PERK inhibition with GSK2606414 in zebrafish evokes developmental defects consistent

with Wolcott-Rallison syndrome phenotypes

Liliana M. Almeida[a,b], Leonor Pereira Lima [a,b], Nuno A. S. Oliveira [a,b], Rui F. O. Silva [a,b], Bruno

Sousa [a,b], José Bessa [c,d], Brígida R. Pinho [a,b], Jorge M. A. Oliveira [a,b,*]

[a]UCIBIO, Applied Molecular Biosciences Unit, Mitochondria and Neurobiology Lab,

Faculdade de Farmácia, Universidade do Porto, 4050-313 Porto, Portugal

[b]i4HB, Institute for Health and Bioeconomy, Universidade do Porto, 4050-313 Porto, Portugal

[c]IBMC, Instituto de Biologia Molecular e Celular, Universidade do Porto, 4200-135 Porto,

Portugal

[d]i3S, Instituto de Investigação e Inovação em Saúde, Universidade do Porto, 4200-135 Porto,

Portugal

*Corresponding author:

Jorge M. A. Oliveira (jorgemao@ff.up.pt)

Departamento de Ciências do Medicamento, Laboratório de Farmacologia, Faculdade de

Farmácia, Universidade do Porto

Rua de Jorge Viterbo Ferreira, 228, 4050-313 Porto, Portugal | Tel. +351 220428610

Author's ORCID:

Liliana M. Almeida - 0000-0003-1042-511X

Leonor Pereira Lima - 0000-0003-3454-1799

Nuno A. S. Oliveira - 0000-0002-0735-8457

Rui F. O. Silva - 0000-0001-5470-778X

Bruno Sousa - 0000-0002-3995-8545

José Bessa - 0000-0002-8591-7138

Brígida R. Pinho - 0000-0002-1627-6795

Jorge M. A. Oliveira - 0000-0002-6040-5355

Abbreviations List:

2-NBDglucose, (2-(7-Nitro-2,1,3-benzoxadiazol-4-yl)-D-glucosamine); ATF4, Activating

Transcription Factor 4; CHOP, C/EBP homologous protein; dpf, days post-fertilization; dTC,

d-tubocurarine; eIF2α, eukaryotic translation initiation factor 2α; ER, Endoplasmic reticulum;

hfp, hours post-fertilization; GSK, GSK2606414; ISR, Integrated Stress Response; NPH,

Nikon-Prior-Hamamatsu; PERK, Protein kinase R-like ER kinase; WRS, Wolcott-Rallison

Syndrome

Running Title: Zebrafish PERK in developmental diseases

Abstract

Background PERK (EIF2AK3) is an endoplasmic reticulum stress kinase whose loss of

function disturbs human development, leading to skeletal dysplasia and permanent neonatal

diabetes, as observed in the Wolcott-Rallison Syndrome (WRS). The lack of effective, less

invasive therapies for developmental diseases highlights the need for animal models that

replicate complex pathological phenotypes, while allowing scalable drug screening. Zebrafish,

with their high fecundity and rapid development, facilitate efficient *in vivo* drug testing.

Methods We aimed to assess the potential of zebrafish for studying PERK function and its

pharmacological modulation, particularly as a model for developmental diseases like WRS.

Bioinformatic analyses assessed the similarity between human and zebrafish PERK. Increasing

concentrations of GSK2606414 were used to inhibit PERK. A combination of behavioural and

functional assays evaluated the effects of GSK2606414 on zebrafish skeletal, neuromuscular,

and cardiac development. Fluorescence microscopy in transgenic zebrafish expressing

fluorescent pancreatic markers and a glucose probe assessed the diabetic-like phenotype.

Results We found high similarity between human and zebrafish PERK, along with bioactivity

of the PERK inhibitor GSK2606414 in zebrafish. PERK inhibition evoked defects in WRS

relevant parameters, such as growth and skeletal development, as well as neuromuscular and

cardiac deficiencies, whereas parameters not associated with WRS like otolith area and

eye/body ratio remained unaffected. Moreover, PERK inhibition decreased pancreatic β cell

mass and disrupted glucose homeostasis, indicating a diabetic phenotype.

Conclusion These findings evidence zebrafish's potential for studying PERK function and its

pharmacological modulation in developmental disorders like WRS, aiding research on

pathophysiology and experimental treatments.

Keywords: developmental diseases; metabolic diseases; model organism; zebrafish; PERK;

Wolcott-Rallison syndrome

1. Introduction

Protein kinase RNA-like endoplasmic reticulum kinase (PERK) is an endoplasmic reticulum (ER) membrane kinase that activates in response to disruptions in ER protein homeostasis (proteostasis) by promoting a protective response, the integrated stress response (ISR). Upon activation by stress, PERK phosphorylates eukaryotic translation initiation factor 2α (eIF2α) that decreases global protein synthesis, alleviating nascent protein load (1) and boosts the synthesis of transcription factors like activating transcription factor 4 (ATF4) and C/EBP homologous protein (CHOP). These transcription factors regulate the expression of chaperones, proteases and components of the autophagic pathway, thus contributing to proteostasis maintenance (1). During development, protein synthesis plays a critical role in cell division, differentiation, and the rapid growth of embryos (2), and PERK is essential for detecting protein misfolding and adjusting protein synthesis to maintain proteostasis (3).

In humans, loss-of-function mutations in the *EIF2AK3* gene encoding for PERK cause a rare (prevalence of <1/1 000 000; ORPHA:1667) autosomal recessive developmental disease named Wolcott-Rallison Syndrome (WRS), with patients dying before 35 years of age (4). WRS is mainly characterized by skeletal dysplasia and neonatal diabetes mellitus (5), but WRS patients may also present broad symptomatology like motor neuropathy, intellectual deficit, early neurodegeneration, and cardiac malformations (4). This broad symptomatology is likely due to the widespread distribution of PERK, with several loss-of-function mutations totally or partially abolishing its kinase activity (4, 6). Existing therapies for WRS patients include blood glucose control with insulin pumping and transplant of liver/pancreas and kidney (7). The scarcity of non-invasive and more effective therapeutic options for WRS patients highlights the need for further therapeutic investigation, which requires efficient WRS models.

The currently available *in vivo* models for the developmental disease WRS are rodents with PERK knock-out or loss-of-function mutations in PERK that exhibit the WRS hallmarks

– neonatal diabetes and skeletal dysplasia (8, 9) – and the broad-spectrum phenotypes – cardiac,

muscle and cognitive abnormalities (10-12). However, for large exploratory studies of new

therapeutics, there are efficiency advantages in using small vertebrates like zebrafish before

testing the most promising candidates in rodent models. Zebrafish are increasingly used to

develop disease models given their advantageous features: high fecundity, external

fertilization, and rapid formation of complete organs, making zebrafish ideal for investigating

developmental diseases and for rapid and scalable *in vivo* drug testing (13, 14). Previous studies

that targeted PERK in zebrafish, used either genetic (morpholino knockdown) or

pharmacological inhibition (15-17). In such studies, PERK inhibition with GSK2606414 was

used in zebrafish adults to study sleep regulation (15), and PERK inhibition with GSK2656157

or PERK knockdown was used to study redox regulation and neurogenesis in zebrafish

embryos (16, 17). To the best of our knowledge, there are no previous studies in zebrafish with

a primary focus on studying PERK function in developmental diseases, including WRS.

Here, we combined bioinformatic analyses, molecular biology techniques, behaviour,

and functional assays to assess the effects of pharmacological PERK inhibition in zebrafish.

We used transgenic zebrafish expressing pancreatic reporters and a fluorescent glucose probe

to assess diabetic-like phenotypes. We performed functional and structural microscopy to

assess skeletal, neuromuscular, and cardiac development. Our data show that zebrafish holds

potential as a model to study PERK function in developmental disorders, such as WRS.

2. Material and Methods

2.1 Drugs, solvents, and solutions

Stock solutions of the PERK inhibitor GSK2606414 (Merck Millipore, 516535) [15, 18], the muscle relaxant D-tubocurarine (dTC; Sigma, T2379), and the anesthetic tricaine methanesulfonate (0.02%; Sigma, E10521) were prepared in DMSO (Sigma, 276855) and diluted in standard E3 medium [19]. DMSO levels were kept under 0.2% [20].

2.2 Zebrafish maintenance and husbandry

Adult AB strain zebrafish were supplied by the Interdisciplinary Centre of Marine and Environmental Research (CIIMAR, Portugal), transgenic strains of zebrafish were obtained from José Bessa's laboratory at the Institute for Research and Innovation in Health (i3s, University of Porto, Portugal). Zebrafish adults were maintained at $28 \pm 1°C$ on a 14 h:10 h light:dark cycle [21, 22]. Breeding pairs (1:1, male:female) were placed in breeding tanks on the day before egg collection. Ninety minutes after starting the light period, eggs were collected, and time point was recorded as 0 h post fertilization (hpf). **Ethic statement:** Handling of zebrafish followed the European Directive 2010/63/EU and the Portuguese Law (Decreto-Lei 113/2013). Experiments were performed according to the 3Rs principle by reducing the number of animals used and using refined techniques that reduce animal suffering, using procedures approved by the i3S Animal Welfare Body.

2.3 Drug treatments

5 zebrafish/well were randomly distributed in 24-well plates (0.5 mL E3/well) and kept at $28 \pm 1°C$ on a 14 h:10 h light: dark cycle throughout the assay. Zebrafish were continuously

exposed to GSK2606414 or solvent (DMSO) from 4 to 76 hpf and solutions were renewed

daily (21). dTC was incubated for 10 minutes before assays endpoint ($\geq$ 15 zebrafish).

2.4 Brightfield microscopy

For brightfield microscopy, we used a stereomicroscope (Stemi DV4, Zeiss, Göttingen,

Germany) or an inverted microscope (Eclipse TE300, Nikon, Tokyo, Japan). The inverted

microscope was attached to a motorized stage (ProScan, Prior) and a CCD camera (ORCA-

ER, Hamamatsu), constituting a Nikon-Prior-Hamamatsu (NPH) imaging system that was

controlled by the open-source software Micro-Manager (v. 2.0; https://micro-manager.org):

2.4.1   *Monitoring zebrafish development:* Zebrafish were scored as normal,

abnormal, or dead; hatched (ruptured chorion and free tail movement) or unhatched at

28, 52 and 76 hpf. Death was ascertained according to OECD guideline 236 (23),

normal development as previously described (24), and abnormalities as cardiac and

skeletal (further into scoliosis, curly-up tail, or kyphosis). Dead zebrafish were removed

at each time point and only live ones were used in subsequent assays.

2.4.2   *Morphometric analysis:* Zebrafish body length was measured from the tip of

the head (between the eyes) to the end of the tail (25) and trunk-tail angle was measured

at the intersection between the rostral (trunk) and caudal (tail) notochord at the level of

the anus (Figure 3 B).

2.4.3   *Heartbeat and atrio-ventricular coordination:* Heartbeats were counted in 4

zebrafish per condition, per experiment, during 20 s, at 72-80 hpf (26). Atrio-

ventricular coordination recordings were obtained with "Plot Z-axis profile" on ImageJ

after imaging zebrafish for 90 seconds at 12 frames per second.

2.4.4   *Tail coilings:* Spontaneous activity was measured at 28 hpf in glass bottom 96-

well plates where each zebrafish was imaged for 3 minutes at a frequency of 4.5 frames

per second and 2x2 or 4x4 binning (19).

2.4.5   *Birefringence analysis:* 76 hpf zebrafish were anesthetized, immobilized on a

glass surface, oriented laterally, and illuminated with linearly polarized light (Screen-

Tech, ST-38). An orthogonal polarization filter was placed after the samples to block

directly transmitted light. Thus, only light whose polarization angle is affected by the

sample is collected by the NPH imaging system (27). Pixel intensity in the trunk region

was measured by selecting the region of interest with ImageJ software.

2.5 Touch-evoked escape response

At 76 hpf, at least 6 zebrafish/condition were submitted to 10 alternate touches to the head and

to the tail with 10 µL pipette tip with a recovery time of 30 seconds (28). Data are presented as

response rates in percentage of total touches.

2.6 Fluorescent microscopy

Zebrafish were imaged with the NPH system coupled to a monochromator (Polychrome II,

Photonics) as follows.

2.6.1   *2-NBDG labelling:* 3 hours before 76 hpf end-point, zebrafish were incubated

with a fluorescent glucose analogue - 600 µM 2-NBDglucose (2-(7-Nitro-2,1,3-

benzoxadiazol-4-yl)-D-glucosamine) (Tebu-Bio,10-1459) (29, 30); and a positive

control for neuromast labelling - Mitotracker Deep Red (1 µM, Invitrogen, M22426,

labels polarized mitochondria in neuromasts) in 96 well plates (4 zebrafish /well). At

76 hpf, each zebrafish was anesthetized and imaged in a glass-bottom chamber. 2-

NBDglucose was excited at 475 nm and Mitotracker Deep Red at 650 nm for 1 second.

Emissions were collected using band pass filters (Chroma 69008 – ET –
ECFP/EYFP/mCherry) with a 10 × objective. Images of the entire fish were stitched
with the GNU image manipulation program (The GIMP Development Team, 2019;
https://www.gimp.org), before evaluation of anterior and posterior neuromasts (31).

2.6.2 *Transgenic zebrafish:* Double transgenic zebrafish expressing GFP in insulin-
producing β cells and mCherry in somatostatin-producing δ cells (Tg(ins:GFP,
sst:mCherry)) or in elastase-producing cells (Tg(ins:GFP, ela:mCherry)) were kept in
24-well plates (5 zebrafish/plate) with E3 media. We used two pharmacological
approaches: 1) GSK2606414 exposure from 4 hpf (before the principal islet of
Langerhans is formed within the endocrine pancreas) to 28, 76 or 148 hpf; 2)
GSK2606414 exposure from 76 hpf (when the principal islet is already formed) to 148
hpf (32). At the final time point (28, 76 or 148 hpf) zebrafish were anesthetized by rapid
cooling on ice and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde overnight. GFP was excited at 488
nm and mCherry was excited at 575 nm. Emissions were collected using band pass
filters (Chroma 59022 – EGFP/mCherry) with a 20 × objective. The area of GFP- or
mCherry-labelled pancreas in each image was assessed with the ImageJ software
(https://imagej.nih.gov/ij).

2.8 Western blot

24-27 zebrafish larvae were rinsed with ice-cold water twice before being placed in RIPA
buffer (50 mM Tris (NZYTech, MB01601), 150 mM NaCl (Merck, S9888), 1 mM EDTA
(Sigma-Aldrich, E6758), 1% IGEPAL CA-630 (Sigma-Aldrich, I3021), 1% sodium
deoxycholate (Sigma-Aldrich, D6750), 0.1% sodium dodecyl sulfate (Sigma-Aldrich, L3771)
supplemented with a protease and phosphatase inhibitor cocktail (Thermo Scientific, 78440).
After 3 freeze-thaw cycles, homogenization with Precellys Evolution (6800 rpm, 5 × 42 s with

37 s interval) and centrifugation at 12,000 × g (10 min, 4 °C), supernatant protein

concentrations were quantified by the Bradford method. 30 to 40 µg of protein extracts were

supplemented with Bolt LDS sample buffer (Invitrogen, B0007) and Bolt sample reducing

agent (Invitrogen, B0009), denatured at 95 ºC for 5 min, and loaded into 4–15% Mini-

PROTEAN TGX™ Precast Protein Gels (Biorad, 4561084), which were electrophoresed (125

and 200 V, 30 min) and wet-transferred to PVDF membranes (Millipore, IPVH00010)

overnight (30 V, 4ºC). Membranes were blocked (1 h, room temperature or overnight at 4ºC)

with 5% bovine serum albumin (BSA, NZYTech, MB04602) in PBS with 0.05% Tween 20

(PBST) and incubated with primary antibodies (Supplementary Table 1). After washing with

PBST, membranes were incubated with respective horseradish peroxidase-conjugated

secondary antibodies (1 h) (Supplementary Table 2), for detection with a Chemiluminescent

kit (Novex ECL, Invitrogen, WP20005) and a ChemiDoc MP Imaging system (Bio-Rad).

Membrane Coomassie (Sigma-Aldrich, 27816) staining was used for loading control rather

than 'housekeeping' proteins, as their levels may change under certain conditions (33).

Densitometric analyses were performed with the Image J software. In each independent

experiment, samples from control (0 µM GSK) and 10 µM GSK- treated zebrafish were run in

the same gel.

2.9 Bioinformatic analyses

2.9.1 Comparison of PERK orthologues

Protein sequence data from zebrafish (*Danio rerio,* XP_005156642.2), human (*Homo*

sapiens, AAI26357.1), mouse (*Mus musculus,* AAH54809.1), and fruit fly (*Drosophila*

melanogaster, AAF61200.1) were obtained from UniProt (https://www.uniprot.org/,

28th February 2025). The amino acid sequences from the total human PERK protein and

from its kinase domain were compared with its orthologue proteins from zebrafish,

mouse,   and   fruit   fly,   using   the   Protein   BLAST   tool

(https://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Blast.cgi). Additionally, we determined the identity of

the vital amino acids for GSK2606414 binding to the catalytic site of PERK, by aligning

the protein sequence from zebrafish and human.

2.9.2 Zebrafish PERK 3D structure and molecular docking

The predicted three-dimensional protein structures of zebrafish PERK (UniProt:

B8JI14) and human PERK (UniProt: Q9NZJ5) were obtained from AlphaFold Protein

Structure Database (34, 35). UCSF ChimeraX software was used to visualize, align

(Matchmaker tool) and calculate the root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) of the three-

dimensional structures of human PERK (PDB: 4g31) and zebrafish PERK (UniProt:

B8JI14), and GSK2606414.

2.10 Statistical Analyses

Data are shown as mean ± standard error of the mean (SEM) of the n specified in figure legends.

For experiments with only two groups, comparisons were made with Student's t-test. For

single-factor (drug concentration) comparisons of multiple groups to their respective control,

we used One-Way ANOVA with Dunnett's *post-hoc* test. For two-factor (drug concentration

vs. time) analysis, we used Two-Way ANOVA with Sidak's *post-hoc* test. For survival analysis

we used the Mantel-Cox (Log-rank) test. $P < 0.05$ was taken as statistically significant. Data

analyses were performed with Prism 6.0 (GraphPad).

3. Results

3.1 The PERK-GSK2606414 binding site is conserved in humans and zebrafish

To assess the potential of zebrafish to study PERK function and its pharmacological modulation, we performed bioinformatic comparisons of the amino acid and structural identity of zebrafish and human PERK, including specifically the binding site for the PERK inhibitor GSK2606414. We selected GSK2606414 (hereafter GSK; not to be confused with glycogen synthase kinase) because: it is one of the most used PERK inhibitors (1); it was previously used in zebrafish (15); and the vital amino acids for its binding to PERK are identified (36, 37).

The zebrafish PERK homologue presented 59% global amino acid identity with human PERK (Figure 1 A). Using Protein BLAST, we observed that out of the 12 vital amino acids for GSK binding to PERK (36, 37), there is only one difference between human and zebrafish (Figure 1 B). Such difference is a valine in human vs. isoleucine in zebrafish, and both amino acids are hydrophobic. Using molecular visualization with ChimeraX, we observed that the average distance between the 3D structures of zebrafish and human PERK is under 1 Å (Figure 1 C, D), indicating high similarity (38).

These results predict a high probability of GSK binding and inhibiting zebrafish PERK. To test such prediction, we proceeded with functional assays.

3.2 The PERK inhibitor GSK2606414 is bioactive in zebrafish

To evaluate the effects of PERK inhibition, we evaluated the survival and hatching of zebrafish treated with increasing concentrations of GSK over time (Figure 2 A). We observed a time-dependent decrease in survival, with 10 μM GSK being the concentration that induces a significant effect (50%) at 76 hpf (Figure 2 B). For zebrafish that survived GSK, hatching increased time-dependently, without significant differences across GSK concentrations (Figure

2 C). Next, we assessed the effect of GSK on the levels of PERK pathway (ISR) biomarkers in

the zebrafish at 76 hpf using western blot (Figure 2 D *i*). Treatment with GSK (10 μM, 72h)

significantly decreased levels of phosphorylated eIF2α, ATF4, and CHOP (Figure 2 D *ii-vi*).

Together, GSK effects confirm its bioactivity and are compatible with PERK pathway

inhibition as previously reported (15).

3.3 PERK inhibition induces morphologic defects in zebrafish

PERK loss-of function elicits skeletal dysplasia in patients (5). To investigate the role of PERK

in skeletal development, we exposed zebrafish embryos to the PERK inhibitor from 4 to 76 hpf

and monitored their development over time. GSK (10 μM) evoked a significant time-dependent

increase in morphological defects (Figure 3 A *i*). The most common defect was a curly-up tail

and a few cases of scoliosis (Figures 3 A *ii - iv*). Exposure to GSK (10 μM) caused 20 ± 5

degrees change in the zebrafish trunk-tail angle at 76 hpf (Figure 3 B) and a significant decrease

in body length (Figure 3 C).

To ascertain if the morphological defects evoked by GSK originate primarily in

developing skeletal or muscular structures, we tested if the defects could be reversed by a

muscle relaxant (d-tubocurarine; dTC; antagonist of muscular nicotinic receptors (39);

effective in zebrafish (40)). We observed a concentration-dependent decrease in escape

responses, with a maximal relaxation effect at 3 mM (Figure 3 D *i,ii*), confirming dTC efficacy

as previously described (40). 3 mM dTC did not recover trunk-tail angle in GSK-treated

zebrafish (Figure 3 E), indicating that that abnormal skeletal development, rather than muscle

contraction, is the main cause of the morphological defects.

We measured otolith area (Supplementary Figure 1) and eye/body ratio (Supplementary

Figure 2) as negative controls (unrelated with WRS phenotypes) and found no changes upon

GSK exposure indicating that GSK effects on zebrafish morphology are selective.

These results indicate that upon PERK inhibition, zebrafish presented abnormal skeletal

development and growth retardation, indicating that this small vertebrate holds potential to

study the role of PERK in skeletal development.

3.4 PERK inhibition delays endocrine pancreas development and limits glucose uptake

in zebrafish

Lack of PERK in WRS patients leads to decreased β-cell mass, impaired insulin production

and neonatal diabetes (41, 42). Exocrine pancreas dysfunction was found in only 10.6% of

patients (43, 44). Thus, we explored if zebrafish could be useful to study PERK's role in

pancreatic development.

To ascertain the effects of PERK inhibition in exocrine and endocrine pancreas

development, we used two transgenic zebrafish lines expressing GFP in insulin-producing β-

cells (Figure 4 A): one line also expressed mCherry in somatostatin-producing δ-cells from the

endocrine pancreas – Tg(*ins:GFP, sst:mCherry*); the other line expressed mCherry in elastase-

producing exocrine pancreas –Tg(*ins:GFP, ela:mCherry*). We exposed both lines to GSK (10

µM) and measured the GFP/mCherry labelled areas as proxies for cell mass.

To test if the effects of GSK inhibition were selective for the early embryo

development, we used two exposure protocols: the *early exposure protocol* (Figure 4 B *i*)

started before the formation of the first Langerhans islet (endocrine pancreas); the *late exposure*

protocol started after islet formation (Figure 4 B *ii*). Early PERK inhibition (4 hpf) delayed

development of the endocrine pancreas, significantly decreasing β and δ cell mass at 28 hpf,

which seems to recover overtime (Figure 4 C *i*, D *i*). Late inhibition (76 hpf) failed to alter

endocrine cell mass (Figure 4 C *ii*, D *ii*). Regarding the exocrine pancreas mass, *ela:mCherry*

fluorescence was only detectable at 148 hpf, and remained unchanged with either early or late

GSK exposure protocols (Figure 4 E). These findings support the hypothesis that PERK

inhibition delays the early embryonic development of the endocrine pancreas.

To test if delayed endocrine development affected glucose homeostasis, we measured

the uptake of the fluorescent glucose probe 2-NBDglucose (29) in zebrafish treated with GSK

from 4 to 76 hpf (early exposure protocol). 2-NBDglucose uptake was measured in neuromast

cells, given their direct exposure to probes in the external media, using Mitotracker Deep Red

as a positive control for neuromast staining. Early PERK inhibition significantly decreased the

uptake of 2-NBDglucose (Figure 5 A, B), indicating that PERK inhibition, induces a diabetic-

like phenotype in zebrafish.

3.5 PERK inhibition evokes neuromuscular and cardiac impairments in zebrafish

Beyond diabetes and skeletal dysplasia, patients with loss-of-function mutations in PERK may

also present impaired brain development (45), muscle weakness (46) and cardiac alterations

(47, 48). We first assessed the role of PERK on zebrafish neuromuscular function by measuring

spontaneous tail-coiling and touch-evoked escape responses upon PERK inhibition (49-51).

GSK (10 µM) significantly increased tail-coiling events in early development (28 hpf embryos

inside the chorion; Figure 6 A) and significantly decreased escape responses in later

development (76 hpf larvae; Figure 6 B). To test for altered muscle integrity, we assessed the

arrangement of sarcomeres by measuring how well they diffracted polarized light

(birefringence assay) (52) (Figure 6 C *i*). Treatment with 10 µM GSK significantly decreased

muscle birefringence intensity (Figure 6 C *ii, iii*).

Next, we monitored cardiac morphology and function in PERK-inhibited zebrafish, where

10 µM GSK induced a time-dependent increase in pericardial oedema (Figure 7 A).

Additionally, at 76 hpf, 10 µM GSK induced bradycardia without altering atrio-ventricular

coordination in zebrafish (Figure 7 B).

These results suggest that PERK-inhibited zebrafish present neuromuscular and cardiac abnormalities in morphology and function, indicating that zebrafish are suitable models to study PERK effects on neuromuscular and cardiac development and function.

4. Discussion

This study contributes to the understanding of PERK's role in the embryonic development of zebrafish, building on PERK's functions in zebrafish sleep and oxidative stress regulation (15-17). We show that PERK inhibition causes defective skeletal development and diabetic-like phenotypes, cardiac and neuromuscular alterations in zebrafish, mirroring key features of Wolcott-Rallison syndrome patients. These results highlight the potential of zebrafish to study PERK's role in developmental diseases with multisystem involvement such as the WRS.

PERK inhibition with GSK2606414 (GSK), one of the most used PERK inhibitors in the scientific literature, decreased ISR activation in animals like mice (53), frogs (54) and flies (15). In the present study, we show that GSK decreases the levels of ISR markers in zebrafish, which suggests that GSK is bioactive and effective in decreasing PERK pathway activity. Additionally, GSK evoked key WRS-associated phenotypes (impaired skeletal development and diabetic-like phenotype), while sparing non-WRS-associated parameters as otolith area and eye/body ratio. Although we cannot exclude GSK off-targeting c-KIT and RIPK kinases (55, 56), zebrafish with genetically inhibited KITa/b and RIPK3 (57, 58) did not show the curly-up tail and other structural alterations reported in our study, suggesting that such alterations are not off-targets effects of GSK in c-KIT and RIPK kinases. Thus, these results are compatible with GSK selectively inhibiting PERK in zebrafish.

Loss of PERK function causes growth retardation and skeletal dysplasia in humans (5) and mice, via impairments in collagen secretion, osteoblast differentiation and bone mineralization

(9, 59, 60). Here, we show that PERK inhibition in zebrafish causes growth retardation and

spinal deformities resistant to muscle relaxation with tubocurarine. Since at the time of the

assays (76 hpf) the zebrafish cartilage is starting to ossify (61), our findings indicate that PERK

inhibition impairs zebrafish skeletal development.

PERK controls pancreatic β-cell development and insulin production (62). Loss of PERK

function in humans and mice causes decreased pancreatic mass and neonatal diabetes, by

impairing β-cell proliferation and proinsulin maturation in the endoplasmic reticulum (63-66).

Here we show that PERK inhibition during early zebrafish development delays endocrine

pancreas formation, resulting in a decreased β-cell mass, which gradually recovers overtime.

To assesses whether glucose homeostasis is impaired in PERK-inhibited zebrafish we used the

fluorescence glucose uptake probe 2-NBDglucose. We found reduced 2-NBDglucose uptake,

which indicates that glucose homeostasis remains partly compromised despite the ongoing β-

cell mass recovery. Such recovery in the presence of GSK suggests that zebrafish can

regenerate pancreatic tissue (67, 68) by PERK-independent mechanisms. The identification of

such PERK-independent mechanisms in zebrafish may assist the development of novel

therapies for β-cell regeneration for human diabetes (69).

In contrast to the delayed development of the zebrafish endocrine pancreas, we found no

effect of PERK-inhibition upon the mass of the exocrine pancreas. While different mechanisms

regulate development of the endocrine and exocrine pancreas (43, 65), we cannot exclude that

extended exposure of zebrafish to the PERK inhibitor may alter the mass of the exocrine

pancreas. Future studies using selective PERK knockout in zebrafish pancreatic cell sub-types

may contribute to understand differential pancreatic vulnerability.

Beyond pancreatic dysfunction, PERK inhibition in humans and mice impairs neuronal

and muscular functions (5, 6, 11, 70, 71). Here we show that PERK inhibition in zebrafish

increases spontaneous tail movements early in development, which arise in a spinal central

pattern generator that provides rhythmic depolarizations (49, 51), and decreases touch-evoked

escape responses later in development, which arise in sensory neurons (50, 51). We also show

that PERK-inhibited zebrafish display altered muscular integrity, likely contributing to

decreased escape responses. Thus, as with mammals, the mechanisms underlying motor

impairment in PERK-inhibited zebrafish combine dysfunctions in neurons and muscle.

Patients and mice with PERK loss of function often display cardiac malformations (10,

47, 48). Here we show that PERK-inhibited zebrafish display cardiac abnormalities, such as

oedema and bradycardia. The transparency and small size of young zebrafish is amenable to

the detection of cardiac abnormalities that would be fatal in larger animals due to insufficient

oxygen diffusion (72). Moreover, zebrafish may assist discovery of heart regeneration

mechanisms (73). Thus, future studies with a more detailed structural and functional

characterization of the cardiac abnormalities in PERK-inhibited or deleted zebrafish, may

provide valuable insights into disease mechanisms and potential therapeutics.

5. Conclusions

This study highlights the potential of the small vertebrate zebrafish as a model for

developmental diseases, namely those caused by PERK inhibition like the WRS. We show that

pharmacological inhibition of PERK with GSK2606414 mimicked WRS pathophysiology by

inducing defective growth and skeletal development, and diabetic-like phenotypes such as

delayed development of the endocrine pancreas and altered glucose homeostasis. PERK

inhibition also impaired neuromuscular and cardiac development, while sparing non-WRS

associated parameters like otolith area and eye/body ratio. Future studies using CRISPR/Cas9

technology can be used to generate zebrafish models with conditional/selective expression of

human PERK with WRS-driving mutations (74). Also, future research on the mechanisms

governing PERK-independent pancreatic regeneration in zebrafish may uncover potential

therapeutic targets for diabetes. Further, the scalability of zebrafish models holds great

potential to enhance the efficiency of drug screening against PERK-associated developmental

diseases.

Declarations

Authorship contribution

Conceptualization – LA, BRP, JMAO; **Methodology –** LA, NASO, JB, BRP, JMAO; **Investigation –** LA, LPL, NASO, RFOS, BS; **Validation** – LA, LPL, NASO, RFOS, BS; **Data Curation** – LA; **Formal Analysis** – LA, LPL, NASO, RFOS; **Visualization** – LA, LPS, NASO; **Writing – original draft** – LA; **Writing – review and editing** – LA, LPL, NASO, JB, BRP, JMAO; **Resources** – JB, JMAO; **Funding acquisition** – JB, JMAO; **Project administration** – JMAO; **Supervision –** BRP, JMAO.

Funding

JMAO's laboratory - FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, Portugal – (UIDB/04378/2020; UIDP/04378/2020; LA/P/0140/2020). LMA - FCT PhD fellowship - SFRH/BD/138451/2018. BRP - FCT funding program DL57/2016 - Norma transitória (DL57/2016/CP1346/CT0016). JB's laboratory - FCT project PTDC/BIA-MOL/3834/2021. JB's FCT contract CEECIND/03482/2018.

Conflict of interest statement

No financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Data availability statement

The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Bioinformatic analyses of PERK identity and GSK2606414-binding in human vs. zebrafish. (**A**) Percentage of identity between human, fruit fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*), zebrafish (*Danio rerio*), and mouse (*Mus musculus*) PERK (total and kinase domain); Protein BLAST. (**B**) Comparing vital GSK2606414 (GSK)-binding amino acids in the catalytic domain of human and zebrafish PERK. Valine 651 in human (yellow) is substituted by the also hydrophobic Isoleucine 671 (red) in zebrafish; Protein BLAST. (**C**) Predicted GSK (purple, #) binding to human (light blue) and zebrafish (dark blue) PERK; ChimeraX. (**D**) Root Mean Square Deviation (RMSD) comparing human and zebrafish PERK tertiary structures and respective reference values; ChimeraX.

Figure 2. GSK2606414 effects on zebrafish survival, hatching, and PERK pathway biomarkers. (**A**) Experimental timeline. (**B**) Zebrafish survival when exposed to GSK2606414 (GSK; 0-10 μM) over time (4-76 hours post-fertilization; hpf); n = 50-234 zebrafish, 5 independent breedings, Mantel-Cox test for survival, *P < 0.05 vs. 0 μM GSK (control). (**C**) Hatching of zebrafish treated with GSK; n= 50-234 zebrafish, 5 breedings, Two-Way ANOVA, time effect: #P < 0.05. (**D**) Western blot of live 76 hpf zebrafish: *i*) Schematic representation of the PERK pathway biomarkers; *ii-vi*) Representative blots and quantifications; n = 4 independent experiments (pool of 24-27 larvae per condition and per experiment); *t*-test: *P < 0.05.

Figure 3. GSK2606414 impaired skeletal development in zebrafish. (**A**) (*i*) Morphological defects following GSK2606414 (GSK) (0-10 μM) treatment overtime; *P < 0.05, 10 vs. 0 μM GSK; #P<0.05, effect of time for 10 μM GSK, Two-Way ANOVA with Sidak *post-hoc*; n =

50-234 zebrafish; 5 independent experiments. (*ii-v*) Proportion of curly-up tail and scoliosis at

76 hpf, and representative images. (**B, C**) Measurements (blue lines) and quantifications of

trunk-tail angle and body length at 76 hpf; *$P < 0.05$ vs 0 μM GSK, One-Way ANOVA with

Dunnett's *post-hoc*; $n = 15$ zebrafish, 3 independent experiments. (**D**) Effect of muscle relaxant

d-tubocurarine (dTC, 0.03–3 mM) on escape responses after head or tail touch at 76 hpf; Grey

bands are mean ± SEM for control zebrafish; *$P < 0.05$ vs 0 mM dTC, One-Way ANOVA with

Dunnett's *post-hoc, n = 15* zebrafish, 3 independent experiments. (**E**) (*i-iv*) Representative

images of zebrafish for the indicated-treatments. (*v*) Quantification of zebrafish with

morphological defects at 76 hpf for the indicated treatments. *$P < 0.05$ vs control, One-Way

ANOVA with Sidak's *post-hoc*, $n = 15$ zebrafish; 3 independent breedings. Blue arrows: curly-

up tail.

Figure 4. Pancreatic development in transgenic zebrafish. (**A**) Representative images of normal

pancreas development in Tg(*ins:GFP, sst:mCherry*) and Tg(*ins:GFP, ela:mCherry*) zebrafish.

(**B**) early (*i*) and late (*ii*) GSK2606414 (GSK)-exposure protocols. (**C-E**) Area measurements

for *ins:GFP* (green, insulin-producing β-cells), *sst:mCherry* (red, somatostatin-producing δ-

cells), and *ela:mCherry* (red, elastase-producing exocrine cells), in zebrafish exposed to 10 μM

GSK since 4 hpf (*i*, early exposure) or since 76 hpf (*ii*, late exposure). *$P < 0.05$, *t*-test, $n = 4$-

33 larvae. Representative images of GFP and mCherry are shown below respective bars. Scale

bars indicate 200 μm.

Figure 5. GSK2606414 effects on 2-NBDglucose uptake in zebrafish. (**A**) Representative

brightfield and fluorescence images of zebrafish at 76 hpf, following treatment with (*i*) 0 μM

(control) or (*ii*) 10 μM GSK2606414 since 4 hpf. Images show functional labelling at 76 hpf

with the fluorescent glucose analogue 2-NBDglucose (2-NBDG) for neuromasts that uptake

glucose, and with MitoTracker Deep Red that labels mitochondria in neuromasts as positive

control. In the "Merge" images, yellow circles highlight neuromasts with both 2-NBDglucose

and MitoTracker, while red circles highlight those containing MitoTracker only. Below, 2x

amplified images show neuromasts from the zebrafish lateral line, with arrows indicating

neuromasts on the side proximal to the microscope objective (the paired neuromasts on the

opposite side are unmarked). (**B**) Quantification of neuromasts labelled with 2-NBDglucose.

*$P < 0.05$, t-test, $n = 9\text{-}12$ zebrafish per condition.

Figure 6. GSK2606414 effects on neuromotor responses and muscle integrity. (**A**) (*i*)

Representative tail coiling time-lapse: white line highlights notochord movement. (*ii*)

Quantification of tail coiling in 28 hpf zebrafish treated with GSK2606414 since 4 hpf; $n = 23\text{-}$

26 zebrafish. (**B**) Quantification of escape responses after head (*i*) or tail (*ii*) touches at 76 hpf;

$n = 13\text{-}114$ zebrafish. (**C**) (*i*) Schematic representation of the birefringence assay for muscle

integrity; (*ii*) Representative images of muscle birefringence at 76 hpf. (*iii*) Quantification of

birefringence intensity; $n = 15$ zebrafish. (**A-C**) Grey bands are mean $\pm$ SEM for 0 μM GSK

(control); *$P < 0.05$ vs. (control), One-Way ANOVA with Dunnett's *post-hoc*.

Figure 7. GSK2606414-induced morphological and functional cardiac defects. (**A**) (*i*)

Quantification of live zebrafish with pericardial oedema at the indicated hpf and GSK

concentrations. *$P < 0.05$, 10 vs. 0 μM GSK (control); Two-Way ANOVA with Sidak *post-*

hoc $n= 50\text{-}234$ zebrafish; 5 independent experiments. (*ii,iii*) Representative images of zebrafish

treated with GSK vs. control; blue arrow: pericardial oedema. (**B**) (*i*) Heartbeats per minute

(bpm) of 76 hpf zebrafish exposed to increasing GSK concentrations since 4 hpf; Grey band is

mean $\pm$ SEM for control; *$P < 0.05$ vs control, One-Way ANOVA with Dunnett's *post-hoc*, n

= 13-116 zebrafish; (*ii*) Representative images of the heart and plots of atrio-ventricular

coordination in control and 10 µM GSK-treated zebrafish (a: atrium – red; v: ventricle – blue).

References

1.   Almeida LM, Pinho BR, Duchen MR, Oliveira JMA. The PERKs of mitochondria

protection during stress: insights for PERK modulation in neurodegenerative and metabolic

diseases. Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc. 2022.

2.   Peshkin L, Wuhr M, Pearl E, Haas W, Freeman RM, Jr., Gerhart JC, et al. On the

Relationship of Protein and mRNA Dynamics in Vertebrate Embryonic Development. Dev

Cell. 2015;35(3):383-94.

3.   Wang P, Li J, Tao J, Sha B. The luminal domain of the ER stress sensor protein PERK

binds misfolded proteins and thereby triggers PERK oligomerization. J Biol Chem.

2018;293(11):4110-21.

4.   Senee V, Vattem KM, Delepine M, Rainbow LA, Haton C, Lecoq A, et al. Wolcott-

Rallison Syndrome: clinical, genetic, and functional study of EIF2AK3 mutations and

suggestion of genetic heterogeneity. Diabetes. 2004;53(7):1876-83.

5.   Julier C, Nicolino M. Wolcott-Rallison syndrome. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2010;5:29.

6.   Bruch J, Kurz C, Vasiljevic A, Nicolino M, Arzberger T, Hoglinger GU. Early

Neurodegeneration in the Brain of a Child Without Functional PKR-like Endoplasmic

Reticulum Kinase. J Neuropathol Exp Neurol. 2015;74(8):850-7.

7.   Tzakis AG, Nunnelley MJ, Tekin A, Buccini LD, Garcia J, Uchida K, et al. Liver,

pancreas and kidney transplantation for the treatment of Wolcott-Rallison syndrome. Am J

Transplant. 2015;15(2):565-7.

8.   Harding HP, Zeng H, Zhang Y, Jungries R, Chung P, Plesken H, et al. Diabetes mellitus

and exocrine pancreatic dysfunction in perk-/- mice reveals a role for translational control in

secretory cell survival. Mol Cell. 2001;7(6):1153-63.

9.   Zhang P, McGrath B, Li S, Frank A, Zambito F, Reinert J, et al. The PERK eukaryotic

initiation factor 2 alpha kinase is required for the development of the skeletal system, postnatal

growth, and the function and viability of the pancreas. Mol Cell Biol. 2002;22(11):3864-74.

10.   Shimizu T, Maruyama K, Kawamura T, Urade Y, Wada Y. PERK participates in

cardiac valve development via fatty acid oxidation and endocardial-mesenchymal

transformation. Sci Rep. 2020;10(1):20094.

11.   Gallot YS, Bohnert KR, Straughn AR, Xiong G, Hindi SM, Kumar A. PERK regulates

skeletal muscle mass and contractile function in adult mice. FASEB J. 2019;33(2):1946-62.

12.   Trinh MA, Kaphzan H, Wek RC, Pierre P, Cavener DR, Klann E. Brain-specific

disruption of the eIF2alpha kinase PERK decreases ATF4 expression and impairs behavioral

flexibility. Cell Rep. 2012;1(6):676-88.

13.   Teame T, Zhang Z, Ran C, Zhang H, Yang Y, Ding Q, et al. The use of zebrafish (Danio

rerio) as biomedical models. Anim Front. 2019;9(3):68-77.

14.   Choi TY, Choi TI, Lee YR, Choe SK, Kim CH. Zebrafish as an animal model for

biomedical research. Exp Mol Med. 2021;53(3):310-7.

15.   Ly S, Lee DA, Strus E, Prober DA, Naidoo N. Evolutionarily Conserved Regulation of

Sleep by the Protein Translational Regulator PERK. Curr Biol. 2020;30(9):1639-48 e3.

16.   Jin B, Xie L, Zhan D, Zhou L, Feng Z, He J, et al. Nrf2 dictates the neuronal survival

and differentiation of embryonic zebrafish harboring compromised alanyl-tRNA synthetase.

Development. 2022;149(17).

17.   Mukaigasa K, Tsujita T, Nguyen VT, Li L, Yagi H, Fuse Y, et al. Nrf2 activation

attenuates genetic endoplasmic reticulum stress induced by a mutation in the

phosphomannomutase 2 gene in zebrafish. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2018;115(11):2758-63.

18.   Stockwell SR, Platt G, Barrie SE, Zoumpoulidou G, Te Poele RH, Aherne GW, et al.

Mechanism-based screen for G1/S checkpoint activators identifies a selective activator of

EIF2AK3/PERK signalling. PLoS One. 2012;7(1):e28568.

19.   Oliveira NAS, Pinho BR, Pinto J, Guedes de Pinho P, Oliveira JMA. Edaravone

counteracts redox and metabolic disruptions in an emerging zebrafish model of sporadic ALS.

Free Radic Biol Med. 2024;217:126-40.

20.   Hoyberghs J, Bars C, Ayuso M, Van Ginneken C, Foubert K, Van Cruchten S. DMSO

Concentrations up to 1% are Safe to be Used in the Zebrafish Embryo Developmental Toxicity

Assay. Front Toxicol. 2021;3:804033.

21.   Silva RFO, Pinho BR, Santos MM, Oliveira JMA. Disruptions of circadian rhythms,

sleep, and stress responses in zebrafish: New infrared-based activity monitoring assays for

toxicity assessment. Chemosphere. 2022;305:135449.

22.   Pinho BR, Reis SD, Hartley RC, Murphy MP, Oliveira JMA. Mitochondrial superoxide

generation induces a parkinsonian phenotype in zebrafish and huntingtin aggregation in human

cells. Free Radic Biol Med. 2019;130:318-27.

23.   OECD. Test No. 236: Fish Embryo Acute Toxicity (FET) Test. 2013.

24.   Kimmel CB, Ballard WW, Kimmel SR, Ullmann B, Schilling TF. Stages of embryonic

development of the zebrafish. Dev Dyn. 1995;203(3):253-310.

25.   Martinez R, Navarro-Martin L, Luccarelli C, Codina AE, Raldua D, Barata C, et al.

Unravelling the mechanisms of PFOS toxicity by combining morphological and transcriptomic

analyses in zebrafish embryos. Sci Total Environ. 2019;674:462-71.

26.   Pinho BR, Santos MM, Fonseca-Silva A, Valentao P, Andrade PB, Oliveira JM. How

mitochondrial dysfunction affects zebrafish development and cardiovascular function: an in

vivo model for testing mitochondria-targeted drugs. Br J Pharmacol. 2013;169(5):1072-90.

27. Oliveira NAS, Pinho BR, Oliveira JMA. Swimming against ALS: How to model

disease in zebrafish for pathophysiological and behavioral studies. Neurosci Biobehav Rev.

2023;148:105138.

28. Pinho BR, Reis SD, Guedes-Dias P, Leitao-Rocha A, Quintas C, Valentao P, et al.

Pharmacological modulation of HDAC1 and HDAC6 in vivo in a zebrafish model: Therapeutic

implications for Parkinson's disease. Pharmacol Res. 2016;103:328-39.

29. Lee J, Jung DW, Kim WH, Um JI, Yim SH, Oh WK, et al. Development of a highly

visual, simple, and rapid test for the discovery of novel insulin mimetics in living vertebrates.

ACS Chem Biol. 2013;8(8):1803-14.

30. Wang L, Kong H, Jin M, Li X, Stoika R, Lin H, et al. Synthesis of disaccharide modified

berberine derivatives and their anti-diabetic investigation in zebrafish using a fluorescence-

based technology. Org Biomol Chem. 2020;18(18):3563-74.

31. Stengel D, Zindler F, Braunbeck T. An optimized method to assess ototoxic effects in

the lateral line of zebrafish (Danio rerio) embryos. Comp Biochem Physiol C Toxicol

Pharmacol. 2017;193:18-29.

32. Tiso N, Moro E, Argenton F. Zebrafish pancreas development. Mol Cell Endocrinol.

2009;312(1-2):24-30.

33. Li R, Shen Y. An old method facing a new challenge: re-visiting housekeeping proteins

as internal reference control for neuroscience research. Life Sci. 2013;92(13):747-51.

34. Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, et al. Highly

accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. Nature. 2021;596(7873):583-9.

35. Varadi M, Anyango S, Deshpande M, Nair S, Natassia C, Yordanova G, et al.

AlphaFold Protein Structure Database: massively expanding the structural coverage of protein-

sequence space with high-accuracy models. Nucleic Acids Res. 2022;50(D1):D439-D44.

36.   Axten JM, Medina JR, Feng Y, Shu A, Romeril SP, Grant SW, et al. Discovery of 7-

methyl-5-(1-{[3-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]acetyl}-2,3-dihydro-1H-indol-5-yl)-7H-p

yrrolo[2,3-d]pyrimidin-4-amine (GSK2606414), a potent and selective first-in-class inhibitor

of protein kinase R (PKR)-like endoplasmic reticulum kinase (PERK). J Med Chem.

2012;55(16):7193-207.

37.   Chintha C, Carlesso A, Gorman AM, Samali A, Eriksson LA. Molecular modeling

provides a structural basis for PERK inhibitor selectivity towards RIPK1. RSC Adv.

2019;10(1):367-75.

38.   Carugo O, Pongor S. A normalized root-mean-square distance for comparing protein

three-dimensional structures. Protein Sci. 2001;10(7):1470-3.

39.   Rahman MM, Basta T, Teng J, Lee M, Worrell BT, Stowell MHB, et al. Structural

mechanism of muscle nicotinic receptor desensitization and block by curare. Nat Struct Mol

Biol. 2022;29(4):386-94.

40.   Guzman L, Besa G, Linares D, González L, Pont C, Bartolini M, et al. Evaluation of

the effects of acetylcholinesterase inhibitors in the zebrafish touch-evoked response:

quantitative vs. qualitative assessment. Environ Sci Eur. 2020;32:12.

41.   Sumegi A, Hendrik Z, Gall T, Felszeghy E, Szakszon K, Antal-Szalmas P, et al. A

novel splice site indel alteration in the EIF2AK3 gene is responsible for the first cases of

Wolcott-Rallison syndrome in Hungary. BMC Med Genet. 2020;21(1):61.

42.   Rubio-Cabezas O, Patch AM, Minton JA, Flanagan SE, Edghill EL, Hussain K, et al.

Wolcott-Rallison syndrome is the most common genetic cause of permanent neonatal diabetes

in consanguineous families. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2009;94(11):4162-70.

43.   Iida K, Li Y, McGrath BC, Frank A, Cavener DR. PERK eIF2 alpha kinase is required

to regulate the viability of the exocrine pancreas in mice. BMC Cell Biol. 2007;8:38.

44.   Aldrian D, Bochdansky C, Kavallar AM, Mayerhofer C, Deeb A, Habeb A, et al.

Natural history of Wolcott-Rallison syndrome: A systematic review and follow-up study. Liver

Int. 2024;44(3):811-22.

45.   de Wit MC, de Coo IF, Julier C, Delepine M, Lequin MH, van de Laar I, et al.

Microcephaly and simplified gyral pattern of the brain associated with early onset insulin-

dependent diabetes mellitus. Neurogenetics. 2006;7(4):259-63.

46.   Abdelmeguid Y, Mowafy EW, Marzouk I, Franco E, ElSayed S. Clinical and molecular

characteristics of infantile-onset diabetes mellitus in Egypt. Ann Pediatr Endocrinol Metab.

2022;27(3):214-22.

47.   Thornton CM, Carson DJ, Stewart FJ. Autopsy findings in the Wolcott-Rallison

syndrome. Pediatr Pathol Lab Med. 1997;17(3):487-96.

48.   Bejiqi R, Retkoceri R, Zeka N, Bejiqi R, Bejic S. An Infant With Neonatal Diabetes

and Double Outlet Right Ventricle - Wolcott- Rallison syndrome. Med Arch. 2018;72(4):289-

91.

49.   Zindler F, Beedgen F, Brandt D, Steiner M, Stengel D, Baumann L, et al. Analysis of

tail coiling activity of zebrafish (Danio rerio) embryos allows for the differentiation of

neurotoxicants with different modes of action. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf. 2019;186:109754.

50.   Roberts AC, Chornak J, Alzagatiti JB, Ly DT, Bill BR, Trinkeller J, et al. Rapid

habituation of a touch-induced escape response in Zebrafish (Danio rerio) Larvae. PLoS One.

2019;14(4):e0214374.

51.   von Wyl M, Konemann S, Vom Berg C. Different developmental insecticide exposure

windows trigger distinct locomotor phenotypes in the early life stages of zebrafish.

Chemosphere. 2023;317:137874.

52.   Berger J, Sztal T, Currie PD. Quantification of birefringence readily measures the level

of muscle damage in zebrafish. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2012;423(4):785-8.

53.   Moreno JA, Halliday M, Molloy C, Radford H, Verity N, Axten JM, et al. Oral

treatment targeting the unfolded protein response prevents neurodegeneration and clinical

disease in prion-infected mice. Sci Transl Med. 2013;5(206):206ra138.

54.   Cagnetta R, Wong HH, Frese CK, Mallucci GR, Krijgsveld J, Holt CE. Noncanonical

Modulation of the eIF2 Pathway Controls an Increase in Local Translation during Neural

Wiring. Mol Cell. 2019;73(3):474-89 e5.

55.   Rojas-Rivera D, Delvaeye T, Roelandt R, Nerinckx W, Augustyns K, Vandenabeele P,

et al. When PERK inhibitors turn out to be new potent RIPK1 inhibitors: critical issues on the

specificity and use of GSK2606414 and GSK2656157. Cell Death Differ. 2017;24(6):1100-10.

56.   Mahameed M, Wilhelm T, Darawshi O, Obiedat A, Tommy WS, Chintha C, et al. The

unfolded protein response modulators GSK2606414 and KIRA6 are potent KIT inhibitors. Cell

Death Dis. 2019;10(4):300.

57.   Wen W, Chen J, Zhou Y, Li G, Zhang Y. Loss of Ripk3 attenuated neutrophil

accumulation in a lipopolysaccharide-induced zebrafish inflammatory model. Cell Death

Discov. 2022;8(1):88.

58.   Hultman KA, Bahary N, Zon LI, Johnson SL. Gene Duplication of the zebrafish kit

ligand and partitioning of melanocyte development functions to kit ligand a. PLoS Genet.

2007;3(1):e17.

59.   Li Y, Iida K, O'Neil J, Zhang P, Li S, Frank A, et al. PERK eIF2alpha kinase regulates

neonatal growth by controlling the expression of circulating insulin-like growth factor-I

derived from the liver. Endocrinology. 2003;144(8):3505-13.

60.   Wei J, Sheng X, Feng D, McGrath B, Cavener DR. PERK is essential for neonatal

skeletal development to regulate osteoblast proliferation and differentiation. J Cell Physiol.

2008;217(3):693-707.

61.   Tonelli F, Bek JW, Besio R, De Clercq A, Leoni L, Salmon P, et al. Zebrafish: A

Resourceful Vertebrate Model to Investigate Skeletal Disorders. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne).

2020;11:489.

62.   Cavener DR, Gupta S, McGrath BC. PERK in beta cell biology and insulin biogenesis.

Trends Endocrinol Metab. 2010;21(12):714-21.

63.   Welters A, Meissner T, Konrad K, Freiberg C, Warncke K, Judmaier S, et al. Diabetes

management in Wolcott-Rallison syndrome: analysis from the German/Austrian DPV

database. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2020;15(1):100.

64.   Feng D, Wei J, Gupta S, McGrath BC, Cavener DR. Acute ablation of PERK results in

ER dysfunctions followed by reduced insulin secretion and cell proliferation. BMC Cell Biol.

2009;10:61.

65.   Zhang W, Feng D, Li Y, Iida K, McGrath B, Cavener DR. PERK EIF2AK3 control of

pancreatic beta cell differentiation and proliferation is required for postnatal glucose

homeostasis. Cell Metab. 2006;4(6):491-7.

66.   Sowers CR, Wang R, Bourne RA, McGrath BC, Hu J, Bevilacqua SC, et al. The protein

kinase PERK/EIF2AK3 regulates proinsulin processing not via protein synthesis but by

controlling endoplasmic reticulum chaperones. J Biol Chem. 2018;293(14):5134-49.

67.   Moss JB, Koustubhan P, Greenman M, Parsons MJ, Walter I, Moss LG. Regeneration

of the pancreas in adult zebrafish. Diabetes. 2009;58(8):1844-51.

68.   Pisharath H, Rhee JM, Swanson MA, Leach SD, Parsons MJ. Targeted ablation of beta

cells in the embryonic zebrafish pancreas using E. coli nitroreductase. Mech Dev.

2007;124(3):218-29.

69.   Karampelias C, Liu KC, Tengholm A, Andersson O. Mechanistic insights and

approaches for beta cell regeneration. Nat Chem Biol. 2025.

70. Asl SN, Vakili R, Vakili S, Soheilipour F, Hashemipour M, Ghahramani S, et al.

Wolcott-Rallison syndrome in Iran: a common cause of neonatal diabetes. J Pediatr Endocrinol

Metab. 2019;32(6):607-13.

71. Longo F, Mancini M, Ibraheem PL, Aryal S, Mesini C, Patel JC, et al. Cell-type-

specific disruption of PERK-eIF2alpha signaling in dopaminergic neurons alters motor and

cognitive function. Mol Psychiatry. 2021;26(11):6427-50.

72. Bournele D, Beis D. Zebrafish models of cardiovascular disease. Heart Fail Rev.

2016;21(6):803-13.

73. Ross Stewart KM, Walker SL, Baker AH, Riley PR, Brittan M. Hooked on heart

regeneration: the zebrafish guide to recovery. Cardiovasc Res. 2022;118(7):1667-79.

74. Cornet C, Di Donato V, Terriente J. Combining Zebrafish and CRISPR/Cas9: Toward

a More Efficient Drug Discovery Pipeline. Front Pharmacol. 2018;9:703.

Figures

A Global amino acid comparison

Total Protein
Kinase domain

fruit fly 55.8 %
32.7 %
zebrafish 59.2 %
58.8 %
mouse 88.9 %
87.4 %

% of Identity of PERK homologues
to human protein sequence

B Comparison of vital* amino acids in kinase domain

Human PERK

	642	643	645	650	651	653	885	887	888	890	952	955
🧍	L	A	L	I	V	Y	I	M	Q	C	V	F
🐟	L	A	L	I	I	Y	I	M	Q	C	V	F
	662	663	665	670	671	673	874	876	877	879	941	944
	✓	✓	✓	✓	☐	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

* 12 vital amino acids for GSK2606414 binding

valine (V) and isoleucine (I) are both hydrophobic

C Molecular visualization of GSK binding to PERK

☐ human PERK
☐ zebrafish PERK
☐ @, valine 651 (human)
☐ @, isoleucine 671 (zebrafish)
☐ #, GSK2606414 (GSK)

D Structural similarity of human vs. zebrafish PERK

Root Mean Square Deviation

Total protein	0.868 Å	**High similarity** (0-1 Å)
Catalytic domain	0.371 Å	**High similarity** (0-1 Å)

Figure 1

A Experimental timeline

B Survival analysis

GSK2606414
(µM): ● 0 ■ 0.3 ▼ 3 ● 0.1 ▲ 1 ◆ 10

C Hatching analysis

D PERK pathway biomarkers

A Morphological defects

i

Live zebrafish with morphological defects (% of 4 hpf)

GSK2606414 (µM): ●─ 0 ●─ 0.1 ■─ 0.3 ▲─ 1 ▼─ 3 ◆─ 10

ii

Morphological defects at 76 hpf (% of 4 hpf)

GSK2606414 (µM): 0 10

□ Scoliosis ▒ Curly-up tail

iii – Normal morphology

iv – Curly-up tail

v – Scoliosis

500 µm

B Trunk-tail angle

Control

10 µM GSK

700 µm

Trunk-tail angle (°) vs GSK2606414 (µM)

C Body length

700 µm

Body length (% of control) vs GSK2606414 (µM)

D **Positive control for tubocurarine (dTC)**

i – Head reflex

ii – Tail reflex

Reflexes (% of total) vs dTC (mM)   Control ± SEM

E **The muscle relaxant tubocurarine (dTC) does not rescue the curly-up tail evoked by GSK2606414**

i – Control

ii – 3 mM dTC

iii – 10 µM GSK2606414

iv - 10 µM GSK2606414 + 3 mM dTC

500 µm

v

Zebrafish with morphological defects (% of 4 hpf)

| 10 µM GSK | - | + | - | + |
| 3 mM dTC | - | - | + | + |

Figure 3

A Pancreatic development

i 28 hpf **ii** 76 hpf **iii** 148 hpf

ins:GFP + sst:mCherry   *ins:GFP + sst:mCherry*   *ins:GFP+ sst:mCherry*   *ins:GFP + ela:mCherry*

300 µm

B **i** Early (4 hpf) GSK exposure protocol

GSK

📷   📷   📷

0   4   28   76   148 (hpf)

ii Late (76 hpf) GSK exposure protocol

GSK

📷

0   76   148 (hpf)

C *ins:GFP (β cell; endocrine)*

i Early: 4 hpf → 28 hpf   76 hpf   148 hpf

GFP area (% of control)

200 — 150 — 100 — 50 — 0

*

GSK (µM) 0 10   0 10   0 10

ii Late: 76 hpf → 148 hpf

GFP area (% of control)

200 — 150 — 100 — 50 — 0

GSK (µM) 0 10

D *sst:mCherry* (δ cell; endocrine)

i Early: 4 hpf → 28 hpf   76 hpf   148 hpf

mCherry area (% of control)

200 — 150 — 100 — 50 — 0

*

GSK (µM) 0 10   0 10   0 10

ii Late: 76 hpf → 148 hpf

mCherry area (% of control)

200 — 150 — 100 — 50 — 0

GSK (µM) 0 10

E *ela:mCherry* (exocrine)

i Early: 4 hpf → 148 hpf

mCherry area (% of control)

200 — 150 — 100 — 50 — 0

GSK (µM) 0 10

ii Late: 76 hpf → 148 hpf

mCherry area (% of control)

200 — 150 — 100 — 50 — 0

GSK (µM) 0 10

A 2-NBD glucose uptake to neuromasts

i Control   **ii** 10 µM GSK2606414

B Neuromast quantification

Figure 5

A Tail coiling events (28 hpf)

i

400 µm

ii

B Touch-evoked escape responses (76 hpf)

i

ii

Control ± SEM

C Birefringence assay (76 hpf)

i

Unpolarized light

Linearly polarized light

Birefringent muscle sarcomeres

Polarized light

Objective

ii

Control

Brightfield

Birefringence

10 µM GSK

Brightfield

Birefringence

600 µm

iii

Control ± SEM

Figure 6

A Pericardial oedema

i

ii 28 hpf
Control

10 µM GSK
300 µm

iii 76 hpf
600 µm

B Heart beat analysis

i

Control ± SEM

ii
Control

10 µM GSK

Atrio-ventricular coordination

Control

10 µM GSK

1 sec.

Figure 7

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Figure 1. GSK2606414 (GSK) does not alter zebrafish otolith area. **(A)** Representative images of zebrafish at 76hpf following treatment with control (0 µM GSK) or 10 µM GSK since 4 hpf. Arrows: (u) utricular/anterior otolith, (s) saccular/posterior otolith. **(B)** Mean ± SEM of the otolith area, *P* > 0.05, t-test, *n* = 15 larvae, 3 zebrafish experiments.

Supplementary Figure 2. GSK2606414 does not alter zebrafish eye/body ratio. **(A)** Representative images of zebrafish at 76hpf following treatment with control (0 µM GSK) or 10 µM GSK since 4 hpf. Solid blue lines: body length; dashed yellow lines: eye diameter. **(B)** Mean ± SEM of the eye/body ratio, $P > 0.05$, t-test, n = 15 zebrafish, 3 independent experiments.

Supplementary Table 1. Primary antibodies used in western blots from Fig. 2 D.

Antibody	Dilution	Supplier	Catalog Number	RRID
anti-ATF4	1:500	Proteintech	Cat# 10835-1-AP	AB_2058600
anti-CHOP	1:1000	Proteintech	Cat# 15204-1-AP	AB_2292610
anti-eIF2α	1:1000	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# AHO0802	AB_2536316
anti-p-eIF2α	1:500	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# MA5-15133	AB_10983400

Supplementary Table 2. Secondary antibodies used in western blots from Fig. 2 D.

Antibody	Dilution	Supplier	Catalog Number	RRID
anti-mouse	1:4000	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# G-21040	AB_2536527
anti-rabbit	1:4000	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# G-21234	AB_2536530