Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2015 November 25; 137(46): 14673–14685. doi:10.1021/jacs.5b07849.

N-Terminal Extensions Retard A β 42 Fibril Formation but Allow Cross-Seeding and Coaggregation with A β 42

Olga Szczepankiewicz[†], Björn Linse[†], Georg Meisl^{||}, Eva Thulin[†], Birgitta Frohm[†], Carlo Sala Frigerio[‡], Michael T. Colvin[⊥], Angela C. Jacavone[⊥], Robert G. Griffin[⊥], Tuomas Knowles^{||}, Dominic M. Walsh^{‡,§}, and Sara Linse^{*,†}

[†]Department of Biochemistry and Structural Biology, Lund University, P O Box 124, 221 00 Lund, Sweden [‡]Laboratory for Neurodegenerative Research, Conway Institute of Biomedical and Biomolecular Research, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Republic of Ireland [§]Laboratory for Neurodegenerative Research, Ann Romney Center for Neurologic Diseases, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, United States ^{||}Department of Chemistry, Cambridge University, Lensfield Road, Cambridge, CB2 1EW, United Kingdom [⊥]Department of Chemistry and Francis Bitter Magnet Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, United States

Abstract

Amyloid β -protein (A β) sequence length variants with varying aggregation propensity coexist in vivo, where coaggregation and cross-catalysis phenomena may affect the aggregation process. Until recently, naturally occurring amyloid β -protein (A β) variants were believed to begin at or after the canonical β -secretase cleavage site within the amyloid β -protein precursor. However, N-terminally extended forms of A β (NTE-A β) were recently discovered and may contribute to Alzheimer's disease. Here, we have used thioflavin T fluorescence to study the aggregation kinetics of A β 42 variants with N-terminal extensions of 5–40 residues, and transmission electron microscopy to analyze the end states. We find that all variants form amyloid fibrils of similar morphology as A β 42, but the half-time of aggregation ($t_{1/2}$) increases exponentially with extension length. Monte Carlo simulations of model peptides suggest that the retardation is due to an underlying general physicochemical effect involving reduced frequency of productive molecular encounters. Indeed, global kinetic analyses reveal that NTE-A β 42s form fibrils via the same mechanism as A β 42, but all microscopic rate constants (primary and secondary nucleation, elongation) are reduced for the N-terminally extended variants. Still, A β 42 and NTE-A β 42 coaggregate to form mixed fibrils and fibrils of either A β 42 or NTE-A β 42 catalyze aggregation of all monomers. NTE-A β 42 monomers display reduced aggregation rate with all kinds of seeds implying that extended termini interfere with the ability of monomers to nucleate or elongate. Cross-seeding or coaggregation may therefore represent an important contribution in the in vivo formation of assemblies believed to be important in disease.

*Corresponding Author: sara.linse@biochemistry.lu.se.

Supporting Information: The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/jacs.5b07849. Supporting figures (PDF)

Notes: The authors declare no competing financial interest.

Graphical abstract

Introduction

An improved understanding of the molecular mechanism underlying amyloid β peptide ($A\beta$) aggregation and its modulation by intrinsic and extrinsic factors may provide a basis for the development of future treatments and diagnostics of Alzheimer's disease (AD).^{1,2} Genetic evidence links the amyloid β -protein precursor (APP) to AD pathogenesis, and additional evidence suggests that a proteolytic product of APP, $A\beta$, is the causal agent.³ The coexistence in vivo of several $A\beta$ sequence length variants with extensions and truncations at both termini, and with varying aggregation propensity, makes it important to determine the influence of each length variation on the aggregation mechanism as well as its effect on other members of the ensemble. Insights into the plethora of phenomena that may occur in complex peptide mixtures, for example, cross-catalysis and coaggregation of different peptides, are a prerequisite for understanding the mechanism of $A\beta$ aggregation in vivo. A first step toward this goal is to find the mechanism by which extensions and truncations hinder or promote aggregation of each variant per se. More intriguing, the next step involves investigations of the interplay between coexisting length variants, and to elucidate conditions promoting cross-catalysis and coaggregation processes.

Production of $A\beta$ is initiated by β -amyloid cleaving enzyme-1 (BACE1), which hydrolyzes the Met671–Asp672 peptide bond of APP. (The amino acid numbering used throughout is for the human sequence of the longest isoform of APP, APP₇₇₀.) This generates two products: APPs β (residues 1–671) and C99 (residues 672–770).^{4,5} BACE1 also cuts at a second less-favored site 11 residues further C-terminal, producing C89 (residues 682–770) and a slightly longer version of APPs β (residues 1–681). The C99 and C89 fragments are substrates for γ -secretase, a unique aspartyl protease which cleaves within the transmembrane domains of certain type I membrane proteins.

More than 30 different primary structures of $A\beta$ have been detected in human specimens^{6–15} including $A\beta$ peptides with N-termini originating at, before, or after the canonical BACE1 cleavage site Asp672, which is numbered Asp1 in $A\beta$ peptides. The first evidence that APP may be proteolyzed at residues other than at the canonical BACE1 and α -secretase (the latter cleaves APP between Gln686 and Lys687, and precludes formation of $A\beta$) sites came from mass spectrometric analysis of cerebrospinal fluid, which identified 11 peptides with N-termini before Asp672.¹⁶ N-Terminally extended $A\beta$ (NTE- $A\beta$) variants with up to 9

residue extensions have been detected in human plasma⁷ and even longer variants with extension 34 residues have been found in tissue culture studies.¹² Importantly, culture medium rich in NTE-A β variants blocks long-term potentiation (LTP),⁶ a cellular correlate of learning and memory, the disruption of which is believed to be relevant to synaptic changes that occur in the early stages of AD.¹⁷ Although the precise sequences of the synaptotoxic species and whether their activity is mediated by monomeric or aggregated NTE-A β is not yet known, it is clear that the presence of NTEs is compatible with toxic activity.

Full-length APP has to our knowledge not been observed to form amyloid although the highly aggregation prone A β segment is embedded in its sequence. The aggregation of A β has been studied for almost three decades, but only recently have mechanistic studies been conducted with an aim to find the underlying microscopic steps of the process. Specifically, the aggregation kinetics data for A β 42 are reconciled with a mechanism including primary nucleation of monomers in solution, secondary nucleation of monomers on fibril surface, and elongation of fibrils by monomer attachment to their ends.¹⁸ The secondary nucleation was found to be the dominant route for generation of new aggregates, and in vitro it is the microscopic process responsible for the generation of most of the toxicity.^{18–21} Comparison of A β 40 vs A β 42 reveals the importance of C-terminal identity; for A β 40, all rate constants are reduced relative to A β 42, with the largest effect on primary nucleation.²² In a previous study, we found that A β 40 and A β 42 form separate fibrils in binary mixtures²³ and do not cross-catalyze the aggregation of each other, which may be related to their local packing differences yielding distinct fibril structures.^{23,24} While certain N-terminal truncations have been observed to accelerate A β aggregation,^{25–27} the effects of N-terminal extensions on the aggregation propensity and mechanism have not been quantified.

Here we have studied the effect of N-terminal sequence extensions on the rate of amyloid formation by experiment and simulation. The fibril formation kinetics was studied by means of thioflavin T (ThT) fluorescence for A β (M1–42) and six variants with N-terminal extensions of 5–40 residues (Figure 1A). Monte Carlo simulations were set up to model the fibril formation kinetics of hexa-peptides without or with N-terminal extensions of 1–6 residues (Figure 1C). In both experiment and simulation, we find that all extended variants form fibrils, but the rate of fibril formation is significantly reduced with a progressive retardation the longer the extensions. This suggests that the retarding effect on the fibril formation reaction due to terminal extensions is a general physicochemical effect related to the decreased probability of “productive” molecular encounters between monomers and between monomers and fibrils, and we discuss the generality of this finding. Aggregation kinetics as a function of peptide concentration and time were subjected to a global kinetic analysis which indicated that terminal extensions significantly reduce the rate constants for primary and secondary nucleation as well as elongation. Coaggregation experiments starting from monomer mixtures, monitored by ThT fluorescence and immuno-gold transmission electron microscopy (TEM), suggest that extended peptides and A β (M1–42) form mixed fibrils. Self- and cross-seeding experiments suggest that monomer identity is the determining factor for the rate of surface catalysis. Our results highlight the importance of the relative concentration of A β sequence length variants and how changes in the ratios of different variants have the potential to elevate or decrease production of toxic intermediates. In this

regard, our demonstration that NTE-A β species can aggregate and provide a catalytic surface for aggregation of canonical forms of A β adds a new player to the already crowded field of A β species that can contribute to A β aggregation in vivo. These and other recent studies demonstrate that the physiochemical properties of the individual A β components will determine the overall aggregation process in the naturally occurring heterogeneous A β family of peptides; this process is necessarily complex and sensitive to changes in the composition and concentration of both canonical and noncanonical forms of A β .

Materials and Methods

Expression and Purification of A β (M1–42) and N-Terminally Extended A β

Six variants of A β were produced with extensions of 5, 10, 15, 20, 30, or 40 residues from the APP sequence added to the N-terminus of A β (M1–42) (Figure 1A). The genes for N-terminally extended variants (by 5, 10, 15, 20, 30, or 40 residues from APP) were produced through stepwise extension of the synthetic A β (M1–42) gene²⁸ by PCR using oligonucleotides with the desired extensions with *E. coli* preferred codons. The genes were cloned into PetSac vector and DNA sequence confirmed on plasmids prepared from single colonies. A β (M1–42) and the N-terminally extended variants were expressed in *E. coli* (BL2 DE3 PLYS Star). The peptides were purified using ion exchange and size exclusion steps as described.²⁸ The purity of the peptides was confirmed by SDS PAGE (Figure 1), RP-HPLC and MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry. Purified peptides were stored as lyophilized aliquots. The approximate yields of the final pure peptides per liter culture were as follows: 20 mg of A β 42, 30 mg of –5A β 42, 40 mg of –10A β 42, 30 mg of –15A β 42, 20 mg of –20A β 42, 15 mg of –30A β 42, and 10 mg of –40A β 42.

Expression and Purification of A β (1–42)

A β 1–42 was expressed in BL21 De3 pLYS star in fusion with a small ubiquitin-related modifier (SUMO) fusion protein placed N-terminal to the A β 42 sequence. The sequence of the 163 residue fusion construct is as follows with the SUMO cleavage site underlined: MSYYHHHHHH-LESTSLYKKAGSGSLQDSEVNQEAKPEVKPEVKPETHINL-KVSDGSSEIFFKIKKTTPLRRLMEAFKRQKGKEMDSLRLFL-YDGIRIQADQAPEDLDMEDNDIIEAHREQIGGDAEFRHDSGY-EVHHQKLVFFAEDVGSNKGAIIGLMVGGVVIA. Cells from 2 L of culture were sonicated in 50 mL of 10 mM Tris/HCl, 1 mM EDTA, pH 8 (buffer A) with 0.5 mg of DNase for 90 s, 50% duty cycle, max power. Sonication was performed in a glass beaker immersed in ice/water slurry, and immediately followed by centrifugation for 10 min at 15 000 rpm in SS34 rotor at 4 °C. The supernatant was removed and pellet again sonicated for 10 min in 50 mL buffer A, followed by 8 min centrifugation at 15 000 rpm. Sonication and centrifugation was repeated once more. The supernatant was removed, and the pellet (inclusion bodies) was dissolved in 50 mL of buffer A with 8 M urea. Highest quality urea was dissolved just prior to use to avoid covalent modification of the protein. The dissolved inclusion bodies were diluted with 150 mL of buffer A and purified by ion exchange chromatography on 30 mL DEAE cellulose resin equilibrated in 2 M urea in buffer A. The resin was washed with 300 mL of 2 M urea in buffer A with 75 mM NaCl, and the fusion protein eluted in 2 M urea in buffer A with 125 mM NaCl. The eluted protein was diluted

with three volumes of buffer A with 92 mM NaCl to reach final concentration 100 mM NaCl and 0.5 M urea. SUMO-1 protease was added (preparation described below), and the solution was incubated at room temp for 2 h. This gave close to complete cleavage, after which the sample was lyophilized, dissolved in 6 M GuHCl, and subjected to two rounds of gel filtration on a 26 × 600 mm Superdex75 column in 20 mM NaP buffer with 0.2 mM EDTA, pH 8.0, to isolate monomer.

Preparation of SUMO-Hydroxylase

SUMO-1 hydroxylase with a His6 tag²⁹ was expressed in *E. coli* (BL21-DE3) by inoculating 100 mL of LB broth and grown overnight at 30 °C, which was added to 1 L of LB broth and grown at 30 °C until OD₆₀₀ = 1.0. Subsequently the temperature of the incubator was lowered to 20 °C and 0.5 mM IPTG was added 1 h after the temperature change, and the protein was expressed overnight. Cells were harvested and frozen stored at –80 °C until purification. The pellet was subjected to two freeze–thaw cycles (frozen in liquid N₂ and thawed in a 45 °C water bath) and resuspended in 40 mM HEPES/KOH, pH 7.4 with 150 mM KCl and 20 mM β-mercaptoethanol (Buffer B), followed by addition of 10 mg lysozyme, 0.5 mg of DNase, and a EDTA free Complete tablet. The pellet was sonicated with a tip sonicator (Branson 450 sonifier) 50% duty cycle, 2 min followed by 2 min rest (repeated twice) and pelleted at 17.5 k rpm for 30 min. The supernatant was added to 5 mL of Ni:NTA resin and washed with buffer A (150 mL) and eluted with buffer A with 250 mM imidazole added. The eluted protein was placed into 10 kDa snakeskin dialysis tube and left to dialyze for 2 days at 4 °C in 40 mM HEPES:KOH, 100 mM KCl, and 10 mM β-mercaptoethanol at pH 7.4. Following dialysis, the sample was concentrated with a 10 kDa centrifugal concentrator to a final volume of 2 mL with an equal volume of glycerol added, and 100 μL aliquots were frozen until needed.

Preparation of Samples for Kinetic Experiments

For kinetic experiments, 0.2–0.5 mg aliquots of the purified Aβ1–42, Aβ(M1–42), or NTE-Aβ peptides were dissolved in 1 mL 6 M GuHCl, 20 mM sodium phosphate, 0.2 mM EDTA, pH 8.5, and subjected to gel filtration on a Superdex 75 10/300 column in 20 mM sodium phosphate buffer pH 8.0, with 200 μM EDTA and 0.02% NaN₃. The middle part of monomer peak was collected on ice, lyophilized, dissolved in 6 M GuHCl, 20 mM sodium phosphate, 0.2 mM EDTA, pH 8.5 and subjected to a second round of gel filtration to ensure complete removal of trace amounts of aggregates and small molecule contaminants from *E. coli*. The middle part of monomer peak was collected on ice and was typically found to have a concentration in the range 20–70 μM (determined by absorbance of the collected part of the chromatogram peak using $\epsilon_{280} = 1400 \text{ L mol}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-1}$). The collected monomer was supplemented with 10 μM thioflavin T (ThT) from a 2 mM stock and used to prepare a dilution series in the range 0.5–20 μM peptide in 20 mM sodium phosphate buffer pH 8, with 200 μM EDTA, 10 μM ThT and 0.02% NaN₃. The ThT concentration was optimized to give a linear response for the concentration of fibrils.¹⁸ The dilution series were prepared in low-binding tubes on ice using careful pipetting to avoid introduction of air bubbles. Each sample was pipetted into multiple wells of a 96 well half area plate of black polystyrene with clear bottom and PEG coating (Corning 3881), 80 μL per well. The samples were added to the plate from lower to higher concentration after which the plate was sealed with a

plastic film (Corning 3095). Two to three 96-well plates were set up for each variant with all solutions in quadruplicate.

Aggregation Kinetics by Thioflavin T Fluorescence

The experiment was initiated by placing the 96-well plate at 37 °C in a plate reader (Fluostar Omega, Optima or Galaxy from BMG Labtech, Offenburg, Germany). The ThT fluorescence was measured through the bottom of the plate every 60 or 120 s (with excitation filter 440 nm, and emission filter 480 nm).

Circular Dichroism (CD) Spectroscopy

Monomers were isolated by gel filtration in 5 mM sodium phosphate buffer with 40 mM NaF, pH 8.0, and spectra recorded immediately in 1 mm quartz cuvettes between 250 and 185 nm at 37 °C using a JASCO J-815 polarimeter with scan rate 20 nm/min, response 16s, slit 1 nm. CD spectra were then recorded repeatedly during the aggregation reaction and at the end. Alternatively, to obtain aggregation time courses, the CD signal at 198 nm, reporting on the disappearance of unstructured monomer (negative signal) and appearance of β -sheet (positive signal) was recorded as a function of time for up to 24 h or until a stable plateau value was reached after a transition had been observed.

Kinetic Analysis

The global kinetic analysis to extract rate constants for the different A β variants was performed using the fitting platform Amylofit.³⁰ These analyses use master equations derived by considering the contributions from primary nucleation, secondary nucleation, and elongation.³¹ For each NTE-A β 42 variant, aggregation kinetics data at several peptide concentrations were uploaded, normalized and globally fitted.

Negative Contrast TEM

The morphology of A β aggregates formed from solutions incubated as above were assessed by negative contrast electron microscopy (EM) as described previously.³² Briefly, samples (5 μ L) were applied to carbon-coated Formvar grids left for 1 min, fixed with glutaraldehyde, washed with MQ water, wicked dry with filter paper, and 2% uranyl acetate added and incubated for two min. The grid was wicked dry and allowed to air-dry for 10 min. Grids were stored in a sealed container and viewed under a Tecnai G2 BIOTWIN electron transmission microscope operated at 120 V. All reagents were supplied by Electron Microscopy Sciences (Hatfield, PA). Duplicate samples were analyzed and at least duplicate grids examined, and the EM operator was blind to sample identity.

Double Antibody Immuno-Gold Labeling and Negative Contrast TEM

These studies were performed on end-stage aggregation products formed from (i) 5 μ M A β (1–42), that is, recombinant A β that lacked an exogenous methionine, (ii) 5 μ M –30A β 42, and (iii) a mixed solution containing 2.5 μ M A β (1–42) and 2.5 μ M –30A β 42. Samples (5 μ L) were applied to carbon-coated Formvar grids left for 5 min and blocked with 1% BSA in PBS for 10 min, and then incubated for a further 30 min with 1G6 (Covance, Dedham, MA), a monoclonal antibody that recognizes an epitope just N-terminal of the A β

region (APP649–652) and readily detects recombinant NTE-A β 42, but not A β 1–42.³³ Grids were then washed with PBS (3 drops in 10 min) and incubated for 20 min with rabbit anti-mouse bridging antibody (Cappel, MP Biomedicals, Solon, OH) in 1% BSA, PBS. Grids were again washed with PBS (3 drops in 10 min) and then incubated for 20 min with Protein A conjugated to 10 nm gold particles (University Medical Center, Utrecht, The Netherlands) in 1% BSA, PBS. Grids were washed in PBS (2 drops in 5 min) and then fixed for 1 min in 0.5% (v/v) glutaraldehyde. Thereafter, samples were washed with 20 mM glycine in PBS (4 drops in 10 min) and then incubated for 30 min with 3D6, a monoclonal antibody that specifically recognizes the free Asp1 N-terminal residue of A β .³⁴ Visualization of 3D6 was achieved as described above for 1G6, but used a rabbit antimouse bridging antibody and Protein A conjugated to 5 nm gold particles (University Medical Center, Utrecht, The Netherlands). All samples treated with both the 3D6 and 1G6 antibody. On completion of this procedure grids were washed in Milli-Q water (4 drops in 10 min) and wicked dry with filter paper, and samples stained for 30 s with 0.75% (w/v) uranyl formate. Duplicate samples were analyzed and at least duplicate grids examined and the EM operator was blind to sample identity.

Monte Carlo Simulations of Amyloid Formation

The model peptides used in these simulations contain only two kinds of residues, amyloidogenic (Φ) and nonamyloidogenic (O), differing only in terms of the average lifetime of their fibrillar contacts. The algorithm for the Monte Carlo simulations is reported elsewhere,^{35,36} and in brief it operates as follows. Inter-residue contacts are grouped in two categories, strong and weak contacts, with different average lifetime. Strong contacts are the fibrillar contacts involving the C-terminal six residues in each peptide as outlined in Figure 5D. The average lifetime for these contacts is given by the parameter τ_s . Weak contacts are all other intra- or intermolecular contacts involving the C-terminal six residues and the residues in the extension. The average lifetime for these contacts is given by the parameter τ_w . All contacts (strong and weak, intra-, and intermolecular) are allowed to form with equal probability but their formation is governed by their physical separation in space, which is modeled via the effective contact order (ECO) at each stage of the simulation. Each simulated system contains 100 peptides, which before the simulation are equally dispersed in the system and unfolded with no contacts formed between any residues. Each simulation cycle starts by randomly picking two residues which may be in the same or on two different peptides. The probability of forming a contact between the randomly chosen residues is proportional to $1/\text{ECO}^{1.5}$. If no contact is formed, the program steps forward to the next cycle. If a strong contact is formed, it is assigned a lifetime which is randomly picked from an exponential decay with the time constant τ_s . If a weak contact is formed, it is assigned a lifetime randomly picked from an exponential decay with the time constant τ_w . If a contact forms next to a preexisting one, its randomly assigned lifetime is multiplied by the cooperativity factor f_c . Each simulation cycle ends by terminating the contacts that expire on that cycle. In an earlier study³⁶ it was found that 5–20 times longer average survival time for a fibrillar contact ($\tau_s/\tau_w = 5\text{--}20$) is a sufficient criterion for fibrillar structure to dominate at equilibrium, and a value of $\tau_s/\tau_w = 10$ was used in the current simulations. The parameter settings were as follows. Number of peptides per simulated system: 100, $\tau_s = 40$ MCU, $\tau_w =$

4 MCU, $f_c = 2$. One Monte Carlo Unit (MCU) is defined as the square of the system size (10 000 simulation cycles in the present case).

Results

N-Terminally Extended A β Variants

We investigated the aggregation propensity of six recombinant NTE-A β 42 peptides with progressively longer primary sequences. These designed variants span the full range of N-terminal extensions identified in human plasma⁷ and in cell culture.⁶ Our peptides incorporate juxtaposed APP sequence of 5, 10, 15, 20, 30, or 40 residues upstream of M671 (Figure 1A). Synthetic genes were produced through stepwise extension of the A β (M1–42) gene²⁸ using PCR. The requirement for a start codon results in a methionine residue at the N-terminus of each peptide. The methionine at the N-terminal side of Asp1 is common to all seven peptides and designated residue 0, while N-terminal extensions are assigned negative numbers based on the size of the extension. All seven peptides expressed well in *E. coli*, and were readily purified to homogeneity (Figure 1B) using the two-step chromatographic procedure developed for A β (M1–40) and A β (M1–42).²⁸ Throughout, A β 42 refers to A β (M1–42). Recombinant A β beginning at Asp1 and ending at Ala42, referred to as A β 1–42, was used in coaggregation experiments for immuno-gold TEM analysis (see below).

NTE-A β Peptides Aggregate to Form Amyloid Fibrils

Fibril formation of NTE-A β 42 peptides was investigated under conditions where A β 42 is known to rapidly form amyloid fibrils.^{18,37} Aggregation starting from freshly isolated monomers was followed by monitoring the ThT fluorescence as a function of time at 37 °C in 20 mM sodium phosphate, 0.2 mM EDTA, 10 μ M ThT, 0.02% sodium azide, pH 8.0 under quiescent condition. Under these conditions all six NTE-A β 42 peptides form ThT-positive fibrils over time (1–14 h for 10 μ M peptide solutions; examples of data shown in Figure 2A).

Characteristic of nucleated polymerization reactions, all aggregation curves have sigmoidal-like appearances with a lag phase, a growth phase and a final plateau, (Figures 2A and S1). However, the aggregation process is retarded for all NTE-A β 42 peptides relative to A β 42. The time of half completion ($t_{1/2}$) was extracted from each aggregation trace as the point in time where the ThT fluorescence intensity is halfway between the initial baseline and the final plateau. We find that even the peptide with the shortest extension, –5A β 42, aggregates significantly more slowly than A β 42 and the effect is more pronounced for the longer extensions. Log($t_{1/2}$) values, obtained for reactions starting from 10 μ M monomer of each peptide, are plotted versus extension length in Figure 2B. Although –20A β 42 deviates somewhat from the overall trend, the data are reasonably well fitted by a straight line ($R = 0.965$), implying that $t_{1/2}$ grows exponentially with extension length. Similar trends are observed when the aggregation process is followed by circular dichroism (CD) spectroscopy (Figure 2C). CD spectra recorded at the start and end of the reactions reveal that the NTE-A β 42 peptides are unstructured as monomers and that the aggregates formed are β -sheet rich (Figure 2D). At all time points, the observed spectra can be reconstructed by a weighted superposition of the start and end spectra (Figure 2E), as previously reported for A β 42.⁶¹

Each NTE-A β 42 peptide was studied at a range of concentrations covering at least 1 order of magnitude. The $t_{1/2}$ values versus initial monomer concentration are shown in Figure 3 with linear (Figure 3A) and logarithmic (Figure 3B) axes. We find that the aggregation of each NTE-A β 42 peptide is retarded compared to A β 42 over the entire concentration range. For each variant, $t_{1/2}$ versus peptide concentration was fitted by a power function (Figure 3A) yielding a straight line in the double logarithmic plot (Figure 3B). The scaling exponent in the power function becomes the slope in the double logarithmic plot, and serves as a guide to the dominant nucleation mechanisms.³⁸ The similarity for the exponent of all variants (-1.2 to -1.5) suggests that their aggregation is governed by the same underlying mechanism as for A β 42, which is dominated by secondary nucleation of monomers on the fibril surface at all time-points except at the very beginning of reactions starting from monomeric peptide.^{18–21}

Morphology of Aggregates

Transmission electron microscopy was used to study the morphology of end-stage aggregates. All six extended variants were found to form amyloid fibrils that appear similar to each other (Figure 4) and to typical A β (1–42) and A β (M1–42) fibrils.²⁸ In all cases, individual filaments are obvious and two or more filaments are twisted around a common long axis. Clearly visible nodes appear at regular intervals corresponding to minima in apparent thickness, akin to the appearance of nodes when fibers are twisted together to form a rope. Individual filaments have a diameter of ~ 5 nm and the fibrils formed from two twisted filaments have diameters of ~ 14 nm.

Monte Carlo Simulations of Amyloid Formation

Monte Carlo simulations were used to follow the aggregation kinetics of model peptides with a hexa-residue aggregation-prone segment and 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 residues in an N-terminal extension (Figure 1C). In the simulations, all interactions were treated as attractive and the model peptides contain only two kinds of residues, amyloidogenic (Φ) and nonamyloidogenic (O). All kinds of inter-residue contacts (OO, O Φ , and $\Phi\Phi$) were allowed to form with equal probability, depending on the physical separation, which is modeled via the effective contact order (ECO) at each stage of the simulation (Figure 5A–C), while $\Phi\Phi$ contacts within fibrillar structure (Figure 5D, E) were assumed to persist on average 10 times longer than O Φ or OO contacts or any nonfibrillar $\Phi\Phi$ contacts. An individual nonfibrillar contact may thus survive longer than a fibrillar one, but on average the fibrillar contacts survive 10-fold longer than the nonfibrillar ones. A similar model with kinetic discrimination governing the contacts in a lower free energy structure has previously been used to model protein folding³⁵ and fibril formation of peptides with only amyloidogenic residues.³⁶

While Monte Carlo simulations contain no time variable, we find that the terminal extensions reduce the apparent aggregation rate in terms of the number of simulations cycles needed to reach a certain fraction of aggregated species (Figure 5F–H). This is reflected both in an increased number of cycles needed to reach a state with half the peptides in fibrillar form and a reduced steepness of the growth phase. The longer the extension, the more the simulated aggregation trace deviates from symmetric sigmoidal shape. Notably, the effect of

terminal extension (Figure 5F) is similar to the effect of diluting the system by increasing the size of the simulated system (Figure 5G).

Kinetic Analysis of Experimental Data

The quiescent aggregation data obtained over a range of initial monomer concentrations were fitted globally for each NTE-A β 42 length variant using the AmyloFit platform.³⁰ We find that the data for all NTE-A β 42s are reasonably well fitted using the same mechanism as for A β 42 (Figures 6A and S2), that is, with three microscopic steps corresponding to primary nucleation (rate constant k_n), elongation (k_+), and surface-catalyzed secondary nucleation (k_2). For A β 42, fragmentation is a slow reaction under quiescent conditions,¹⁸ and the data for the extended variants are also well fitted by setting the fragmentation rate to zero. Examples of experimental data and the best fit using a model with primary nucleation, elongation and surface-catalyzed secondary nucleation are shown in Figure 6A for -15A β 42 and in Figure S2 for all NTE-A β 42s. The kinetic analyses yield two products of rate constants, $k_n k_+$ and $k_2 k_+$, referred to as the combined rate constants, since the measured aggregation kinetics from monomer depend only on these products not the rate constants individually.³¹

The resulting rate constants are shown for all NTE-A β 42 in Figure 7A, and for -15A β 42 we find $k_n k_+ = 1.3 \text{ M}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-2}$ and $k_2 k_+ = 6 \times 10^8 \text{ M}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-2}$. These values are 700- and 70-fold lower than those for A β 42, respectively. Curves generated using the same rate constants as for A β 42 ($k_n k_+ = 900 \text{ M}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-2}$ and $k_2 k_+ = 4 \times 10^{10} \text{ M}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-2}$; ref 18) clearly do not fit the -15A β 42 data (Figure 6B). Misfits are also obtained if only the rate constant for primary nucleation (Figure 6C) or only the rate constant for secondary nucleation (Figure 6D) is allowed to shift relative to the value for A β 42. Thus, the combined elongation-nucleation rate constants for both primary and secondary processes are reduced for -15A β 42. Similar results are obtained for the other five variants; the data are reasonably well fitted by the same model as the data for A β 42 if all rate constants are allowed to take lower values (Figure S2), with a progressively larger reduction the longer the extension (Figure 7A). The data are well fitted if both primary and secondary nucleation have reaction orders of 2 for all NTE-A β 42s, as for A β 42,¹⁸ suggesting that the observed behavior is not the result of an altered reaction order.

The results (Figure 7A) suggest that $\log(k_n k_+)$ and $\log(k_2 k_+)$ decrease roughly linearly with extension length, and thus the reduction in rate constants is exponential in terminal extension length. We find that the N-terminal extensions reduce $k_n k_+$ by up to 4 orders of magnitude and $k_2 k_+$ by up to 3 orders of magnitude.

Seeded Aggregation Kinetics

Seeded aggregation kinetics experiments were set up to resolve the individual rate constants and to determine whether the reduction of $k_2 k_+$ for NTE-A β is due to the extended termini interfering with the catalytic activity of the fibril surface or with the monomer's ability to nucleate on the surface. Self-seeding experiments were set up for each variant (A β 42 or NTE-A β 42) by supplementing purified monomer with preformed seeds of the same variant. Cross-seeding experiments were set up for each variant by supplementing purified monomer

with preformed seeds of A β 42 or each of the other NTE-A β 42s. Examples of normalized data are shown in Figure 8 for self- and cross-seeding of A β 42, -15A β 42, and -30A β 42, and these and additional data are shown non-normalized in Figure S3A. While there is some variation in the final ThT intensity over the seeded samples, SDS PAGE analysis (Figure S3B) shows that in all cases most of the monomer is converted to fibrils by the end of the reaction. In all cases of self-seeding, we observe shortening of the lag phase in the presence of preformed seeds as would be expected in the presence of a surface-catalyzed secondary nucleation process of monomer on fibril surface.³⁸ Moreover, we find a very close correspondence between self-seeding and cross-seeding effects, irrespective of the identity of the seeds added to each monomeric peptide; for example, the aggregation of -15A β 42 is equally catalyzed by -15A β 42 seeds or A β 42 seeds or any NTE-A β 42 seed (middle column of Figures 8 and S3). Likewise, the aggregation of A β 42 or -30A β 42 is equally catalyzed by A β 42 seeds or any NTE-A β 42 seed (left and right column of Figures 8 and S3). On the contrary, if we compare the aggregation of different kinds of monomers on the same seeds (horizontal comparisons in Figures 8 and S3), we observe widely different time dependencies. The positive curvature in the aggregation curves is preserved up to ca. 10% seed, but is not seen at the highest seed concentration (30%) for most variants due to the very high elongation rate at this high seed concentration.³⁸

The aggregation at 30% seed at early time points is to a good approximation governed by elongation processes alone. Therefore, the initial gradient can be used in order to extract the relative elongation rate. We find that the elongation rates are reduced for NTE-A β 42s in comparison with A β 42 by over an order of magnitude (Figure 7B). With these values of the elongation rate constant for each variant at hand, we may resolve the rate constants of primary and secondary nucleation (Figure 7B). After this analysis, it is clear that N-terminal extensions reduce the rate constants of all three microscopic steps in the mechanism, with the largest effect on the rate constant for primary nucleation, k_n . The trend lines in Figure 7B imply a reduction in k_2 and k_+ by over an order of magnitude, and a reduction in k_n by up to 3 orders of magnitude over the extension series studied here.

Coaggregation Experiments

To determine whether A β 42 coaggregates with NTE-A β 42, component monomers were mixed and their aggregation monitored using ThT fluorescence. Each peptide was separately isolated as monomer by gel filtration, and these solutions were used to prepare a series of samples in which (i) and (ii) one peptide was held constant at a concentration of 5 μ M with increasing amounts (0- 5 μ M) of the other peptide, or (iii) the total peptide concentration was held at 5 μ M and the ratio of the peptides was varied (5:0, 4:1, 3:2, 2.5:2.5, 2:3, 2:4 and 0.5:4.5). Examples of coaggregation data for A β 42 and -15A β 42 are shown in Figure 9A, and for A β 42 and each NTE-A β 42 in Figure S4. In all cases, the macroscopic aggregation curve displays a single sigmoidal-like transition, indicative of one joint aggregation process. Most strikingly, there is a very strong dependence on A β 42 concentration, which seems to be the driver of the overall aggregation.

Immuno-gold TEM was used to examine whether joint fibrils are formed in monomer mixtures displaying a single sigmoidal-like aggregation curve. Such experiments require two

antibodies: one specific for an epitope in NTE-A β not present in A β , and one specific for an epitope in A β not present in an NTE-A β . We chose 1G6 since this antibody recognizes an epitope in APP N-terminal of Asp1 (APP649–652; ref 33) and therefore recognizes NTE-A β , but not A β 1–42. Conversely, 3D6 recognizes the free N-terminal Asp1 of A β and therefore reacts with A β 1–42, but not NTE-A β .³⁴ For these experiments A β 1–42 was expressed with an N-terminal fusion partner (a SUMO domain) to obtain Asp1 at the N-terminus after proteolytic digestion with SUMO protease. The fibrils formed in reactions starting from monomer mixtures of A β 1–42 and –30A β 42 as well as in pure samples of A β 1–42 or –30A β 42 were probed by 3D6 (Asp1-specific with 5 nm gold particles) and 1G6 (NTE-specific with 10 nm gold particles). We find that fibrils formed from a homogeneous solution of A β 1–42 or –30A β 42 are labeled with only 3D6 or only 1G6, respectively. In contrast, the mixed sample yields fibrils that are labeled with both 3D6 and 1G6 (Figure 9B). Some fibrils label predominantly with 3D6, and others with 1G6, but significant numbers of fibrils were labeled with both 3D6 and 1G6 and in some cases portions of the same fibrils are labeled with both antibodies. These results demonstrate that at least some fibrils contain both A β 1–42 and –30A β 42—a finding consistent with the single transitions seen in the ThT aggregation curves for mixed peptide solutions (Figures 9 and S4).

Discussion

Mutation, overexpression, or altered-processing of APP underlie all known monogenic cases of familial AD (fAD). APP undergoes substantial post-translational processing and many different proteolytic fragments of APP have been identified. Still, therapeutic targeting has focused on canonical forms of A β ,³⁹ driven by the observation that increased relative ratios of A β 42:A β 40 are associated with most, but not all, fAD mutations. However, available data support a pathogenic role for other APP metabolites.^{40–42} Indeed, the recent discovery of bioactive NTE-A β peptides could partly explain the lack of efficacy of experimental therapies designed to target canonical A β species.² For instance, it is possible that while BACE1 inhibitors reduce canonical A β they increase N-terminally extended or truncated A β species.⁴³ In this regard, it is important to note that some NTE-A β s have already been found to be potent neurotoxins.⁶

In this study, we set out to investigate the aggregation behavior of NTE-A β 42 peptides, and whether their aggregation is influenced by A β 42 and vice versa. We find that all variants form fibrils of similar morphology as A β 42 fibrils (Figure 4), but the rate by which these fibrils form is progressively lower the longer the extension (Figure 2A,C). As previously found for A β 42,⁶¹ the CD spectra for the NTE-A β 42s can at all time points be reconciled with unstructured monomer, or β -sheet fibrils or a weighted superposition of spectra for these start and end structures (Figure 2D,E) meaning that the species distribution is dominated by these two forms at all time points. This is seen on a macroscopic level as an overall retarded aggregation process, and the time taken to achieve half-maximal aggregation ($t_{1/2}$) increases approximately exponentially with extension length (Figure 2B). Detailed kinetic analysis of concentration-dependent ThT fluorescence data for each extended variant (Figure 3) allows this observation to be resolved into the underlying microscopic steps in the reaction mechanism (Figures 6 and 7), suggesting that the rate constants of all steps are reduced. A β and NTE-A β appear to coaggregate into joint fibrils

(Figure 9), and the extended N-termini do not interfere with the catalytic sites presented for surface nucleation on the fibrils (Figure 8).

The same aggregation mechanism as recently found for A β 42 (primary nucleation, elongation, and surface-catalyzed secondary nucleation of monomers on fibril surfaces) can be used to globally fit the data for each NTE-A β 42, implying the underlying reaction mechanism can to a large extent still be described by the same aggregation model as for A β 42. The analyses provide combined rate constants for primary nucleation and elongation, $k_n k_+$, and for secondary nucleation and elongation, $k_2 k_+$. Both products are dramatically influenced by the N-terminal extensions; the data can only be fitted if both products are allowed to take lower values than for A β 42 (Figure 6C,D), with a more severe reduction the longer the extension length (Figure 7A).

While the kinetic analysis implies that primary nucleation is more strongly retarded than secondary nucleation, it does not resolve the relative effects on elongation and nucleation. We therefore analyzed aggregation data in the high seed regime. Here the ThT signal increase at early time points is, to a good approximation, governed by elongation alone, and the initial gradient can be used to estimate the relative elongation rate constant. With an estimate of the elongation rate constant, we can in turn estimate the rate constants of primary and secondary nucleation. From this analysis (Figure 7B), we can conclude that the rate constants for all three microscopic processes are reduced upon N-terminal extension of A β 42. The elongation and secondary nucleation rate constants are affected similarly, both decreasing by more than an order of magnitude. The primary nucleation rate constant is even more strongly affected, decreasing by up to 3 orders of magnitude.

The reduction in primary nucleation rate implies an interference of the extended termini with the nucleating monomers. In the cases of elongation and secondary nucleation, we may compare self- and cross-seeding data to resolve whether the extended termini interfere with seed or monomer. A β 42 or NTE-A β 42 was found to aggregate equally fast if supplemented with fibrils of A β 42 or any NTE-A β 42. On the contrary, if the seed type is held constant, there is a marked difference in the observed reaction rate between A β 42 monomers and NTE-A β 42 monomers. The results at high seed concentration reveal that the monomer identity, rather than seed identity, dictates the elongation rate (Figures 8 and S3). Also at low seed concentration, the monomer identity dictates the observed aggregation curves, and we infer that N-terminal extensions interfere with the nucleating monomers also in secondary nucleation. This is opposite to C-terminal variation, in which case the identity of the fibrils dictates the rate of surface catalyzed nucleation; A β 42 monomers fail to nucleate on A β 40 fibrils,²³ and A β 40 monomers fail to nucleate on A β 42 fibrils.^{23,24} This contrasting behavior most likely reflects on the one hand the flexibility of the N-terminus and on the other hand the much higher level of structural organization of the C-terminus, as inferred from solid-state NMR studies.^{24,44,45} While solid state data fail to detect residues 1–10 within the β -sheet of the A β 42 fibrils,^{24,46} we speculate that the extended N-termini may appear as flexible appendices that decorate fibrils akin to a polymer brush.

We also examined the aggregation process in solutions that initially contained two kinds of monomers, A β 42 and NTE-A β 42. All six NTE-A β s were examined in combination with

$A\beta_{42}$ at several molar ratios. In all cases, we observe a single aggregation process compatible with coaggregation of $A\beta_{42}$ and NTE- $A\beta_{42}$ (Figures 9 and S4). Notably, we have shown previously that mixtures of $A\beta$ peptides that do not form coaggregates produce biphasic aggregation curves²³ very different from those reported here. The asymmetry in behavior (Figure 9A), with the $A\beta_{42}$ concentration being the main determinant of the half times observed for mixtures, can be understood in terms of $A\beta_{42}$ seeds providing a catalytic surface for nucleation of all variants. In addition, $A\beta_{42}$ and NTE- $A\beta_{42}$ monomers may cooperate in conucleation events. Our data imply that $A\beta_{42}$ aggregation will drive the aggregation of NTE- $A\beta_{42}$ and therefore the $A\beta_{42}$ concentration may be a main risk factor. In mixtures with $A\beta_{42}$, aggregation of NTE- $A\beta_{42}$ s becomes as fast as for $A\beta_{42}$ alone, although NTE- $A\beta_{42}$ s are intrinsically less aggregation prone and aggregate much more slowly in isolation.

While natural amyloid-forming peptides may have one⁴⁷ or several kinds of residues (as in the case of $A\beta$), the use of only one kind of amyloidogenic residue and one kind of non-amyloidogenic residue in our simulations leaves less room for parameter adjustment and the results are more likely to be general. We find that the number of simulation cycles required to reach the midpoint of the aggregation process grows exponentially with extension length (Figure 5), as in the experiments (Figure 3). If we compare the systems during ongoing reactions at the same number of simulation cycles, the fraction of peptides in the fibrillar aggregates is lower the longer the terminal extension. The “productive” molecular collisions leading to in-register fibrillar contacts compete with a larger number of “nonproductive” molecular collisions the longer the terminal extension.

The striking similarity between the experimental results for the extended $A\beta$ variants and the results of the Monte Carlo simulations for simplified model peptides suggest that also in the case of NTE- $A\beta_{42}$ s the reduced overall aggregation rate may arise from a protection mechanism relying on the unstructured termini competing with the aggregation-prone segment for productive molecular encounters between monomers and between monomers and fibrils. Such a general physicochemical effect would lower the aggregation rate for any amyloidogenic peptide if extended at the N- or C-terminus by flanks of nonamyloidogenic sequence. Similar mechanisms may be at hand also for all kinds of aggregates that involve a discrete peptide segment. A theoretical study found that the free energy of peptide cluster formation was increased by disordered flanks, thus reducing the aggregation tendency.⁴⁸ Retardation of aggregation by flanking polypeptide segments occurs also when an amyloidogenic peptide segment is embedded in folded monomeric proteins. In those cases, unfolding of the monomer precedes amyloid formation, and stabilizing interactions with and within the rest of the protein prevent fibril formation even more.⁴⁹ The rate of aggregation may increase upon destabilization of the protein through pH reduction, mutation or reduced affinity for a ligand.^{50–53}

Besides the specific knowledge uncovered about NTE- $A\beta$ s, our results have important implications for the more general physiochemical observation that aggregation activity can be effectively diluted by adding a nonaggregation prone sequence. The reduced aggregation rates observed here for NTE- $A\beta$ variants are compatible with experimental observations of increased aggregation when the N-terminus is truncated,^{25,26} and with the effects of

extension and truncation of other proteins and peptides.^{54–60} In many polypeptides associated with protein aggregation diseases, the amyloid-forming segment is part of a larger protein or peptide, which seems to protect against aggregation. Enhanced aggregation rates have been observed upon trimming of the protein sequence through proteolysis, or when the amyloidogenic segment is produced as a separate peptide, as long as the amyloidogenic segment remains intact. Examples of this phenomenon are provided by the cell cycle protein Cks1,⁵⁴ α -synuclein,^{55–59} and myoglo-bin.⁶⁰

Conclusion

A β 42 variants with up to 40 residue N-terminal extensions form fibrils of very similar morphology as A β starting at Asp1. However, the fibril formation process is strongly retarded in the extended variants. The half time grows exponentially with extension length, and the rate constants for all underlying microscopic processes are reduced. The retardation is consistent with a general physicochemical effect involving reduced frequency of amyloid-productive molecular encounters between monomers and between monomers and fibrils. A β 42 and NTE-A β 42 can coaggregate into mixed fibrils, and nucleation of monomers on the surface of fibrils accelerates the overall reaction in pure samples as well as in sequence mixtures. Once incorporated into fibrils, N-terminal extensions of A β monomers have little effect on the seeding capacity. A β and NTE-A β s nucleate equally fast on fibrils of A β and fibrils of NTE-A β s and the aggregation rate in seeded samples is governed by the monomer identity. In nature, A β exists as a heterogeneous family of peptides which include NTE-A β s. The overall aggregation process may be determined by the concentration of the most aggregation prone A β -variants, which may serve as initiators for the formation of synaptotoxic aggregates of NTE-A β s.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank Maria Ericsson of the Harvard Medical School Electron Microscopy Facility for assistance with immuno-EM studies. We also thank Dr. Kendra K. Fredrick for her assistance in preparing the SUMO-A β vector. 3D6 was a kind gift from Dr. G. Basi, Elan Pharmaceuticals. The present study was funded by the Swedish Research Council, VR and its Linneaus Centre Organizing Molecular Matter (SL), the European Research Council (SL,TPJK), the Crafoord Foundation (SL), Lars Hiertas Minne (OS), the Royal Physiographic Society (OS), the National Institute of Health grant AG046275 (DMW), the BrightFocus Foundation (DMW), the Cambridge Home and EU Scholarship Scheme (GM), The Frances and Augustus Newman Foundation (TPJK) and the BBSRC (TPJK) and by the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering of the National Institute of Health under grants EB-003151, and EB-002026 (M.T.C., A.C.J., and R.G.G.).

References

1. Hebert LE, Weuve J, Scherr PA, Evans DA. *Neurology*. 2013; 80:1778–1783. [PubMed: 23390181]
2. Selkoe D. *J Ann Neurol*. 2013; 74:328–336.
3. Hardy J. *J Neurochem*. 2009; 110:1129–1134. [PubMed: 19457065]
4. Vassar R, Bennett BD, Babu-Khan S, Kahn S, Mendiaz EA, Denis P, Teplow DB, Ross S, Amarante P, Loeloff R, Luo Y, Fisher S, Fuller J, Edenson S, Lile J, Jarosinski MA, Biere AL, Curran E,

- Burgess T, Louis JC, Collins F, Treanor J, Rogers G, Citron M. *Science*. 1999; 286:735–741. [PubMed: 10531052]
5. Cai H, Wang Y, McCarthy D, Wen H, Borchelt DR, Price DL, Wong PC. *Nat Neurosci*. 2001; 4:233–234. [PubMed: 11224536]
 6. Welzel AT, Maggio JE, Shankar GM, Walker DE, Ostaszewski BL, Li S, Klyubin I, Rowan MJ, Seubert P, Walsh DM, Selkoe D. *J Biochemistry*. 2014; 53:3908–3921.
 7. Kaneko N, Yamamoto R, Sato TA, Tanaka K. *Proc Jpn Acad, Ser B*. 2014; 90:104–117. [PubMed: 24621957]
 8. Haass C, Schlossmacher MG, Hung AY, Vigo-Pelfrey C, Mellon A, Ostaszewski BL, Lieberburg I, Koo EH, Schenk D, Teplow DB, Selkoe D. *J Nature*. 1992; 359:322–325.
 9. Haass C, Selkoe D. *J Cell*. 1993; 75:1039–42.
 10. Gowing E, Roher AE, Woods AS, Cotter RJ, Chaney M, Little SP, Ball MJ. *J Biol Chem*. 1994; 269:10987–10990.
 11. Larner A. *J Neurobiol Aging*. 1999; 20:65–69.
 12. Portelius E, Olsson M, Brinkmalm G, Ruetschi U, Mattsson N, Andreasson U, Gobom J, Brinkmalm A, Holtta M, Blennow K, Zetterberg H. *J Alzheimer's Dis*. 2013; 33:85–93. [PubMed: 22886024]
 13. Portelius E, Andreasson U, Ringman JM, Buerger K, Daborg J, Buchhave P, Hansson O, Harmsen A, Gustavsson MK, Hanse E, Galasko D, Hampel H, Blennow K, Zetterberg H. *Mol Neurodegener*. 2010; 5:2. [PubMed: 20145736]
 14. Portelius E, Westman-Brinkmalm A, Zetterberg H, Blennow K. *J Proteome Res*. 2006; 5:1010–1016. [PubMed: 16602710]
 15. Bros P, Delatour V, Vialaret J, Lalere B, Barthelemy N, Gabelle A, Lehmann S, Hirtz C. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2015; 53:1437–4331.
 16. Portelius E, Brinkmalm G, Tran AJ, Zetterberg H, Westman-Brinkmalm A, Blennow K. *Neurodegener Dis*. 2009; 6:87–94. [PubMed: 19229112]
 17. Shankar GM, Walsh DM. *Mol Neurodegener*. 2009; 4:48–60. [PubMed: 19930651]
 18. Cohen SI, Linse S, Luheshi LM, Hellstrand E, White DA, Rajah L, Otzen DE, Vendruscolo M, Dobson CM, Knowles TP. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2013; 110:9758–9763. [PubMed: 23703910]
 19. Cohen SIA, Arosio P, Presto J, Kurudenkandy FR, Biverstal H, Dolfe L, Dunning C, Yang X, Frohm B, Vendruscolo M, Johansson J, Dobson CM, Fisahn A, Knowles TP, Linse S. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. 2015; 22:207–213. [PubMed: 25686087]
 20. Arosio P, Cukalevski C, Frohm B, Knowles TPJ, Linse S. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2014; 136:219–225. [PubMed: 24313551]
 21. Arosio P, Knowles TPJ, Linse S. *Phys Chem Chem Phys*. 2015; 17:7606–7618. [PubMed: 25719972]
 22. Meisl G, Yang X, Hellstrand E, Frohm B, Kirkegaard JB, Cohen SI, Dobson CM, Linse S, Knowles TP. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2014; 111:9384–9389. [PubMed: 24938782]
 23. Cukalevski C, Yang X, Meisl G, Weininger U, Bernfur K, Frohm B, Knowles TPJ, Linse S. *RSC Chemical Science*. 2015; 6:4215–4233.
 24. Xiao Y, Ma B, McElheny D, Parthasarathy S, Long F, Hoshi M, Nussinov R, Ishii Y. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. 2015; 22:499–505. [PubMed: 25938662]
 25. Pike CJ, Overman MJ, Cotman CW. *J Biol Chem*. 1995; 270:23895–23898. [PubMed: 7592576]
 26. D'Arrigo C, Tabaton M, Perico A. *Biopolymers*. 2009; 91:861–873. [PubMed: 19562755]
 27. Galante D, Corsaro A, Florio T, Vella S, Pagano A, Sbrana F, Vassalli M, Perico A, D'Arrigo C. *Int J Biochem Cell Biol*. 2012; 44:2085–2093. [PubMed: 22903022]
 28. Walsh DM, Thulin E, Minogue A, Gustavsson T, Pang E, Teplow DB, Linse S. *FEBS J*. 2009; 276:1266–1281. [PubMed: 19175671]
 29. Andreasson C, Fiaux J, Rampelt H, Mayer MP, Bukau B. *J Biol Chem*. 2008; 283:8877–8884. [PubMed: 18218635]
 30. Meisl G, Kirkegaard JB, Arosio P, Vendruscolo M, Dobson CM, Linse S, Knowles TP. *J Nature Protocols*. 2015 in press.

31. Cohen SIA, Vendruscolo M, Dobson CM, Knowles TP. *J J Chem Phys.* 2011; 135:065106. [PubMed: 21842955]
32. Walsh DM, Lomakin A, Benedek GB, Condron MM, Teplow DB. *J Biol Chem.* 1997; 272:22364–22372. [PubMed: 9268388]
33. Mc Donald JM, O'Malley TT, Liu W, Mably AJ, Brinkmalm G, Portelius E, Wittbold WM, Frosch MP, Walsh DM. *Alzheimer's Dementia.* 2015; doi: 10.1016/j.jalz.2015.01.005
34. Feinberg H, Saldanha JW, Diep L, Goel A, Widom A, Veldman GM, Weis WI, Schenk D, Basi GS. *Alzheimer's Res Ther.* 2014; 6:31. [PubMed: 25024748]
35. Linse S, Linse B. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2007; 129:8481–8486. [PubMed: 17564448]
36. Linse B, Linse S. *Mol BioSyst.* 2011; 7:2296–2303. [PubMed: 21589952]
37. Hellstrand E, Boland B, Walsh DM, Linse S. *ACS Chem Neurosci.* 2010; 1:13–18. [PubMed: 22778803]
38. Cohen SI, Vendruscolo M, Dobson CM, Knowles TP. *J Mol Biol.* 2012; 421:160–171. [PubMed: 22406275]
39. Hardy J, Selkoe D. *J Science.* 2002; 297:353–356.
40. Neve RL, McPhie DL, Chen Y. *Brain Res.* 2000; 886:54–66. [PubMed: 11119687]
41. Moore S, Evans LDB, Andersson T, Portelius E, Smith J, Dias TB, Saurat N, McGlade A, Kirwan P, Blennow K, Hardy J, Zetterberg H, Livesey F. *J Cell Rep.* 2015; 11:689–696.
42. Cantlon A, Sala Frigerio CS, Walsh DM. *J Alzheimer's Dis Parkinson's Dis.* 2015; 2:12–24.
43. Portelius E, Dean RA, Andreasson U, Mattsson N, Westerlund A, Olsson M, Demattos RB, Racke MM, Zetterberg H, May PC, Blennow K. *Alzheimer's Res Ther.* 2014; 6:75. [PubMed: 25404952]
44. Balbach JJ, Petkova AT, Oyler NA, Antzutkin ON, Gordon DJ, Meredith SC, Tycko R. *Biophys J.* 2002; 83:1205–1216. [PubMed: 12124300]
45. Bertini I, Gonnelli L, Luchinat C, Mao JF, Nesi A. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:16013–16022. [PubMed: 21882806]
46. Colvin MT, Silvers R, Frohm B, Su Y, Linse S, Griffin RG. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2015; 137:7509–7518. [PubMed: 26001057]
47. Fandrich M, Dobson CM. *EMBO J.* 2002; 21:5682–5690. [PubMed: 12411486]
48. Abeln S, Frenkel D. *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2008; 4:e1000241. [PubMed: 19096500]
49. Tartaglia GG, Pawar AP, Campioni S, Dobson CM, Chiti F, Vendruscolo M. *J Mol Biol.* 2008; 380:425–436. [PubMed: 18514226]
50. Ramirez-Alvarado M, Merkel JS, Regan L. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2000; 97:8979–8984. [PubMed: 10908649]
51. Kad NM, Myers SL, Smith DP, Smith DA, Radford SE, Thomson NH. *J Mol Biol.* 2003; 330:785–797. [PubMed: 12850147]
52. Szczepankiewicz O, Cabaleiro-Lago C, Tartaglia GG, Vendruscolo M, Hunter T, Hunter GJ, Nilsson H, Thulin E, Linse S. *Mol BioSyst.* 2011; 7:521–532. [PubMed: 21076757]
53. Masino L, Nicastro G, Calder L, Vendruscolo M, Pastore A. *FASEB J.* 2011; 25:45–54. [PubMed: 20810784]
54. Bader R, Seeliger MA, Kelly SE, Ilag LL, Meersman F, Limones A, Luisi BF, Dobson CM, Itzhaki LS. *J Biol Chem.* 2006; 281:18816–18824. [PubMed: 16675442]
55. Kessler JC, Rochet JC, Lansbury PT. *Biochemistry.* 2003; 42:672–678. [PubMed: 12534279]
56. Hoyer W, Cherny D, Subramaniam V, Jovin TM. *Biochemistry.* 2004; 43:16233–16242. [PubMed: 15610017]
57. Murray IV, Giasson BI, Quinn SM, Koppaka V, Axelsen PH, Ischiropoulos H, Trojanowski JQ, Lee VMY. *Biochemistry.* 2003; 42:8530–8540. [PubMed: 12859200]
58. Li W, West N, Colla E, Pletnikova O, Troncoso JC, Marsh L, Dawson TM, Jakala P, Hartmann T, Price DL, Lee MK. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2005; 102:2162–2167. [PubMed: 15684072]
59. Lewis KA, Yaeger A, deMartino GN, Thomas PJ. *J Bioenerg Biomembr.* 2010; 42:85–95. [PubMed: 20148295]
60. Correa DHA, Ramos CH. *Int J Biol Macromol.* 2011; 48:583–588. [PubMed: 21300089]

61. Cukalevski R, Boland B, Frohm B, Thulin E, Walsh D, Linse S. ACS Chem Neurosci. 2012; 3:1008–1016. [PubMed: 23259036]

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Figure 1.

Aβ42 and model peptides used for in vitro and in silico studies. (A) Amino acid sequences of Aβ42 and the six NTE-Aβ peptides, with 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, and 40 extra amino acids from APP and (B) their migration on 4–20% polyacrylamide SDS tris-tricine gel with peptides visualized by staining with coomassie brilliant blue. The number of residues in the extension is given under each lane. The same Aβ42 sample was loaded in the two outer lanes to help to identify the migration of NTE-Aβs; the gel is curved as indicated by the dashed black line. (C) Schematic representation of the model hexapeptide and NTE-model peptides used in the Monte Carlo simulations with six amyloidogenic residues (Φ) and 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 nonamyloidogenic residues (O).

Figure 2.

(A) Examples of aggregation kinetics for Aβ42 and the six NTE-Aβ42 peptides.

Aggregation was monitored by ThT fluorescence at ca. 10 μM peptide concentration in 20 mM sodium phosphate, 0.2 mM EDTA, 0.02% NaN₃, pH 8.0 under quiescent condition. The individual traces from four replicates are shown, and the results are representative of at least eight different experiments. The same data is shown without normalization and truncation in Figure S1. (B) The logarithm of the time of half completion ($t_{1/2}$) of the aggregation process for each extension length at 10 μM peptide concentration was determined from the experiments conducted as in (A). The solid line is a straight line fitted to the data points. (C) Aggregation kinetics as monitored by the CD signal at 198 nm for Aβ42 (black), -15Aβ42 (yellow), -30Aβ42 (red), and -40Aβ42 (purple). (D) Examples of CD spectra recorded before (solid lines) and after (dotted lines) the aggregation reactions for Aβ42 (black), -15Aβ42 (yellow), -30Aβ42 (red), and -40Aβ42 (purple). (E) Examples of CD spectra recorded for -15Aβ42 at start (black line) and end (red line), as well as during the transition at 2.5 h (blue dots), 3.2 h (green dots), and 4 h (orange dots), with weighted superpositions of the start and end spectra shown as solid lines in the respective colors. All data in panels (C)–(E) are obtained at ca. 10 μM total peptide concentration in 5 mM sodium phosphate, 40 mM NaF, pH 8.0 under quiescent conditions.

Figure 3. Concentration dependence of aggregation kinetics for A β 42 and NTE-A β 42 peptides under quiescent conditions. The time of half completion of the aggregation process, $t_{1/2}$, is plotted as a function of peptide concentration for A β 42 and the NTE-A β 42 peptides in 20 mM sodium phosphate, 0.2 mM EDTA, 0.02% NaN₃, pH 8.0. Half times and peptide concentrations are shown in linear scales in (A) and logarithmic scales in (B). Each data point is the average, and the error bars represent SD of four replicates. For each peptide, we include the peptide concentrations at which fibril formation was observed within the time frame of experiment. The solid lines show fits of a power function to each data set. The color codes per extension length are given in panel (A).

Figure 4.

TEM of end-stage reaction time points for the six NTE-A β 42 peptides: (A) -5A β 42, (B) -10A β 42, (C) -15A β 42, (D) -20A β 42, (E) -30A β 42, and (F) -40A β 42. All NTE-A β 42 peptides form fibrils that are very similar to those formed from A β 1-42 and A β (M1-42).^{19,28}

Figure 5.

Monte Carlo Simulations to test the effect of N-terminal extensions on fibril formation. (A–C) Effective contact order (ECO) is defined as the number of covalent amino-acid connections for the shortest path (dashed red line) between the trial residues (red) and three examples of different values of ECO are shown. (D) Fibrillar contacts. (E) Each peptide is allowed to interact with a maximum of three other peptides. Panels (F)–(H) show results of the simulations of model peptides with six amyloidogenic (Φ) residues in an aggregation-prone segment numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and up to 6 non-amyloidogenic (O) residues in an N-terminal extension numbered –1, –2, –3, –4, –5, and –6. The average of 100 simulations of systems of 100 peptides of each length (labeled with the number of residues in the extension) is shown in panels for two concentration, c : (F) $c = 0.0025$ and (G) $c = 0.0008$. (H) Number of simulation steps required until 50% of the fibrillar contacts are formed (using $c = 0.0025$ as in panel F).

Figure 6. Aggregation kinetics data for 4, 5, 6.4, 8, 10, 12.5, 16, and 20 μM $\text{A}\beta_{42}$. Data are from a single experiment in which four replicates for each condition are shown. At least two repeat experiments were performed for each peptide. The results of global fitting to all data are shown with the curves at each concentration shown in the same color as the respective data points. (A) The best fit using a model with primary nucleation, elongation, and surface-catalyzed secondary nucleation, with the resulting rate constants $k_n k_+ = 1.3 \text{ M}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-2}$ and $k_2 k_+ = 6 \times 10^8 \text{ M}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-2}$. (B) Curves generated using the parameters for $\text{A}\beta_{42}$ ($k_n k_+ = 900 \text{ M}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-2}$ and $k_2 k_+ = 4 \times 10^{10} \text{ M}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-2}$). (C) The best fit under the assumption that only the primary nucleation rate constant is shifted relative to $\text{A}\beta_{42}$. (D) The best fit under the assumption that only the rate constant for secondary nucleation is shifted relative to $\text{A}\beta_{42}$.

Figure 7.

Microscopic rate constants. (A) Combined rate constants (obtained from kinetic analyses of concentration-dependent data, as exemplified in Figures 6 and S2) for primary nucleation and elongation ($k_n k_+$, blue upward triangle) and for secondary nucleation and elongation ($k_2 k_+$, green downward triangle), as a function of extension length. (B) Dependence of individual rate constants on N-terminal extension resolved after analysis of data obtained in the high seed regime. This analysis yields the relative elongation rate constant (k_+ , red circle), used to resolve the relative rate constants for primary nucleation (k_n , blue upward triangle), and secondary nucleation (k_2 , green downward triangle).

Figure 8. Seeded aggregation kinetics of 5 μM A β 42 monomers (left column), 5 μM -15A β 42 monomers (middle column), and 5 μM -30A β 42 monomers (right column) by seeds of A β 42 (top row), -15A β 42 (second row), -30A β 42 (third row), and -40A β 42 (bottom row) in comparison with unseeded reactions (black data points). The seed concentrations are 0.3% (blue), 1% (green), 3% (yellow), and 30% (red) of the monomer concentration at time zero. The data are presented as normalized ThT fluorescence intensity versus time, with three replicates of each condition.

Figure 9.

Coaggregation of NTE-A β and A β . (A) Aggregation kinetics starting from monomer mixtures of -15A β 42 and A β 42. Left: data for solutions with A β 42 held constant at 5 μ M and -15A β 42 varied from 0 to 5 μ M (color codes given in the panel). Middle: -15A β 42 held constant at 5 μ M and A β 42 varied from 0 to 5 μ M. Right: Sum of A β 42 and -15A β 42 held constant at 5 μ M. The A β 42 concentration follows the color codes given in the panel, and the -15A β 42 concentration is 5 μ M minus the A β 42 concentration. (B) Negative stain TEM of fibrils formed from 5 μ M A β 1-42 (left), 2.5 μ M A β 1-42 + 2.5 μ M -30A β 42 (middle), or 5 μ M -30A β 42 (right), taken at the time points as indicated with circles at the inset aggregation curves for 5 μ M A β 1-42 (black), 2.5 μ M A β 1-42 + 2.5 μ M -30A β 42 (brown), and 5 μ M -30A β 42 (red). Fibrils were added to grids and incubated with 3D6 (an antibody specific for Asp-1) conjugated to 5 nm gold nanoparticle and 1G6 (an antibody specific for an epitope in the 30-residue extension) conjugated to 10 nm gold nanoparticle. All samples were treated with both the 3D6 and 1G6 antibody. The middle panel contains fibrils decorated with both 5 and 10 nm gold nanoparticles marked with black and red arrows, respectively. Left and right fields contain fibrils marked by only 5 and 10 nm gold nanoparticles, respectively. A small number of these are marked with arrows. In control experiments, preformed 1-42 fibrils and preformed -30A β 42 fibrils were mixed and used for immuno-EM, in which case no fibrils stained with both 3D6 and 1G6 were detected (see Figure S5).