

ALTERATIONS OF EXPRESSION OF RNA MODIFICATION REGULATORS BY CARCINOGENS IN THE ALTERNATIVE CHICKEN EGG MODEL Kobets T¹, Duan JD¹, Brunnemann KD¹, Iacobas DA², Iacobas S¹, Vock E³, Deschl U³, Williams GM¹ ¹ New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, USA

ABSTRACT

The abundance of cellular RNA structural modifications is well documented. Such epitranscriptome alterations ultimately regulate the expression of genes that control many biological processes. However, their role in the development of many pathologic conditions, including chemical carcinogenesis in the developing organism, remains unclear. Similar to epigenetic alterations, the dynamic nature of epitranscriptome modifications is controlled by various including methyltransferases, pseudoU synthetases and enzymes, demethylases. The current study utilized microarray platform to investigate presence and expression of genes which encode for the aforementioned enzymes in the Chicken Egg Model (CEM) after 3 daily injections of a wide array of established genotoxic and epigenetic carcinogens and their comparators. The set of tested chemicals included dialkylnitrosamines, aromatic amines, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, aflatoxins, clofibric acid and phenobarbital. The CEM is an alternative to animal models tool that uses fetal chicken livers collected 3 hours after the last dosing on the incubation day 11, to evaluate various effects of chemicals, including their potential to produce DNA damage, alterations in gene expression and histologic changes. Chicken embryo-fetus is an intact, metabolically active organism, which by definition is not yet subjected to regulations as an animal. Chemical-specific deregulation of 15 genes which encode for several RNA modification enzymes in other species including humans, was observed in CEM. These include METTL14, ALKBH5, FTO, PUS, TRMT, ALKBH3 and TET. Most significant changes in the gene expression pattern were produced by genotoxic hepatocarcinogens dialkylnitrosamines and benzo[a]pyrene. Moreover, the majority of genotoxic carcinogens also altered the expression of several small nucleolar RNAs, including SNORD17, SNORA62 and SNORA81, which guide methylation and pseudo-uridylation of rRNA and tRNA. These findings lead to the hypothesis that chemicals are capable of producing epitranscriptome modifications, which in combination with established genotoxic and/or epigenetic DNA damaging effects contribute to carcinogenesis. Based on our findings, CEM is an appropriate model to investigate this hypothesis.

INTRODUCTION

Methylation of RNA bases, was first observed in eukaryotic cells, including rat and human cancer cells. A plethora of post-transcriptional chemical modifications of various RNA species has been established since. Epitranscriptome modifications play an important role in stability, processing, export and translation of mRNA and maintenance of RNA structure. These changes contribute to regulation of gene expression and control many biologic and developmental processes, including cell differentiation. RNA modifications are dynamic, and as such, are controlled by various enzymes (Fig. 2). TRMT FTO METTL3 PUS ALKBH5 NSUN2 METTL14 WTAP TRUB1 ALKBH1



Figure 1. RNA structure modifications and their regulators.

Chicken Egg Model (CEM) is an alternative to animal model that allows for extensive evaluation of multiple effects produced by xenobiotics, including genotoxicity, teratogenicity, histopathologic changes and genomic profiling. Thus, this novel model can be utilized to assess chemical-induced epitranscriptome modifications in the liver tissue of intact, metabolically competent chicken embryo-fetuses.

² Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX, USA

Pseudouridine (Ψ



green colors indicate not significantly deregulated genes. a, vehicle deionized water; b, vehicle 20% aqueous solution of HS15.

³ Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH&Co. KG, Biberach an der Riss, Germany



Kobets T., latropoulos M.J., Duan J. D., Brunnemann K.D., lacobas D.A., lacobas S., Vock E., Deschl U., Williams G.M. (2018). Toxicol Sci. 166, 82-96.

Williams G.M., Duan J.D., Brunnemann K.D., latropoulos M.J., Vock E., Deschl, U. (2014). Toxicol Sci. 141, 18-28.