 µL of 2x Laemmli sample

buffer + **β**-mercaptoethanol on ice. For westerns conducted on *C380, cha-Gal80/+ ;*

UAS:EGFP-FMRP, FMR1^{Δ50M}/+ larvae ectopically expressing the wild-type and FXS-

causing point mutants, 5 ventral ganglia (including optic lobes) were dissected and added

to 100µL of 2x Laemmli sample buffer + **β**-mercaptoethanol on ice. Then, the ventral

ganglia were homogenized in a 1.6 mL microcentrifuge tube for 30 seconds on ice using

a hand-held homogenizer. Homogenates were incubated on ice for 3 minutes, and then

processed as indicated above for S2R+ cells. For both assays, the primary antibodies

used were mouse anti-dFMR1 (1:3,000; 6A15; Abcam, Cambridge, UK), rabbit anti-EGFP

(1:2,000; Proteintech Group, Rosemont, IL), and mouse anti-α-tubulin (1:1,000; 12G10;

Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank, Iowa City, IA). Secondary antibodies used were

horse anti-mouse HRP or goat anti-rabbit HRP which were both diluted 1:1,000 in block

(Cell Signaling Technology, Danvers, MA).

Primary motor neuron imaging and neurite transport analysis

For analysis of *C380, cha-Gal80/+ ; UAS:EGFP-FMRP, FMR1^{Δ50M}/+* larvae

expressing either wild-type FMRP or the KH2 mutant, primary larval motor neurons were

collected and cultured as described above. At 4 days post-harvest, live neurons were

imaged using an Olympus FV3000 scanning confocal microscope with a 100x (NA 1.4)

objective. For soma imaging, images were digitally zoomed to 2.95x for optimal resolution

and a z-stack was obtained with 0.39µm slices through the entire soma. Images were

presented as Z-projections made using ImageJ2/FIJI. For neurite transport analysis, live

cells were imaged with a 100x objective (NA 1.4) digitally zoomed to 1.79x so branching

neurites could be imaged. Movies were collected containing four 0.39µm z-slices, over

100 frames (8:04 minutes). Movies were then analyzed using the Kymolyzer plugin in

ImageJ2/FIJI from which granule velocities and directionality were obtained, using a lower

speed limit set to the pixel size (0.138µm) (Basu et al., 2020). To calculate the average

number of neuritic granules in primary motor neurons, the max-intensity Z-projection of

the first time point was used (Frame 1). The number of granules in the soma and neurites

were manually counted using the Cell Counter plugin for ImageJ2/FIJI. Additionally, the

proportion of neuritic granules 10µm or further from the cell body was determined from

these images. The scale was globally set, and a symmetrical circle was drawn tightly

around each cell using the oval selection tool in ImageJ, containing as much of the cell

as possible. The diameter of each cell body was recorded in µm. The center of each circle

was determined and marked using the Pencil tool. A line was drawn to the center of each

granule within neurites and distance from the cell body was recorded in µm. These were

subtracted by the radius for their respective cell body to obtain the final distance.

Luciferase reporter assays

Luciferase reporter assays were done essentially as we have described (Nesler *et*

al., 2013). At three days post transfection, 75 µL of resuspended cells were added in three

technical replicates to a 96-well white, flat bottom polystyrene assay plate (Costar,

Washington, DC). FLuc and RLuc expression was measured using the Dual-Glo

Luciferase Assay System kit (Promega, Madison, WI) per the manufacturer's instructions

and luminescence detected using a Synergy™ HTX Multi-Mode Microplate Reader

(BioTek, Winooski, VT). FLuc values were normalized to corresponding RLuc values. The

FLuc/RLuc ratio for each experiment was normalized to its respective control. The

experiment was repeated three times for each FLuc reporter.

Single molecule FISH and FISH-quant image analysis

For analysis of *C380, cha-Gal80/+ ; UAS:EGFP-FMRP, FMR1^{Δ50M}/+* larvae

expressing either wild-type FMRP or the KH2 mutant, primary larval motor neurons were

collected and cultured as described above. Custom Stellaris® FISH Probes were

designed against *Drosophila melanogaster camkii* and *chic* by utilizing the Stellaris® FISH

Probe Designer (Table S3; Biosearch Technologies, Hoddesdon, UK). Primary motor

neurons were hybridized with the indicated Stellaris FISH Probe set labeled with either

Quasar-570 or 670 (Biosearch Technologies) following the manufacturer's instructions.

Briefly, at 3-4 days post culturing, cells growing on #1.5 cover glass were washed in PBS.

Cells were then incubated in fixation buffer (3.7% formaldehyde in PBS) for 10 minutes

at room temperature, then washed twice in PBS. To permeabilize cells were immersed in

70% ethanol at 4°C for at least 1 hour and up to a week. Ethanol was aspirated and cells

were washed in Stellaris Wash Buffer A for 5 minutes, then hybridized with the indicated

probe(s) in a dark, humid hybridization chamber at 37°C for 5-16 hours. Probes were

used at a final molarity of 0.125μM in Stellaris Hybridization buffer. Hybridization buffer

was aspirated, and cells were incubated with Wash Buffer A twice at 37°C for 30 minutes,

then washed with Stellaris Wash Buffer B for 5 minutes at room temperature. Buffer was

aspirated and Vectashield Mounting Medium was added to the #1.5 cover glass in the

imaging dish and a clean coverslip was placed on top and sealed with clear nail polish.

Imaging dishes were stored in the dark at -20°C for up to 2 days before imaging on an

ONI Nanoimager S. Approximately 15 cells were imaged per genotype using the widefield

microscopy application. To detect smFISH probes, cells were exposed to 7% 570- or 640-

laser power for 1,500 milliseconds. Z-projection was obtained with 0.2 μm slices through

the entire cell. EGFP-FMRP was imaged sequentially which allowed us to distinguish the

soma and neurites from background. To analyze smFISH images, we used the FISH-

Quant Matlab application to detect, localize and quantify mRNA in primary motor neurons

(Mueller et al., 2013). Motor neuron soma and neurites were outlined individually by hand,

which allowed us to differentiate mRNAs residing within the soma and neurites.

Quantification and statistical analysis

All data were initially recorded in Excel (Microsoft) and then graphed and analyzed

in Prism version 9.0.2 (GraphPad). Results were considered statistically significant if

$p < 0.05$. Error bars throughout the study indicate mean ± SEM. n.s. = not significant, *

$p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, and **** $p < 0.0001$. Outliers were identified and removed

using ROUT method in Prism. Statistical tests and sample sizes for each experiment are

indicated within the corresponding figure legend and/or in methods section.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:

Designed experiments: ELS, SAB. Performed experiments: ELS

Analyzed the data: ELS, SAB. Wrote the paper: ELS, SAB

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

We thank members of the S.A.B. lab for useful discussions. S2 cell lines and cDNAs were

obtained from the *Drosophila* Genomics Resource Center which is supported by NIH

grant 2P40OD010949. Fly lines were obtained from the Bloomington *Drosophila* Stock

Center which is funded by NIH grant P40OD018537. We thank Samantha Patterson for

assistance with FRAP experiments, Sarala Pradhan for help with developing and testing

the FMRP translational reporter assay, and Navneeta Kaul for assistance constructing

several of the *pAc5.1-FLuc 3'UTR* reporters. We are also grateful to the Knoebel Center

for Healthy Aging for use of the ONI NanoImager for smFISH experiments. We

acknowledge funding for this study to S.A.B. from NIH grant R15MH114019 and from the

Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs PRMRP grant W81XWH2110026.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS:

The authors declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES:

Agulhon, C., Blanchet, P., Kobetz, A., Marchant, D., Faucon, N., Sarda, P., Moraine, C.,

Sittler, A., Biancalana, V., Malafosse, A., and Abitbol, M. (1999). Expression of FMR1,

FXR1, and FXR2 genes in human prenatal tissues. J Neuropathol Exp Neurol *58*, 867-

880. 10.1097/00005072-199908000-00009.

Antar, L.N., Afroz, R., Dictenberg, J.B., Carroll, R.C., and Bassell, G.J. (2004).

Metabotropic glutamate receptor activation regulates Fragile X mental retardation

protein and Fmr1 mRNA localization differentially in dendrites and at synapses. J

Neurosci *24*, 2648-2655. 10.1523/Jneurosci.0099-04.2004.

Antar, L.N., Dictenberg, J.B., Plociniak, M., Afroz, R., and Bassell, G.J. (2005).

Localization of FMRP-associated mRNA granules and requirement of microtubules for

activity-dependent trafficking in hippocampal neurons. Genes Brain Behav *4*, 350-359.

10.1111/j.1601-183X.2005.00128.x.

Antar, L.N., Li, C., Zhang, H., Carroll, R.C., and Bassell, G.J. (2006). Local functions for

FMRP in axon growth cone motility and activity-dependent regulation of filopodia and

spine synapses. Mol Cell Neurosci *32*, 37-48. 10.1016/j.mcn.2006.02.001.

Ascano, M., Jr., Mukherjee, N., Bandaru, P., Miller, J.B., Nusbaum, J.D., Corcoran,

D.L., Langlois, C., Munschauer, M., Dewell, S., Hafner, M., et al. (2012). FMRP targets

distinct mRNA sequence elements to regulate protein expression. Nature *492*, 382-386.

10.1038/nature11737.

Athar, Y.M., and Joseph, S. (2020). RNA-Binding Specificity of the Human Fragile X

Mental Retardation Protein. J Mol Biol *432*, 3851-3868. 10.1016/j.jmb.2020.04.021.

Banani, S.F., Lee, H.O., Hyman, A.A., and Rosen, M.K. (2017). Biomolecular

condensates: organizers of cellular biochemistry. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol *18*, 285-298.

10.1038/nrm.2017.7.

Banani, S.F., Rice, A.M., Peeples, W.B., Lin, Y., Jain, S., Parker, R., and Rosen, M.K.

(2016). Compositional Control of Phase-Separated Cellular Bodies. Cell *166*, 651-663.

10.1016/j.cell.2016.06.010.

Barbee, S.A., Estes, P.S., Cziko, A.M., Hillebrand, J., Luedeman, R.A., Coller, J.M.,

Johnson, N., Howlett, I.C., Geng, C., Ueda, R., et al. (2006). Staufen- and FMRP-

containing neuronal RNPs are structurally and functionally related to somatic P bodies.

Neuron *52*, 997-1009. 10.1016/j.neuron.2006.10.028.

Basu, H., Ding, L., Pekkurnaz, G., Cronin, M., and Schwarz, T.L. (2020). Kymolyzer, a

Semi-Autonomous Kymography Tool to Analyze Intracellular Motility. Curr Protoc Cell

Biol *87*, e107. 10.1002/cpcb.107.

Behm-Ansmant, I., Rehwinkel, J., Doerks, T., Stark, A., Bork, P., and Izaurralde, E.

(2006). MRNA degradation by miRNAs and GW182 requires both CCR4 : NOT

deadenylase and DCP1 : DCP2 decapping complexes. Gene Dev *20*, 1885-1898.

10.1101/gad.1424106.

Bolte, S., and Cordelieres, F.P. (2006). A guided tour into subcellular colocalization

analysis in light microscopy. J Microsc *224*, 213-232. 10.1111/j.1365-

2818.2006.01706.x.

Chae, Y.S., Lee, S.H., Cheang, Y.H., Lee, N., Rim, Y.S., Jang, D.J., and Kaang, B.K.

(2010). Neuronal RNA granule contains ApCPEB1, a novel cytoplasmic polyadenylation

element binding protein, in Aplysia sensory neuron. Exp Mol Med *42*, 30-37.

10.3858/emm.2010.42.1.003.

Chen, E., Sharma, M.R., Shi, X., Agrawal, R.K., and Joseph, S. (2014). Fragile X

mental retardation protein regulates translation by binding directly to the ribosome. Mol

Cell *54*, 407-417. 10.1016/j.molcel.2014.03.023.

Cheney, P.P., Weisgerber, A.W., Feuerbach, A.M., and Knowles, M.K. (2017). Single

Lipid Molecule Dynamics on Supported Lipid Bilayers with Membrane Curvature.

Membranes (Basel) *7*. 10.3390/membranes7010015.

Coller, J., and Parker, R. (2005). General translational repression by activators of

mRNA decapping. Cell *122*, 875-886. 10.1016/j.cell.2005.07.012.

Cougot, N., Bhattacharyya, S.N., Tapia-Arancibia, L., Bordonne, R., Filipowicz, W.,

Bertrand, E., and Rage, F. (2008). Dendrites of mammalian neurons contain specialized

P-body-like structures that respond to neuronal activation. J Neurosci *28*, 13793-13804.

10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4155-08.2008.

Darnell, J.C., Fraser, C.E., Mostovetsky, O., and Darnell, R.B. (2009). Discrimination of

common and unique RNA-binding activities among Fragile X mental retardation protein

paralogs. Hum Mol Genet *18*, 3164-3177. 10.1093/hmg/ddp255.

Darnell, J.C., Fraser, C.E., Mostovetsky, O., Stefani, G., Jones, T.A., Eddy, S.R., and

Darnell, R.B. (2005). Kissing complex RNAs mediate interaction between the Fragile-X

mental retardation protein KH2 domain and brain polyribosomes. Genes Dev *19*, 903-

918. 10.1101/gad.1276805.

Darnell, J.C., Van Driesche, S.J., Zhang, C., Hung, K.Y., Mele, A., Fraser, C.E., Stone,

E.F., Chen, C., Fak, J.J., Chi, S.W., et al. (2011). FMRP stalls ribosomal translocation

on mRNAs linked to synaptic function and autism. Cell *146*, 247-261.

10.1016/j.cell.2011.06.013.

Davidovic, L., Jaglin, X.H., Lepagnol-Bestel, A.M., Tremblay, S., Simonneau, M.,

Bardoni, B., and Khandjian, E.W. (2007). The fragile X mental retardation protein is a

molecular adaptor between the neurospecific KIF3C kinesin and dendritic RNA

granules. Hum Mol Genet *16*, 3047-3058. 10.1093/hmg/ddm263.

Davis, J.K., and Broadie, K. (2017). Multifarious Functions of the Fragile X Mental

Retardation Protein. Trends Genet *33*, 703-714. 10.1016/j.tig.2017.07.008.

De Boulle, K., Verkerk, A.J., Reyniers, E., Vits, L., Hendrickx, J., Van Roy, B., Van den

Bos, F., de Graaff, E., Oostra, B.A., and Willems, P.J. (1993). A point mutation in the

FMR-1 gene associated with fragile X mental retardation. Nat Genet *3*, 31-35.

10.1038/ng0193-31.

Dictenberg, J.B., Swanger, S.A., Antar, L.N., Singer, R.H., and Bassell, G.J. (2008). A

direct role for FMRP in activity-dependent dendritic mRNA transport links filopodial-

spine morphogenesis to fragile X syndrome. Dev Cell *14*, 926-939.

10.1016/j.devcel.2008.04.003.

Drozd, M., Bardoni, B., and Capovilla, M. (2018). Modeling Fragile X Syndrome in

Drosophila. Front Mol Neurosci *11*, 124. 10.3389/fnmol.2018.00124.

El Fatimy, R., Davidovic, L., Tremblay, S., Jaglin, X., Dury, A., Robert, C., De Koninck,

P., and Khandjian, E.W. (2016). Tracking the Fragile X Mental Retardation Protein in a

Highly Ordered Neuronal RiboNucleoParticles Population: A Link between Stalled

Polyribosomes and RNA Granules. Plos Genet *12*, e1006192.

10.1371/journal.pgen.1006192.

Estes, P.S., O'Shea, M., Clasen, S., and Zarnescu, D.C. (2008). Fragile X protein

controls the efficacy of mRNA transport in Drosophila neurons. Mol Cell Neurosci *39*,

170-179. 10.1016/j.mcn.2008.06.012.

Feng, Y., Absher, D., Eberhart, D.E., Brown, V., Malter, H.E., and Warren, S.T. (1997).

FMRP associates with polyribosomes as an mRNP, and the I304N mutation of severe

fragile X syndrome abolishes this association. Mol Cell *1*, 109-118. 10.1016/s1097-

2765(00)80012-x.

Formicola, N., Vijayakumar, J., and Besse, F. (2019). Neuronal ribonucleoprotein

granules: Dynamic sensors of localized signals. Traffic *20*, 639-649. 10.1111/tra.12672.

Gareau, C., Houssin, E., Martel, D., Coudert, L., Mellaoui, S., Huot, M.E., Laprise, P.,

and Mazroui, R. (2013a). Characterization of fragile X mental retardation protein

recruitment and dynamics in Drosophila stress granules. PLoS One *8*, e55342.

10.1371/journal.pone.0055342.

Gareau, C., Martel, D., Coudert, L., Mellaoui, S., and Mazroui, R. (2013b).

Characterization of Fragile X Mental Retardation Protein granules formation and

dynamics in Drosophila. Biol Open *2*, 68-81. 10.1242/bio.20123012.

Goering, R., Hudish, L.I., Guzman, B.B., Raj, N., Bassell, G.J., Russ, H.A., Dominguez,

D., and Taliaferro, J.M. (2020). FMRP promotes RNA localization to neuronal

projections through interactions between its RGG domain and G-quadruplex RNA

sequences. Elife *9*. ARTN e52621

10.7554/eLife.52621.

Gopal, P.P., Nirschl, J.J., Klinman, E., and Holzbaur, E.L. (2017). Amyotrophic lateral

sclerosis-linked mutations increase the viscosity of liquid-like TDP-43 RNP granules in

neurons. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *114*, E2466-E2475. 10.1073/pnas.1614462114.

Ishizuka, A., Siomi, M.C., and Siomi, H. (2002). A Drosophila fragile X protein interacts

with components of RNAi and ribosomal proteins. Gene Dev *16*, 2497-2508.

10.1101/gad.1022002.

Kim, S.H., Dong, W.K., Weiler, I.J., and Greenough, W.T. (2006). Fragile X mental

retardation protein shifts between polyribosomes and stress granules after neuronal

injury by arsenite stress or in vivo hippocampal electrode insertion. J Neurosci *26*, 2413-

2418. 10.1523/Jneurosci.3680-05.2006.

Kim, T.H., Tsang, B., Vernon, R.M., Sonenberg, N., Kay, L.E., and Forman-Kay, J.D.

(2019). Phospho-dependent phase separation of FMRP and CAPRIN1 recapitulates

regulation of translation and deadenylation. Science *365*, 825-829.

10.1126/science.aax4240.

Kroschwald, S., Maharana, S., and Alberti, S. (2017). Hexanediol: a chemical probe to

investigate the material properties of membrane-less compartments. Matters.

10.19185/matters.201702000010.

Lai, A., Valdez-Sinon, A.N., and Bassell, G.J. (2020). Regulation of RNA granules by

FMRP and implications for neurological diseases. Traffic *21*, 454-462.

10.1111/tra.12733.

Li, C., Bassell, G.J., and Sasaki, Y. (2009). Fragile X Mental Retardation Protein is

Involved in Protein Synthesis-Dependent Collapse of Growth Cones Induced by

Semaphorin-3A. Front Neural Circuits *3*, 11. 10.3389/neuro.04.011.2009.

Li, P., Banjade, S., Cheng, H.C., Kim, S., Chen, B., Guo, L., Llaguno, M., Hollingsworth,

J.V., King, D.S., Banani, S.F., et al. (2012). Phase transitions in the assembly of

multivalent signalling proteins. Nature *483*, 336-340. 10.1038/nature10879.

Mittag, T., and Parker, R. (2018). Multiple Modes of Protein-Protein Interactions

Promote RNP Granule Assembly. J Mol Biol *430*, 4636-4649.

10.1016/j.jmb.2018.08.005.

Molliex, A., Temirov, J., Lee, J., Coughlin, M., Kanagaraj, A.P., Kim, H.J., Mittag, T., and

Taylor, J.P. (2015). Phase separation by low complexity domains promotes stress

granule assembly and drives pathological fibrillization. Cell *163*, 123-133.

10.1016/j.cell.2015.09.015.

Morales, J., Hiesinger, P.R., Schroeder, A.J., Kume, K., Verstreken, P., Jackson, F.R.,

Nelson, D.L., and Hassan, B.A. (2002). Drosophila fragile X protein, DFXR, regulates

neuronal morphology and function in the brain. Neuron *34*, 961-972. Doi

10.1016/S0896-6273(02)00731-6.

892 Mueller, F., Senecal, A., Tantale, K., Marie-Nelly, H., Ly, N., Collin, O., Basyuk, E.,

893 Bertrand, E., Darzacq, X., and Zimmer, C. (2013). FISH-quant: automatic counting of

894 transcripts in 3D FISH images. Nat Methods *10*, 277-278. 10.1038/nmeth.2406.

895 Myrick, L.K., Deng, P.Y., Hashimoto, H., Oh, Y.M., Cho, Y., Poidevin, M.J., Suhl, J.A.,

896 Visootsak, J., Cavalli, V., Jin, P., et al. (2015a). Independent role for presynaptic FMRP

897 revealed by an FMR1 missense mutation associated with intellectual disability and

898 seizures. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *112*, 949-956. 10.1073/pnas.1423094112.

899 Myrick, L.K., Hashimoto, H., Cheng, X., and Warren, S.T. (2015b). Human FMRP

900 contains an integral tandem Agenet (Tudor) and KH motif in the amino terminal domain.

901 Hum Mol Genet *24*, 1733-1740. 10.1093/hmg/ddu586.

902 Myrick, L.K., Nakamoto-Kinoshita, M., Lindor, N.M., Kirmani, S., Cheng, X., and Warren,

903 S.T. (2014). Fragile X syndrome due to a missense mutation. Eur J Hum Genet *22*,

904 1185-1189. 10.1038/ejhg.2013.311.

905 Nesler, K.R., Sand, R.I., Symmes, B.A., Pradhan, S.J., Boin, N.G., Laun, A.E., and

906 Barbee, S.A. (2013). The miRNA pathway controls rapid changes in activity-dependent

907 synaptic structure at the Drosophila melanogaster neuromuscular junction. PLoS One *8*,

908 e68385. 10.1371/journal.pone.0068385.

909 Patel, A., Lee, H.O., Jawerth, L., Maharana, S., Jahnel, M., Hein, M.Y., Stoynov, S.,

910 Mahamid, J., Saha, S., Franzmann, T.M., et al. (2015). A Liquid-to-Solid Phase

911 Transition of the ALS Protein FUS Accelerated by Disease Mutation. Cell *162*, 1066-

912 1077. 10.1016/j.cell.2015.07.047.

913 Pieretti, M., Zhang, F.P., Fu, Y.H., Warren, S.T., Oostra, B.A., Caskey, C.T., and

914 Nelson, D.L. (1991). Absence of expression of the FMR-1 gene in fragile X syndrome.

915 Cell *66*, 817-822. 10.1016/0092-8674(91)90125-i.

916 Pradhan, S.J., Nesler, K.R., Rosen, S.F., Kato, Y., Nakamura, A., Ramaswami, M., and

917 Barbee, S.A. (2012). The conserved P body component HPat/Pat1 negatively regulates

918 synaptic terminal growth at the larval Drosophila neuromuscular junction. J Cell Sci *125*,

919 6105-6116. 10.1242/jcs.113043.

920 Prieto, M., Folci, A., Poupon, G., Schiavi, S., Buzzelli, V., Pronot, M., Francois, U.,

921 Pousinha, P., Lattuada, N., Abelanet, S., et al. (2021). Missense mutation of Fmr1

922 results in impaired AMPAR-mediated plasticity and socio-cognitive deficits in mice. Nat

923 Commun *12*, 1557. 10.1038/s41467-021-21820-1.

924 Ray, D., Kazan, H., Cook, K.B., Weirauch, M.T., Najafabadi, H.S., Li, X., Gueroussov,

925 S., Albu, M., Zheng, H., Yang, A., et al. (2013). A compendium of RNA-binding motifs

926 for decoding gene regulation. Nature *499*, 172-177. 10.1038/nature12311.

927 Reeve, S.P., Bassetto, L., Genova, G.K., Kleyner, Y., Leyssen, M., Jackson, F.R., and

928 Hassan, B.A. (2005). The Drosophila fragile X mental retardation protein controls actin

dynamics by directly regulating profilin in the brain. Curr Biol *15*, 1156-1163.

10.1016/j.cub.2005.05.050.

Richter, J.D., and Zhao, X. (2021). The molecular biology of FMRP: new insights into

fragile X syndrome. Nat Rev Neurosci. 10.1038/s41583-021-00432-0.

Santoro, M.R., Bray, S.M., and Warren, S.T. (2012). Molecular mechanisms of fragile X

syndrome: a twenty-year perspective. Annu Rev Pathol *7*, 219-245. 10.1146/annurev-

pathol-011811-132457.

Schwartz, J.C., Wang, X., Podell, E.R., and Cech, T.R. (2013). RNA seeds higher-order

assembly of FUS protein. Cell Rep *5*, 918-925. 10.1016/j.celrep.2013.11.017.

Shin, Y., and Brangwynne, C.P. (2017). Liquid phase condensation in cell physiology

and disease. Science *357*. 10.1126/science.aaf4382.

Sudhakaran, I.P., Hillebrand, J., Dervan, A., Das, S., Holohan, E.E., Hulsmeier, J.,

Sarov, M., Parker, R., VijayRaghavan, K., and Ramaswami, M. (2014). FMRP and

Ataxin-2 function together in long-term olfactory habituation and neuronal translational

control. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *111*, E99-E108. 10.1073/pnas.1309543111.

Suhl, J.A., Chopra, P., Anderson, B.R., Bassell, G.J., and Warren, S.T. (2014). Analysis

of FMRP mRNA target datasets reveals highly associated mRNAs mediated by G-

quadruplex structures formed via clustered WGGA sequences. Hum Mol Genet *23*,

5479-5491. 10.1093/hmg/ddu272.

Suhl, J.A., and Warren, S.T. (2015). Single-Nucleotide Mutations in FMR1 Reveal Novel

Functions and Regulatory Mechanisms of the Fragile X Syndrome Protein FMRP. J Exp

Neurosci *9*, 35-41. 10.4137/JEN.S25524.

Tourriere, H., Chebli, K., Zekri, L., Courselaud, B., Blanchard, J.M., Bertrand, E., and

Tazi, J. (2003). The RasGAP-associated endoribonuclease G3BP assembles stress

granules. J Cell Biol *160*, 823-831. 10.1083/jcb.200212128.

Tsang, B., Arsenault, J., Vernon, R.M., Lin, H., Sonenberg, N., Wang, L.Y., Bah, A., and

Forman-Kay, J.D. (2019). Phosphoregulated FMRP phase separation models activity-

dependent translation through bidirectional control of mRNA granule formation. Proc

Natl Acad Sci U S A *116*, 4218-4227. 10.1073/pnas.1814385116.

Valverde, R., Pozdnyakova, I., Kajander, T., Venkatraman, J., and Regan, L. (2007).

Fragile X mental retardation syndrome: structure of the KH1-KH2 domains of fragile X

mental retardation protein. Structure *15*, 1090-1098. 10.1016/j.str.2007.06.022.

Van Treeck, B., and Parker, R. (2018). Emerging Roles for Intermolecular RNA-RNA

Interactions in RNP Assemblies. Cell *174*, 791-802. 10.1016/j.cell.2018.07.023.

Vijayakumar, J., Perrois, C., Heim, M., Bousset, L., Alberti, S., and Besse, F. (2019).

The prion-like domain of Drosophila Imp promotes axonal transport of RNP granules in

vivo. Nat Commun *10*, 2593. 10.1038/s41467-019-10554-w.

Wan, L., Dockendorff, T.C., Jongens, T.A., and Dreyfuss, G. (2000). Characterization of

dFMR1, a Drosophila melanogaster homolog of the fragile X mental retardation protein.

Mol Cell Biol *20*, 8536-8547. 10.1128/mcb.20.22.8536-8547.2000.

Xu, K., Bogert, B.A., Li, W., Su, K., Lee, A., and Gao, F.B. (2004). The fragile X-related

gene affects the crawling behavior of Drosophila larvae by regulating the mRNA level of

the DEG/ENaC protein pickpocket1. Curr Biol *14*, 1025-1034.

10.1016/j.cub.2004.05.055.

Zang, J.B., Nosyreva, E.D., Spencer, C.M., Volk, L.J., Musunuru, K., Zhong, R., Stone,

E.F., Yuva-Paylor, L.A., Huber, K.M., Paylor, R., et al. (2009). A mouse model of the

human Fragile X syndrome I304N mutation. Plos Genet *5*, e1000758.

10.1371/journal.pgen.1000758.

Zhang, Y., O'Connor, J.P., Siomi, M.C., Srinivasan, S., Dutra, A., Nussbaum, R.L., and

Dreyfuss, G. (1995). The fragile X mental retardation syndrome protein interacts with

novel homologs FXR1 and FXR2. Embo J *14*, 5358-5366.

Zhang, Y.Q., Bailey, A.M., Matthies, H.J., Renden, R.B., Smith, M.A., Speese, S.D.,

Rubin, G.M., and Broadie, K. (2001). Drosophila fragile X-related gene regulates the

MAP1B homolog Futsch to control synaptic structure and function. Cell *107*, 591-603.

10.1016/s0092-8674(01)00589-x.