Identification of novel mechanosensory genes in *Caenorhabditis Elegans*

Khalid Yasseen

University of California, Berkeley; Department of Molecular & Cell Biology

Abstract

Caenorhabditis Elegans is a non-parasitic nematode that has been well-established as a model organism. *C. elegans* has been a useful model for mechanosensory responses and has previously identified a gene class of *mec* mutants that produces imperative mechanosensitive proteins. In the present study, a genetic screen was performed to identify additional mechanosensory genes that could produce mechanosensory mutants. After random and unbiased introduction of gene mutations, 8 mutants with mechanosensory phenotypes were chosen and assayed. Of the 8, 1 was shown to be a wild type, while 4 were members of the *mec* gene class and 3 were novel genes: *unc, rol,* and *dpy*. The *unc* mutant was characterized by very low responsiveness (mean touch response index = 8.67 , $p < 0.01$) and was homologous to an UNC-119 protein in many other species. The *mec* mutants observed were that of *mec-4, mec-10,* and *mec-7*, though the phenotypes were very similar and only genetic sequencing was able to differentiate them. Furthermore, one *mec* mutant, *mec-7*, was found to have a human orthologous protein in the form of TUBB6 and TUBB8 which elucidates a possible pathway for future work.

Introduction

Caenorhabditis Elegans are free-living, hermaphroditic non-parasitic soil nematode (Hart and Chao, 2009; Strange, 2006). Adult *C. elegans* have a size of ~1 mm in length, a rapid life cycle and a large number of offspring (Hart and Chao, 2009; Brenner, 1974). In 1963, Sydney Brenner recognized the advantages of these characteristics from a molecular biology perspective and began research on *C. elegans* (Brenner, 1974; Strange, 2006). The usefulness of *C. elegans* for genetic studies has been exploited to address a number of biological problems ranging from aging to cell cycle control to synaptic transmission (Brenner, 1974; Strange, 2006). The nervous system of *C. elegans* is composed of only 302 neurons, which is a large advantage for neurobiology studies (Strange, 2006). A further important characteristic of *C. elegans* is its mechanosensitive and chemosensitive interactions with its environment (Strange, 2006; Hart and Chao, 2009). This allows experimenters to perform mechanosensory assays that can directly test the mechanosensory mechanisms in *C. elegans* which can be used to understand mechanosensation in humans. Such an experiment identified five important neurons necessary for mechanosensory responses by killing selected neurons with a laser (Bianchi, 2007). The mechanosensory response was assessed by a "gentle touch response" assay, although other methods have been demonstrated (Chalfie et al., 2013; Shaw et al., 2016). The "gentle touch response" assay consists of scoring responsiveness of worms when they are exposed to a light or gentle stimulus. One of the findings in *C. elegans* is that of mechanosensory mutants that have diminished responsiveness as a result of specific gene mutations. One such mutant class is that of the *mec* gene, which includes the *mec-4* and *mec-10* gene (Shi et al., 2018). The proteins MEC-4 and MEC-10 make up a mechanosensitive sodium channel. In the present study, a gentle touch response assay will be used in a systematic search of more mechanosensory mutants and locate any associated genes.

Methods

Randomly mutated loci were introduced genome-wide in *C. elegans* in an unbiased manner and 8 candidate phenotypes that seem to have some sort of movement and/or mechanosensory defect were identified and used. A "gentle touch assay" was then performed to characterize the touch response of the worms. This assay utilized an eyebrow hair attached to a toothpick which was then used to gently stimulate the *C. elegans* mutants. Responses were assessed by reversals, which included backwards movements, stopping, starting, and accelerating movements. The mutant worms were touched 10 times in this fashion, and their responses were recorded. Stimulation was switched between tail touch and head touch to prevent desensitization and to test for region selective mutants. This 10-touch test was performed on ten worms for each mutant strain. Two controls were present, a negative wild type control and a positive *mec-*10 control. Results were analyzed by calculating a touch response index then performing statistical analysis using Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Microsoft Office 365 ProPlus 2016). Averages were calculated for the responses (yielding a $0 - 1$ score), then the average of each worms average score was calculated. This average was reported in percentage form $(0 - 100)$ and combined with multiple iterations of this assay. The mutant genes were then mapped and sequenced. Genes were characterized using ApE (A Plasmid Editor), Expasy, and the Basic Local Alignment Search Tool (BLAST).

Results

Responses were scored as a "1" or "0" based on the demonstration of a reversal behavior. Score was averaged to give a "touch response index" on a scale of 0 to 100. **Figure 1** depicts the scoring of a wild type negative control and known mechanosensory positive control, which includes touch response index per worm. Row averages represent possible

sensitization/desensitization measures that could represent a confounding variable. Each column was averaged, and the final touch response index for each worm strain was calculated by averaging the touch response index from each. The final averages of touch response indices for each worm were analyzed, descriptive statistics depicted in **Figure 2.** In **Figure 3**, touch response index as an average percentage (from 0 to 100) is plotted for each unknown mutant strain. A single factor ANOVA was performed which found a significant difference between groups (p < 0.001), shown in **Figure 4**. Post-hoc Tukey analysis (**Figure 5**) shows statistical significance in differences between several groups, especially those against wild type (Unknown B, Unknown C, and Unknown F). Genes were mapped and sequenced and were characterized using Expasy and BLAST tools. **Figure 6** (A-H) shows wild-type versus mutant alignment and translation of sequenced gene to identify the mutation. Then the translated protein was run through Expasy to identify important relevant protein motifs. The protein was also processed through BLAST to ascertain related genes in different species. Of those unknowns that were chosen, Unknown H was shown to have no mutation after alignment (**Figure 6. H**) and translation. Unknowns A, B, and D had a nonsense mutation, while C, E, F, and G had missense mutations. Unknown A (**Figure 6. A**) had a C to T substitution at position 836 which gives rise to a stop codon, resulting in a truncated protein. Its average touch response index was 70.16 (σ^2 = 22.23, SE = 9.07, against WT $p = 0.106$). This protein has two known motifs similar to signature tubulin subunits. Unknown B had a C to T substitution at position 308 resulting in a premature stop codon. The average touch response index was 8.67 (σ^2 = 8.38, SE = 3.42, against WT p < 0.01). This protein had no known structural motifs based on the amino acid sequence. For Unknown C, there is a three-nucleotide missense from CTT to GCC at position 2162 which gives rise to an Ala to Leu amino acid substitution. Its average touch response index was 70.33 (σ^2 =

18.86, $SE = 6.29$, against WT $p \le 0.05$). This protein showed similarity to the amiloride-sensitive sodium channel signature motif. For Unknown D, there was a C to T substitution at position 566 resulting in a stop codon. The average touch response index was 82 (σ^2 = 8.06, SE = 2.69, against WT $p = 0.88$). Upon observation, Unknown D had a starkly unique morphological phenotype which was expressed as a short and fat worm. Unknown E had a G to A substitution at position 213 which results in an Arg to His substitution. The average touch response index was 71.22 (σ^2 = 19.41, SE = 6.47, against WT p = 0.055). Like Unknown D, Unknown E also had a unique phenotype, which was expressed as a rolling movement when stimulated. Unknown worm F had a G to C substitution at position 2027 which results in a Gly to Arg substitution. The average touch response index was 36.11 (σ^2 = 10.14, SE = 3.38, against WT p < 0.01). For Unknown G, there was a C to T substitution at position 315 which resulted in a Phe to Ser substitution. The average touch response index was 70 (σ^2 =20.86, SE =8.52, against WT p = 0.10). Lastly, Unknown H had no mismatches between the wild type and mutant versions, however this sequence had an odd open reading frame which resulted in three stop codons. The average touch response index was 78.5 (σ^2 = 20.16, SE = 8.23, against WT p = 0.71). Unknown F and G shared the same amiloride-sensitive sodium channel signature motif with Unknown C according to Expasy.

Figure 1: Data collection for gentle touch response assay and calculations of touch response index (score $0 - 1$) for wild-type and *mec* mutants

Figure 2: Descriptive statistics for average touch response index for all assayed strains

Figure 3: Touch Response Index Averages (percentage 0 – 100 score) plotted against assayed mutants. Error Bars represent standard deviation.

ANOVA: Single Factor

SUMMARY

Figure 5: Post-hoc Tukey Analysis of ANOVA results

 $1 - 4:$

[confidence level: (0)] MREI PS00227 TUBULIN Tubulin subunits alpha, beta, and gamma signature

 $140 - 146$: [confidence level: (0)] GGGTGSG

Figure 6a: Alignment with ApE of Unknown A wild type to mutant. ApE translated mutant and wildtype sequences with noted differences. Expasy results with two similar motif sequences of tubulin subunits. BLAST results of first 10 out of 100 similar species with graphical representation.

Unknown B

301>caqqcqcaaqccqaatcqqcaaqatatqtccqatatcqatttqcqccqaattttctqaaattaaaqacqqtcqqcqcqacqqtcqaqttcaaqqtcqqcq>400 301>caqqcqbaaqccqaatcqqcaaqatatqtccqatatcqatttqcqccqaattttctqaaattaaaqacqqtcqqcqcqacqqtcqaqttcaaqqtcqqcq>400

Translation 219 a.a. MW=25264.3500000000006

MetLysAlaGluGlnGlnGlnGlnSerIleAlaProGlySerAlaThrPheProSerGln MetProArgProProProValThrGluGlnAlaIleThrThrGluAlaGluLeuLeuAla LysAsnGlnIleThrProAsnAspValLeuAlaLeuProGlyIleThrGlnGlyPheLeu CysSerProSerAlaAsnValTyrAsnIleGluPheThrLysPheGlnIleArqAspLeu AspThrGluHisValLeuPheGluIleAlaLysProGluAsnGluThrGluGluAsnLeu GlnAlaGlnAlaGluSerAlaArgTyrValArgTyrArgPheAlaProAsnPheLeuLys LeuLysThrvalGlyAlaThrValGluPheLysValGlyAspValProIleThrHisPhe ArgMetIleGluArgHisPhePheLysAspArgLeuLeuLysCysPheAspPheGluPhe GlyPheCysMetProAsnSerArgAsnAsnCysGluHisIleTyrGluPheProGlnLeu SerGlnGlnLeuMetAspAspMetIleAsnAsnProAsnGluThrArgSerAspSerPhe TyrPheValGluAsnLysLeuValMetHisAsnLysAlaAspTyrSerTyrAspAlaEnd

??? (117 extra codons after stop) MetLysAlaGluGlnGlnGlnGlnSerIleAlaProGlySerAlaThrPheProSerGln MetProArgProProProValThrGluGlnAlaIleThrThrGluAlaGluLeuLeuAla LysAsnGlnIleThrProAsnAspValLeuAlaLeuProGlyIleThrGlnGlyPheLeu CysSerProSerAlaAsnValTyrAsnIleGluPheThrLysPheGlnIleArgAspLeu AspThrGluHisValLeuPheGluIleAlaLysProGluAsnGluThrGluGluAsnLeu GlnAlaEndAlaGluSerAlaArgTyrValArgTyrArgPheAlaProAsnPheLeuLys LeuLysThrValGlyAlaThrValGluPheLysValGlyAspValProIleThrHisPhe ArgMetIleGluArgHisPhePheLysAspArgLeuLeuLysCysPheAspPheGluPhe GlyPheCysMetProAsnSerArgAsnAsnCysGluHisIleTyrGluPheProGlnLeu SerGlnGlnLeuMetAspAspMetIleAsnAsnProAsnGluThrArgSerAspSerPhe TyrPheValGluAsnLysLeuValMetHisAsnLysAlaAspTyrSerTyrAspAlaEnd

Translation 102 a.a. MW=11269.0800000000005

Hits for all PROSITE (release 2019_10) motifs on sequence USERSEQ1 :

Figure 6b: Alignment with ApE of Unknown B wild type to mutant. ApE translated mutant and wildtype sequences with noted differences. Expasy results shows no similar protein sequences. BLAST results of first 10 out of 100 similar species with graphical representation.

PS01206 ASC Amiloride-sensitive sodium channels signature

 $577 - 597$: [confidence level: (0)] YsvEgCyrsCfQq1VLkeCrC

Figure 6c: Alignment with ApE of Unknown C wild type to mutant. ApE translated mutant and wildtype sequences with noted differences. Expasy results shows protein motif of amiloride-sensitive sodium channels signature. BLAST results of first 10 out of 100 similar species with graphical representation.

Hits for all PROSITE (release 2019_10) motifs on sequence USERSEQ1 :

no hit!

Figure 6d: Alignment with ApE of Unknown D wild type to mutant. ApE translated mutant and wildtype sequences with noted differences. Expasy results shows no similar protein motifs. BLAST results of first 10 out of 100 similar species with graphical representation.

no hit! Max Total Query Per E **Description** Accession Score Score Cover value Ident \blacktriangledown Loa loa nematode cuticle collagen domain-containing protein partial mRNA 62.0 22% **7e-07** 36.14% XM 003143129.1 62.0 \blacktriangledown Trichinella spiralis cuticle collagen rol-6 (Tsp_02838) mRNA, complete cds 26% 0.060 28.71% XM 003379120.1 47.0 470 Trichinella spiralis cuticle collagen 39 (Tsp_03443) mRNA, complete cds 43.1 18% 0.99 25.37% XM 003379743.1 43.1 $\overline{\mathbf{v}}$ Loa loa hypothetical protein partial mRNA 40.0 40.0 16% 98 31.58% XM_003135557.1 20 30 40 50 60 70 60 90 60 90 60 110 62 130 40 50 60 70 60 70 80 200 210 220 230 240 250 260 270 280 290 300 310 Sequence (U) BLAST Results for: Protein Sequence **EXPLORATE SET AND SE THE INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY OF SAS** 39 W | | | | . . 48 W I \blacksquare \blacks 000 110 120 120 140 150 160 170 180 190 200 210 220 230 240 250 260 270 280 290 320 330 348 Query_40761: 1..348 (348 aa) Tracks shown: 2/3

Figure 6e: Alignment with ApE of Unknown E wild type to mutant. ApE translated mutant and wildtype sequences with noted differences. Expasy results shows no similar protein motifs. BLAST reveals 4 similar species with graphical representation.

PS01206 ASC Amiloride-sensitive sodium channels signature

Figure 6f: Alignment with ApE of Unknown F wild type to mutant. ApE translated mutant and wildtype sequences with noted differences. Expasy results shows amiloride-sensitive sodium channel motif signature. BLAST results of first 10 out of 100 similar species with graphical representation.

PS01206 ASC Amiloride-sensitive sodium channels signature

Figure 6g: Alignment with ApE of Unknown G wild type to mutant. ApE translated mutant and wildtype sequences with noted differences. Expasy results shows amiloride-sensitive sodium channel motif signature. BLAST results of first 10 out of 100 similar species with graphical representation.

Tracks shown: 2/3 **Figure 6h**: Alignment with ApE of Unknown H wild type to mutant. ApE translated wildtype sequence with STOP codons highlighted. Expasy results show no similar sequence motifs. BLAST results of one similar species and graphical representation shown.

Discussion

This experiment aimed to elucidate possible genes and their functions in *C. elegans* by exploiting unique mechanosensory characteristics. This was done by introducing random unbiased mutations and choosing mechanosensory typed phenotypes for testing. Then, worms were assayed using a gentle touch response assay to determine a touch response index. Based on the results, there were four genes characterized by this screening. One gene is the *mec* gene that had 4 phenotypes, the *unc* gene, *dpy* gene, and *rol* gene that had one phenotype each. One chosen phenotype was a wildtype worm. Unknown B was the most prominent phenotype, with very little observed

Per.

Ident

 $|256$

260

Accession

responses and an average touch response index of 8.67, meaning a responsiveness of less than 10%. This phenotype was linked to the *unc* gene which was illustrated by the UNC-119 homologs in other species through tBLAST. Furthermore, the touch response index of Unknown B was decreased significantly in every post-hoc comparison except when compared against the *mec-10* positive control. However, this worm mutant showed more homology to UNC-119 than to MEC or related proteins. This *unc* gene results in a truncated UNC protein which causes major mechanosensory deficiencies. Another clear phenotype was represented by Unknown D, with a touch response index of 82, but clearly observed morphological change. These worms were observed to be shorter than wildtype worms with a stubbier, fatter appearance. There was no statistical significance in post-hoc comparisons to wild-type, and some mutants had significantly decreased touch response indices compared to Unknown D. The gene associated with this phenotype is *dpy* and is most homologous to a SCARA5 protein in other species. The mutant form of this gene results in a nonsense mutation and truncated DPY protein which causes severe morphological changes. Another phenotypically clear mutant was that of Unknown E, which was found to be a *rol* gene mutant. This mutant had an average touch response index of 71.22, with no statistical significance against wildtype and unknown D. This mutation is a missense that causes an amino acid change from Arg to His, and gives a phenotype associated with rolling movements. As explained, this mutant had almost wild type mechanosensory responses, but its movements were characterized by a clear rolling pattern upon stimulation in stark contrast to the sinusoidal movements typical of *C. elegans*. When this protein sequence was run through tBLAST, 4 homologs emerged, one called the Loa Loa nematode cuticle collagen, and another was ROL-6 in *Trichinella spiralis*. This and the observations seen gave evidence for the implication of the *rol* gene in this particular mechanosensory mutant. Unknown H had a phenotype similar to that of wild type, with a touch response index of 78.5, which was not statistically significant in comparison to wild type, unknown D, and unknown E. Furthermore, when sequenced and aligned using ApE, there were no mismatches or mutations in the mutant sequence and when run through tBLAST the results illustrated a known *C. elegans* cuticle collagen protein. This supports the conclusion that Unknown H was a wild type worm. The remaining worms, Unknown A, C, F and G were versions of a *mec* mutant. Unknown F, with a touch response index of 36.11, was significantly lower compared to every group except for the known *mec-10* control mutant. This mutant resulted in a Gly to Arg missense mutation when sequences were analyzed and translated. When the amino acid sequence was analyzed through tBLAST there were numerous homologs to MEC-10 in other species. This suggests that the gene responsible for the phenotype in Unknown F was that of *mec*-*10*. One of the key results in this mutant that was not relevant in the analysis of the aforementioned mutants was that of the Expasy motif search, that yielded a sequence similarity to the amiloride-sensitive sodium channels signature motifs. This motif was also implicated in the sequences of Unknown C and Unknown G's protein. However, one of the most contradictory evidences is that of the statistical analysis which shows statistical significance in the difference between *mec-10* control mutants v. Unknown C and *mec-10* v. Unknown G. Unknown G is also not statistically different when compared to wild-type (although Unknown C is). This supports a hypothesis of a *mec* mutant that is region specific. After sequencing and aligning the mutant to wild-type sequences, it is clear that Unknown C and Unknown G are mechanosensory mutants due to the missense substitutions that result from the mutations (Unknown C results in an Ala to Leu; Unknown G results in a Ser to Phe). Looking further into the data, it was noticed that the Unknown G had a tBLAST result that showed homology to *mec-4* and *mec-10*, which suggests a varied *mec* phenotype. This likely is consistent with a *mec* mutation that affects the head or tail region,

although some of the data shows no difference in the average touch response index for head stimulations versus tail stimulations. Nonetheless, it can be confirmed that Unknown G is a mutant of a *mec* gene, and further experimentation will be required to elucidate the specific type. For Unknown C, it is more difficult to elucidate the specific *mec* mutant although it is clear that Unknown C is a *mec* mutant. It shares the same motif as two known *mec* mutants, as well as having a statistically significant difference in average touch response index compared to wild type (mean $= 70.33$, $p < 0.05$). However, tBLAST results are inconclusive as they point to a homolog of an SCNN1D protein, which is a sodium channel in other species. It is likely that this is a *mec* mutant that effects the tail region, as some average touch indices of just the tail region showed just slightly lower responsiveness, although this may not prove to be statistically significant. The last mutant, Unknown A, has a touch response index average of 70.16, with no statistical difference against wild type and other mutants except for Unknown F and *mec-10* control. The mutant substitution results in a nonsense mutation based on ApE alignment and translation. Expasy showed a similar motif to tubulin subunits, and tBLAST analysis revealed homologs and orthologs to tubulin in other species. This is connected to a known *mec* protein known as MEC-7 which is orthologous to TUBB6 and TUBB8. This is evidence that Unknown A is likely a mutant of *mec-7*.

Despite the results of the study, there are a fair share of limitations. One of the biggest surprises came in the form of the statistical analysis which showed insignificant differences in a few relevant comparisons. For instance, despite clear evidence that Unknown G contained a mutant *mec-10* or *mec-4*, the statistics showed an insignificant difference between this group and wild type. Furthermore, Unknown G was statistically significant compared to the *mec-10* positive control, which should be insignificant if Unknown G's identity as a *mec-10* or *mec-4* is to be confirmed with statistics. This may represent an error in the methodology versus error in the

conclusions, due to the other evidences that support the conclusions. A possible argument could be that of a desensitization consequence of multiple stimulations back to back with not enough time in between. However, most of the statistics suggest increased mechanosensory response which would not align with a desensitization argument. It is also possible that false positives were recorded, meaning mechanosensory responses that were not considered reversals were recorded as "1" rather than "0". This would explain some of the statistical inconsistencies and align with the expected results of a *mec* mutant. However, it is also the case that the gentle response assay itself was performed incorrectly, since it is a very sensitive assay. The gentle response assay could portray a high mechanosensory response if performers unintentionally performed a harsh touch. Even if a harsh touch occurred 20% of the time, that could reduce the touch response index enough to be statistically significant (i.e. Mean = 70.66 with 20% decrease would be 56.528). For the most part, the methodological errors are simple but can have a huge difference on the statistics. Nonetheless, the preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusions made above and the statistics, when aligned with the conclusions, only solidify the conclusion more.

This study is a genetic screen of mechanosensory deficient *C. elegans* mutant phenotypes that identified four gene classes: *mec, rol, dpy,* and *unc.* This gives great insight into mechanosensation in *C. elegans* and provides a starting point for understanding mechanotransduction and mechanosensation from a neurobiological perspective. Another important discovery is a potential human application when considering the orthologous *mec-7* gene to the TUBB6 and TUBB8 proteins in humans. These screens rely heavily on careful conduction of the procedure and even a few false positives can have dramatic effects on the statistical analyses. However, the gene classes discovered through ApE alignment, Expasy search, and tBLAST analysis allowed sufficient evidence to locate and conclude the identities of the 8 phenotypes.

References

Bianchi, L. 2007. Mechanotransduction: Touch and feel at the molecular level as modeled in Caenorhabditis elegans. *Mol. Neurobiol.* 36:254–271. doi:10.1007/s12035-007-8009-5.

Brenner, S. 1974. THE GENETICS OF CAENORHABDITIS ELEGANS. *Genetics*. 77.

- Chalfie, M., A.C. Hart, C.H. Rankin, and M.B. Goodman. 2013. Assaying mechanosensation. *WormBook*. doi:10.1895/wormbook.1.172.1.
- Hart, A.C., and M.Y. Chao. 2009. From odors to behaviors in caenorhabditis elegans. *In* The Neurobiology of Olfaction. CRC Press. 1–33.
- Shaw, M., M. Elmi, V. Pawar, and M.A. Srinivasan. 2016. Investigation of mechanosensation in C elegans using light field calcium imaging. *Biomed. Opt. Express*. 7:2877. doi:10.1364/boe.7.002877.
- Shi, S., S.M. Mutchler, B.M. Blobner, O.B. Kashlan, and T.R. Kleyman. 2018. Pore-lining residues of mec-4 and mec-10 channel subunits tune the caenorhabditis elegans degenerin channel's response to shear stress. *J. Biol. Chem.* 293:10757–10766. doi:10.1074/jbc.RA118.002499.
- Strange, K. 2006. An overview of C. elegans biology. *Methods Mol. Biol.* 351:1–11. doi:10.1385/1-59745-151-7:1.