**The antimicrobial peptide Defensin cooperates with Tumour Necrosis**

**Factor to drive tumour cell death in *Drosophila***

Jean-Philippe Parvy[1]*, Yachuan Yu[1], Anna Dostalova[2], Shu Kondo[3], Alina

Kurjan[5], Philippe Bulet[4], Bruno Lemaitre[2], Marcos Vidal[1] and Julia B.

Cordero[1, 5]*

[1] CRUK Beatson Institute, Garscube Estate, Switchback Road, Glasgow, G61

1BD, UK

[2] Global Health Institute, School of Life Sciences, Ecole Polytechnique

Federale de Lausanne, Station 19, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

[3] Invertebrate Genetics Laboratory, Genetic Strains Research Center,

National Institute of Genetics, Mishima 411-8540, Japan

[4] Institute for Advanced Biosciences, CR University Grenoble Alpes, Inserm

U1209, CNRS UMR5309, Immunologie Analytique des Pathologies

Chroniques, Grenoble, France

[5] Institute of Cancer Sciences, University of Glasgow, Garscube Estate,

Switchback Road, Glasgow, G61 1QH, U.K

* Corresponding Authors: j.parvy@beatson.gla.ac.uk,

Julia.Cordero@glasgow.ac.uk

**Abstract**

Antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) are small cationic molecules best known as

mediators of the innate defence against microbial infection. While *in vitro* and

*ex vivo* evidence suggest AMPs' capacity to kill cancer cells, *in vivo*

demonstration of an anti-tumour role of endogenous AMPs is lacking. Using a

*Drosophila* model of tumourigenesis, we reveal a role for the AMP Defensin in

the control of tumour progression. Our results reveal that Tumour Necrosis

Factor mediates exposure of phosphatidylserine (PS), which makes tumour

cells selectively sensitive to the action of Defensin remotely secreted from

tracheal and fat tissues. Defensin binds tumour cells in PS-enriched areas,

provoking cell death and tumour regression. Altogether, our results provide

the first *in vivo* demonstration for a role of an endogenous AMP as an anti-

cancer agent, as well as a mechanism that explains tumour cell sensitivity to

the action of AMPs.

**Introduction**

Vast amount of evidence demonstrates the key role of systemic

immunity in tumour progression and patient outcome. Efforts to manipulate

the immune response to tumours are at the core of basic and translational

cancer research. In mammals and flies, tumourigenesis triggers inflammation

and activation of the immune system, leading to tumour cell death (Cordero et

al., 2010; Parameswaran and Patial, 2010; Parisi et al., 2014; Teng et al.,

2008). Tumour Necrosis Factor (TNF) is an important player in these

tumour/immune interactions and has pleiotropic effects on tumours, including

induction of cell death (Ham et al., 2016; Parameswaran and Patial, 2010).

This function is conserved in *Drosophila*, where the single TNF homolog Eiger

(Egr), produced by tumour-associated macrophages (TAMs), has been shown

to drive cell death of neoplastic tumours, generated in imaginal discs by the

loss of apico-basal complex components such as Disc large 1, Scribble or

Lethal giant larvae (Cordero et al., 2010; Parisi et al., 2014; Parvy et al.,

2018). Moreover, using *disc large 1 Drosophila* mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$ hereafter

referred to as *dlg*), we recently reported that tumour-derived Egr, acts on

haemocytes to activate Toll pathway in the *Drosophila* fat body, which was

necessary to mediate TNF-dependent tumour cell death (Parisi et al., 2014).

However, the mechanisms by which Toll signalling activation in immune

tissues executes tumour cell death remain unknown (Figure 1A).

In *Drosophila* as in mammals, Toll pathway is well known to play a

central role in the innate immune response to infection (Lemaitre et al., 1996).

Downstream effectors of the Toll pathway include antimicrobial peptides

(AMPs), which possess microbicidal activities against various pathogens.

They display potent antimicrobial activity *in vitro* by disrupting negatively-

charged microbial membranes. While intracellular activities have been

reported, many AMPs kill pathogens by inserting into the lipid bilayer and

disrupting the membrane integrity (Brogden, 2005). Host cells are instead

protected from AMP as they are positively charged and contain cholesterol

(Brender et al., 2012). *In vitro* studies have revealed AMPs capacity to kill

cancer cells (Deslouches and Di, 2017). However, whether this cancer-killing

activity is a natural function of AMPs is unknown, as there are no reports on

an *in viv*o paradigm addressing such question. Since the Toll pathway is

activated in *dlg* mutant tumour bearing larvae and is required for optimal TNF-

induced tumour cell death (Parisi et al., 2014), we hypothesised that AMPs

may be involved in this process.

Here we show that *Drosophila defensin* is induced in the fat body and

tracheal system of *dlg* mutant tumour bearing larvae. We find Defensin

consistently associated to dying tumour cells. Critically, systemic and tissue

specific knockdown of Defensin demonstrates a non-redundant role of the

AMP in controlling tumour growth through the induction of tumour cell death.

Anti-tumoural Defensin production relies on TNF-dependent activation of both

Toll and Imd pathway. Our results demonstrate that *dlg* mutant tumours

expose PS in response to haemocyte-derived TNF and that Defensin is

present in PS enriched area on the tumour surface. Finally, we find that lack

of TNF prevents tumour PS exposure and makes them insensitive to the

action of Defensin. Collectively, our results reveal an anti-tumoural role for

Defensin *in vivo* and provide insights into the molecular mechanisms, which

make tumours sensitive to the killing action of an endogenous AMP.

**Results**

***dlg* tumour bearing larvae express the AMP Defensin**

In order to assess expression of several AMPs we performed RT-

qPCR analysis on fat bodies dissected from wild type controls ($w^{1118}$) or *dlg*

mutant larvae (Figure 1B). Results showed consistent and statistically

significant upregulation of *defensin* in fat bodies of *dlg* larvae compared to

wild-type ones (Figure 1B). Other Toll-dependent AMPs display a trend to be

increased (*drosomycin* and *attacin A*), even though data was highly variable

amongst biological replicates, while other AMPs were not transcriptionally

regulated (*drosocyn*, *cecropin A1*) (Figure 1B). Interestingly, human β-

Defensin 1 displays anticancer activity *in vitro* (Bullard et al., 2008; Sun et al.,

2006), and deletion of human *defensin* genes appears prevalent in some

cancer types (Ye et al., 2018). This prompted us to explore the role of

*Drosophila* Defensin in *dlg* mutant tumours. Using *dlg* larvae reared on

antibiotics, we confirmed that *defensin* upregulation was independent of the

presence of microbes (Figure 1C). Moreover, larvae bearing *dlg* imaginal

discs tumours induced by RNAi (*en>UAS-dcr2; UAS-dlg-IR*) also displayed

increased *defensin* expression, confirming AMP gene induction as a

consequence of *dlg*-driven epithelial transformation rather than whole body

gene loss (Figure 1D). We conclude that Defensin, an AMP known for its

activity against microbes, is induced, in a sterile environment, by the presence

of tumours.

**Defensin restrains *dlg* tumour growth and promotes tumour cell death.**

We next hypothesized that Defensin may be an important mediator of

anti-tumour immunity *in vivo*. To test this hypothesis, we generated null

mutant alleles for the *defensin (def)* gene using the CRISPR/Cas9 system

(*def^{sk3}* and *def^{sk4}*) (Figure 1E) (Hanson et al., 2018). Survival analysis of *def^{sk3}*

flies confirmed that this AMP contribute to resist systemic infection to certain

Gram-positive bacteria (Figure supplement 1) (Levashina et al., 1995). To

evaluate the effect of Defensin on tumour development, we combined *def* and

*dlg* loss of function alleles. Compared to *dlg* mutant animals, *dlg;def* double

mutants displayed a significant increase in tumour size (Figure 2A). Tumour

growth is limited by apoptotic tumour cell death as revealed by Dcp1 staining

(Parisi et al., 2014). Interestingly, tumours from *dlg;def* double mutants display

a very strong decrease in apoptosis (Figure 2B-E'), suggesting that increased

tumour size in absence of Defensin is due to a decrease in tumour cell death.

This was further supported by the similar proliferation rates measured in *dlg*

and *dlg,def* mutant tumours as per quantification of anti-phophoHistone H3

staining (Figure supplement 2A-E'). Importantly, the effect of Def on tumour

size and cell death were still observed when *dlg* and *dlg,def* larvae were

reared in sterile conditions (Figure supplement 2F-J') and further confirmed

upon ubiquitous knock down of *def* using RNA interference (IR) (Figure 2F-J').

Furthermore, fat body overexpression of *def* significantly rescued tumour

volume and tumour cell death of *dlg;def$^{sk3}$* double mutant animals (Figure 2K

and L). Additionally, larval injection of a synthetic Defensin peptide increased

tumour cell death of *dlg* or *dlg;def$^{sk3}$* imaginal discs (Figure 2M), while it had

no effect on tissues from wild-type larvae, indicating that Defensin can

selectively promote cell death of tumour cells. Altogether, these results

demonstrate that Defensin is required to control *dlg*-dependent

tumourigenesis *in vivo* through induction of tumour cell death.

**Defensin remotely produced from immune tissues bind to tumour cells**

Having shown that Defensin restrict tumour growth, we sought to

determine the tissues that produced endogenous Defensin in the context of

tumour bearing. Previous studies have shown that Defensin is not produced

by imaginal discs or tumours (Bunker et al., 2015; Kulshammer et al., 2015).

In the context of infection, Defensin can be produced by the fat body as well

the tracheal and gut epithelium (Tzou Immunity 2000). We monitored *defensin*

expression by RT-qPCR in various immune tissues of tumour bearing

animals. We observed that the fat body, homologue to the mammalian liver

and adipose tissue, and the trachea, a network of tubes transporting oxygen

to cells that resembles the mammalian vasculature, were the main sources of

*defensin* in these animals (Figure 3A). This was also supported by Defensin

immunostaining, which detected AMP expression in the fat body (Figure 3B),

and tumour-associated (Figure 3C) and tumour-distant trachea (Figure 3D).

Transcript assessment upon targeted IR knock down of *defensin* in the

respective tissues further confirmed the various domains of endogenous gene

expression (Figure 3E and J). Importantly, knocking down *defensin*

expression specifically in the fat body or the trachea of *dlg* animals, resulted in

increased tumour size and decreased tumour cell death (Figure 3F-I' and K-

N') confirming the non-redundant functional requirement of *defensin* in both

tissues to efficiently promote tumour cell death.

To further investigate the possibility that Defensin produced by the fat

body and the trachea can specifically target tumour cells, we made use of an

inducible haemagglutinin (HA) tagged form of Defensin (*UAS-def-HA*). We

noticed leaky HA protein expression in the tracheal system of animals

carrying the *UAS-def-HA* construct only (Figure 4A and B), while no staining

was detected in tissues from wild type larvae (data not shown). Therefore,

expressing *UAS-def-HA* in the fat body using a Gal4 specific driver (*lpp>def-*

*HA*) resulted in detectable protein expression in both the trachea and the fat

body (Figure 4C and D). Strikingly, immunostaining revealed the presence of

Defensin-HA in transformed imaginal discs from *dlg* mutant animals (Figure

4E and E') but not in normal tissues from heterozygous animals (Figure 4F

and F').

Consistently, using anti-Defensin antibody, we observed Defensin

staining on *dlg* mutant tumour (Figure 4G-H'') but not in the wild-type discs

(Figure 4I). Interestingly, we predominantly observed Defensin bound to

tumour areas enriched with apoptotic cells (Figure 4H-H''). High-resolution

imaging showed Defensin enrichment at the membrane of these dying cells

(Figure 4J-J'').

Altogether, these results show that Defensin produced by the trachea

and fat body selectively binds tumour cells to target them for apoptosis.

**Toll and Imd pathway contribute to Defensin expression in *dlg* mutant**

**larvae**

*defensin* expression upon systemic infection relies on both Toll and

Imd pathways (Lemaitre et al., 1996; Leulier et al., 2000). While we previously

showed that Toll pathway activation in *dlg* mutant larvae is required to achieve

maximal tumour cell death (Parisi et al., 2014), the involvement of the Imd

pathway in tumour bearing animals was still elusive. To assess the

contribution of the Imd pathway to both *defensin* expression and tumour

burden, we analysed these two phenotypes in larvae deficient for the Imd-

pathway. We observed a 55-60% decrease in *defensin* expression in *dlg*

mutants carrying a loss of function allele affecting *imd* (*dlg;imd$^1$*) (Figure 5A)

or the gene encoding the downstream transcription factor Relish (*dlg;rel$^{E20}$*)

(Figure 5F). Consistently, analysis of tumour phenotypes revealed increased

tumour volume and decreased tumour cell death in *dlg;imd$^1$* and *dlg;rel$^{E20}$*

animals when compared with *dlg* counterparts (Figure 5B-E' and G-J').

Altogether, these data demonstrate that the Imd pathway is required for

*defensin* upregulation, impairment of tumour growth and induction of tumour

cell death in *dlg* mutant larvae.

Upon infection, AMP expression in the trachea exclusively relies on the

Imd pathway (Tzou et al., 2000). We therefore looked at *defensin* expression

and tumour phenotype in *dlg* mutant larvae where *imd* expression had been

knocked down specifically within tracheal cells (*dlg;btl>imd-IR*). In this setting,

*defensin* expression was significantly reduced in the whole larvae (Figure 6A).

Consistently, tumour volume was increased while tumour cell death was

decreased (Figure 6B-E') showing the requirement of Imd pathway in the

tracheal system to control tumour burden.

In the fat body, both Imd and Toll patways contribute to AMPs

expression during infection (Tzou et al., 2002). To evaluate the contribution of

Toll and Imd pathways in fat body in tumour bearing larvae, we monitored

*defensin* expression and tumour phenotype in *dlg* animals in which Toll or Imd

pathways have been selectively knocked down in the fat body. Knocking

down *myd88,* which encodes a common adaptor to Toll receptors (Imler and

Zheng, 2004), or *imd* in the fat body resulted in a significant decrease in

*defensin* expression (Figure 6F) and, consistently, increased tumour volume

and decreased tumour cell death (Figure 6G-K'). Moreover, concomitant

overexpression of *defensin* and *Myd88-IR* or *Imd-IR* in the fat body of *dlg*

larvae was sufficient to significantly rescue the tumour volume and tumour cell

death phenotypes resulting from fat body knockdown of *Myd88* or *Imd* in *dlg*

animals (Figure 6L-O).

We conclude that, in *dlg* mutant animals, Toll and Imd pathways have

non-redundant roles in restricting tumour growth and promoting tumour cell

death through the control of *defensin* expression. Importantly, forced Defensin

expression in an otherwise immune-compromised animal is sufficient to

reduce tumour growth and to promote tumour cell death.

**Defensin is enriched in tumour areas exposing phosphatidylserine**

AMPs targeting of pathogens, involves the recognition of negatively

charged molecules exposed on the cell surface (Yeaman and Yount, 2003). A

key question raised by our study is how Defensin can selectively bind and kill

tumour cells (Figure 4 and Figure 2M). Selective action of cationic AMP is

attributed to their ability to interact with negative charged membrane such as

those found in bacteria. We hypothesized that the membrane of tumour cells

from *dlg* mutant larvae might change their electrostatic properties, making

them sensitive to the action of Defensin. Phosphatidylserine (PS) is a

negatively charged phospholipid, normally restricted to the inner leaflet of the

cell membrane. However, PS can be exposed on the outer leaflet for example

in apoptotic cells, which tags these cells for phagocytosis (Birge et al., 2016;

Shklyar et al., 2013; Tung et al., 2013). Moreover, PS exposure has been

shown to occur independently of apoptosis in many cancer cell types (Riedl et

al., 2011). Therefore, we investigated whether PS externalisation could be a

factor allowing specific targeting of tumour cells by Defensin. Our data

revealed that *dlg* but not wild-type tissues, displayed high levels of Annexin V

staining (Figure 7A and B), indicating increased exposure of PS by *dlg*

tumours. We next looked at the ability of Defensin to specifically associate

with tumour cells exposing PS and found that Defensin localized in PS-

enriched areas on *dlg* tumours (Figure 7A-A''). Thus, Defensin produced by

immune responsive tissues binds specifically to tumour cells and this ability

correlated with the exposure of PS.

**The TNF homolog Eiger is required for PS exposure and Defensin anti-**

**tumoural activity.**

Previous studies have shown that circulating macrophage-like cells in

*Drosophila,* called haemocytes, bind to *dlg* mutant tumours and contribute to

cell death (Parisi et al., 2014). This process is mediated by the release of Egr

from haemocytes (Cordero et al., 2010; Parisi et al., 2014), which then

activates the JNK pathway in target cells to promote apoptosis (Igaki et al.,

2009). Moreover, Toll pathway–activation in tumour bearing animals also

requires Egr (Parisi et al., 2014). Accordingly, we found that *defensin*

upregulation observed in *dlg* animals was lost in *dlg;egr³* double mutants

(Figure 7C). We next tested whether PS exposure in tumours was dependent

on Egr, and observed an almost complete loss of cell-surface PS in *dlg;egr³*

tumours (Figure 7A, D and E). Therefore, Egr is required for PS exposure in

these tumours. We then analysed PS exposure in *dlg* mutant tumours, upon

specific *egr* knockdown in haemocytes (*dlg;hml>egr-IR*), and observed a

strong decrease in cell surface-exposed PS compared to control tumours

(*dlg;hml>ctrl-IR*) (Figure 7F-H).  This indicates that PS exposure in tumour

cells is likely triggered by the release of Egr from haemocytes.

Importantly, Egr-dependent signalling and PS exposure were intact in *dlg;def*

and *dlg;imd* mutants (Figure 7I-L and Figure supplement 3). This indicates

that Egr signalling and PS exposure precedes the action of Defensin in *dlg*

tumours. To further assess whether Egr was required for Defensin-induced

tumour cell death, we injected synthetic Defensin peptide into control, *dlg* or

*dlg;egr[3]* mutant larvae. As expected, Defensin injection was able to robustly

promote tumour cell death in *dlg* mutant tumours (Figure 7M). However,

Defensin was unable to affect tumours derived from Egr-deficient animals,

demonstrating the requirement of Egr for tumour cell death induced by

Defensin (Figure 7M).

**Discussion**

While the role of antimicrobial peptides in innate immune defense has been

well-recognized for decades (Bahar and Ren, 2013), recent reports revealed

potential additional physiological functions of AMPs. including aging and

neurodegeneration (Cao et al., 2014; Kounatidis et al., 2017; Lezi et al.,

2018), wound-healing (Chung et al., 2017; Tokumaru et al., 2005), resistance

to oxidative stress (Mergaert et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2011), immune signaling

(Tjabringa et al., 2003; van Wetering et al., 2002) and anti-cancer activity

(Deslouches and Di, 2017). However, due to the absence of AMP mutants,

most of these studies have relied on the use of exogenous sources of AMPs

or genetic modification of upstream regulators of AMP expression. Recently,

the use of loss of function alleles of *Drosophila* Diptericin (DptB), allowed to

establish a role for the AMP in long-term memory (Barajas-Azpeleta et al.,

2018). Pioneer work reporting systematic deletion of multiple AMPs in

*Drosophila*, opens the door for in-depth analysis of the endogenous functions

of these molecules (Hanson et al., 2018). Using such tools and a genetically

defined *in vivo* tumour model, our study demonstrates a role for Defensin in

the control of tumours and deciphers the molecular mechanism allowing

specific tumour cell targeting by the AMP. Collectively, our results suggest a model of tumour control in two steps: Firstly, the cellular immune response to tumours involves the binding of haemocytes to tumour cells and activation of TNF pathway leading to PS exposure (Figure 7N). This is followed by a humoral response achieved by the action of antimicrobial peptides remotely produced by the fat body and the trachea (Figure 7N). Thus, the two branches of *Drosophila* innate immunity contribute to tumour elimination.

**A role for a *Drosophila* AMP in tumour control**

Using mutants as well as ubiquitous or targeted knockdowns, our study reveals that Defensin is non-redundantly required to drive tumour cell death and restrict tumour growth in neoplastic tumours generated by loss the apico-basal determinant Dlg. This was reinforced by detection of Defensin on dying tumour cells as well as genetic rescue and injection experiments showing that Defensin can actively drive tumour cell death. Several *in vitro* studies in mammals have shown AMPs anti-tumoural potential (Deslouches and Di, 2017). Amongst these suggested anticancer peptides, Human β-Defensin 1 (hBD1) appears downregulated in 82% of prostate cancer and in 90% of renal clear cell carcinomas (Donald et al., 2003), and expression of hBD1 induces cell death in prostate and renal cancer cells *in vitro* (Bullard et al., 2008; Sun et al., 2006). Moreover, a recent report shows prevalent deletion of Human *defensin* gene cluster in some tumour types including prostate, lung and colorectal cancers, as well as a decrease overall survival in patients carrying these deletions (Ye et al., 2018). However, since the classification of a molecule as AMP is based on structural protein features, it is important to

mention that Human Defensins are not homologous of, but rather have

structural resemblances to Drosophila AMPs due to convergent evolution

(Shafee et al., 2017). Further studies are required to determine if anticancer

activity displayed by Defensins from different species is linked to their

structural properties.

As upon infection (Tzou et al., 2000), we show that the fat body and the

trachea are the main sources of Defensin in tumours bearing larvae.

Moreover, our results indicated that Defensin's maximal expression, and anti-

tumour properties rely on Imd and Toll pathways activation. As expected from

previous studies on anti-pathogenic immunity, Imd appears to play a critical

role in the tracheal system, while both Imd and Toll drive Defensin expression

in the fat body (Hoffmann and Reichhart, 2002; Tzou et al., 2002).

Consistently, overexpressing Defensin partially rescued the effect of Imd or

Toll knockdown on *dlg* tumours. However, Toll and Imd pathways are major

regulators of multiple AMPs in the *Drosophila* fat body. Then, it is conceivable

that AMPs other than Defensin may possess similar anti-tumoural activity. In

fact, a recent study in *Drosophila* shows that ectopic expression of several

antimicrobial peptides, including the Defensin, can increase cell death in a

haematopoietic tumour model (Araki et al., 2018). Authors also reported

activation of Toll and Imd pathways together with increased expression of

several AMPs in those tumour bearing animals. Together with our study, this

suggests a general anti-tumoural propertie of *Drosophila* AMPs.

**Defensin specifically targets tumour cells**

Importantly, we show that Defensin targets tumour cells for apoptosis

while sparing normal cells. As their human counterparts, we show that

*Drosophila* tumours can expose PS independently of cell death (Riedl et al.,

2011). Interestingly, an *in vitro* study showed selective anticancer activity of

some synthetic peptides derived from beetle Defensin against cancer cells

exposing PS (Iwasaki et al., 2009). A similar targeting mechanism has also

been proposed to explain temporin-1CEa or L-K6 anticancer activities towards

melanoma cells and breast cancer cells respectively (Wang et al., 2016;

Wang et al., 2017). PS is a mark of apoptotic cells, which is used as an "eat

me" signal by phagocytes (Shklyar et al., 2013; Tung et al., 2013). In

*Drosophila*, the phagocytic receptor Simu together with Draper contribute to

the elimination of apoptotic to the recognition of PS (Shklyar et al., 2013; Tung

et al., 2013). It would be interesting to test the role of these receptors in the

control of *dlg* tumour progression.

Our results indicate that PS exposure precedes Defensin action and is

not just an "eat-me" signal but likely contributes to changing the membrane of

tumour cells making them sensitive to the action of AMPs. It is tempting to

speculate that deleterious effect of AMPs observed upon aging or

neurodegeneration may involve a similar targeting mechanism of 'foreign-

looking' or unfit cells (Cao et al., 2013; Kounatidis et al., 2017; Lezi et al.,

2018). However, in this case, the immune system might rather accelerate

disease by promoting loss of important cell type.

Noteworthy, other negatively charged molecules enriched on tumour

surface such as heparan sulfates and O-glycosylated mucins may also

contribute to the targeting by AMPs (Hollingsworth and Swanson, 2004;

Knelson et al., 2014).

**Defensin action requires TNF**

TNF is a major player in the tumour microenvironment by exerting

pleiotropic effects on both the tumour and its surroundings (Ham et al., 2016;

Parameswaran and Patial, 2010). In our *dlg* mutant model, we observed that

defensin induction requires TNF supporting previous observations that

induction of innate immune response in tumour bearing animal relied on Egr

produced by the tumour (Parisi et al., 2014). Indeed, Toll activation in the fat

body has been proposed to be a consequence of tumour-derived TNF that

drives haemocyte proliferation leading to an increase in Toll ligand Spatzle

(Parisi et al., 2014). Whether Imd pathway is also indirectly activated by the

changes in immune cell activity in response to tumour or by alternative

mechanisms remains an open question.

Our results show that haemocyte-derived TNF is required for PS

exposure by the tumour, a key process for tumour targeting by Defensin.

Consistently, haemocyte-derived TNF is shown to drive cell death in *dlg*

mutant tumours (Parisi et al., 2014). The precise molecular mechanisms

driving PS exposure downstream of TNF remain unknown. However,

haemocyte-derived TNF, through TNF receptor, activates JNK pathway,

which triggers many changes in tumour cells including apoptosis (Igaki et al.,

2002; Moreno et al., 2002), ROS production (Fogarty et al., 2016;

Santabarbara-Ruiz et al., 2015), loss of cell polarity (Zhu et al., 2010),

modification of extracellular matrix (Uhlirova and Bohmann, 2006),

proliferation and cell migration (Beaucher et al., 2007; Igaki et al., 2006;

Pastor-Pareja et al., 2004; Srivastava et al., 2007). Thus, TNF might also

sensitize cells through activation of the JNK pathway (Cordero et al., 2010)

providing, in addition to PS exposure, a secondary sensitization of tumour

cells to the action of the AMP. Further studies are needed to explore a

potential link between JNK activation and PS exposure since pleiotropic

effects of JNK may drive PS exposure downstream of TNF.

Another consequence of TNF-dependent JNK activation in tumours is

the increased expression of matrix metalloproteases (Mmps) by tumour cells

(Uhlirova and Bohmann, 2006). Importantly, we show that Mmp-1 induction

and then JNK pathway activation are still present in tumour from larvae

devoided of Defensin. This demonstrates that TNF signalling acts upstream of

Defensin. Mmps degrade the basal membrane facilitating metastasis of

primary tumour cells (Beaucher et al., 2007; Pastor-Pareja et al., 2004;

Srivastava et al., 2007). Interestingly, a study reported that human Mmp-7 can

cleave immature Defensins, promoting their activation (Wilson et al., 1999;

Wilson et al., 2009). Indeed, the pro-domain present in AMPs is thought to

keep their *in vivo* activity silent, allowing local activation of AMP upon

cleavage. While the mechanisms of *Drosophila* Defensin pro-domain

cleavage remain unknown, it would be interesting to explore whether the

changes in the tumour microenvironment could also affect Defensin

activation.

In conclusion, our study provides the first direct *in vivo* demonstration of the

role of an endogenous AMP as an anti-cancer agent in *Drosophila*. Our data

points to a conserved mechanism of tumour control by AMPs, a potent arm of

the innate immune system. Importantly, we identify cellular features within

tumours, which may be predictive of their sensitivity to be targeted by AMPs.

This study provides a new paradigm to decipher the molecular mechanisms

influencing anti-tumoural functions of an AMP, which may extend to other

non-canonical roles of AMPs, such as in ageing, long-term memory and

wound healing. Moreover, together with the new genetic tools allowing

targeting of all *Drosophila* AMPs (Hanson et al., 2018), our study establishes

new bases to explore *in vivo* a potential important natural mechanism of

defence against tumours.

**Material and Methods**

***Drosophila* housekeeping and rearing**

Flies were reared at 25°C under 12h/12h light/dark cycles on standard

oatmeal and molasses medium (Fernandez-Ayala et al., 2009). Details on fly

strains used in this study are presented in Table supplement 1 and detailed

genotypes are included in corresponding figure legends.

For assessment of tumour volume and tumour cell death, flies were

transferred to medium embryo collection cages and allowed to lay eggs for 8h

at room temperature (RT) on agar/grape juice plates (2.1% agar, 25% grape

juice, 1.25% sucrose, 0.2% methyl 4-hydroxybenzoate) supplemented with

yeast paste. Plates were kept at 25°C until hatching. 200 larvae hatched

within a 4h time window were collected and transferred to rearing bottles

containing 45mL of fly food to avoid any developmental delay and/or

starvation effects due to overcrowding conditions. The tumour phenotype was

analysed close to the normal developmental time, i.e. 7 days after hatching.

Tumours were dissected and stained for further analysis (see below).

**Generation of *defensin* mutants**

*def*<sup>sk3</sup> and *def*<sup>sk4</sup> mutants were generated using CRISPR/cas9

technology (Hanson et al., 2018). Mutants were isogenized through

backcrosses with a $w^{1118}$ *iso* line as previously described in Ferreiera-Teixeira

et al, 2014.

**Survival assays**

Survival of *def*<sup>SK3</sup> animals was compared to wild type controls

(isogenised background, *iso*). Male flies (5-7 days old) were pricked in the

thorax with a needle dipped in a concentrated pellet of fresh overnight

bacterial culture. Infected flies were kept at 29°C. *Listeria innocua* was

cultured in Brain heart infusion medium at 37°C and used at optical density of

200nm ($OD_{600}$). *Erwinia carotovora carotovora 15* was cultured in Luria-

Bertani broth at 29°C and used at $OD_{600}$ 200. Experiments were repeated

three times independently and one representative experiment is shown.

**Immunohistochemistry**

Tissues were dissected in Phosphate Buffer Saline (PBS) and fixed for

20min in 4% formaldehyde. Fat body samples were fixed for 30min using the

same protocol. Tissues were washed three times in PBS containing 1% of

Triton-X100 (PBT) and incubated overnight at 4°C with primary antibodies.

Tissues were washed 5 times in PBT and incubated for 2h at RT with

secondary antibodies and 4',6-Diamidine-2′-phenylindole dihydrochloride

(DAPI, Sigma) (1µg/mL). After three washes in PBT, tissues were mounted in

Vectashield (Vector Laboratories, Inc.) using Secured-Seal spacers (Thermo

Fisher Scientific).

The following primary antibodies and corresponding dilutions were

used: rabbit anti-Dcp1 (1/100), rabbit anti-phosphoHistone H3 (ser10 and

ser28 mixed, 1/100) and mouse anti-HA (1/1000) (Cell Signalling

Technology); mouse anti-Mmp1 (1/10) (Developmental Studies Hybrydoma

Bank, 3B8D12); chicken anti-GFP (1/4000) Abcam) and guinae pig anti-

Defensin (1/100) (Kind gift from Dahua Chen, (Ji et al., 2014)). Secondary

goat antibodies were Alexa Fluor® 488nm or 594nm (Invitrogen) conjugated

and were used at 1/500 dilution.

Confocal images were captured using a Zeiss 710 or Zeiss 880 with

Airyscan confocal microscope and processed with Fiji 2.0.0 or Adobe

Photoshop C.S5.1.

**Quantification of tumour volume and tumour cell death**

For analysing tumour phenotype, images were acquired using optimal

slice parameter and 12bits using a Zeiss 710 confocal microscope.

Quantifications were made as previously described (Parisi et al., 2014).

Briefly, we used Volocity 3D imaging analysis software (Perkin Elmer) to

quantify the total volume of tumour identified by DAPI staining and cell death

visualised with anti-Dcp1 staining. When haltere or leg discs tumours were

still associated with the wing disc, they were not considered for quantification.

Quantifications were done in at least three independent biological replicates

for each genetic setting. Single representative experiments are presented

except for *dlg;def* double mutant rescue experiments (Figure 1L-M) for which

replicates are pooled due to the few larvae available. In all cases the

difference between control and mutant tumour were strongly reproducible

between replicates.

**Sterile rearing conditions**

To rule out any effect of infection on the tumour phenotypes,

*Drosophila* larvae were reared on standard food supplemented with penicillin

and streptomycin (100 IU/ml and 100 mg/ml, respectively) (Figure 1A, Figure

supplement 3A-E' and Figure supplement 4G).

**qRT-PCR analysis**

Total RNA from 7 to 10 whole larvae or tissues collected from 10 to 20

larvae (10 larvae for fat body, 20 larvae for trachea) was extracted using

TRIzol (Thermo Fisher Scientific), according to the manufacturer's

instructions. RNA was treated with Turbo DNA free Kit (Life Technologies

LTD) and RNA concentration and quality were monitored using a Nanodrop

(Thermo Fisher Scientific). The same amount of total RNA (1µg for whole

larvae and fat body or 100ng for trachea) was used to perform the three

independent reverse-transcriptions using the High-Capacity cDNA Reverse

Transcription Kit (Applied Biosystems). cDNAs were pooled and qPCR was

performed using PerfeCTa SYBR green (Quanta Bio), following the

manufacturer's instructions. cDNA amplification was monitored with Applied

Biosystems 7500 fast instruments. Serial 10-fold dilutions of an external

standard were used to produce a standard curve, and RNA samples were

included to control for the absence of DNA contamination. *rpl32* expression

was used to normalize expression levels of target genes. Data was analysed

using the Ct method ($2^{-\Delta\Delta ct}$). All qPCR experiments were carried out on three

to seven independent biological replicates (see figure legends for details) and,

larvae were sampled from the same bottle used to analyse the tumour

phenotype. GraphPad Prism7 software was used for graphical representation

and statistical analysis. Primer targets and sequences are presented in Table

supplement 2.

**PCR amplification of genomic DNA**

To verify the sequence of *def*^*sk3*^ and *def*^*sk4*^ mutants, genomic DNA was

extracted from single flies by grinding whole animals with a 200µL pipette tip

containing 50µL of squishing buffer (10mM Tris-HCl pH 8.2, 1mM EDTA,

25mM NaCl, 200µg proteinase K) followed by incubation at 37°C for 30min.

Proteinase K was heat-inactivated at 95°C for 2min. 1µL of genomic DNA was

used for PCR amplification using PfuUltra II Fusion DNA Polymerase (Agilent)

(for primers see Table supplement 2) and Eppendorf Mastercycler Ep

Gradient Thermal Cycler.

**Annexin V staining and quantification**

Tumours were dissected in PBS and incubated in Annexin V binding

buffer (Fisher Scientific) containing 5% of Alexa Fluor (488nm or 568nm)

conjugated Annexin V (Life Technologies LTD) for 10min. Tissues were

washed quickly in Annexin V binding buffer and fixed in 4% formaldehyde for

20min. Immunostaining, mounting and imaging were then carried out as

described above.

We used Fiji 2.0.0 software to quantify Annexin V staining at the

tumour surface. Maximal Z-projection of whole tumours were generated and

the Colour Threshold tool was then used to detect the red pixels that

represented Annexin V staining at the surface of tumours. The hue slider was

set to include only the red signal, and the brightness slider was adjusted to

exclude any background signal. This area was then selected and measured in

pixels.

**Synthetic Defensin production and injections**

The                mature                Defensin                peptide

(ATCDLLSKWNWNHTACAGHCIAKGFKGGYCNDKAVCVCRN)                was

synthesised (over 90% purity) and the purity controlled by Genepep using

Ultra Performance Liquid Chromatography/ Mass Spectrometry. We

subsequently compared the integrity of synthetic Defensin with authentic

Defensin purified from *Drosophila* hemolymph using two complementary

approaches, namely Matrix-Assisted Laser Desorption/Ionization-Mass

Spectrometry (MALDI-MS) for molecular mass determination and trypsin

digestion followed by nanoLiquid Chromatography/Electrospray Ionization

tandem Mass Spectroscopy (nano*LC/ESI MS/MS*) for molecular integrity

confirmation. Those analyses confirmed the similar mass between natural and

synthetic Defensin (respectively provided by Bulet EIRL and Genepep) as well

the presence of disulphide bonds within synthetic Def, demonstrating it is the

mature peptide (Data not shown).

For injection experiments, larvae were collected, washed three times in

cold sterile PBS and injected on a fly pad (Flystuff-SLS UK) upon $CO_2$

anaesthesia using Nanoject II and glass capillaries 3.5 inch (Drummond).

Larvae were injected with 69nL of PBS containing 7.5nmol of synthetic

Defensin or 69nL of PBS only as control. Larvae were then gently transferred

into agar/grape juice plates and kept at 25°C. Tumours were dissected 4h

after injection and stained for visualization of nuclei and tumour cell death as

describe above.

**Statistical analyses**

All data are presented as mean ± SD and n values are indicated in the

figure legends. Statistical analyses were carried out using GraphPad Prism7

software and only significant differences are indicated in dot-plots. Survival

upon infection was analysed using Log-rank test. qPCR data were analysed

using unpaired t-test with a two-tailed p value. Tumour volume and tumour

cell death comparing 2 samples were analysed using Mann-Whitney test with

a two-tailed p value and the one comparing 3 genotypes were analysed using

One-way ANOVA followed by Turkey's multiple comparisons test. Tumour

volume from injected larvae was analysed using Two-way ANOVA followed by

Turkey's multiple comparisons test and only significant statistical differences

between ctrl and Defensin injected larvae for each genotype tested are

indicated.

**Acknowledgments:** We would like to thank Dr. Dahua Chen for the anti-
Defensin antibody, the Vienna *Drosophila* Resource Centre and the
Bloomington *Drosophila* Stock Centre for fly stocks, and Dr. Sébastien Voisin
for his critical contribution in mass spectrometry analyses. JPP and YY are
supported by Cancer Research UK core funding through the CRUK Beatson
Institute (A17196). JBC is a Sir Henry Dale Fellow jointly funded by the
Wellcome Trust and the Royal Society (grant number 104103/Z/14/Z). *In*
*memory of Marcos Vidal (1974-2016).*

**Author contributions:** MV initiated this project. JPP performed most of the
experiments in this study; YY and AK provided technical assistance; AD
assayed fly survival upon infection; SK and BL generated the *defensin* mutant
flies; PB analysed the quality of synthetic Def; JPP and JBC designed
experiments and analysed the data; BL provided important insights into AMPs
and *Drosophila* immunity; JPP, PB, BL and JBC wrote the paper; JBC
directed the study.

**Competing interests:** Authors declare no competing interests.

**Data and material availability:** All data and materials supporting the findings
of this study are available from the corresponding authors upon request.

## References

**References**

Araki, M., Awane, R., Sato, T., Ohkawa, Y., and Inoue, Y. (2018). Anti-tumor effects
of antimicrobial peptides, targets of the innate immune system, against
hematopoietic tumors in Drosophila mxc mutants. BioRxiv.
Bahar, A.A., and Ren, D. (2013). Antimicrobial peptides. Pharmaceuticals (Basel)
*6*, 1543-1575.
Barajas-Azpeleta, R., Wu, J., Gill, J., Welte, R., Seidel, C., McKinney, S., Dissel, S., and
Si, K. (2018). Antimicrobial peptides modulate long-term memory. PLoS Genet
*14*, e1007440.
Beaucher, M., Hersperger, E., Page-McCaw, A., and Shearn, A. (2007). Metastatic
ability of Drosophila tumors depends on MMP activity. Dev Biol *303*, 625-634.
Birge, R.B., Boeltz, S., Kumar, S., Carlson, J., Wanderley, J., Calianese, D., Barcinski,
M., Brekken, R.A., Huang, X., Hutchins, J.T.*, et al.* (2016). Phosphatidylserine is a
global immunosuppressive signal in efferocytosis, infectious disease, and cancer.
Cell Death Differ *23*, 962-978.
Brender, J.R., McHenry, A.J., and Ramamoorthy, A. (2012). Does cholesterol play a
role in the bacterial selectivity of antimicrobial peptides? Front Immunol *3*, 195.
Brogden, K.A. (2005). Antimicrobial peptides: pore formers or metabolic
inhibitors in bacteria? Nat Rev Microbiol *3*, 238-250.
Bullard, R.S., Gibson, W., Bose, S.K., Belgrave, J.K., Eaddy, A.C., Wright, C.J., Hazen-
Martin, D.J., Lage, J.M., Keane, T.E., Ganz, T.A.*, et al.* (2008). Functional analysis of
the host defense peptide Human Beta Defensin-1: new insight into its potential
role in cancer. Mol Immunol *45*, 839-848.
Bunker, B.D., Nellimoottil, T.T., Boileau, R.M., Classen, A.K., and Bilder, D. (2015).
The transcriptional response to tumorigenic polarity loss in Drosophila. Elife *4*.
Cao, J., Ni, J., Ma, W., Shiu, V., Milla, L.A., Park, S., Spletter, M.L., Tang, S., Zhang, J.,
Wei, X.*, et al.* (2014). Insight into insulin secretion from transcriptome and
genetic analysis of insulin-producing cells of Drosophila. Genetics *197*, 175-192.
Cao, Y., Chtarbanova, S., Petersen, A.J., and Ganetzky, B. (2013). Dnr1 mutations
cause neurodegeneration in Drosophila by activating the innate immune
response in the brain. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *110*, E1752-1760.
Chung, E.M.C., Dean, S.N., Propst, C.N., Bishop, B.M., and van Hoek, M.L. (2017).
Komodo dragon-inspired synthetic peptide DRGN-1 promotes wound-healing of
a mixed-biofilm infected wound. NPJ Biofilms Microbiomes *3*, 9.
Cordero, J.B., Macagno, J.P., Stefanatos, R.K., Strathdee, K.E., Cagan, R.L., and Vidal,
M. (2010). Oncogenic Ras diverts a host TNF tumor suppressor activity into
tumor promoter. Dev Cell *18*, 999-1011.
Deslouches, B., and Di, Y.P. (2017). Antimicrobial peptides with selective
antitumor mechanisms: prospect for anticancer applications. Oncotarget.
Donald, C.D., Sun, C.Q., Lim, S.D., Macoska, J., Cohen, C., Amin, M.B., Young, A.N.,
Ganz, T.A., Marshall, F.F., and Petros, J.A. (2003). Cancer-specific loss of beta-
defensin 1 in renal and prostatic carcinomas. Lab Invest *83*, 501-505.
Fernandez-Ayala, D.J., Sanz, A., Vartiainen, S., Kemppainen, K.K., Babusiak, M.,
Mustalahti, E., Costa, R., Tuomela, T., Zeviani, M., Chung, J.*, et al.* (2009).
Expression of the Ciona intestinalis alternative oxidase (AOX) in Drosophila
complements defects in mitochondrial oxidative phosphorylation. Cell Metab *9*,
449-460.

Fogarty, C.E., Diwanji, N., Lindblad, J.L., Tare, M., Amcheslavsky, A., Makhijani, K.,
Bruckner, K., Fan, Y., and Bergmann, A. (2016). Extracellular Reactive Oxygen
Species Drive Apoptosis-Induced Proliferation via Drosophila Macrophages. Curr
Biol *26*, 575-584.
Ham, B., Fernandez, M.C., D'Costa, Z., and Brodt, P. (2016). The diverse roles of
the TNF axis in cancer progression and metastasis. Trends Cancer Res *11*, 1-27.
Hanson, M.A., Dostalova, A., Ceroni, C., Poidevin, M., Kondo, S., and Lemaitre, B.
(2018). Synergy and remarkable specificity of antimicrobial peptides in vivo
using a systematic knockout approach. BioRxiv.
Hoffmann, J.A., and Reichhart, J.M. (2002). Drosophila innate immunity: an
evolutionary perspective. Nat Immunol *3*, 121-126.
Hollingsworth, M.A., and Swanson, B.J. (2004). Mucins in cancer: protection and
control of the cell surface. Nat Rev Cancer *4*, 45-60.
Igaki, T., Kanda, H., Yamamoto-Goto, Y., Kanuka, H., Kuranaga, E., Aigaki, T., and
Miura, M. (2002). Eiger, a TNF superfamily ligand that triggers the Drosophila
JNK pathway. EMBO J *21*, 3009-3018.
Igaki, T., Pagliarini, R.A., and Xu, T. (2006). Loss of cell polarity drives tumor
growth and invasion through JNK activation in Drosophila. Curr Biol *16*, 1139-
1146.
Igaki, T., Pastor-Pareja, J.C., Aonuma, H., Miura, M., and Xu, T. (2009). Intrinsic
tumor suppression and epithelial maintenance by endocytic activation of
Eiger/TNF signaling in Drosophila. Dev Cell *16*, 458-465.
Imler, J.L., and Zheng, L. (2004). Biology of Toll receptors: lessons from insects
and mammals. J Leukoc Biol *75*, 18-26.
Iwasaki, T., Ishibashi, J., Tanaka, H., Sato, M., Asaoka, A., Taylor, D., and
Yamakawa, M. (2009). Selective cancer cell cytotoxicity of enantiomeric 9-mer
peptides derived from beetle defensins depends on negatively charged
phosphatidylserine on the cell surface. Peptides *30*, 660-668.
Ji, S., Sun, M., Zheng, X., Li, L., Sun, L., Chen, D., and Sun, Q. (2014). Cell-surface
localization of Pellino antagonizes Toll-mediated innate immune signalling by
controlling MyD88 turnover in Drosophila. Nat Commun *5*, 3458.
Knelson, E.H., Nee, J.C., and Blobe, G.C. (2014). Heparan sulfate signaling in
cancer. Trends Biochem Sci *39*, 277-288.
Kounatidis, I., Chtarbanova, S., Cao, Y., Hayne, M., Jayanth, D., Ganetzky, B., and
Ligoxygakis, P. (2017). NF-kappaB Immunity in the Brain Determines Fly
Lifespan in Healthy Aging and Age-Related Neurodegeneration. Cell Rep *19*, 836-
848.
Kulshammer, E., Mundorf, J., Kilinc, M., Frommolt, P., Wagle, P., and Uhlirova, M.
(2015). Interplay among Drosophila transcription factors Ets21c, Fos and Ftz-F1
drives JNK-mediated tumor malignancy. Dis Model Mech *8*, 1279-1293.
Lemaitre, B., Nicolas, E., Michaut, L., Reichhart, J.M., and Hoffmann, J.A. (1996).
The dorsoventral regulatory gene cassette spatzle/Toll/cactus controls the
potent antifungal response in Drosophila adults. Cell *86*, 973-983.
Leulier, F., Rodriguez, A., Khush, R.S., Abrams, J.M., and Lemaitre, B. (2000). The
Drosophila caspase Dredd is required to resist gram-negative bacterial infection.
EMBO Rep *1*, 353-358.
Levashina, E.A., Ohresser, S., Bulet, P., Reichhart, J.M., Hetru, C., and Hoffmann, J.A.
(1995). Metchnikowin, a novel immune-inducible proline-rich peptide from

Drosophila with antibacterial and antifungal properties. Eur J Biochem *233*, 694-
700.

Lezi, E., Zhou, T., Koh, S., Chuang, M., Sharma, R., Pujol, N., Chisholm, A.D., Eroglu,
C., Matsunami, H., and Yan, D. (2018). An Antimicrobial Peptide and Its Neuronal
Receptor Regulate Dendrite Degeneration in Aging and Infection. Neuron *97*,
125-138 e125.

Mergaert, P., Kikuchi, Y., Shigenobu, S., and Nowack, E.C.M. (2017). Metabolic
Integration of Bacterial Endosymbionts through Antimicrobial Peptides. Trends
Microbiol *25*, 703-712.

Moreno, E., Yan, M., and Basler, K. (2002). Evolution of TNF signaling
mechanisms: JNK-dependent apoptosis triggered by Eiger, the Drosophila
homolog of the TNF superfamily. Curr Biol *12*, 1263-1268.

Parameswaran, N., and Patial, S. (2010). Tumor Necrosis Factor-α Signaling in
Macrophages. Crit Rev Eukaryot Gene Expr *20*, 87-103.

Parisi, F., Stefanatos, R.K., Strathdee, K., Yu, Y., and Vidal, M. (2014). Transformed
epithelia trigger non-tissue-autonomous tumor suppressor response by
adipocytes via activation of Toll and Eiger/TNF signaling. Cell Rep *6*, 855-867.

Parvy, J.P., Hodgson, J.A., and Cordero, J.B. (2018). Drosophila as a Model System
to Study Nonautonomous Mechanisms Affecting Tumour Growth and Cell Death.
Biomed Res Int *2018*, 7152962.

Pastor-Pareja, J.C., Grawe, F., Martin-Blanco, E., and Garcia-Bellido, A. (2004).
Invasive cell behavior during Drosophila imaginal disc eversion is mediated by
the JNK signaling cascade. Dev Cell *7*, 387-399.

Riedl, S., Rinner, B., Asslaber, M., Schaider, H., Walzer, S., Novak, A., Lohner, K.,
and Zweytick, D. (2011). In search of a novel target - phosphatidylserine exposed
by non-apoptotic tumor cells and metastases of malignancies with poor
treatment efficacy. Biochim Biophys Acta *1808*, 2638-2645.

Santabarbara-Ruiz, P., Lopez-Santillan, M., Martinez-Rodriguez, I., Binagui-Casas,
A., Perez, L., Milan, M., Corominas, M., and Serras, F. (2015). ROS-Induced JNK
and p38 Signaling Is Required for Unpaired Cytokine Activation during
Drosophila Regeneration. PLoS Genet *11*, e1005595.

Shafee, T.M., Lay, F.T., Phan, T.K., Anderson, M.A., and Hulett, M.D. (2017).
Convergent evolution of defensin sequence, structure and function. Cell Mol Life
Sci *74*, 663-682.

Shklyar, B., Levy-Adam, F., Mishnaevski, K., and Kurant, E. (2013). Caspase
activity is required for engulfment of apoptotic cells. Mol Cell Biol *33*, 3191-3201.

Srivastava, A., Pastor-Pareja, J.C., Igaki, T., Pagliarini, R., and Xu, T. (2007).
Basement membrane remodeling is essential for Drosophila disc eversion and
tumor invasion. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *104*, 2721-2726.

Sun, C.Q., Arnold, R., Fernandez-Golarz, C., Parrish, A.B., Almekinder, T., He, J., Ho,
S.M., Svoboda, P., Pohl, J., Marshall, F.F*., et al.* (2006). Human beta-defensin-1, a
potential chromosome 8p tumor suppressor: control of transcription and
induction of apoptosis in renal cell carcinoma. Cancer Res *66*, 8542-8549.

Teng, M.W., Swann, J.B., Koebel, C.M., Schreiber, R.D., and Smyth, M.J. (2008).
Immune-mediated dormancy: an equilibrium with cancer. J Leukoc Biol *84*, 988-
993.

Tjabringa, G.S., Aarbiou, J., Ninaber, D.K., Drijfhout, J.W., Sorensen, O.E.,
Borregaard, N., Rabe, K.F., and Hiemstra, P.S. (2003). The antimicrobial peptide
LL-37 activates innate immunity at the airway epithelial surface by

transactivation of the epidermal growth factor receptor. J Immunol *171*, 6690-
6696.

Tokumaru, S., Sayama, K., Shirakata, Y., Komatsuzawa, H., Ouhara, K., Hanakawa,
Y., Yahata, Y., Dai, X., Tohyama, M., Nagai, H.*, et al.* (2005). Induction of
keratinocyte migration via transactivation of the epidermal growth factor
receptor by the antimicrobial peptide LL-37. J Immunol *175*, 4662-4668.

Tung, T.T., Nagaosa, K., Fujita, Y., Kita, A., Mori, H., Okada, R., Nonaka, S., and
Nakanishi, Y. (2013). Phosphatidylserine recognition and induction of apoptotic
cell clearance by Drosophila engulfment receptor Draper. J Biochem *153*, 483-
491.

Tzou, P., De Gregorio, E., and Lemaitre, B. (2002). How Drosophila combats
microbial infection: a model to study innate immunity and host-pathogen
interactions. Curr Opin Microbiol *5*, 102-110.

Tzou, P., Ohresser, S., Ferrandon, D., Capovilla, M., Reichhart, J.M., Lemaitre, B.,
Hoffmann, J.A., and Imler, J.L. (2000). Tissue-specific inducible expression of
antimicrobial peptide genes in Drosophila surface epithelia. Immunity *13*, 737-
748.

Uhlirova, M., and Bohmann, D. (2006). JNK- and Fos-regulated Mmp1 expression
cooperates with Ras to induce invasive tumors in Drosophila. EMBO J *25*, 5294-
5304.

van Wetering, S., Mannesse-Lazeroms, S.P., van Sterkenburg, M.A., and Hiemstra,
P.S. (2002). Neutrophil defensins stimulate the release of cytokines by airway
epithelial cells: modulation by dexamethasone. Inflamm Res *51*, 8-15.

Wang, C., Chen, Y.W., Zhang, L., Gong, X.G., Zhou, Y., and Shang, D.J. (2016).
Melanoma cell surface-expressed phosphatidylserine as a therapeutic target for
cationic anticancer peptide, temporin-1CEa. J Drug Target *24*, 548-556.

Wang, C., Dong, S., Zhang, L., Zhao, Y., Huang, L., Gong, X., Wang, H., and Shang, D.
(2017). Cell surface binding, uptaking and anticancer activity of L-K6, a
lysine/leucine-rich peptide, on human breast cancer MCF-7 cells. Sci Rep *7*, 8293.

Wilson, C.L., Ouellette, A.J., Satchell, D.P., Ayabe, T., Lopez-Boado, Y.S., Stratman,
J.L., Hultgren, S.J., Matrisian, L.M., and Parks, W.C. (1999). Regulation of intestinal
alpha-defensin activation by the metalloproteinase matrilysin in innate host
defense. Science *286*, 113-117.

Wilson, C.L., Schmidt, A.P., Pirila, E., Valore, E.V., Ferri, N., Sorsa, T., Ganz, T., and
Parks, W.C. (2009). Differential Processing of {alpha}- and {beta}-Defensin
Precursors by Matrix Metalloproteinase-7 (MMP-7). J Biol Chem *284*, 8301-8311.

Ye, Z., Dong, H., Li, Y., Ma, T., Huang, H., Leong, H.S., Eckel-Passow, J., Kocher, J.A.,
Liang, H., and Wang, L. (2018). Prevalent Homozygous Deletions of Type I
Interferon and Defensin Genes in Human Cancers Associate with
Immunotherapy Resistance. Clin Cancer Res *24*, 3299-3308.

Yeaman, M.R., and Yount, N.Y. (2003). Mechanisms of antimicrobial peptide
action and resistance. Pharmacol Rev *55*, 27-55.

Zhao, H.W., Zhou, D., and Haddad, G.G. (2011). Antimicrobial peptides increase
tolerance to oxidant stress in Drosophila melanogaster. J Biol Chem *286*, 6211-
6218.

Zhu, M., Xin, T., Weng, S., Gao, Y., Zhang, Y., Li, Q., and Li, M. (2010). Activation of
JNK signaling links lgl mutations to disruption of the cell polarity and epithelial
organization in Drosophila imaginal discs. Cell Res *20*, 242-245.

**Figure 1**

**Figure 2**

**Figure 3**

**Figure 4**

**Figure 5**

Figure 6

**Figure 7**

**Figure Legends**

**Figure 1 | *def* is induced in *dlg* mutant tumour bearing animals.** A, Working model showing the cooperation between haemocyte-derived TNF and the immune response in the fat body in tumour cell death (Parisi et al, 2014). B, RT-qPCR analyses showing expression of several AMPs in the fat body of $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant tumour bearing larvae compared to wild-type ($w^{1118}$) larvae (n=4). C, RT-qPCR analysis of *def* expression in $w^{1118}$ and $dlg^{40.2}$ whole larvae reared on antibiotics (n=7). D, RT-qPCR analysis showing *def* expression in larvae expressing a *ctrl-IR* or a *dlg-IR* in the posterior part of the wing disc (*en>;UAS-dcr2*) (n=3). E, Schematic representation of the *def* gene locus showing mutant alleles generated (UTR: Untranslated Regions, SP: Signal Peptide, PrD: Pro-Domain, Def: Mature Defensin). <u>Statistical analysis:</u> B-D, Student t-test, B, ***p=0.0003, C, **p=0.0074, D, *p=0.042.

**Figure 2 | Def restricts tumour growth and promotes tumour cell death.**
A-E', Quantification of tumour volume (TV) (A) and tumour cell death (TCD) (B) in wing imaginal discs from $dlg^{40.2}$ (n=17), $dlg^{40.2};def^{sk3}$ (n=19) and $dlg^{40.2};def^{sk4}$ (n=20) mutant larvae and representative immunofluorescence images of tissues quantified (C-E'). F, RT-qPCR analysis showing *def* expression upon ubiquitous knockdown ($dlg^{40.2}; tub>$) (n=3). G-J', Quantification of TV (G) and TCD (H) in wing imaginal discs from larvae ubiquitously expressing a *control-IR* (*ctrl-IR*: n=10) or a *def-IR* (n=15) and representative immunofluorescence images of tissues quantified (I-J'). K-L, Quantification of TV (G) and TCD (H) in wing imaginal discs from *dlg* mutant controls ($dlg^{40.2};lpp>$: n=28), *dlg;def^{sk3}* mutants controls ($dlg^{40.2};def^{sk3};lpp>$: n=31) or *dlg;def^{sk3}* mutants expressing *def* in the fat body ($dlg^{40.2};def^{sk3},UAS-def;lpp>$: n=27). M, Effect of PBS (ctrl) or synthetic Def injection on TCD from wild-type larvae ($w^{1118}$, ctrl: n=10, Def: n=9), $dlg^{40.2}$ (ctrl: n=10, Def: n=10) and $dlg^{40.2};def^{sk3}$ (ctrl: n=11, Def: n=18) mutant larvae. Tissues were stained with 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI, blue) for nuclei visualization and with anti-cleaved Decapping protein 1 (Dcp1) antibody (red) to detect apoptotic cell death. Scale bars=50 μm. <u>Statistical analysis:</u> A, B, K, N, One way ANOVA, *p<0.05, ****p<0.0001; F, Student t-test, ****p<0.0001, G-H, Mann-Whitney test, G, **p=0.0054, H, ****p<0.0001; M, Two way ANOVA (only relevant significant statistics are indicated), *p<0.05, ****p<0.0001.

**Figure 3 | Def from the trachea and the fat body mediates tumour cell death.** A, RT-qPCR analysis of *def* expression in gut, fat body and trachea dissected from $w^{1118}$ or $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae (n=3). B-D, Fat body (B) tumour associated (C) and tumour distant trachea (D) from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae stained with DAPI (blue) and anti-Def antibody (red). E, RT-qPCR analysis of *def* expression from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*lpp*>) expressing a *ctrl-IR* or *def-IR* in the fat body (n=4). F-I', Quantification of TV (F) and TCD (G) in wing imaginal discs from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*lpp*>) expressing a *ctrl-IR* (n=15) or *def-IR* (n=17) in the fat body and representative immunofluorescence images of tissues quantified (H-I'). J, RT-qPCR analysis of *def* expression from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*btl*>) expressing a *ctrl-IR* or *def-IR* in the trachea (n=3). K-N', Quantification of TV (K) and TCD (L) in wing imaginal discs from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*btl*>) expressing a *ctrl-IR* (n=14) or *def-IR* (n=16) in the trachea and representative immunofluorescence images of tissues quantified (M-N'). Tumours were stained with DAPI (blue) and anti-Dcp1 antibody (red). Scale bars=50 μm. <u>Statistical analysis</u>: A, E, J, Student t-test, E, **p=0.0054, J, ****p<0.0001; F, G, K, L, Mann-Whitney test, F, G, ****p<0.0001, K, ***p=0.0009, L, ***p=0.0004.

**Figure 4 | Def from the fat body and the trachea associates with dying tumour cells.** A-B, DAPI (blue) and anti-HA antibody (red) staining showing leakiness of the def-HA construct in trachea of the *UAS-def-HA* larvae. C-D, DAPI (blue) and anti-HA antibody (red) staining showing expression of a *UAS-def-HA* transgene in the fat body and the trachea when driven with a fat body specific driver (*lpp*>*UAS-def-HA*). E-E', DAPI (white), anti-Dcp1 (green) and anti-HA antibody (red) staining of $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant tumour from larvae expressing the *def-HA* construct in the fat body and the trachea ($dlg^{40.2}$;*lpp*>*UAS-def-HA*). F-F', DAPI (white), anti-Dcp1 (green) and anti-HA antibody (red) staining of $dlg^{40.2}$ heterozygous wing disc from larvae expressing the *def-HA* construct in the fat body ($dlg^{40.2}$/*FM7*;*lpp*>*UAS-def-HA*). G-H'', $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant tumour stained with DAPI (blue), anti-Def (red) and anti-Dcp1 (green) antibodies. I, wild type ($w^{1118}$) wing imaginal disc stained with DAPI (blue), anti-Def (red) and anti-Dcp1 (green) antibodies. J-J'', High-resolution imaging of a single dying tumour cell stained with DAPI (blue), anti-Def (red) and anti-Dcp1 (green) antibodies. A-I, Scale bars=50 μm, J-J'', Scale bar=2.5 μm.

**Figure 5 | Imd and Toll pathway activation are required for *def* expression and Def-mediated tumour cell death.** A, RT-qPCR analysis of *def* expression from $dlg^{40.2}$ and $dlg^{40.2}$;*imd¹* mutant larvae (n=4). B-E', Quantification of TV (B) and TCD (C) in wing imaginal discs from $dlg^{40.2}$ (n=15) and $dlg^{40.2}$;*imd¹* (n=14) mutants larvae and representative immunofluorescence images of tissues quantified stained with DAPI (blue) and anti-Dcp1 antibody (red) (D-E'). F, RT-qPCR analysis showing *def* expression in $dlg^{40.2}$ and $dlg^{40.2}$; *rel^{E20}* mutant animals (n=5). G-J', Quantification of TV (G) and TCD (H) from $dlg^{40.2}$ (n=12) and $dlg^{40.2}$;*rel^{E20}* (n=10) mutant larvae and representative pictures of the corresponding tumours (I-J'). Scale bars=50 µm. Statistical analysis: A, F, Student t-test, A, ***p<0.0003, F, ****p<0.0001; B, C, G, H, Mann-Whitney test, B, C, H, ****p<0.0001, G, **p=0.009.

**Figure 6 | Imd and Toll pathway activation are required in the trachea and the fat body.** A, RT-qPCR analysis of *def* expression from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*btl>*) expressing a *ctrl-IR* or *imd-IR* in the trachea (n=3). B-E', Quantification of TV (B) and TCD (C) from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*btl>*) expressing a *ctrl-IR* (n=18) or *imd-IR* (n=15) in the trachea and representative immunofluorescence images of tissues quantified stained with DAPI (blue) and anti-Dcp1 antibody (red) (D-E'). F, RT-qPCR analysis of *def* expression from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*lpp>*) expressing a *ctrl-IR*, an *imd-IR* or a myd88-IR in the fat body. G-K', Quantification of TV (G) and TCD (H) from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*lpp>*) expressing a *ctrl-IR*, an *imd-IR* or a myd88-IR in the fat body and representative immunofluorescence images of tissues quantified (I-K'). L-O, Quantification of TV (L, N) and TCD (M, O) from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*lpp>*) expressing a *ctrl-IR*, an *imd-IR* alone or in combination with a *UAS-def* in the fat body (L, M) and from $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant larvae ($dlg^{40.2}$;*lpp>*) expressing a *ctrl-IR*, a *myd88-IR* alone or in combination with a *UAS-def* in the fat body (N, O). Scale bars=50 µm. Statistical analysis: A, Student t-test, A, ***p=0.0001; B, C, Mann-Whitney test, B, ***p=0.0003, C, ***p=0.0002; F, G, H, L-O, One way ANOVA, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ****p<0.0001.

**Figure 7 | TNF is required for PS exposure and Defensin-driven tumour cell death.** A-A'', DAPI (blue), Annexin V (green) and anti-Def (red) staining of $dlg^{40.2}$ mutant tumours. B, D, E, Annexin V (green) and DAPI (blue) staining of wing

imaginal discs from larvae of the indicated genotypes. C, RT-qPCR analysis showing *def* expression in wild-type, *dlg*$^{40.2}$ or *dlg*$^{40.2}$;*egr*$^3$ mutants. F, G, Annexin V (green) and DAPI (blue) staining of wing imaginal discs from *dlg* mutant larvae (*dlg*$^{40.2}$,*hml>*) expressing a *ctrl-IR* (n=5) or an *egr-IR* (n=9) in the haemocytes. H, Quantification of Annexin V signal on tumours from the corresponding genotypes. I-L, Annexin V (green) and anti-Dcp1 (red) antibody staining of tumours from *dlg*$^{40.2}$, *dlg*$^{40.2}$;*def*$^{sk3}$, *dlg*$^{40.2}$;*def*$^{sk4}$ and *dlg*$^{40.2}$ mutant larvae. M, Quantification of TCD upon PBS (ctrl) or Def injection in wild-type (*w*$^{1118}$, ctrl: n=10, Def: n=14), *dlg*$^{40.2}$ (ctrl/Def: n=18) or *dlg*$^{40.2}$;*egr*$^3$ (ctrl: n=20, Def: n=13) mutant larvae. N, A model for Def antitumoural activity. Scale bars=50 μm. Statistical analysis: C, One way ANOVA, *p<0.05; H, Mann-Whitney test, ***p=0.001; M, Two way ANOVA (only relevant significant statistics are indicated), **p<0.01.