Zebrafish as a model to study PERK function in developmental diseases: implications for

Wolcott-Rallison syndrome

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, Faculty

of Pharmacy, University of Porto, 4050-313 Porto, Portugal

[b]i4HB, Institute for Health and Bioeconomy, Department of Drug Sciences, Faculty of

Pharmacy, University of 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

15
16 **Corresponding author:**
17 Jorge M. A. Oliveira (jorgemao@ff.up.pt)
18 Departamento de Ciências do Medicamento, Laboratório de Farmacologia, Faculdade de
19 Farmácia, Universidade do Porto
20 Rua de Jorge Viterbo Ferreira, 228, 4050-313 Porto, Portugal | Tel. +351 220428610

21
Abbreviations:
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

29
30 **Complete text character count with spaces**: 61 428.

32 **Acknowledgments:** Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT): UIDB/04378/2020;
33 UIDP/04378/2020; LA/P/0140/2020; SFRH/BD/138451/2018; DL57/2016/CP1346/CT0016;
34 PTDC/BIA-MOL/3834/2021; CEECIND/03482/2018.

36
37 **Running Title:** Zebrafish PERK in developmental diseases

Abstract

Developmental diseases are challenging to investigate due to their clinical heterogeneity and relatively low prevalence. The Wolcott-Rallison Syndrome (WRS) is a rare developmental disease characterized by skeletal dysplasia and permanent neonatal diabetes due to loss-of-function mutations in the endoplasmic reticulum stress kinase PERK (EIF2AK3). The lack of efficient and less invasive therapies for WRS highlights the need for new animal models that replicate the complex pathological phenotypes, while preserving scalability for drug screening. Zebrafish exhibits high fecundity and rapid development that facilitate efficient and scalable *in vivo* drug testing. Here, we aimed to assess the potential of zebrafish to study PERK function and its pharmacological modulation, and as model organism of developmental diseases such as the WRS. Using bioinformatic analyses, we showed high similarity between human and zebrafish PERK. We used the pharmacological PERK inhibitor GSK2606414, which was bioactive in zebrafish, to modulate PERK function. Using transgenic zebrafish expressing fluorescent pancreatic markers and a fluorescent glucose probe, we observed that PERK inhibition decreased β cell mass and disrupted glucose homeostasis. By combining behavioural and functional assays, we show that PERK-inhibited zebrafish present marked skeletal defects and defective growth, as well as neuromuscular and cardiac deficiencies, which are clinically relevant in WRS patients, while sparing parameters like otolith area and eye/body ratio which are not associated with WRS. These results show that zebrafish holds potential to study PERK function and its pharmacological modulation in developmental disorders like WRS, assisting research on their 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 or (eIF2 α) that decreases global protein synthesis and thus alleviates the proteostasis system [1]. Additionally, ISR promotion by PERK boosts the synthesis of specific transcription factors such as activating transcription factor 4 (ATF4) and C/EBP homologous protein (CHOP) that regulate the expression of chaperones, proteases and components of the autophagic pathway, thus contributing to proteostasis recovery [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].

Global knockout of PERK in mice induces several developmental defects, namely reduced bone density, mineralization and body size [4], loss of insulin-producing beta cells and hyperglycaemia [5-7]. Additionally, PERK inhibition reduces skeletal muscle mass, and strength [8] and impairs cardiac valve formation [9]. In humans, loss-of-function mutations in the *EIF2AK3* gene encoding for PERK cause a rare (ORPHA:1667) autosomal recessive developmental disease named Wolcott-Rallison Syndrome (WRS) [10].

Clinically, WRS is characterized by the presence of skeletal dysplasia and neonatal diabetes mellitus [5]. Additionally, WRS patients may present broad spectrum symptoms – such as motor neuropathy, intellectual deficit, early neurodegeneration, and cardiac malformations – likely due to the widespread distribution of PERK with several loss-of-function mutations totally or partially abolishing its kinase activity [11, 12]. The prognosis of

WRS patients is usually poor and death occurs at a young age (< 35 years old) from multiple

organ failure with predominant liver and renal dysfunction, and encephalopathy [5]. Existing

therapies include blood glucose control with insulin pumping and transplant of liver/pancreas

and kidney [13]. 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 developmental diseases such as WRS are

rodents with loss-of-function mutations in PERK that exhibit the WRS hallmarks – neonatal

diabetes and skeletal dysplasia [6, 7] – and the broad-spectrum phenotypes – cardiac, muscle

and cognitive abnormalities [8, 9, 14]. However, for exploratory studies of new therapeutics

that typically occur in large scales, there are efficiency advantages in using small vertebrates

such as zebrafish before testing the most promising candidates in rodent models. The small

vertebrate zebrafish is increasingly used to develop disease models given its 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 [15, 16]. Previous studies that targeted PERK in zebrafish, used either genetic

(morpholino knockdown) or pharmacological inhibition [17-19]. In such studies, PERK

inhibition with GSK2606414 was used in zebrafish adults to study sleep regulation [18], and

PERK inhibition with GSK2656157 or PERK knockdown was used to study redox regulation

and neurogenesis in zebrafish embryos [17, 19]. Thus, 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.

In the present study, 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 used functional and structural microscopy

to assess skeletal, neuromuscular, and cardiac phenotypes. 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

GSK2606414 (Merck Millipore, 516535) was used to inhibit PERK [20] in zebrafish, as previously done [18]. Stock drug solutions were prepared in anhydrous DMSO (Sigma, 276855). D-tubocurarine (dTC, Sigma, t2379) solution was prepared in MilliQ water and used as a muscle relaxant. Prior to assays, stocks were diluted in embryo (E3) medium: 5 mM NaCl (Sigma, S9888), 0.17 mM KCl (Chem-Lab, cl00.1133.1000), 0.33 mM CaCl2•2H2O (Panreac, 131232.1211), 0.33 mM MgCl2•6H2O (Sigma, TA523733) and 0.0001% methylene blue (Sigma, M9140) [21]. Tricaine methanesulfonate (Sigma, E10521) was used as anesthetic at 0.02%. In the assay solutions, DMSO was always kept under 0.2% [22].

2.2 Zebrafish maintenance and husbandry

Adult AB strain zebrafish were supplied by the Interdisciplinary Centre of Marine and Environmental Research (CIIMAR, Portugal) and maintained in 45 L tanks at $28 \pm 1°C$ on a 14 h:10 h light:dark cycle and handled for egg production as we previously detailed [23, 24]. Handling of zebrafish followed the European Directive 2010/63/EU and the Portuguese Law (Decreto-Lei 113/2013). Briefly, adults (1:1, male:female) were placed in a 0.7 L breeding tank with circulating water in contact with the main tank on the day before egg collection. Ninety minutes after starting the light period, eggs were collected and washed. This time point was recorded as 0 h post fertilization (hpf).

2.3 Drug treatments

Zebrafish were randomly distributed in 24-well plates (5 zebrafish/well; 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 [23]. In each experiment, all drug concentrations were assayed at least in duplicate wells (5 + 5 zebrafish). Experiments were repeated at least three times independently (≥ 30 zebrafish) [25]. Tubocurarine (dTC) was incubated for 10 minutes before assays endpoint in 5 zebrafish, in at least three independent experiments (≥ 15 zebrafish).

2.4 Brightfield microscopy

For brightfield microscopy, a stereomicroscope (Stemi DV4, Zeiss, Göttinger, Germany) or an inverted microscope (Eclipse TE300, Nikon, Tokyo, Japan) were used. The inverted microscope was attached to a motorized stage (ProScan, Prior) and a CCD camera (ORCA-ER, Hamamatsu), all controlled by the open-source software Micro-Manager (v. 2.0; https://micro-manager.org). This Nikon-Prior-Hamamatsu (NPH) imaging system was used to perform the following brightfield imaging protocols:

2.4.1 Monitoring zebrafish development

At regular time points (28, 52 and 76 hpf) zebrafish were scored as normal, abnormal, or dead; hatched (ruptured chorion and free tail movement) or unhatched. Zebrafish were classified as dead if lacking one of the following: somite formation, tail detachment or heartbeat; as according to OECD guideline 236 [26]. Normal development was as previously described [27]. Abnormalities were scored as cardiac and skeletal (further into scoliosis, curly-up tail, or kyphosis). Dead zebrafish were

removed from the experiments and only live zebrafish were used in the following assays.

2.4.2 Morphometric analysis

Brightfield images were used for morphometric analysis of head-tail angle and body length of zebrafish. Body length was measured from the tip of the zebrafish head (between the eyes) to the end of the tail [28]. Trunk-tail angle was measured with the angle tool of ImageJ at the intersection between the rostral (trunk) and caudal (tail) notochord at the level of the anus (Figure 3 B). Both parameters (length and angle) were quantified by a researcher blinded to experimental conditions.

2.4.3 Heartbeat and atrio-ventricular coordination

Heartbeats were counted by microscopic visualization of at least two zebrafish per well (4 zebrafish per condition, per experiment), during 20 s, at 72-80 hpf [25]. Recordings of atrio-ventricular coordination were obtained by imaging live zebrafish for 90 seconds at 12 frames per second. After the experiments, the atrium and ventricle were visually identified, and the recordings were obtained with "Plot Z-axis profile" on ImageJ.

2.4.4 Tail coilings

Zebrafish spontaneous activity was assessed by monitoring tail coiling movements at 28 hpf in glass bottom 96-well plates. Each zebrafish was imaged for 3 minutes at a frequency of 4.5 frames per second and 2x2 or 4x4 binning [21]. After imaging, tail coilings were assessed by researchers blinded to experimental conditions.

2.4.5 Birefringence analysis

For muscle 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 microscope [29]. Pixel intensity in the trunk region was measured by selecting the region of interest with ImageJ software by a researcher blinded to experimental conditions.

2.5 Touch-evoked escape response

At 76 hpf, at least two zebrafish per well (6 zebrafish per 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 [30]. Data are presented as response rates in percentage of total touches.

2.6 Fluorescent labelling and microscopy of zebrafish

At 73 hpf, zebrafish were incubated with a fluorescent glucose analogue - 600 µM 2-NBDglucose (2-(7-Nitro-2,1,3-benzoxadiazol-4-yl)-D-glucosamine) (200 µL, Tebu-Bio,10-1459) [31, 32]; and a positive control for neuromast labelling - Mitotracker Deep Red (1 µM, Invitrogen, M22426) for 3 hours in 96 well plates (4 zebrafish /well). At 76 hpf, each zebrafish was washed twice with E3 solution, anesthetized with 0.02% tricaine methanesulfonate (Sigma, E10521) and imaged in a glass-bottom chamber. For imaging, we used the NPH microscope with a monochromator (Polychrome II, Photonics). 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 [33] by a researcher blinded to the treatment conditions.

2.7 Imaging of fluorescent transgenic zebrafish

Double transgenic zebrafish expressing GFP in insulin-producing β cells (endocrine pancreas) and mCherry in somatostatin producing δ cells (endocrine pancreas), Tg(*ins:GFP, sst:mCherry*), or expressing GFP in β cells and mCherry in elastase producing-cells (exocrine pancreas), Tg(*ins:GFP, ela:mCherry*) [34], were obtained from José Bessa's laboratory at the Institute for Research and Innovation in Health (i3s, University of Porto, Portugal). Transgenic zebrafish were kept in 24-well plates (5 zebrafish/plate) with E3 media until the start of drug treatments (DMSO 0.15%, GSK2606414 3–10 μM). 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 [35]. Drug solutions were renewed daily. At the final time point (28, 76 or 148 hpf) zebrafish were anesthetized by rapid cooling on ice and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde overnight. Zebrafish were imaged with the NPH inverted microscope. 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) by a researcher blinded to the treatment conditions.

2.8 Western blot

A pool of 24 to 27 zebrafish larvae were used per condition. Larvae were rinsed with ice-cold system 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, samples were

homogenized with Precellys Evolution (6800 rpm, 5×42 s with 37 s interval) and centrifuged

at $12,000 \times$ g (10 min, 4 °C). Supernatant protein concentrations were quantified by the

Bradford method. Protein extracts supplemented with Bolt LDS sample buffer (Invitrogen,

B0007) and Bolt sample reducing agent (Invitrogen, B0009) were denatured at 95 ºC for 5 min.

30 to 40 µg of protein were loaded into 4–15% Mini-PROTEAN® TGX™ Precast Protein Gels

(Biorad, 4561084), electrophoresed between 125 and 200 V for 30 min and wet-transferred to

PVDF membranes (Millipore, IPVH00010) overnight (30 V, 4ºC). Membranes were then

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 then incubated with primary

antibodies: anti-ATF4 (1:500, overnight, Proteintech Cat# 10835-1-AP, RRID: AB_2058600);

anti-CHOP (1:1000, overnight, Proteintech Cat# 15204-1-AP, RRID:AB_2292610); anti-

eIF2α (1:1000, overnight, Thermo Fisher Scientific Cat# AHO0802, RRID: AB_2536316);

anti-p-eIF2α (1:500, overnight, Thermo Fisher Scientific Cat# MA5-15133,

RRID:AB_10983400). After washing with PBST for 15 min, membranes were incubated with

respective horseradish peroxidase-conjugated secondary antibodies for 1 h: anti-mouse

(1:4000, 1 h, Thermo Fisher Scientific Cat# G-21040, RRID: AB_2536527); anti-rabbit

(1:4000, 1 h, Thermo Fisher Scientific Cat# G-21234, RRID:AB_2536530). Detection was

performed using 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 proteins usually described as 'housekeeping', because the

levels of these proteins may change in certain biological or pathological conditions, while

coomassie stains all proteins with loading higher than 50 ng [36]. 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), fruit fly (*Drosophila*

melanogaster, AAF61200.1), and nematode (*Caenorhabditis elegans*, AAF61201.1)

were obtained from NCBI Protein (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/protein/). The amino

acid sequence from the total human PERK protein and from its catalytic domain were

compared with its orthologue proteins from zebrafish, mouse, fruit fly, and nematode,

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 [37, 38]. To visualize and align the three-dimensional structures of

human PERK (PDB: 4g31), zebrafish PERK (UniProt: B8JI14), and GSK2606414, we

used UCSF ChimeraX [39]. The human GSK2606414-bound PERK structure (PDB:

4g31) was used as a starting model and superimposition with zebrafish PERK was done

in UCSF ChimeraX, using the Matchmaker tool. To assess the structural similarity

between zebrafish and human PERK and infer about GSK2606414 binding efficiency,

we calculated the root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) in ChimeraX software for the

total protein and for the catalytic site of zebrafish PERK.

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 the 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. For all analyses, a *P* value under 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 [18]; and the vital amino acids for its binding to PERK are identified [40, 41].

Although the zebrafish PERK homologue presented a 52-58% global amino acid identity with human PERK, when comparing the 3D protein structure and the vital amino acids for GSK binding in the catalytic site we observed a high similarity (Figure 1). 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 [42]. Moreover, using Protein BLAST, we observed that out of the 12 vital amino acids for GSK binding to PERK [40, 41], 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.

Together, 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 in zebrafish, we evaluated the survival and hatching

of fish 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 lowest concentration that

induces a significant effect (50%) at 76 hpf (Figure 2 B). Zebrafish that failed to survive GSK

inside the chorion were excluded from hatching analysis. For surviving zebrafish, there was a

time-dependent increase in hatching 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*). Results show that

treatment with GSK (10 µM, 72h) significantly decreased levels of phosphorylated of 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 [18].

3.3 PERK inhibition induces skeletal defects in zebrafish

PERK inhibition in humans impairs skeletal development as evidenced by the presence of

skeletal dysplasia in WRS patients [5]. To assess the potential of zebrafish for studying the role

of PERK in zebrafish 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 are primarily skeletal or

involve an abnormal muscle contraction, we tested if the defects could be reversed by a muscle

relaxant (d-tubocurarine; dTC; antagonist of muscular nicotinic receptors [43]; effective in

zebrafish [44]). We confirmed dTC efficacy by observing a concentration-dependent decrease

in escape responses, with a maximal effect at 3 mM (Figure 3 D *i,ii*), as previously described [44]. Even with the fully relaxing 3 mM dTC concentration there was no recovery of trunk-tail angle in GSK-treated zebrafish (Figure 3 E). These results indicate that abnormal skeletal development, rather than muscle contraction, is the main cause of the morphological defects.

To evaluate the selective toxicity of GSK, we examined otolith area (Supplementary figure 1 A) and eye/body ratio (Supplementary figure 1 B) and found no significant effects in such parameters that are unrelated to cardinal WRS phenotypes.

Collectively, these results indicate that upon PERK inhibition, zebrafish presented skeletal abnormalities and growth retardation, indicating that the 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

PERK is involved in blood glucose control by governing insulin production and β-cell mass. In WRS patients, lack of PERK leads to decreased β-cell mass, impaired insulin production and neonatal diabetes [45, 46]. Exocrine pancreas dysfunction associated with loss of PERK in acinar cells may occur, although with a prevalence of 10.6% of WRS patients [47, 48]. Thus, we explored if zebrafish could be used as an animal model to study PERK's role in pancreatic development, ascertaining 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 respective 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*). With late inhibition (76 hpf), we found no significant differences in endocrine cell mass (Figure 4 C *ii*, D *ii*). Regarding the exocrine pancreas mass, *ela:mCherry* fluorescence was only detectable at 148 hpf, and no significant differences were found with either early or late GSK exposure protocols (Figure 4 E). These findings support the hypothesis that PERK inhibition selectively delayed the early embryonic development of the endocrine pancreas.

To test if delayed endocrine development affected glucose homeostasis, we measured the uptake of a fluorescent glucose probe (2-NBDglucose [31]) 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. We found that early PERK inhibition significantly decreased the uptake of 2-NBDglucose (Figure 5 A, B). These results show that upon PERK inhibition, zebrafish present a diabetic-like phenotype that resembles WRS with delayed endocrine pancreas development and impaired glucose homeostasis, highlighting zebrafish as a potential model to study the effects of PERK on pancreatic development.

3.5 PERK inhibition evokes neuromuscular and cardiac impairments in zebrafish

Beyond impairments in skeletal and pancreatic development, PERK inhibition also impairs the

development of cardiac valves and skeletal muscle, and can lead to neurodegeneration [5, 8,

9]. To test if zebrafish holds potential to study the mechanisms behind PERK effects on

neuromuscular development, we assessed spontaneous tail-coiling and touch-evoked escape

responses upon PERK inhibition [49-51]. We found that 10 μM GSK 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 [11, 53]. We

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

We monitored heart rate at 76 hpf and observed that 10 μM GSK induced bradycardia without

altering atrio-ventricular coordination (Figure 7 B).

These results are compatible with PERK-inhibited zebrafish presenting cardiac and

neuromuscular abnormalities in morphology and function, suggesting that zebrafish are

suitable animal models to study PERK effects on cardiac and neuromuscular development and

function.

4.   Discussion

In the present study we expand the understanding of PERK's role in the embryonic

development of multiple zebrafish organs, adding to previous knowledge of PERK's function

in zebrafish sleep regulation and oxidative stress handling [17-19]. Specifically, we show that

PERK inhibited-zebrafish presented skeletal defects and diabetic-like phenotypes, cardiac and

neuromuscular alterations. These phenotypes resemble the clinical features of patients with loss-of-function mutation in PERK, such as in the Wolcott-Rallison syndrome. Thus, these results support the potential of zebrafish to study PERK's role in developmental diseases with clinically relevant multisystem involvement such as the Wolcott-Rallison syndrome.

4.1 Pharmacological inhibition of PERK

To inhibit PERK activity in zebrafish we used a pharmacological approach with GSK2606414 (GSK), one of the most used PERK inhibitors in the scientific literature [1]. PERK inhibition with GSK decreased ISR activation in animals such as mice [54], frogs [55] and flies [18]. 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 incubation produced robust results consistent with WRS-associated phenotypes (skeletal impairments and diabetic-like phenotype), while sparing non-WRS-associated parameters as otolith area and eye/body ratio, being compatible with selective effects of PERK inhibition. We cannot rule out the possibility that GSK is also acting on off-targets, such as kinases of the c-KIT and RIPK families [56, 57]. However, previous studies that genetically inhibited KITa/b and RIPK3 activities in zebrafish did not show the structural alterations and defective growth we observed with GSK-treatment [58, 59].

4.2 Skeletal impairments

Regarding the development of the skeleton, zebrafish and humans share great similarities in anatomy and physiology including the main skeletal cell types and development pathways [60]. Mechanistically, PERK's loss-of-function delays the differentiation and proliferation of osteoblasts and decreases the secretion of type I collagen. As these are essential factors for normal bone development, PERK's loss-of-function decreases bone mineralization [4]. Due to

PERK loss-of-function, WRS patients present short stature and skeletal dysplasia, particularly

noticeable in long bones, pelvis, and vertebrae [5]. Mice with PERK ablation exhibit postnatal

growth retardation, bone loss and skeletal dysplasia [7, 61]. Here, we show that zebrafish

treated with a PERK inhibitor also present decreased growth and skeletal defects.

4.3 Diabetic-like phenotype

PERK controls pancreatic development and insulin production since PERK ablation in mice

reduced β cell mass, impaired proinsulin maturation and induced hyperglycaemia [6, 62-64].

In humans, WRS neonatal diabetes is insulin requiring but not autoimmune, being caused by

loss of PERK function, which likely disrupts insulin maturation in the endoplasmic reticulum

[5-7]. WRS patients also present a hypoplastic pancreas, with smaller insulin-secreting β cells

[65]. In the present study, we show that early PERK inhibition with GSK2606414 in zebrafish

delays endocrine pancreas development, reducing β-cell mass. Although β-cell mass recovers

overtime, as assessed by the GFP reporter in transgenic zebrafish, insulin production likely

remains partly compromised given the reduced uptake of 2-NBDglucose. Recovery of β -cell

mass in zebrafish can be explained by its ability to regenerate pancreatic tissue [66, 67]. As

this recovery occurs in the presence of the PERK inhibitor, it likely involves PERK-

independent protective mechanisms. The identification of such mechanisms may assist the

development of novel WRS therapies that harness the potential of PERK-independent

pancreatic recovery.

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

effect of 10 μM GSK2606414 upon the mass of the exocrine pancreas at 148 hpf. While

different mechanisms regulate development of the endocrine and exocrine pancreas, we cannot

rule out that our zebrafish model may present differences in the mass of the exocrine pancreas

upon extended exposure to the PERK inhibitor. Additionally, exocrine pancreas alterations are

relatively uncommon occurring only in 10.6% of WRS patients [48]. Still, one hypothesis to

explain the differential effect of inhibiting PERK in endocrine and exocrine pancreas might

reside in PERK's cell autonomous effects. Selective PERK knockout in the endocrine pancreas

of mice induces hyperglycaemia and decreased β cell mass but does not induce exocrine

atrophy. Conversely, PERK knockout in the exocrine pancreas induces atrophy in the exocrine

portion but not in the endocrine portion and without causing diabetes [47, 63]. Future studies

using selective PERK knockout in zebrafish pancreatic cell sub-types may contribute to

understand differential pancreatic vulnerability.

4.4 Neuromuscular and cardiac development

In addition to skeletal and pancreatic development, PERK ablation also impairs the

development of skeletal muscle and heart valves [4, 9], which explains why WRS patients may

also present neuromuscular and cardiac dysfunctions [11, 53, 68]. Here, we show that zebrafish

developed neuromuscular and cardiac abnormalities upon PERK inhibition, as discussed

below.

Regarding neuromuscular function, WRS patients display brain structural abnormalities,

microcephaly, and muscle weakness, by mostly unknown mechanisms associated with the loss

of PERK function [5, 12]. We show that PERK inhibition increased spontaneous tail

movements in early zebrafish embryonic development, which arise in a spinal central pattern

generator that provides rhythmic depolarizations [49, 51]. Later in development, PERK

inhibition manifested as decreased touch-evoked escape response, which arise in sensory

neurons [50, 51]. Skeletal defects and impairments in muscle integrity might also contribute

to the decreased escape responses in zebrafish treated with GSK2606414. Interestingly,

selective PERK ablation in either skeletal muscle or nigral dopaminergic neurons sufficed to

evoke motor impairments in mice [8, 69]. Thus, the mechanisms causing motor impairment

upon PERK inhibition likely combine dysfunctions originating in neurons and in muscle.

Regarding cardiac alterations, clinicians reported multiple cases of WRS patients with

structural malformations and altered rhythmicity [53, 70], and PERK knockout mice show

abnormal heart valves [9]. The transparency of young zebrafish allows non-invasive

examination of heart structure and function. Furthermore, their small body size permits oxygen

diffusion, enabling the detection of developmental cardiac abnormalities that would be fatal in

mammals due to inadequate oxygen supply [71]. Our data demonstrate that inhibiting PERK

in zebrafish induces morphologic and functional cardiac abnormalities. Nonetheless, further

functional and structural measurements are necessary to characterize the cardiac abnormalities

and assess their relevance for broad-spectrum WRS.

5. Conclusions

In this study, we demonstrate the potential of the small vertebrate zebrafish for the study of

developmental diseases, namely diseases caused by PERK inhibition such as the WRS. We

show that pharmacological inhibition of PERK with GSK2606414 induced skeletal defects,

defective growth, and diabetic-like phenotypes, such as delayed development of the endocrine

pancreas and altered glucose homeostasis, which also occur in WRS patients. Inhibiting PERK

in zebrafish also produced neuromuscular and cardiac abnormalities, while sparing non-WRS

associated parameters such as otolith area and eye/body ratio. In future studies, CRISPR/Cas9

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

human PERK with WRS-driving mutations [72]. Also, future research on the mechanisms

governing PERK-independent pancreatic regeneration in zebrafish may uncover potential

therapeutic avenues for diabetic patients. Lastly, the scalability of zebrafish models holds great

potential to enhance the efficiency of drug screening against developmental diseases like the

WRS.

Declarations

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Liliana M. Almeida: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Validation, Data curation, Visualization, Formal analysis, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing; **Leonor Pereira Lima:** Investigation, Validation, Formal analysis, Visualization, Writing – review and editing; **Nuno A. S. Oliveira:** Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Visualization, Formal analysis, Writing – review and editing; **Rui F. O. Silva:** Investigation, Validation, Formal analysis; **Bruno Sousa:** Investigation, Validation; **José Bessa:** Methodology, Resources, Writing – review and editing, Funding acquisition; **Brígida R. Pinho:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review and editing, Supervision; **Jorge M. A. Oliveira:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Resources, Writing – review and editing; Funding acquisition, Project administration, Supervision.

Funding

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

Competing Interests

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

 Figure legends

 Figure 1. Bioinformatic analyses of PERK identity and GSK2606414-binding in human vs

 zebrafish. (**A**) Percentage of identity between human, nematode (*Caenorhabditis elegans*), fruit

 fly (*Drosophila melanogaster*), zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) and mouse (*Mus musculus*) PERK

 (total and catalytic domain); Protein BLAST. (**B**) Comparison of 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 (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) for the comparison between

 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 protein samples from 76 hpf zebrafish that survived

 GSK treatment: *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-induced skeletal abnormalities 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.

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 the functional labelling at 76

hpf with the fluorescent glucose analogue 2-NBDglucose (2-NBDG; labels neuromasts that

upload glucose), and with the MitoTracker Deep Red probe (labels mitochondria in

neuromasts, working as positive control for neuromast presence). Circles in the "Merge" images highlight either neuromasts containing 2-NBDglucose and MitoTracker (yellow circles), or containing MitoTracker only (red circles). Below, 2x amplified images of the tails are provided with arrowheads marking neuromasts from the zebrafish lateral line on the side proximal to the microscope objective (the paired neuromasts from the lateral line on the other side, distal to the objective, are without arrows). (**B**) Quantification of neuromasts labelled with 2-NBDglucose. *$P < 0.05$, t-test, $n = 9$-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 (GSK) since 4 hpf; $n = 23$-26 zebrafish. (**B**) Quantification of escape responses after head (*i*) or tail (*ii*) touches at 76 hpf; $n = 13$-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* $n= 50$-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 the indicated 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] L.M. Almeida, B.R. Pinho, M.R. Duchen, J.M.A. Oliveira, The PERKs of mitochondria

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

diseases, Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc, (2022).

[2] L. Peshkin, M. Wuhr, E. Pearl, W. Haas, R.M. Freeman, Jr., J.C. Gerhart, A.M. Klein, M.

Horb, S.P. Gygi, M.W. Kirschner, On the Relationship of Protein and mRNA Dynamics in

Vertebrate Embryonic Development, Dev Cell, 35 (2015) 383-394.

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

binds misfolded proteins and thereby triggers PERK oligomerization, J Biol Chem, 293 (2018)

4110-4121.

[4] J. Wei, X. Sheng, D. Feng, B. McGrath, D.R. Cavener, PERK is essential for neonatal

skeletal development to regulate osteoblast proliferation and differentiation, J Cell Physiol, 217

(2008) 693-707.

[5] C. Julier, M. Nicolino, Wolcott-Rallison syndrome, Orphanet J Rare Dis, 5 (2010) 29.

[6] H.P. Harding, H. Zeng, Y. Zhang, R. Jungries, P. Chung, H. Plesken, D.D. Sabatini, D.

Ron, Diabetes mellitus and exocrine pancreatic dysfunction in perk-/- mice reveals a role for

translational control in secretory cell survival, Mol Cell, 7 (2001) 1153-1163.

[7] P. Zhang, B. McGrath, S. Li, A. Frank, F. Zambito, J. Reinert, M. Gannon, K. Ma, K.

McNaughton, D.R. Cavener, 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, 22 (2002) 3864-3874.

[8] Y.S. Gallot, K.R. Bohnert, A.R. Straughn, G. Xiong, S.M. Hindi, A. Kumar, PERK

regulates skeletal muscle mass and contractile function in adult mice, FASEB J, 33 (2019)

1946-1962.

[9] T. Shimizu, K. Maruyama, T. Kawamura, Y. Urade, Y. Wada, PERK participates in cardiac

valve development via fatty acid oxidation and endocardial-mesenchymal transformation, Sci

Rep, 10 (2020) 20094.

[10] M. Delepine, M. Nicolino, T. Barrett, M. Golamaully, G.M. Lathrop, C. Julier, EIF2AK3,

encoding translation initiation factor 2-alpha kinase 3, is mutated in patients with Wolcott-

Rallison syndrome, Nat Genet, 25 (2000) 406-409.

[11] V. Senee, K.M. Vattem, M. Delepine, L.A. Rainbow, C. Haton, A. Lecoq, N.J. Shaw, J.J.

Robert, R. Rooman, C. Diatloff-Zito, J.L. Michaud, B. Bin-Abbas, D. Taha, B. Zabel, P.

Franceschini, A.K. Topaloglu, G.M. Lathrop, T.G. Barrett, M. Nicolino, R.C. Wek, C. Julier,

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

suggestion of genetic heterogeneity, Diabetes, 53 (2004) 1876-1883.

[12] J. Bruch, C. Kurz, A. Vasiljevic, M. Nicolino, T. Arzberger, G.U. Hoglinger, Early

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

Reticulum Kinase, J Neuropathol Exp Neurol, 74 (2015) 850-857.

[13] A.G. Tzakis, M.J. Nunnelley, A. Tekin, L.D. Buccini, J. Garcia, K. Uchida, H.L. Neville,

M.A. Nares, P. Ruiz, O. Bodamer, Liver, pancreas and kidney transplantation for the treatment

of Wolcott-Rallison syndrome, Am J Transplant, 15 (2015) 565-567.

[14] M.A. Trinh, H. Kaphzan, R.C. Wek, P. Pierre, D.R. Cavener, E. Klann, Brain-specific

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

flexibility, Cell Rep, 1 (2012) 676-688.

[15] T. Teame, Z. Zhang, C. Ran, H. Zhang, Y. Yang, Q. Ding, M. Xie, C. Gao, Y. Ye, M.

Duan, Z. Zhou, The use of zebrafish (Danio rerio) as biomedical models, Anim Front, 9 (2019)

68-77.

[16] T.Y. Choi, T.I. Choi, Y.R. Lee, S.K. Choe, C.H. Kim, Zebrafish as an animal model for

biomedical research, Exp Mol Med, 53 (2021) 310-317.

[17] K. Mukaigasa, T. Tsujita, V.T. Nguyen, L. Li, H. Yagi, Y. Fuse, Y. Nakajima-Takagi, K.

Kato, M. Yamamoto, M. Kobayashi, 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, 115 (2018) 2758-2763.

[18] S. Ly, D.A. Lee, E. Strus, D.A. Prober, N. Naidoo, Evolutionarily Conserved Regulation

of Sleep by the Protein Translational Regulator PERK, Curr Biol, 30 (2020) 1639-1648 e1633.

[19] B. Jin, L. Xie, D. Zhan, L. Zhou, Z. Feng, J. He, J. Qin, C. Zhao, L. Luo, L. Li, Nrf2

dictates the neuronal survival and differentiation of embryonic zebrafish harboring

compromised alanyl-tRNA synthetase, Development, 149 (2022).

[20] S.R. Stockwell, G. Platt, S.E. Barrie, G. Zoumpoulidou, R.H. Te Poele, G.W. Aherne, S.C.

Wilson, P. Sheldrake, E. McDonald, M. Venet, C. Soudy, F. Elustondo, L. Rigoreau, J. Blagg,

P. Workman, M.D. Garrett, S. Mittnacht, Mechanism-based screen for G1/S checkpoint

activators identifies a selective activator of EIF2AK3/PERK signalling, PLoS One, 7 (2012)

e28568.

[21] N.A.S. Oliveira, B.R. Pinho, J. Pinto, P. Guedes de Pinho, J.M.A. Oliveira, Edaravone

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

Free Radic Biol Med, 217 (2024) 126-140.

[22] J. Hoyberghs, C. Bars, M. Ayuso, C. Van Ginneken, K. Foubert, S. Van Cruchten, DMSO

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

Assay, Front Toxicol, 3 (2021) 804033.

[23] R.F.O. Silva, B.R. Pinho, M.M. Santos, J.M.A. Oliveira, Disruptions of circadian rhythms,

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

toxicity assessment, Chemosphere, 305 (2022) 135449.

[24] B.R. Pinho, S.D. Reis, R.C. Hartley, M.P. Murphy, J.M.A. Oliveira, Mitochondrial

superoxide generation induces a parkinsonian phenotype in zebrafish and huntingtin

aggregation in human cells, Free Radic Biol Med, 130 (2019) 318-327.

[25] B.R. Pinho, M.M. Santos, A. Fonseca-Silva, P. Valentao, P.B. Andrade, J.M. Oliveira,

How mitochondrial dysfunction affects zebrafish development and cardiovascular function: an

in vivo model for testing mitochondria-targeted drugs, Br J Pharmacol, 169 (2013) 1072-1090.

[26] OECD, Test No. 236: Fish Embryo Acute Toxicity (FET) Test, (2013).

[27] C.B. Kimmel, W.W. Ballard, S.R. Kimmel, B. Ullmann, T.F. Schilling, Stages of

embryonic development of the zebrafish, Dev Dyn, 203 (1995) 253-310.

[28] R. Martinez, L. Navarro-Martin, C. Luccarelli, A.E. Codina, D. Raldua, C. Barata, R.

Tauler, B. Pina, Unravelling the mechanisms of PFOS toxicity by combining morphological

and transcriptomic analyses in zebrafish embryos, Sci Total Environ, 674 (2019) 462-471.

[29] N.A.S. Oliveira, B.R. Pinho, J.M.A. Oliveira, Swimming against ALS: How to model

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

148 (2023) 105138.

[30] B.R. Pinho, S.D. Reis, P. Guedes-Dias, A. Leitao-Rocha, C. Quintas, P. Valentao, P.B.

Andrade, M.M. Santos, J.M. Oliveira, Pharmacological modulation of HDAC1 and HDAC6 in

vivo in a zebrafish model: Therapeutic implications for Parkinson's disease, Pharmacol Res,

103 (2016) 328-339.

[31] J. Lee, D.W. Jung, W.H. Kim, J.I. Um, S.H. Yim, W.K. Oh, D.R. Williams, Development

of a highly visual, simple, and rapid test for the discovery of novel insulin mimetics in living

vertebrates, ACS Chem Biol, 8 (2013) 1803-1814.

[32] L. Wang, H. Kong, M. Jin, X. Li, R. Stoika, H. Lin, K. Liu, Synthesis of disaccharide

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

fluorescence-based technology, Org Biomol Chem, 18 (2020) 3563-3574.

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

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

Pharmacol, 193 (2017) 18-29.

[34] A. Eufrasio, C. Perrod, F.J. Ferreira, M. Duque, M. Galhardo, J. Bessa, In Vivo Reporter

Assays Uncover Changes in Enhancer Activity Caused by Type 2 Diabetes-Associated Single

Nucleotide Polymorphisms, Diabetes, 69 (2020) 2794-2805.

[35] N. Tiso, E. Moro, F. Argenton, Zebrafish pancreas development, Mol Cell Endocrinol,

312 (2009) 24-30.

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

as internal reference control for neuroscience research, Life Sci, 92 (2013) 747-751.

[37] J. Jumper, R. Evans, A. Pritzel, T. Green, M. Figurnov, O. Ronneberger, K.

Tunyasuvunakool, R. Bates, A. Zidek, A. Potapenko, A. Bridgland, C. Meyer, S.A.A. Kohl,

A.J. Ballard, A. Cowie, B. Romera-Paredes, S. Nikolov, R. Jain, J. Adler, T. Back, S. Petersen,

D. Reiman, E. Clancy, M. Zielinski, M. Steinegger, M. Pacholska, T. Berghammer, S.

Bodenstein, D. Silver, O. Vinyals, A.W. Senior, K. Kavukcuoglu, P. Kohli, D. Hassabis,

Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold, Nature, 596 (2021) 583-589.

[38] M. Varadi, S. Anyango, M. Deshpande, S. Nair, C. Natassia, G. Yordanova, D. Yuan, O.

Stroe, G. Wood, A. Laydon, A. Zidek, T. Green, K. Tunyasuvunakool, S. Petersen, J. Jumper,

E. Clancy, R. Green, A. Vora, M. Lutfi, M. Figurnov, A. Cowie, N. Hobbs, P. Kohli, G.

Kleywegt, E. Birney, D. Hassabis, S. Velankar, AlphaFold Protein Structure Database:

massively expanding the structural coverage of protein-sequence space with high-accuracy

models, Nucleic Acids Res, 50 (2022) D439-D444.

[39] E.F. Pettersen, T.D. Goddard, C.C. Huang, E.C. Meng, G.S. Couch, T.I. Croll, J.H. Morris,

T.E. Ferrin, UCSF ChimeraX: Structure visualization for researchers, educators, and

developers, Protein Sci, 30 (2021) 70-82.

[40] J.M. Axten, J.R. Medina, Y. Feng, A. Shu, S.P. Romeril, S.W. Grant, W.H. Li, D.A.

Heerding, E. Minthorn, T. Mencken, C. Atkins, Q. Liu, S. Rabindran, R. Kumar, X. Hong, A.

Goetz, T. Stanley, J.D. Taylor, S.D. Sigethy, G.H. Tomberlin, A.M. Hassell, K.M. Kahler,

L.M. Shewchuk, R.T. Gampe, 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, 55 (2012) 7193-7207.

[41] C. Chintha, A. Carlesso, A.M. Gorman, A. Samali, L.A. Eriksson, Molecular modeling

provides a structural basis for PERK inhibitor selectivity towards RIPK1, RSC Adv, 10 (2019)

367-375.

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

three-dimensional structures, Protein Sci, 10 (2001) 1470-1473.

[43] M.M. Rahman, T. Basta, J. Teng, M. Lee, B.T. Worrell, M.H.B. Stowell, R.E. Hibbs,

Structural mechanism of muscle nicotinic receptor desensitization and block by curare, Nat

Struct Mol Biol, 29 (2022) 386-394.

[44] L. Guzman, G. Besa, D. Linares, L. González, C. Pont, M. Bartolini, A. Haigis, J. Legradi,

D. Muñoz-Torrero, J. Gómez-Catalán, M. Barenys, Evaluation of the effects of

acetylcholinesterase inhibitors in the zebrafish touch-evoked response: quantitative vs.

qualitative assessment, Environ Sci Eur, 32 (2020) 12.

[45] A. Sumegi, Z. Hendrik, T. Gall, E. Felszeghy, K. Szakszon, P. Antal-Szalmas, L. Beke,

A. Papp, G. Mehes, J. Balla, G. Balla, 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,

21 (2020) 61.

[46] O. Rubio-Cabezas, A.M. Patch, J.A. Minton, S.E. Flanagan, E.L. Edghill, K. Hussain, A.

Balafrej, A. Deeb, C.R. Buchanan, I.G. Jefferson, A. Mutair, G. Neonatal Diabetes

International Collaborative, A.T. Hattersley, S. Ellard, Wolcott-Rallison syndrome is the most

common genetic cause of permanent neonatal diabetes in consanguineous families, J Clin

Endocrinol Metab, 94 (2009) 4162-4170.

[47] K. Iida, Y. Li, B.C. McGrath, A. Frank, D.R. Cavener, PERK eIF2 alpha kinase is required

to regulate the viability of the exocrine pancreas in mice, BMC Cell Biol, 8 (2007) 38.

[48] D. Aldrian, C. Bochdansky, A.M. Kavallar, C. Mayerhofer, A. Deeb, A. Habeb, A.

Romera Rabasa, A. Khadilkar, A. Ucar, B. Knoppke, D. Zafeiriou, M. Lang-Muritano, M.

Miqdady, S. Judmaier, V. McLin, V. Furdela, T. Muller, G.F. Vogel, Natural history of

Wolcott-Rallison syndrome: A systematic review and follow-up study, Liver Int, 44 (2024)

811-822.

[49] F. Zindler, F. Beedgen, D. Brandt, M. Steiner, D. Stengel, L. Baumann, T. Braunbeck,

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

of neurotoxicants with different modes of action, Ecotoxicol Environ Saf, 186 (2019) 109754.

[50] A.C. Roberts, J. Chornak, J.B. Alzagatiti, D.T. Ly, B.R. Bill, J. Trinkeller, K.C. Pearce,

R.C. Choe, C.S. Campbell, D. Wong, E. Deutsch, S. Hernandez, D.L. Glanzman, Rapid

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

14 (2019) e0214374.

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

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

Chemosphere, 317 (2023) 137874.

[52] J. Berger, T. Sztal, P.D. Currie, Quantification of birefringence readily measures the level

of muscle damage in zebrafish, Biochem Biophys Res Commun, 423 (2012) 785-788.

[53] C.M. Thornton, D.J. Carson, F.J. Stewart, Autopsy findings in the Wolcott-Rallison

syndrome, Pediatr Pathol Lab Med, 17 (1997) 487-496.

[54] J.A. Moreno, M. Halliday, C. Molloy, H. Radford, N. Verity, J.M. Axten, C.A. Ortori,

A.E. Willis, P.M. Fischer, D.A. Barrett, G.R. Mallucci, Oral treatment targeting the unfolded

protein response prevents neurodegeneration and clinical disease in prion-infected mice, Sci

Transl Med, 5 (2013) 206ra138.

[55] R. Cagnetta, H.H. Wong, C.K. Frese, G.R. Mallucci, J. Krijgsveld, C.E. Holt,

Noncanonical Modulation of the eIF2 Pathway Controls an Increase in Local Translation

during Neural Wiring, Mol Cell, 73 (2019) 474-489 e475.

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

M.J.M. Bertrand, 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, 24

(2017) 1100-1110.

[57] M. Mahameed, T. Wilhelm, O. Darawshi, A. Obiedat, W.S. Tommy, C. Chintha, T.

Schubert, A. Samali, E. Chevet, L.A. Eriksson, M. Huber, B. Tirosh, The unfolded protein

response modulators GSK2606414 and KIRA6 are potent KIT inhibitors, Cell Death Dis, 10

(2019) 300.

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

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

Discov, 8 (2022) 88.

[59] K.A. Hultman, N. Bahary, L.I. Zon, S.L. Johnson, Gene Duplication of the zebrafish kit

ligand and partitioning of melanocyte development functions to kit ligand a, PLoS Genet, 3

(2007) e17.

[60] D.J.M. Bergen, E. Kague, C.L. Hammond, Zebrafish as an Emerging Model for

Osteoporosis: A Primary Testing Platform for Screening New Osteo-Active Compounds, Front

Endocrinol (Lausanne), 10 (2019) 6.

[61] Y. Li, K. Iida, J. O'Neil, P. Zhang, S. Li, A. Frank, A. Gabai, F. Zambito, S.H. Liang, C.J.

Rosen, D.R. Cavener, PERK eIF2alpha kinase regulates neonatal growth by controlling the

expression of circulating insulin-like growth factor-I derived from the liver, Endocrinology,

144 (2003) 3505-3513.

[62] D. Feng, J. Wei, S. Gupta, B.C. McGrath, D.R. Cavener, Acute ablation of PERK results

in ER dysfunctions followed by reduced insulin secretion and cell proliferation, BMC Cell

Biol, 10 (2009) 61.

[63] W. Zhang, D. Feng, Y. Li, K. Iida, B. McGrath, D.R. Cavener, PERK EIF2AK3 control

of pancreatic beta cell differentiation and proliferation is required for postnatal glucose

homeostasis, Cell Metab, 4 (2006) 491-497.

[64] C.R. Sowers, R. Wang, R.A. Bourne, B.C. McGrath, J. Hu, S.C. Bevilacqua, J.C. Paton,

A.W. Paton, S. Collardeau-Frachon, M. Nicolino, D.R. Cavener, The protein kinase

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

endoplasmic reticulum chaperones, J Biol Chem, 293 (2018) 5134-5149.

[65] A. Welters, T. Meissner, K. Konrad, C. Freiberg, K. Warncke, S. Judmaier, O.

Kordonouri, M. Wurm, M. Papsch, G. Fitzke, S.C. Schmidt, S.R. Tittel, R.W. Holl, Diabetes

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

database, Orphanet J Rare Dis, 15 (2020) 100.

[66] J.B. Moss, P. Koustubhan, M. Greenman, M.J. Parsons, I. Walter, L.G. Moss,

Regeneration of the pancreas in adult zebrafish, Diabetes, 58 (2009) 1844-1851.

[67] H. Pisharath, J.M. Rhee, M.A. Swanson, S.D. Leach, M.J. Parsons, Targeted ablation of

beta cells in the embryonic zebrafish pancreas using E. coli nitroreductase, Mech Dev, 124

(2007) 218-229.

[68] S.N. Asl, R. Vakili, S. Vakili, F. Soheilipour, M. Hashemipour, S. Ghahramani, E. De

Franco, H. Yaghootkar, Wolcott-Rallison syndrome in Iran: a common cause of neonatal

diabetes, J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab, 32 (2019) 607-613.

[69] F. Longo, M. Mancini, P.L. Ibraheem, S. Aryal, C. Mesini, J.C. Patel, E. Penhos, N.

Rahman, M. Mamcarz, E. Santini, M.E. Rice, E. Klann, Cell-type-specific disruption of PERK-

eIF2alpha signaling in dopaminergic neurons alters motor and cognitive function, Mol

Psychiatry, 26 (2021) 6427-6450.

[70] R. Bejiqi, R. Retkoceri, N. Zeka, R. Bejiqi, S. Bejic, An Infant With Neonatal Diabetes

and Double Outlet Right Ventricle - Wolcott- Rallison syndrome, Med Arch, 72 (2018) 289-

291.

[71] D. Bournele, D. Beis, Zebrafish models of cardiovascular disease, Heart Fail Rev, 21

(2016) 803-813.

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

a More Efficient Drug Discovery Pipeline, Front Pharmacol, 9 (2018) 703.

A Global amino acid comparison

% of Identity of PERK homologues

B Comparison of vital* amino acids in catalytic domain

* 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 (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

i

GSK2606414 ⊣ PERK ⟶ eIF2α ⟶ p-eIF2α ⟶ ATF4 ⟶ CHOP

ii

iii p-eIF2α **iv** eIF2α **v** ATF4 **vi** CHOP

Figure 2

A Morphological defects

i

Live zebrafish with morphological defects at each time-point (% of 4 hpf)

#

GSK2606414 (µM): 0, 0.1, 0.3, 1, 3, 10

Time (hpf)

ii

Morphological defects at 76 hpf (% of live zebrafish at 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 (°)

GSK2606414 (µM)

C Body length

700 µm

Body length (% of control)

GSK2606414 (µM)

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

i – Head reflex

ii – Tail reflex

Reflexes (% of total)

Control ± SEM

dTC (mM)

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 live zebrafish at 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

ii Late: 76 hpf → 148 hpf

GFP area (% of control)
GSK (µM) 0 10

D *sst:mCherry (δ cell; endocrine)*

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

ii Late: 76 hpf → 148 hpf

mCherry area (% of control)
GSK (µM) 0 10

E *ela:mCherry* (exocrine)

i Early: 4 hpf → 148 hpf

ii Late: 76 hpf → 148 hpf

mCherry area (% of control)
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

iii 76 hpf

Control

10 µM GSK

200 µm

600 µm

B Heart beat analysis

i

ii

Atrio-ventricular coordination

Control

v
a

10 µM GSK

v
a

Control

10 µM GSK

1 sec.

Figure 7

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.