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Preface

Developmental Genetics –
or what can genetics tell us about evolution, development, human birth defects, and disease?

The idea of a genetic basis of development began in the mid-19th century at the intersection of descriptive embryology and cytology. Modern histological techniques afforded WILHELM HIS (1831-1904) to visualise the cell nucleus, chromosomes, and distinct steps of mitosis. By improving these techniques THEODOR BOVERI (1862-1915) could demonstrate that each parent contributes equivalent chromosomes to the zygote, and each chromosome is an independently inherited unit. He revealed that an incorrect number or improper combination of chromosomes in the embryo causes abnormal development of the organism. Finally, THOMAS H. MORGAN (1866-1945) founded the field of Drosophila genetics and was able to demonstrate that genes are carried on chromosomes and that the latter represent the mechanical basis of heredity [KOHLER, 1994; GARLAND, 2000; MOODY, 2007]. Thenceforward the main interest was to determine the fundamental principles of genetics. New technologies in molecular biology and cloning were developed to reveal gene inheritance, regulation of expression, and discovering the genetic code. Mutagenising the entire genome and screening for developmental abnormalities in Drosophila revealed important regulatory genes in invertebrates. Following homology cloning in various animals discovered counterparts of many of these genes in other invertebrates and vertebrates. The existence of genes, which are important for developmental processes, found in various organisms, demonstrate that developmental programs and molecular genetic processes are highly conserved during development [MOODY, 2007]. Indeed, the Human Genome Project could identify homologues in humans and demonstrate that many of these regulatory genes underlie human developmental disorders. The conservation between genomes of different species allows the utilization of animal models to gain important insights of clinical relevance.

Hearing and Deafness

The senses of hearing and balance rely on the function of specialised mechanoreceptor cells called “hair cells”, which are vital to perceive sound as well as motion. Sound frequencies and intensities are detected by hair cells in the cochlear, while those in the semicircular canals and otolith organs sense changes in gravity and acceleration. In the past it has been difficult to study the biology of hair cells because they are housed within the inner ear, which itself is located in the temporal bone of the skull, a less accessible region in model organisms like mouse or chicken [BISONNETTE, 1996]. However, since the establishment of the zebrafish as genetic model organism, the understanding of structure and function of hair cells has been improved because of the embryonic zebrafish’s transparency and better accessibility. Hair cells are extremely sensitive to mechanical irritations and damages are irreversible and can lead to hearing impairment or even to the complete loss of the ability to hear. Deafness might caused by complications at birth, certain infectious diseases, use of ototoxic drugs, exposure to excessive noise, advanced age or may be inherited.
Deafness is the most common inherited sensory defect. Studies have attributed about 50% of childhood sensorineural hearing impairment to genetic factors. More than 62 human deafness genes, including mitochondrial genes, have been identified yet [VAN CAMP & SMITH, 2007]. Heritable forms of hearing loss can be congenital or delayed onset; conductive, sensorineural, or mixed type; mild to profound in degree; progressive or non-progressive; unilateral or bilateral and symmetrical or asymmetrical in severity and configuration [CORDES & FRIEDMAN, 2000]. Mutations giving rise to anatomical defects in the inner ear have been isolated in a large-scale screen for mutations causing visible abnormalities in the zebrafish embryo [MULLINS, 1994; HAFFTER, 1996; WHITFIELD, 1996; VAN EEDEN, 1999]. 58 mutants have been classified as having a primary ear phenotype; these fall into several phenotypic classes, affecting presence or size of the otoliths, size and shape of the otic vesicle and formation of the semicircular canals. Many of the ear and otolith mutants show an expected behavioural phenotype: embryos fail to balance correctly, and may swim on their sides, upside down, or in circles [GRANATO, 1996].

Hereditary hearing impairment is classified into nonsyndromic (or isolated) or syndromic (i.e., hearing loss associated with other anomalies) forms [PETIT, 1996]. Nonsyndromic hearing impairment is almost exclusively caused by mutations within a single gene and are not associated with any other abnormalities or defects. Up to 30% of deafness in children can be attributed to syndromic forms.

To date several hundred such syndromes have been described, a number of these can be classified as early developmental defects [GORLIN, 1995]. Progress in localization and identification of genes, which are responsible for sensorineural hearing loss, provide new subclassification of the diseases associated with appropriated genes. 75% to 80% of genetic deafness is attributed to autosomal recessive gene disorders and 18% to 20% to autosomal dominant gene disorders. The identification of autosomal dominant disorders is facilitated by a positive family history reflecting a classical dominant inheritance pattern and recognizable phenotype. In reality, the variation in expressivities of dominant genes leads to different phenotypic characteristics being present in various affected members of the same family.

Inherited Deafness Disorders

One example for such an autosomal dominant disorder is the Branchio-Oto-Renal syndrome, caused by a mutation in the EYA1 gene, which has a counterpart in the zebrafish dog-eared mutation, characterised by defective formation of the inner ear, less responsiveness to vibrational stimuli and failure to balance when swimming [WHITFIELD, 1996]. Branchio-Oto-Renal syndrome is a disorder with otologic, branchial and renal manifestations, that shows a highly variable expressivity. The Branchio-Oto-Renal syndrome occurs in 2% of children with congenital hearing impairment. Seventy-five percent of patients with Branchio-Oto-Renal syndrome have significant hearing loss. Of these, 30% are conductive, 20% are sensorineural, and 50% demonstrate mixed forms.

Another example gives the Usher syndrome (USH), the most common condition that involves both hearing and vision problems. The major features are hearing impairment and retinitis pigmentosa. Some people with Usher syndrome also have balance problems. Approximately three to six percent of all deaf or hard-hearing children have Usher syndrome. The three types of Usher syndrome are Usher
syndrome type 1 (USH1), Usher syndrome type 2 (USH2), and Usher syndrome type 3 (USH3). USH1 is the most severe form and together with USH2 are the most common types. Together, they account for approximately 90-95 percent of all children come down with the Usher syndrome. Persons with USH1 are profoundly deaf from birth, correlated with severe balance problems. Usually these children start to develop vision problems by the age ten, most often beginning with difficulty seeing at night. In general the progression is rapidly until the patient is completely blind. Among others the Usher syndrome has been linked to the MYO7A gene, the USH1C gene and the CDH23 gene [KEATS & COREY, 1999; AHMED, 2003]. Recently, the zebrafish mutation sputnik [SOLLNER, 2004], which shows defects in hearing and balance, could be linked to mutations in the cadherin-23 gene, the homologue of the human CDH23 gene. The zebrafish mariner mutation [ERNEST, 2000], is due to mutations in the gene encoding myosin VIa, homologous to the human MYO7A gene. These are just a few examples for inherited hearing diseases and their correlated mutations found in zebrafish. They should illustrate that the investigation of these genes in zebrafish can help to get a better understanding of inherited deafness diseases in human.
1 Introduction

Within the last 25 years the zebrafish have become a very popular vertebrate model organism to study cellular, molecular and genetic mechanisms of development [STREISINGER, 1981]. Zebrafish embryos are transparent and simply organised. In contrast to other vertebrate model organisms, zebrafish embryos develop rapidly, the generation interval takes two to three months, and each female produces approximately 200 eggs per week. Because mutations are easy to induce, large-scale screens allow the identification of mutations causing defects in particular biological processes [TWYMAN 2002].

1.1 Ontogenetic development of the zebrafish

![Figure 1](image-url)  
Schematic representation of zebrafish development from the zygote period to the mid-segmentation period. Following the brief zygote period (a), when the embryo is at the one-cell stage, the cleavage (b-g) runs from the 2-cell to 64-cell stage. The blastula-phase (h-p) follows, and runs from the 128-cell stage to the 50% epiboly stage. The formation of the enveloping layer (EVL) and yolk syncytial layer (YSL) starts (i-k). The gastrulation sets off at 50% epiboly and is completed with the bud stage. Then, the process of segmentation begins. Main events during the gastrulation-period: 1. Dorso-ventral axis becomes visible morphologically at Shield stage (s); 2. Simultaneous cell movements of epiboly (blue arrows), convergence (green arrows) and involution (red arrows) (t); Tail bud, somites and brain anlage are indicated by red, green and black arrowheads, respectively (v-x). AP animal pole; VP vegetal pole; BD blastodisc [modified from WEBB & MILLER, 2007].
The externally fertilized zebrafish egg is telolecithal, i.e. a large amount of yolk accumulates at the vegetal pole of the egg (Fig. 1a). Following fertilisation, at the one-cell-stage (0-¾ hours post fertilisation/hpf), the chorion swells and lifts from the egg. Non-yolk cytoplasm streams towards the animal pole of the zygote, segregating the blastodisc from the yolk-rich vegetal pole. The following six cleavages (¾-2¼ hpf) of the cytoplasm pass through are meroblastic, i.e. they intersect the blastodisc incompletely so that the resulting blastomeres remain interconnected by cytoplasmatic bridges (Fig. 1b-g). Following the cleavage-stage, the embryo enters a period referred to as blastula-stage (2¼-5¼ hpf), even though there is no blastocoel present. Rather, small irregular extracellular spaces are formed between the deep cells of the blastodisc. The blastomeres at the boundary of the blastoderm (still cytoplasmically connected) collapse and release their cellular content, including nuclei, into the underlying cytoplasm of the yolk cells, forming a teleost-specific extraembryonic structure, known as the yolk syncytial layer (YSL). When the late blastula stage epiboly starts, both YSL and blastodisc move and spread over the yolk cells in an animal-to-vegetal direction (Fig. 1h-p). At 50% epiboly, when the spread reaches the equator, there is a transient pause and the process of gastrulation (5¼-10 hpf) begins. The morphogenetic cell movements of involution, convergence, and extension occur, developing the primary germ layers (ectoderm and endoderm). Involving cells shape the germ ring (5.7 hpf) by folding the blastoderm back upon itself and moving in a vegetal-to-animal direction. At the same time, convergence movements start to accumulate cells at a position along the germ ring, the future dorsal margin of the embryo, termed the shield (6 hpf). Epiboly continues after shield formation. Due to the process of involution there are two layers within the germ ring. The upper epiblast and the lower hypoblast (Fig. 1q-u). The epiblast keeps moving and forms a second layer, the mesoderm. When gastrulation is completed, cells of the epiblast correspond to the definitive ectoderm and gives rise to neuroectodermal structures, such as the central nervous system and sensory placodes. The hypoblast gives rise to derivatives, ascribed to both mesoderm and endoderm. At the end of gastrulation, when epiboly is completed, the concerted movements have established the dorsal-ventral as well as the anterior-posterior body axis. During the period of segmentation (10-24 hpf), the first rudiments of the primary organs become visible, the somites develop, and the tailbud extends away from the yolk to develop the embryonic tail region (Fig. 1v-z). By 1 day post fertilisation (dpf) the embryos body axis straightens, heartbeat, circulation and pigmentation appear and the fins extend. After 2 dpf the embryo hatches from the chorion and has completed most of its organ formation with heart, brain, etc. detectable. [KIMMEL, 1995; MÜLLER & HASSEL, 2006].

1.2 Neural cell fate determination

During the developmental period of multicellular organisms a diverse range of cell types are manifest showing variances in anatomy, physiological function, neurochemistry and connectivity. The fate of a cell describes what type of cell a certain precursor will become in the course of normal development. With the formation of the three germ layers, the ectoderm, endoderm, and mesoderm, embryonic cells, previously undifferentiated, take on a specific developmental character. Accordingly endodermal cells form the stomach, liver, pancreas, and lungs. Cells arise from the mesoderm form the skeletal
muscle, skeleton, urogenital system, heart, and blood. The ectoderm forms the neural crest, central nervous system, cranial and sensory, ganglia and nerves, pigment cells, and epidermis. How distinct cell fates are generated from initially homogeneous cell populations is a driving question in developmental biology. The ectoderm is such a cell population that is capable of producing an array of derivatives, cells as different in function and form as the sensory neurons or the pigment cells in the skin. The final specification of a cell depends on its competence, the potential to adopt a particular fate. Specification can involve both cell-autonomous mechanisms (intrinsic signals) and inductive signals from a cell's surroundings (extrinsic signals). The migrating ectodermal cells become exposed to these instructive environments and respond to these factors. While cells migrating particular pathways, they segregated into several classes of more specialised progenitors with limited potential.

This first specification is not a permanent stage and cells can be reversed based upon different cues. In contrast, during the later determination cells become irreversibly committed to a particular fate ("cell fate determination"), the ultimate differentiated state to which a cell turns into like a sensory neuron or a pigment cell. This final determination is promoted by a distinct set of extracellular signal molecules [BAKER & BRONNER-FRASER, 2001; CHISHOLM, 2001].

1.3 Pre-placodal ectoderm and cranial sensory placodes

The formation of the vertebrate cranial sensory nervous system depends mainly on the cranial sensory placodes, transient thickened ectodermal regions with neurogenic potential, that expand in the vertebrate head next to the neural tube. These ectodermal placodes comprise the adenohypophyseal, olfactory, lens, trigeminal, and profundal placodes, as well as the otic placode, a series of epibranchial placodes, and a series of lateral line placodes (Fig. 2A). Each of them make vital contributions to the paired sense organs associated with hearing, balance, olfaction and vision by giving rise to a multitude of different cell types, including the neurons of the cranial sensory ganglia [BAKER & BRONNER-FRASER, 2001; MAZET & SHIMMELD, 2005].

Despite the structural and functional diversity of sensory organs and cranial ganglia in the adult, earlier studies led to the assumption that all placodes are initiated through a common cellular and molecular mechanism, which involves a common placodal field [JACOBSON, 1963] – named the “pre-placodal region” comprising the ectodermal precursor cells of all cranial placodes [NIEUWKOOP, 1985; GALLAGHER, 1996; GRAINER, 1992; BAKER & BRONNER-FRASER, 2001]. By late gastrulation (90% epiboly onward), the ectoderm surrounding the anterior neural plate becomes specified. The medial part, which includes the edge of the neural plate, gives rise to the neural crest. In contrast, the lateral section increases to become the pre-placodal ectodermal field (Fig. 4A). Fate-mapping studies in the chicken and zebrafish have mapped the precursors for the olfactory, lens, otic and epibranchial placodes to overlapping regions within this pre-placodal ectodermal field [STREIT, 2002]. The hypothesis of a common placodal region implies that all placodal precursors arise from a continuous domain of the embryonic ectoderm. Additionally this region should be characterised by unique properties like the expression of specific molecular markers, which are expressed in this pre-placodal domain but not in other ectodermal regions. Members of several gene families are expressed in this area, like Fgf, Dlx,
Pax, Six, and Eya. However, most of these genes are not uniquely found in placodal cells but also at later stages of development in other ectodermal and even mesodermal derivates [AKIMENKO, 1994; WHITFIELD, 2002].

During the period of neurulation, extrinsic signals from the underlying mesoderm cause the pre-placodal ectoderm to split into discrete placodes, with a wide variety of distinct developmental cell fates [MOODY, 2007], including sensory receptor cells, sensory neurons, neuroendocrine and endocrine cells, glia, and other supporting cells, depending on their placode of origin. Cranial placodes have been subdivided into two categories. Firstly, the sensory placodes, which give rise to cranial sense organs. They can be further subdivided into non-neurogenic placodes (adenohypophyseal, lens) and complex placodes (otic, olfactory, lateral line). Secondly, the neurogenic placodes (trigeminal, branchial, profundal) whose derivates are crucial elements of several cranial ganglia [BHATTACHARYYA & BRONNER-FRASER, 2004]. Neurons in the cranial sensory ganglia do not solely derive from the neurogenic placodes but also from the neural crest, which forms the rest of the peripheral nervous system [BAKER & BRONNER-FRASER, 2001; BAKER & BRONNER-FRASER, 2002]. Extensive cell and tissue rearrangements are necessary to modify placodal precursor cells to highly specified neurons, involving processes of delamination or invagination (Fig. 2B). In a number of placodes, the underlying basement membrane of thickened epithelium becomes fragmented, thereby allowing cells to delaminate from the epithelium (e.g. lateral line) and migrating within the ectoderm to form patches of sensory organs or moving away from the ectodermal surface to become part of the sensory ganglia (e.g. trigeminal). Other placodes invaginate as cup-shaped structures (e.g. adenohypophyseal, lens) and delaminate from the ectodermal surface to form a vesicle first, which differentiates into a highly specialised structure at later stages [MOODY, 2007; SCHLOSSER, 2005]. Except for the lens placode, the cranial placodes differentiate into neuronal or endocrine cells, which comprise the respective sensory and endocrine organs of the peripheral nervous system. The trigeminal, epibranchial and otic placodes provide mitotic neuroblasts, which delaminate from the ectoderm to form the sensory ganglia for the trigeminal (V), the glossopharyngeal (IX), vagus (X), facial (VII), and the statoacoustic (VIII) nerves [WEBB & NODEN, 1993].
Figure 2  Ectodermal placodes in zebrafish. (A) Schematic overview of the different types of ectodermal placodes as distributed at the 10 somite stage. (B) Schematic summary of morphogenesis and cellular derivatives of various ectodermal placodes in zebrafish [B, modified from SCHLOSSER, 2005]. Adenohypophyseal, olfactory, and lens placodes invaginate, trigeminal, lateral line, and epibranchial placodes delaminate from the ectodermal surface. In contrast with higher vertebrates the otic development in zebrafish is different. Instead of placodal cells invaginating to form a cup, ectodermal cells appear basically to thicken and arrange themselves into a solid ball just beneath the surface. All placodal precursor cells (except for the lens) leave the placodal epithelium as mesenchymal cells to migrate and become specialised. In the lateral line placodes, a subset of cells forms the lateral line primordial cell clusters, which migrate as a compact group along the basement membrane. FB, forebrain; MB, midbrain; rh, rhombomere; som, somites.
1.4 Placode subset summary

Olfactory placodes
The olfactory placode is the only placode known to produce glia cells which otherwise originate from neural crest. Derivates from the olfactory placodes are the ciliated sensory receptor cells of the olfactory (odorant-sensing) and vomeronasal (pheromone-sensing) epithelia, whose axons project into the brain to form the olfactory, vomeronasal, and terminal nerves.

Trigeminal placodes
The trigeminal placode forms the trigeminal ganglial complex of two separate ganglia, the ophthalmic and the maxillomandibular ganglion. In vertebrates, the trigeminal neurons are born very early. These primary sensory neurons transmit somatosensory stimuli like touch, pain, and temperature from the skin of the face (ophthalmic branch) and the jaws and teeth (maxillomandibular branch). In anamniotes, like zebrafish, they become part of the primary nervous system that mediates the swimming reflexes.

Lateral line placodes
In fish and aquatic amphibians a variable number of pre- and post-otic lateral line placodes give rise to receptors and sensory neurons of the mechanosensory lateral line system. These placodes undergo remarkable migrations to deposit clusters of cells as precursors of lateral line receptor organs, the neuromasts, in lines over the head and along the entire body axis. Besides the mechanoreceptive lateral line organs that respond to disturbances in the water, some fish (but not the zebrafish) also possess a line system of electroreceptive ampullary organs that respond to weak electrical fields.

Otic placodes
The entire inner ear arises from the otic placode. The cell types deriving from otic placodes include the mechanosensory hair cells (balance and auditory information), supporting cells as well as endolymph secreting cells. Additionally, the otic placodes gives rise to the neurons of the statoacoustic ganglion of the cranial nerve VIII, which provide afferent innervation for the inner ear hair cells.

1.5 Inner ear development in zebrafish
The vertebrate inner ear is a highly developed auditory (cochlea) and vestibular (membranous labyrinth and semicircular canals) system, accountable for the detection of sound waves and accelerations enabling the organism to maintain balance. In the adult it forms a complex three-dimensional construction with several sensory patches, thickened regions of epithelium containing two major cell types, hair cells and supporting cells, arranged in remarkably organised patterns [TORRES & GIRALDEZ, 1998; NORAMLY & GRAINER, 2002].

1 For review see BAKER & BRONNER-FRASER 2001
Although the mature structure is found only in jawed vertebrates, some urochordates possess mechanoreceptor cells with remarkable similarities to vertebrate otic hair cells, molecules and morphogenesis [Fritzsch, 2002; 2006; 2007]. Based on fossil records it is known that the early cyclostomes had a well developed labyrinth with up to seven semicircular canals. Throughout evolution of higher vertebrates these canals have undergone several reductions. Today's living vertebrates commonly obtain three semicircular canals [WEVER, 1974]. Across the vertebrates the dorsal part of the inner ear is highly similar and contains the utricle with the gravity-sensing macula, and the semicircular canals with their rotating-sensing cristae. The ventral part of the ear is more different within the vertebrates, but it typically consists the saccular and lagernar maculae with vestibular and auditory functions (Fig. 3)[BEVER & FEKETE, 2002].

![Phylogeny of the vertebrate inner ear. Zebrafish (20 days), Xenopus (stage 49), chicken (embryonic day 9) and mouse (embryonic day 15) are shown from lateral. The three semicircular canals and both utricular and saccular recess in all four representatives of different chordates during development. The lagernar chamber is rather conserved, and it may be elongated into the cochlear duct. The location of the hearing organs of birds and mammals supports the assumption it may have originated from the saccular macula, which is the hearing organ in most fish and some amphibians. aa, anterior ampulla; asc, anterior semicircular canal; bp, basilar papilla; cc, common crus; es, endolymphic sac; lag, lagena; la, lateral ampulla; lsc, lateral semicircular canal; pa, posterior ampulla; psc, posterior semicircular canal; sac, saccule; ut, utricle [MOODY, 2007].](image)

In zebrafish the inner ear develops, like in other vertebrates, on either side of the hindbrain. The earliest rudiment, the otic placode, becomes visible at around 16 hpf and extends from the posterior end of rhombomere 4 down to rhombomere 6 (Fig. 4B; Fig. 5A). Recent genetic studies have shown that both mesoderm and hindbrain are involved in otic placode induction. The initial signal to start the process of induction comes from the mesoderm and is maintained by signals from the hindbrain. During later gastrulation members of the Fgf gene family appear to be the primary transcription factors involved in otic induction. The response to these early otic induction events involves expression of a variety of transcription factors, many of which are already expressed in the pre-placodal ectodermal field before overt otic morphogenesis (Tab. 1). By the 10 somites stage cells express a wide range of transcription factors and signalling molecules (Fig. 4B). The otic placode-forming competence is initially widespread but becomes restricted to the hindbrain-area as well as the vagal ectoderm at midneural stage. Transplantation of otic placode cells have shown a tendency to develop...
autonomously to a certain extent. However, the final otic fate determination occurs in later stages of formation [FEKETE, 1996; BAKER & BRONNER-FRASER, 2001; STREIT, 2001; STREIT 2004; WHITFIELD, 2002].

Figure 4  Signalling interactions influencing otic induction. Schematic drawings, dorsal view: (A) The pre-placodal ectodermal field at the late epiboly (9-10 hpf) stage. (B) Developing otic placode at 10 somite (14 hpf) stage. A variety of transcription factors genes is involved in the induction of the otic vesicle, e.g. six and eya genes [modified from WHITFIELD, 2002].

Table 1  Molecular markers and early events in otic placode development [modified from BAKER & BRONNER-FRASER, 2001].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (hpf)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Molecular Marker</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 hpf</td>
<td>Late gastrula</td>
<td>Dlx3; Dlx7</td>
<td>Transcription factors</td>
<td>AKIMENKO 1994; ELLIES 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 hpf</td>
<td>Late gastrula</td>
<td>Pax8</td>
<td>Transcription factor</td>
<td>PFEFFER 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 phf</td>
<td>End of gastrulation</td>
<td>eya1</td>
<td>Transcription cofactor</td>
<td>SAHY 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hpf</td>
<td>End of gastrulation</td>
<td>six4.1</td>
<td>Transcription factor</td>
<td>KOBAYASCHI 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 hpf</td>
<td>3 somites</td>
<td>Pax2.1</td>
<td>Transcription factors</td>
<td>KRAUSS 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hpf</td>
<td>6 somites</td>
<td>Pax2.2</td>
<td>Transcription factor</td>
<td>PFEFFER 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 hpf</td>
<td>8 somites</td>
<td>Islet-1</td>
<td>Transcription factor</td>
<td>KORZH 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 hpf</td>
<td>10 somites</td>
<td>Placodes visible</td>
<td></td>
<td>HADDON &amp; LEWIS 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 hpf</td>
<td>10 somites</td>
<td>deltaA, deltaB, deltaC</td>
<td>Notch ligands</td>
<td>HADDON 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5 hpf</td>
<td>19 somites</td>
<td>Fgf8</td>
<td>Transcription factor</td>
<td>REIFERS 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 hpf</td>
<td>21 somites</td>
<td>Otoliths form</td>
<td></td>
<td>HADDON &amp; LEWIS 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 hpf</td>
<td>26 somites</td>
<td>Neuroblast delaminate</td>
<td></td>
<td>HADDON &amp; LEWIS 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 hpf</td>
<td>30 somites</td>
<td>Hair cells differentiate</td>
<td></td>
<td>HADDON &amp; LEWIS 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The otic placode (Fig. 5B) hollows rapidly into the otic vesicle, but unlike in higher vertebrates, such as the chicken, it do not invaginate to form a cup, which pinches off the ectodermal surface to become a closed vesicle. Instead, it appears that the otocyst forms by cavitation. An initially oval group of cells in the ectoderm thickens and models itself into a solid ball without any lumen beneath the surface. The
apical part of the cells, the site where the lumen is about to open up, is already polarised. With increasing polarisation, the nuclei migrate to the basal end and cause the loss of cell-cell contacts at the apical side. Thus, a small slit-like lumen appears and extends into the otic vesicle (Fig. 5D). The vesicle in turn undergoes a series of shape changing events, before it converts into an elaborate three-dimensional array of chambers and ducts filled with endolymphatic fluid [HADDON & LEWIS, 1996]. From 22 hpf onward individual neuroblasts start to delaminate from the otic epithelium passing through an epithelial to mesenchymal transition to leave the otic vesicle. They accumulate beneath the rostral half of the otic vesicle and differentiate into neurons of the statoacoustic ganglion. The ganglion becomes more compact and extends underneath the sensory maculae. Neurons of the statoacoustic ganglion will send projections back to the ear’s sensory patches. At around 42 hpf the process of delamination is completed. While the neuronal precursor cells are delaminating, some of the cells remaining in the otic epithelium differentiate into a variety of sensory patches. All sensory structures of the inner ear contain specialised receptor cells called hair cells. These mechanosensory cells with their characteristic staircased bundle of stereocilia and a kinocilium lie apically in the epithelium to couple endolymphatic vibration with motion of the hair cell bundles (Fig. 5F) [WHITFIELD, 2002].

**Figure 5** The inner ear development in zebrafish. (A) The hollow otic vesicle at 18 hpf, expands from rhombomere 4 up to rhombomere 6. (B-E) Morphogenesis of the otic vesicle. (B) The early otic placode (outlined by arrows) at 13.5 hpf; (C) At 18.5 hpf the placode has hollowed into the otic vesicle, arrow indicates the boundary between rhombomere 4 and 5; (D) Otoliths prominent in the otic vesicle by the stage of 25 hpf; (E) Protrusions of the semicircular canals grow out from the vesicle walls (48 hpf) and meet and fuse at 60-72 hpf. (F) Characteristic bundle of stereocilia of the neuromast. ov, otic vesicle; r, rhombomeres. Scale bar, 50µm [KIMMEL, 1995].

The first indication of the future sensory patches, at about 19 hpf, is the appearance of the otoliths in the otic lumen, two tiny crystalline deposits of calcium carbonate and protein. By 24 hpf the first differentiated hair cells become visible, grouped in two separate clusters beneath each otolith. These early hair cells referred to as tether cells are uncharacteristic in several ways. Both the utricular and the saccular otoliths are formed originally at the anterior and posterior ends of the vesicle (Fig. 5C). By a process termed otolith seeding the first real sensory patches develop. Free otolith precursor particles move through the lumen and to the opposite ends of the vesicle where they bind to the stationary kinocilia of the tether cells. In the adult zebrafish four otoliths are present, one associated with the maculae in the utricle (anterior), one with the macula in the saccula (posterior), and two with the maculae in the lagena (lateral), which arises later during larval development (Fig. 6B). The second
sensory structure, the semicircular canal system, appears between 42 and 48 hpf. It features two main modules, the canals themselves, which are endolymph-filled and bounded by nonsensory epithelium, and their associated sensory patches, the cristae (Fig. 6B). The first sign of canal formation is the inward protrusion of the vesicle epithelium. These thin layers of epithelium covers a hub of acellular matrix, which increases and generates continuous pillars, the developing semicircular canal pirmordia. All together, four such bulges project into the lumen, from the anterior, posterior, ventral, and lateral walls. By 60 hpf the lateral bulge forms three more lumps, pointing in anterior, posterior and ventral direction. These lumps fuse with the anterior, posterior and ventral protrusions, defining the three semicircular canals. The anterior and the posterior canals meet in the middle of the ear at a duct called common crust (Fig. 6A). At this point three canals are present, and each of them ends in an enlarged ampullary sac that houses the sensory cristae. The cristae do not become visible before 60 hpf and their hair cells differ from those of the maculae, presenting exceptionally long kinocilia [HADDON & LEWIS, 1996; WHITFIELD, 2002; MOODY, 2007]. Fish do not possess a cochlea, the specialised hearing organ of amniotes, nor are their inner ears linked to a middle and outer ear system. Instead the macula organs of the sacculus, utricle and lagena detect sound waves, and the swimbladder is used to enhance auditory stimulation of the inner ear [POPPER & FAY, 1993]

**Figure 6**  
(A) Three-dimensional morphology of the adult zebrafish inner ear. Dorsal to the top, anterior to the left [modified from BEVER & FEKETE, 2002].  
(B) Drawing of a zebrafish ear at four days post fertilisation, the three-dimensional structure within the vesicle [WHITFIELD, 2002]. ac, anterior crista; amac, anterior macula; aoto, anterior otolith; assc, anterior semicircular canal; cc, crus commune; la, lagena; lc, lateral crista; lssc, lateral semicircular canal; pc, posterior crista; pmac, posterior macula; poto, posterior otolith; pssc, posterior semicircular canal; s, saccula; u, utricle. Scale bar, 500µm.

### 1.6 Lateral line development in zebrafish

The vertebrate lateral line is a primitive mechanosensory system, like the inner ear, that is present in fish, and larval and adult aquatic amphibians. The neuromasts, the sensory receptors, respond to water movements and allow detection of unidirectional or oscillatory flows. A large number of these neuromasts form a line along the flanks of the animal, extending from the ear to the tail. The neuromasts are arranged on the body surface in a species-specific pattern [GHYSEN & DAMBLY-CHAUDIERE, 2004]. The prominent similarity of hair cells in both lateral line and inner ear led to two different theories about the origin of the otic placode. The first was established by VAN BERGEIJK
[1967], who assumed the inner ear to be a derivate of the lateral line. The other theory, postulated by WEVER [1974], states, that both the lateral line and the otic placode evolved independently. Even though the otic placode is situated very close to the pre- and postotic lateral line placodes in the embryo, the distinct differences in ectodermal competence as well as the timing and distribution of signalling support WEVER’S hypothesis. Furthermore, unlike the inner ear the lateral line has disappeared in the terrestrial tetrapods [WEBB & SHIREY, 2003; STREIT, 2001]

The lateral line system is composed of two major modules, the anterior lateral line encompass all head neuromasts, and the posterior lateral line all neuromast in the trunk and tail. The sensory neurons of the anterior lateral lines are located in the anterior lateral line ganglia, which are found rostral to the ear. The cell bodies of posterior lateral line neurons reside in the posterior lateral line ganglia, located caudal to the ear [WINKELBAUER, 1989; WEBB & NODEN, 1993; NORTHCUTT, 1994]. Both types of ganglia receive contributions from the neural crest [COLLAZO, 1994]. A characteristic structure of the developing posterior lateral line is the primordium, which originates from the posterior lateral line placode (just posterior to the otic placode), and begins to migrate posteriorly along the horizontal myoseptum at about 20 hpf. During this migration, the primordium deposits clusters of cells at regular intervals of five to six somites. Each cluster will develop into a neuromast. At about 42 hpf, the primordium has reached the tail tip and the migration process is completed [GOMPEL, 2001]. The first fully differentiated neuromasts are those of the anterior lateral line and appear during the second day of development at around 36 hpf, closely followed by the posterior neuromasts (Fig. 7A). The differentiation process of the posterior lateral line is completed by the end of developmental day two. Six to eight neuromasts are spread along the myoseptum, the first five evenly distributed, while the last two to three are grouped near the tip of the tail. Soon after the establishment of the posterior line by these primary neuromasts, new neuromasts, termed secondary neuromasts, differentiate along the myoseptum and intersperse between the primary neuromasts in a head-to-tail direction, generally with two somites between each (Fig. 7B) [LENDENT, 2001].
1.7 Cell type development – cell proliferation, cell death, and cell differentiation

During embryonic development cells undergo a variety of specification processes like cell proliferation, programmed cell death (apoptosis), cell migration and differentiation. Combination and coordination of these processes is essential for accurate shape, size, and cellular composition in the developing tissues. A cell death programme, which selects appropriate sets of cells and eliminates inappropriate ones, is important for many developing tissues. In vertebrates for instance, massive numbers of neurons are generated during early development many of which are eliminated at later developmental stages [HAMBURGER & LEVI-MONTALCINI, 1949; FESUS 1991; OPPENHEIM, 1991]. Particularly during critical differentiation events, like sensory organ development, programmed cell death seems to be a seriously important specification factor in multicellular organisms [GLÜCKSMANN, 1951; JACOBSON, 1997]. During apoptosis cells die in response to a range of stimuli in a controlled, regulated way. In this way, cells play an active role in their own death (which is why apoptosis is often referred to as cell suicide) [MOODY, 2007]. In an extrinsic apoptosis pathway, death inducing signalling molecules, bind as ligands to transmembrane death receptors on the target cell. These receptors transmit the information whereupon caspase protein cascades get triggered and activate DNases², inhibiting DNA repair enzymes and breaking down structural proteins in the nucleus. The caspase protein family is one of the main executors of the apoptotic process. After a cell receives the signal to undergo programmed cell death, a series of apoptotic events occur. Actin filaments in the cytoskeleton are disrupted, the cell shrinks and the cytoplasm fragmented. The main apoptotic characteristic is the cleavage of chromosomal DNA into nucleosomal units. Both nucleus and cytoplasm fragments form membrane-bound apoptotic bodies which can be engulfed by phagocytes [DASH, 2007]. Many of the signalling pathways that regulate organ formation are initiated by growth factors that bind on the cell surface of precursor cells. Information transfer from the cell surface to the nucleus regularly pass throughout receptor mediated signal molecules. These cell-signal molecule interactions trigger the activation of transcription factors, which in turn can activate or repress a cascade of events inside the cell. Several different signal transduction pathways can be linked together and can increase or inhibit each others activity. Transcriptional activation or repression of target genes control essential cellular function including cell proliferation, differentiation, and apoptosis during organogenesis. The posttranslational modification of proteins, including those that regulate gene expression, such as transcription factors, provides sensitive and flexible mechanism to dynamically modulate protein function in response to specific signalling input. The alteration occurs either through the addition of phosphate groups (phosphorylation) via the transfer of the terminal phosphate form ATP to an amino acid residue or their removal (dephosphorylation). In cases of transcription factors, changes in phosphorylation state can influence protein stability, conformation, subcellular localisation, cofactor interactions, transactivation potential and transcriptional output. Enzymes catalyse the addition (kinases) or removal (phosphatases) of phosphate groups from proteins [HUNTER, 2000].

² Enzymes capable of cleaving the phosphodiester bonds between the nucleotide subunits of nucleic acids.
1.8 The eyes absent (eya) gene family

The eyes absent gene was first identified in Drosophila [BONINI, 1993] as a nuclear protein, being essential for appropriate eye formation during early embryonic development, where it participates synergistically with eyeless (Pax family), sine oculis (Six family), and dachshund (Dach family) [PIGNONI, 1997; CHEN, 1997; BONINI, 1997, HANDEL, 1998; NIIMI, 1999]. Identified in many species, Eya family genes are expressed in a complex manner in various embryonic and adult tissues and play important roles in the processes of morphogenesis, organogenesis, and cell differentiation. Vertebrate homologues of eya have been isolated from mouse (Eya1-Eya4), human (EYA1-EYA4) and chicken (Eya2, Eya3). All of these eya genes are widely expressed in sensory organs like the eye, ear, lateral line (teleosts), but also in muscle and kidney. Many members of the zebrafish six (1-6), pax (6) and dach (1-2) gene families show a similar range of expression [KOBAYASHI, 2000; PFEFFER, 1998; RILEY, 1999; HAMMOND, 2001].

Vertebrate Eya genes seem to be components of regulatory networks similar to the one acting during eye development in Drosophila. [HEANUE, 1999; XU, 1999; XU, 2003]. In eyes absent mutations in Drosophila, eye progenitor cells display an increased incidence of programmed cell death prior to the first differentiation events. Transcript variations in different eya alleles show variable severity of the eye phenotype, which ranges from rough and only slightly smaller eyes, to rough and much reduced eyes, frequently absent eyes on one side of the head and finally complete absence of eyes. Nevertheless, even with increasing allele severity, there are no specific cell types missing. Therefore, mutations in the eya gene do not seem to affect differentiation of the precursor cells, but the switch between the differentiation pathway and the pathway of apoptosis [BONINI, 1993; LEISERSON, 1994].

1.8.1 Structure and function of the eya gene

While there is only a single eyes absent gene in Drosophila, at least four homologues of this gene (Eya1-4) are present in vertebrates. cDNA cloning of the Drosophila eyes absent gene revealed a conceptual protein sequence with two domains: a divergent proline-serine-threonine rich N-terminus, which functions as transcriptional activation domain, and a highly conserved 271-274 amino acid C-terminus, that has been referred to as eya homologous region (eyaHR), eya domain or Eya homology domain 1 (ED1), which is required for protein-protein interactions [ABDELHAK, 1997; XU, 1997; ZIMMERMAN, 1997; BORSANI, 1999]. In addition, a short region of weak homology, named Eya homology domain 2 (ED2), occurs between the fly and the mammalian sequences in the N-terminal region (Fig. 8C). In this domain a large number of tyrosine (Y) residues are conserved [BONINI, 1993; ZIMMERMAN, 1997]. The eyes absent gene is part of a regulatory gene network, together with the DNA-binding homeodomain factor sine oculis (six) and the dachshund (dach) nuclear cofactor. This network is characterised by transcriptional feedback loops and complex protein-protein interactions [CHEN, 1997]. Because eya genes do not encode a nuclear localization signal or an apparent DNA-binding domain, an interaction with a Six protein, mediated by the eya domain, is required to get the Eyes absent
protein from the cytoplasm to the nucleus and allow for transcriptional regulation of downstream genes (Fig. 8A) [OHIO, 1999; FAN, 2000].

In addition to a function as transcriptional co-factor, Eyes absent can function as an enzyme. Analysis of Eya amino acid sequences reveals that the eya domain contains sequence motifs equivalent to the haloacid dehalogenase (HAD) superfamily of phosphohydrolases. The HAD family, which includes several types of enzymes, including phosphatases, is characterised by a conserved α/β-hydrolase fold that unites three short sequence motifs to form the catalytic core of the enzyme. Motif I at the N-terminal end of the domain is a conserved quintet consisting of two aspartic acid (D), and one threonine (T) residues as well as two variable amino acids (x) in the order of DxTxT. The second aspartic acid distinguishes the phosphatase/phosphohydrolase subgroup from other branches of the HAD suprafamily. Motif II contains an essential serine (S)/threonine (T) at the end of the β-strand. Motif III contains two glycine (G), one aspartic acid (D) and one glutamic acid (E) residue, furthermore two changeable amino acids (x) in the order of GDGxxE at the C-terminal end of the domain (Fig. 8B). The HAD-related region of the eya domain is highly conserved and indicates that Eyes absent might have intrinsic protein tyrosine phosphatase activity and can autocatalytically dephosphorylate itself. Indeed, experiments have shown that the eya domain dephosphorylates various artificial substrates. Mutations in key amino acids within the eya domain can decrease or eliminate catalytic activity. The gene-specific recruitment of a co-activator with intrinsic phosphatase activity provides a molecular mechanism for activation of specific gene targets, including those regulating precursor cell proliferation and survival [LI, 2003; RAYAPUREDDI, 2003; TOOTLE, 2003; REBAY, 2005].

**Figure 8**

(A) Biochemical interactions in a model of a proposed activation of potential downstream targets through Eya, Six, and Dach. Because Eya proteins have no DNA-binding motif, its activation is mediated through interactions with a DNA-binding Six protein [modified from BRODBECK & ENGLERT, 2004]. (B) Eya is a member of the phosphatase subgroup of the HAD superfamily. Eya domain sequences contain the three characteristic HAD motifs (I - III), which are highly conserved in all eya homologues (red residues). Dm, Drosophila melanogaster; Mm, Mus musculus; Hs, Homo sapiens; Dr, Danio rerio [TOOTLE, 2003]. (C) Domain structure of EYA.
1.8.2 Expression sites of eya1 in zebrafish

In the zebrafish embryo, major expression sites of eya1 are several cranial sensory placodes, the branchial arches, and the developing somites (Fig. 9B). Initially, eya1 is expressed in the whole band of the pre-placodal field at the end of gastrulation (Fig. 9A). At around 12 hpf, expression becomes restricted to an anterior and a posterior part, which in later stages of development give rise to the olfactory, otic and lateral line placodes. In the otocyst, eya1 is solely expressed in the ventral part, including the nascent neurons of the statoacoustic ganglion and the sensory patches. While eya1 is expressed in delaminating ganglionic precursor neurons, expression appears to cease from differentiated neurons and is entirely absent from the mature ganglion at the end of the second developmental day. In the anterior and posterior lateral line placode, eya1 is expressed even before condensation of these placodes, as indicated by diffuse eya1 expression in the preotic and postotic areas at 16 hpf. A further expression site of eya1 is the migrating posterior lateral line primordium and the neuromasts generated by the primordium. The neuromasts present the only structures, in which eya1 is expressed in both undifferentiated precursor cells and differentiated cell types. In contrast, eya1 expression in the somites appears only after they have formed from the presomitic mesoderm [SAHLY, 1999].

Figure 9  (A) Early eya1 expression in the pre-placodal ectodermal field at 10hph (dorsal view; anterior to the top) [ANDERMANN]. (B) Expression of eya1 at 24 hpf. ALLG, anterior lateral line ganglion; olf.pl, olfactory placode; ov, otic vesicle; PLLG, posterior lateral line placode [SAHLY, 1999].

1.9 Mutations in eyes absent affect vertebrate inner ear development

Mutations of vertebrate Eya genes and Eya knock-down experiments have shown negative effects on the developing auditory system. The eya1/dog-eared (dog) mutation in zebrafish was identified in a large-scale mutagenesis screen by abnormal morphology of the inner ear [WHITFIELD; 1996]. Homozygous dog-eared embryos show serious defects of both sensory and nonsensory tissues. While the hair cells of the cristae do not differentiate during development, those in the maculae are reduced and misarranged. The otoliths are decreased and the epithelial protrusions of the developing semicircular canals are present, but disorganised (Fig. 10C,D). The mutation also affects the lateral line, where the number of the posterior lateral line neuromasts is reduced, those at the tail tip are absent in almost all dog-eared larvae (Fig. 10A,B). Furthermore, the embryos show ectopic and an
increased level of apoptosis in the developing otic vesicle as well as the lateral line primordium [WHITFIELD, 1996]. The dog-eard phenotype is recessive and caused by a point mutation, found in three independent dog alleles, with various severity. Morphologically, the dog-eared phenotype becomes visible at around 48 - 72 hpf, but this also varies with the different dog alleles. Sequence analysis of eya1 cDNA from each allele revealed, that the mutations result in a truncation of the the eyes absent homology domain. The dog phenotype can be phenocopied by eya1 gene knock-down experiments using morpholino antisense oligonucleotides [KOZLOWSKI, 2005].

Xu et al. [1999] generated a Eya1 knockout mouse, which shows several developmental defects, including abnormal inner ear development. Eya1 heterozygotes (Eya+/−) have conductive hearing loss and renal anomalies similar to those found in human Branchio-Oto-Renal (BOR) syndrome. The hearing loss is associated with middle and inner ear aberrations, whereas the anomalous sound conduction through the middle ear is the main reason for the hearing loss. In contrast Eya1 homozygote (Eya−/−) mice die at birth. The size of the mutant embryos heads is reduced and they lack ears and kidneys completely. In addition, the mutants are characterised by open eyelids, and craniofacial and skeletal defects in the skull, neck, and ripcage (Fig. 10E,F). Otic anomalies involve the outer, middle and inner ear. Outer anomalies include absent or malformed auricles, atresis of the external auditory canal as well as malformed eardrums. The mutant middle ears reveal a present but malformed incus, whereas the maleus and the stapes are absent. Additionally the tympanic cavity is not formed. In contrast, the otic vesicle of the inner ear initially formed is terminated in later development, the inner ear structures are not differentiated at all. The deficiency of otic development is associated with an abnormal induction of apoptosis. Also affected are the facioacoustic ganglia (gVII-VIII) and the endolymphatic duct [XU, 1999].

The Laboratory of PETIT (1996) identified eyes absent as the gene underlying the BOR syndrome, an autosomal dominant inherited birth defect that causes human deafness with variable degrees of severity [ABDELHAK, 1997]. Sequence analysis of the eya coding region in unrelated patients affected by BOR syndrome result in six novel mutations3, all of which are different. However all mutants are located within or in the immediately vicinity of the eya-domain. The clinical phenotype in persons with BOR syndrome is characterised by numerous congenital anomalies involving the branchial arch system, inner and middle ears, as well as kidneys. The most common features are hearing loss (98.5% affected individuals, and approximately 2% of profoundly deaf children), which can be conductive (i.e., due to outer and/or middle ear anomalies), sensorineural (i.e., due to inner ear anomalies), or a mix of both [GRIMSMING & DYRMOSE, 1986]. Further features are preauricula pits (83.6%), branchial anomalies (68.5%), renal anomalies (38.2%), and external ear abnormalities (31.5%). Furthermore, there is a higher rate of miscarriage and infant mortality in BOR families. The syndrome has an estimated prevalence of 1 in 40.000 and the penetrance of the syndrome is highly variable both between and within families [CHEN, 1995].

The association of branchial arch anomalies and hearing impairment has been recognised since the nineteenth century. The name branchio-oto (BO) syndrome has been used to describe a combination of both branchial and otic anomalies, without association of renal abnormalities. The description and addition of the renal anomalies to complete the whole spectrum of the branchio-oto-renal (BOR)
syndrome is credited to the work of MELNICK [1978] and FRASER [1978]. Positional cloning has been shown that the *EYA1* gene on chromosome 8q13.3, homologous to the *Drosophila eyes absent* gene, underlies these syndromes, and that both BOR and BO are allelic phenotypes of mutations in this gene [ABDELHAK, 1997].

Hereditary hearing impairment (HHI) is a heterogeneous class of disorders that shows various patterns of inheritance and involves a multitude of different genes. Mutations that affect the EyaHR domain of the Eyes absent 4 (EYA4) protein were identified to cause late-onset hearing impairment at the DFNA10 locus on chromosome 6q22-23. This nonsyndromic autosomal dominant sensorineural hearing loss (SNHL) was described in two Australian families [WAYNE, 2001; DE LEENHEER, 2001]. PFISTER et al. (2002) reported about a Hungarian family comprising four generations with 11 SNHL affected and eight unaffected members. Mutation analysis of the EYA4 gene revealed an insertion of 4 base pairs, which results in an inaccurate stop codon nearly the eyaHR in all affected family members. Recently screening of the EYA4 gene of an Australian family with nonsyndromic SNHL showed a point mutation in EYA4 that is hypothesized to lead to aberrant pre-mRNA splicing and human disease [HILDEBRAND, 2007].

![Figure 10](image-url) (A, B) DASPEI stain of lateral line neuromasts at 120 hpf. (A) Wild-type (WT) and *dog* embryo. Neuromasts appear as bright dots. *Dogs* lack the set of three neuromasts at the tail tip (arrowheads in WT) and show an abnormal jaw morphology (arrow) [WHITFIELD, 1996]. (C, D) Lateral view of the ear in WT (72 hpf) and in dog (96 hpf); arrowheads indicate the otoliths, arrows mark epithelial protrusions in the ear [WHITFIELD, 1996]. (E, F) WT mouse embryo and *Eya*-/- embryo. At E10.5 *Eya1* homozygous mice show severe craniofacial anomalies like open eyelids, an absent or malformed (asterisk) outer ear and neck [XU, 1999]. Scale bar, (A, B) 200µm; (C, D) 50µm.
2 Aim of thesis

The morphological abnormalities described for the zebrafish *dog-eared* embryos are, in comparison to the widespread embryonic expression of the *eya1* gene, rather partial and restricted to specific embryonic structures. This comparatively mild phenotype is likely the consequences of functional redundancy between various Eya family members. To date four *Eya* genes have been identified in mice and human (*Eya1*-*Eya4*).

The aim of this thesis is to analyse three novel zebrafish *eyes absent* genes, *eya2*, *eya3*, and *eya4*. In order to elucidate the role of *Eya* genes during early embryonic development, with a focus on the inner ear, sequences and temporal expression pattern sites of the three genes were compared to reveal conservation as well as unique and/or overlapping expression sites of these genes. This is due to the fact that functional redundancy most likely can be found between duplicated and/or co-expressed genes. An additional important step to resolve both unique and redundant functions of *eyes absent* genes during vertebrate organogenesis is the knockdown as well as overexpression of eya gene function.

KOZŁOWSKI et al. (2004) have shown that a premature apoptosis in precursors in the otic vesicle is a primary consequence of loss of *eya1* function in the zebrafish embryo. As apoptosis has also resulted from loss of *eya* gene function in *Drosophila* and mouse [BONINI, 1993; XU, 1999], these may reflect a general mechanism of suppression of apoptosis by Eya proteins. Therefore, to clarify if *eya* genes regulate precursor cell survival, *eya* gene function manipulated embryos were investigated for inappropriated programmed cell death.
3 Results – Part I

Based on sequence similarities to the *Drosophila eyes absent* gene, the vertebrate Eya gene family was identified by Bonini (1993). To date, four Eya homologous genes (Eya1-4) have been identified and described in mammals [Xu, 1997; Zimmermann, 1997], one in chicken (Eya2) [Mishima, 1998], two in *Xenopus* (Eya1; Eya3) [David, 2001; Kriebel, 2007], and one in zebrafish (eya1) [Sahly, 1999]. However, function of the various Eya genes are largely unknown yet. To further understanding of the Eya genes during vertebrate development, the zebrafish homologues of eya2, eya3, and eya4 were identified and characterised by sequence analysis, expression pattern observation and functional assays in this thesis.

3.1 Structural analysis of zebrafish eya2, eya3 and eya4 cDNA

To confirm that the isolated clones are indeed three different homologs of the *Drosophila eyes absent* gene, they were sequenced from their 5'- and 3'- ends (Fig.11). Sequence analysis and alignments of the deduced amino acid sequences by using the computer programs BLAST (Basic Local Alignment and Search Tool) and CLUSTAL W found significant homologies with other members of the vertebrate Eya family, as well with the *Drosophila* eya protein.

![Figure 11 Sequencing strategy. The shaded bar represents the respective insert. Arrows indicate orientation of sequenced sections. Sp6 and T3 were used as sequencing primers, P1-P4 are internal primers used for sequencing the full-size clones.](image)

Based on pairwise comparison of 12 vertebrate eya proteins, amino acid identities and similarities could be determined by using the BLAST non-redundant protein database. As would be expected, closest affinity was found for each member of the zebrafish eya family in comparison with the respective mammalian homologues. The highest degree of relationship was found between zebrafish eya4 and the murine and human Eya4 proteins with 74% identity (83% similarity) and 73% (83%), respectively. Zebrafish eya2 protein is 60% identical (73%) with mouse Eya2 and 62% (72%) with human Eya2, while zebrafish eya3 shows an identity of 48% (60%) to mouse Eya3 and 58% (72%) to human Eya3. Comparison of the zebrafish eya1 protein with the other zebrafish eya proteins reveals
Results

an identity (similarity) of 60% (73%) to eya2, 47% (63%) to eya3, and 63% (75%) to eya4. All comparisons between the various eya proteins are presented in Tab. 3.

Analysis of eya2 cDNA (Fig. 12) led to the definition of 1766 bp, containing a coding region of 1431 bp, the ORF (open reading frame). This ORF has the first in-frame initiation codon (ATG) at nucleotide 329 and a stop codon (TAG) at nucleotide 1760, resulting in a predicted protein product of 477 amino acids. The cDNA comprises at least part of the 5’UTR (untranslated region) of 328 bp, but lacks the 3’UTR as well as the poly(A) tail. However, this eya2 cDNA contains two insertions, which are absent in the mouse as well as human protein. The first six bp fragment is located in the N-terminal domain (nucleotides 557-562, predicted amino acids 77-78), the second fragment of nine bp is found in the highly conserved C-terminal (nucleotides 1352-1360, predicted amino acids 342-344). This insertion of three amino acids within the eyaHR (eya homology region) leads to an eyaHR of 274 residues instead of the common 271 residues. In addition, the zebrafish eya2 protein lacks a serine (S) residue in the N-terminus at amino acid position 190. Comparison of the deduced eya2 sequence with those of mouse and human reveals an identity of 64% and 62% respectively for the entire cDNA. The eyaHRs are 79% identical between the zebrafish and the mammalian protein product. The ED2 (eya domain 2) runs from amino acid 100 to 129 and shows an identity of 48% (13/27) to the mouse and 40% (11/27) to the human predicted Eya2 protein.

Sequencing of the eya3 cDNA (Fig. 14) determined a length of 1910 bp for this transcript, including only 96 bp of the 5’UTR. The non-sense stop codon and the 3’UTR with the poly(A) tail are missing. Therefore, the analysed eya3 cDNA lacks the last five assumed amino acids at the 3’ end of the ORF, presumably as a result of the subcloning processes. This partial ORF consists of 1814. The deduced cDNA is 48% and 58% identical to mouse and human, whereas the, 266 amino acid eyaHR shows 79% and 80% of identity to the murine Eya3 and the human Eya3 protein. In the ED2 region, from amino acids 229 to 245, the identity with the proteins of both mouse and human Eya3 is 35% (8/23). The predicted zebrafish eya3 protein has 12 amino acid insertions of differing lengths, which are absent in the homologous mammalian proteins. Localisation and length of these amino acid insertions are listed in Tab. 2. However, it is worth noting that all insertions are three or a multiple of three bp long and therefore do not alter the overall reading frame. All insertions are exclusively in the N-terminal region, except for one amino acid, a valine (V), which is inserted into the ED2 region.

The cDNA encoding the zebrafish eya4 homologue is 2895 bp long, and has an ORF of 1833 bp (Fig. 16). The start codon at nucleotide 426 and a stop codon (TAA) at nucleotide 2259 encompass a predicted protein product of 611 amino acids. Besides the ORF, the sequence contains a 425 bp 5’ UTR as well as a 637 bp 3’ UTR (poly(A) tail not included). Additionally, one insertion and six gaps are present in the N-terminal region compared with respective mouse and human proteins. The insertion of 9 bp spans nucleotides 1287-1295 (predicted amino acids 288-300). Five of the gaps represent a single missing amino acid, one of which is found within the ED2 region, while the sixth gap encompasses a stretch of 28 amino acids. As shown for the zebrafish eya2 and eya3 proteins, there is also a high amino acid identity between the predicted eya4 protein in zebrafish and those in mouse.
(74%) and human (73%). In the eyaHR this identity even rises up to 90% in mouse and 93% in human. The ED2 of the predicted zebrafish eya4 protein displays the strongest conservation of the Eya ED2 of all three Eya proteins. It is 72% (26/36) identical to both mouse and human Eya4 protein.

As previously described for Eya proteins in chicken, mouse and human [XU, 1997; MISHIMA; 1998 RAYAPUREDDI, 2003], alignments of the zebrafish deduced amino acid sequences (Fig. 13; 15; 17) have shown, that the N-terminal domains of eya2, eya3 and eya4 are less identical than the C-termini, and noticeably proline-serine-threonine-rich. These N-terminal regions consist of 39% (eya2), 34% (eya3) and 36% (eya4) proline, serine and threonine residues in total. In addition, the eyaHR of eya2, eya3 and eya4 proteins contain both motif I and motif III of the conserved halocid dehalogenase hydrolases (HAD) [LI, 2003; RAYAPUREDDI, 2003; TOOTLE, 2003; REBAY, 2005]. Motif I (DxDxT) is absolutely identical in the zebrafish, mouse and human deduced proteins of the three eya genes, as is motif III (GDGxxE) in the eya3 gene. In contrast motif III reveals slight differences in the deduced proteins of both compared mammalian Eya4 proteins (Fig. 13; 15; 17).

For the phylogenetic analysis the aligned amino acid sequences shown in Fig 12, 14 and 16 as well as the Drosophila eyes absent protein, which serves as outgroup, were used to construct a phylogenetic tree by the neighbour-joining method [SAITOU & NEI, 1987]. This evolutionary tree approves the close relationship among the different Eya proteins and reveals four distinct groups of relatives: the zebrafish eya1, eya2, eya3 and eya4 proteins with their corresponding murine and human counterparts (Fig. 18). In all protein groups the affinity between mouse and human is higher than in comparison to the zebrafish proteins. Based on the phylogenetic tree two gene duplications must have happened during evolution. Firstly Eya1 and Eya3 duplicated from the original Drosophila eyes absent gene. A second duplication event led to the genes of Eya2 and Eya4. Whereas Eya2 is a duplicate of Eya3 while Eya4 is a duplicate of Eya1.
Results
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Figure 12  
Nucleotide and predicted amino acid sequences of the zebrafish eya2 gene encoding EST, translated from the furthest upstream in-frame methionine (M). The conserved eya homology region (eyaHR) is indicated in bold. An asterisk indicates the stop codon terminating the open reading frame. Bold letters in red indicate HAD motif I and III characteristic for a subgroup of protein tyrosine phosphatases superfamily [TOOTLE, 2003]. The eya homology domain 2 (ED2) is indicated in bold and blue.

Figure 13  
Amino acid sequence comparison of zebrafish, mouse and human Eya2. Alignment of the deduced amino acid sequences for zebrafish eya2 (zeya2), murine Eya2 (mEya2), and three human EYA2 transcripts (hEya2) generated by using the MegAlign program (DNASTAR) with the Clustal method. Grey shading indicates identical residues, green shading insertions and gaps, and red shading the HAD motifs. Bold letters in yellow and blue point out residues variation within motif III. (Gene Bank accession numbers: mEya2, NM010165; hEYA2, NM172113; hEYA2III, NM172111; hEYA2V, NM172110)
Figure 14  (A) Nucleotide and predicted amino acid sequences of the zebrafish eya3 gene encoding EST, translated from the furthermost upstream in-frame methionine (M). The conserved eya homology region (eyaHR) is indicated in bold. Bold letters in red indicate HAD motif I and III characteristic for a subgroup of protein tyrosine phosphatases superfamily [TOOTLE, 2003]. The eya homology domain 2 (ED2) is indicated in bold and blue.

Table 2  N-terminal insertions in the eya3 sequence: nucleotide position within the cDNA, length in base pairs (bp) and predicted amino acids (aa).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nucleotide</th>
<th>bp</th>
<th>aa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>108-117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>152-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>184-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>210-212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>972</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>293-299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 15

**Amino acid sequence comparison of zebrafish, mouse and human Eya3.** Alignment of the deduced amino acid sequences for zebrafish eya3 (zfeya3), three murine Eya3 transcripts (mEya3), and human EYA3 (hEya3) generated by using the MegAlign program (DNASTAR) with the Clustal method. Grey shading indicates identical residues, green shading insertions and gaps, and red shading the HAD motifs. (Gene Bank accession numbers: mEya3I, NM0210071; mEya3II, NM010166; mEya3III, NM211357; hEYA3, NM001990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>zFeya3</th>
<th>mEya3I</th>
<th>mEya3II</th>
<th>mEya3III</th>
<th>hEYA3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amino acid sequence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grey shading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green shading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red shading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gene Bank accession numbers</strong></td>
<td>mEya3I, NM0210071; mEya3II, NM010166; mEya3III, NM211357; hEYA3, NM001990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TATTAGCTGGAGCTCCACCGCGGTGGCGGCCGCTCTAGAACTAGTGGATCCCCCGGGCTG
CAGGAATTCGGCACGAGGTGTGCTCACGTTAACTTCAGGATCAGCAGTTAAAGCGGAAAA
CACGGCTAGTGCAAGACCGCGCTCCTCGGAGTTTGGCTATAGTGCGGATCTGTTGGTTGG
AGCGTTCCGCTCCGGTGCGGCCAGTGCAGCTCTCATGAACTTAGGGAGGACTTCACTGAC
AGCGCGTGCACTGACTGGCGCGAGCTGTTCCTCGCGCTTCACGCAGCTAGACCACTTGAA
TATTTTTGGATGAGCATGTCAACACAGTGAAAGGGAACGGACCTTCTGGAGAGTTTGAAA
ATCGTTGCAACGCCACAACTCAATAAGAGTCTGCTGAGCTGAGCTTGGGAAATTTC
AACTGATGGAGAATACACAGATCTGAAATGACAGCGTGAGAGGGAAATACCTACACTGAG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amino Acid</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**
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Figure 16 (A) Nucleotide and predicted amino acid sequences of the zebrafish eya4 gene encoding EST, translated from the furthermost upstream in-frame methionine (M). The conserved eya homology region (eyaHR) is indicated in bold. An asterisk indicates the stop codon terminating the open reading frame. Bold letters in red indicate HAD motif I and III characteristic for a subgroup of protein tyrosine phosphatases superfamily [TOOTLE, 2003]. The eya homology domain 2 (ED2) is indicated in bold and blue.
Figure 17
Amino acid sequence comparison of zebrafish eya4 (zfeya4), murine Eya4 (mEya4), and three human EYA4 transcripts (hEya4). Alignment of the deduced amino acid sequences for zebrafish eya4 (zfeya4), murine Eya4 (mEya4), and three human EYA4 transcripts (hEya4) generated by using the MegAlign program (DNASTAR) with the Clustal method. Grey shading indicates identical residues, green shading indicates identical residues within motif III (Gene Bank accession numbers: mEya4, NM010167; hEya4I, NM004100; hEya4II, NM172103; hEya4IV, NM172105).
Table 3  Percentages of amino acid identity and similarity* of zebrafish (zf), murine (m), and human (h) Eya proteins. Highest identity/similarity between the zebrafish gene and the mammalian homologs are marked in bold. (Gene Bank accession numbers: zfeya1, NM131193; mEya1, NM010164; hEYA1I, NM172060; hEYA1II, NM172058; hEYA1IV, mEya2, NM010165; hEYA2II, NM172113; hEYA2III, NM172111; hEYA2IV, NM172110; mEya3II, NM0210071; mEya3II, NM010165; mEya3III, NM211357; hEYA3, NM001990) mEya4, NM010187; hEYA4I, NM004100; hEYA4II, NM172163; hEYA4IV, NM172105).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>zfeya2</th>
<th>zfeya3</th>
<th>zfeya4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zfeya1</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%*</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mEya1</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%*</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mEya2</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>64%*</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mEya3</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>48%*</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mEya4</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>64%*</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hEya1</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>58%*</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hEya2</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>62%*</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hEya3</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%*</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hEya4</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>57%*</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Expression pattern analysis of three eya genes in the zebrafish

To investigate the expression patterns of the newly identified eya genes during embryonic and early larval zebrafish development, whole-mount in situ hybridisation experiments were performed. In addition to the standard technique using non-fluorescent staining such as BM-purple or NBT/BCIP, in situ hybridisations were carried out using the TSA Alexa488 fluorescent amplification. This technique has been used successfully in sections earlier but only recently first results could be obtained in zebrafish whole mount in situ hybridisations [CLAY & RAMAKRISHNAN, 2005]. In this work the TSA method was used, because it affords a higher resolution of expression sites, although it is more difficult to detect signals of low-level expressed genes, as eya2, eya3 and eya4. Nevertheless fluorescent in situ signals were successfully detected with the TSA Alexa488 amplification in 24 hpf embryos, hybridised with labelled eya2 and eya4 antisense riboprobes.
Using *in situ* hybridisation allows to obtain detailed information on the timing and localisation of the transcribed mRNA in the embryo. Embryos at the stages from 12 hpf to 72 hpf were hybridised with labelled *eya2* and *eya4* antisense riboprobes. Both genes are widely expressed in distinct but overlapping patterns and show significant similarity to mammalian *Eya2* and *Eya4* expression. Because *eya3* antisense riboprobes repeatedly did not yield any distinct *in situ* labellings, description of expression patterns is restricted to *eya2* and *eya4*.

### 3.2.1 Temporal patterns of *eya2* expression during sensory organ development

Shortly after the tail bud stage, at 12 hpf, *eya2* expression is detected in the developing otic epithelium in two cell clusters at opposite ends of the forming otic placode, in the region of the developing olfactory placode, as well as in a preotic (anterior) and postotic (posterior) placodal domain, the prospective anterior and posterior lateral line placodes. (Fig. 19A,B). In the course of development, expression in the olfactory placode becomes increasingly confined to its periphery. Additionally to the anterior placodal expression, *eya2* also becomes visible in the anterior lateral line ganglion and migrating primordium of the posterior lateral line at the end of the first day of development (Fig. 19C,D).

By 24 hpf, *eya2* is expressed in the ventral edge of the otic epithelium (Fig. 20A,C), where the maculae are formed. *Eya2* positive cells can be identified in delaminating neuronal precursor cells passing from the otic vesicle to the forming statoacoustic ganglion (Fig. 20C). However, there is no *eya2* expression detectable in the ganglion itself at any stage of development (Fig. 20C-E). At this time *eya2* expression in sensory structures is very similar to the zebrafish *eya1* expression, except for the otic vesicle, where *eya1* positive cells are more widespread throughout the ventral domain of the vesicle. Furthermore, contrary to *eya2*, the nascent statoacoustic ganglion expresses *eya1* [Sahly, 1999].

At 48 hpf, *eya2* is merely detectable in the dorsal and ventral edges of the posterior macula (Fig. 20D) and can not be detected anymore at 60 hpf (Fig. 20F,G). At the same stage, *eya2* is no longer expressed in the lateral line sensory ganglia. However, cells in the olfactory placode are still expressing *eya2* in the apical surface, in which the olfactory receptors and sensory neurons exist (Fig. 19G; 20B) [Whitlock & Westerfield, 1998]. These cells remain *eya2* positive at least until 72 hpf. In addition, *eya2* becomes expressed in the anterior and posterior neuromasts of the lateral line system at 30 to 36 hpf and continues until at least 72 hpf (Fig. 19E-I). Expression can be observed in both the primary and secondary neuromasts.

There is no *eya2* expression in non-neural tissues like the mesodermal somites, which are a prominent expression site of *eya1* [Sahly, 1999]. One exception is the pectoral fin, which is a derivate of the paraxial mesoderm. Here *eya2* becomes expressed at around 36 hpf. This expression continues until at least 48 hpf, but can no longer be distinguished at 60 hpf (Fig. 19E-G).
Expression pattern ofeya2 during the first 3 days of development. Whole mounted (A, C) and dissected (B, D-I) embryos hybridised in situ with eya2 antisense riboprobe are shown in lateral views with anterior to the left and dorsal to the top (A, C-I). B shows a dorsal view with anterior left. The stages are indicated in hours post fertilization (h) on each panel. Short arrows indicate the various placodal regions, with closed arrowheads denoting trigeminal placodes, thin open arrowheads pointing to the anterior lateral line placodes and thick open arrowheads indicating posterior lateral line placodes. Longer arrows of the respective version indicate the cranial ganglia deriving from these placodes. The otic placode is outlined with a black dotted line (B). Short thick arrows with closed arrowheads indicate olfactory placodes. Black arrowheads point to lateral line neuromasts, P\textsubscript{1-8}, primary neuromasts; P\textsubscript{1,1}, first secondary neuromast; white arrowheads to lateral line primordia. The pectoral fin bud is outlined with a red dotted line (E, F); ov, otic vesicle. Scale bar, 100µm.
3.2.2 Temporal patterns of *eya4* expression during sensory organ development

*Eya4* expression is first seen in tail bud embryos at 12 hpf. Like *eya2*, it becomes visible in two cell clusters at opposite ends of the forming otic placode (Fig. 21A,B). Shortly afterwards *eya4* expression is observed in the primordium of the posterior lateral line as well as in the otic vesicle, particularly in the anteroventral domain (Fig. 21C,D; Fig. 22A,C).

By 24 hpf the expression of *eya4* is restricted to the differentiated anterior and posterior lateral line ganglion as well as the statoacoustic ganglion, excluding the respective placodes. This expression continues until at least 60 hpf (Fig. 21C-G), whereas the statoacoustic ganglion is a major expression site of this transcription factor (Fig. 22D; Fig. 25H).

In addition *eya4* is abundant expressed in the inner ear. By 24 hpf *eya4* transcripts can solely be detected in the ventral part of the otic epithelium, notably strong in the anterior region (Fig. 22A,C-E), where the anterior macula is formed. Shortly afterwards, around 36 hpf, *eya4* expression becomes visible in the haircells of the anterior macula (Fig. 22E). At 48 hpf, *eya4* is, in addition to the anterior macula, also expressed in the semicircular canal primordia (Fig. 22D). By 60 hpf expression is found in four sensory patches of the inner ear, the anterior macula and three cristae, as well as in the semicircular canals (Fig. 21G; 22F) where it lasts until at least 72 hpf (Fig. 22B). *Eya4* expression in the neuromasts of the anterior and posterior lateral line system starts around 30 to 36 hpf, and becomes particularly intense by 48 hpf (Fig. 21F,H). This expression continues at least until 72 hpf (Fig. 21G,I). Expression can be observed in both, the primary and secondary neuromasts. In the non-neural tissues, *eya4* is first observed in the somites at 20 hpf and persists until around 27 hpf (Fig. 21C). In this respect, contrary to *eya2*, *eya4* resembles the zebrafish *eya1* gene, which is reported to be expressed in the somites during early development until around 26-28 hpf [Sahly, 1999]. The period of *eya4* expression in the pectoral fin seems to be limited to a time window ranges from 48 hpf until
approximately 60 (Fig. 21G). As a result of preparation processing, the pectoral fin often is missing in flatmounts, therefore earlier expression of eya4 in the pectoral fin could not be detected. However observations in the whole-mount may assume that a week expression of eya4 in the pectoral fin already becomes visible at 36 hpf.

**Figure 21** Expression pattern of eya4 during the first 3 days of development. (A, C) Whole mounted and (B, D-I) dissected embryos hybridised in situ with eya4 antisense riboprobe are shown in lateral views with anterior to the left and dorsal to the top (A, C-I). B shows a dorsal view with anterior left. The stages are indicated in hours post fertilization (h) on each panel. Short arrows indicate the various placodal regions, with closed arrowheads denoting trigeminal placodes, thin open arrowheads pointing to the anterior lateral line placodes and thick open arrowheads indicating posterior lateral line placodes. Longer arrows of the respective version indicate the cranial ganglia deriving from these placodes. The otic placode is outlined with a black dotted line (B), the statoacoustic ganglia are indicated by an open arrowhead. Short thick arrows with closed arrowheads indicate olfactory placodes. Black arrowheads point to lateral line neuromasts, $P_2$ primary neuromasts; $P_{1,1}$ first secondary neuromast; white arrowheads to lateral line primordia. The pectoral fin bud is outlined with a red dotted line (F); ov, otic vesicle. Scale bar, 100µm.
Figure 22  
*eya4* expression in the developing otic vesicle. Shown are (A) Whole mounted embryo (anterior to the left, dorsal to the top), (B) dissected (anterior to the left, dorsal to the top) and (C-F) cross-sectional (dorsal to the top) views of *eya4* antisense riboprobe *in situ* hybridised embryos. The stages are indicated in hours post fertilization (h) on each panel. ac, anterior crista; amac, anterior macula; gVIII, statoacoustic ganglion; lc, lateral crista; ov, otic vesicle; pc, posterior crista; ssc, semicircular canal; * hair cells; * supporting cells; arrowheads, neuromast. Scale bar, (A, B) 100µm; (C-F) 25µm.

### 3.2.3 Expression of *eya2* and *eya4* in ectodermal placodes and cranial ganglia

During the period of segmentation, three distinct placodally derived sensory ganglia are formed in the preotic region: the ganglia of the trigeminal nerve, the anterior lateral line, and the vestibuloacoustic nerve. The sensory neurons in these ganglia express the HNK-1 antigen, which is detected by the zn12 antibody, starting at 14 hpf in trigeminal sensory neurons [METCALFE, 1990; TERVARROW, 1990]. At 12 hpf, *eya2* expression is found next to the neural keel, extending around the posterior end of the mid-hindbrain boundary to the anterior margin of rhombomere 3, which is consistent with the expression site of the trigeminal placode. Previous studies reported, about *eya2* homologues in mouse and chicken, which are expressed in the trigeminal placode/ganglion [DUNCAN, 1997; XU, 1997; MISHIMA, 1998], indeed no trigeminal *eya* expression could be detected in the zebrafish so far. To make sure that the observed expression of *eya2* actually marks the area of the trigeminal placode, triple *in situ* hybridisations were undertaken, using the gene markers *pax2.1* and *krox20* in addition to *eya2*. The paired-box containing *pax2.1* gene encodes a putative transcription factor, which is among others expressed in the mid-hindbrain boundary during embryonic development [KRAUSS, 1991]. *Krox20* encodes a zinc finger protein transcription factor, whose expression is restricted to rhombomere 3 and 5 [SCHNEIDER-MAUNOURY, 1993; SEITANIDOU, 1997; WILKINSON, 1998]. With *eya2/pax2.1/krox20* hybridised embryos have shown that *eya2* expression ranges from the *pax2.1* labelled mid-hindbrain boundary to the *krox20* labelled rhombomere 3 (Fig. 23A,C,E), consistent with the trigeminal expression site. In order to distinguish between expression in placodes and in the respective ganglia, cross-sections of *in situ* hybridised and immunolabeled embryos were performed (Fig. 23B,D,F). In cross-section, this expression domain does not show the typical appearance of a placode as a cell-layer of thickened epithelial cells. Instead, the expression extends over several cell diameters at 12 hpf (23C; 24C). By 14 hpf, the first zn12 positive trigeminal neurons are found at a position, which
appears to have expressed eya2 at 12 hpf. However, these immunolabeled sensory neurons do no longer express eya2. Instead, eya2 mRNA can be clearly detected in an overlying region of embryonic ectoderm, the presumed trigeminal placode. While the size of the trigeminal ganglion increases during the next hours of development, at around 17/18 hpf eya2 expression in the trigeminal placode decreases gradually (Fig. 23E; 24E). At the stage of 14 hpf, a second placodal domain expressing eya2 arises from the anterior margin of the otic placode (Fig. 23C; 24C), extending anteriorly, overlying the posterior part of the nascent trigeminal ganglion by 17 hpf (Fig. 23F; Fig. 24E). This placode gives rise to sensory neurons, which are first recognized by zn12 immunolabeling around 18 hpf [METCALFE, 1990], and neuromasts of the anterior lateral line (Fig. 25E,F). In contrast to eya2, eya4 expression could not be detected in trigeminal placodes or ganglia between 12 hpf and 17 hpf (Fig. 24B,D,F).

At 24 hpf, eya2 expression is absent from the trigeminal ganglion and the overlying ectoderm (Fig. 25A,C). In contrast to eya2, eya4 expression can be detected in a subset of statoacoustic sensory neurons (Fig. 25G,H). At the level of the anterior lateral line ganglion, strong expression of both genes can be found in the overlying neuromasts of lateral line. However in the ganglion itself expression of both genes differs, while eya4 is strongly expressed in the ganglion, in comparison eya2 expression greatly appears weaker (Fig. 25A,B,E,F). In the postotic region, eya2 and eya4 transcripts can be detected in the posterior lateral line ganglion but are absent from the overlying ectoderm (Fig. 25A,B,I,J).
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Figure 23  Expression of eya2 in the trigeminal placodal region during early segmentation stage. Embryos in panels A, C, and E were hybridised in situ with eya2 probe (blue), fluorescein-labeled pax2.1 and krx20 probes (red) as indicated, are shown flatmounted in dorsal view, anterior to the top. Embryos in panels B, D, and F hybridised in situ with eya2 were also immunolabeled with zn12 antibody, shown as cross sections through the region of the developing trigeminal ganglion. The stages are indicated in hours post fertilization (hpf) on each panel. Short arrows with closed arrowheads indicate the trigeminal placode, while longer arrows with closed arrowheads point to the trigeminal ganglion. Short arrows with open arrowheads indicate the anterior lateral line placode. Black arrowheads point to small clusters of eya2 expressing cells in the developing otic placode. mhb, midbrain-hindbrain boundary; rh3; rhombomere 3; rh5, rhombomere 5. Scale bars, A, C, E 50µm; B, D, F 25µm.
Figure 24 Comparison of eya2 and eya4 expression in the preotic placodal region during early segmentation stage. All embryos, hybridised in situ with eya2 or eya4 probe (blue) and immunolabeled with zn12 antibody as indicate, are shown flatmounted in dorsal view, anterior to the top. In panels C and E the trigeminal placode respectively ganglion (frame) is also shown 40-times magnified (on the bottom, left corner in each panel) revealing single neuronal cells underlying still eya2 expressing trigeminal placodal cells. The stages are indicated in hours post fertilization (hpf) on each panel. Short arrows with closed arrowheads indicate the trigeminal placode, while longer arrows with closed arrowheads point to the trigeminal ganglion. Short arrows with open arrowheads indicate the anterior lateral line placode. Black arrowheads point to small clusters of eya expressing cells in the developing otic placode. gp, trigeminal placode; gV, trigeminal ganglion. Scale bars, 50µm.
Figure 25  Comparison of eya2 (A, C, E, G, I) and eya4 (B, D, F, H, J) expression in cranial ganglia at 24 hpf. Embryos, in situ hybridised (blue) and immunolabeled with zn12 antibody as indicated, are shown in cross-sections, except for A and B, which are dissected views with anterior to the left and dorsal up. C, D: trigeminal ganglion. E, F: anterior lateral line ganglion. G, H: statoacoustic ganglion. I, J: posterior lateral line ganglion. Arrows with closed arrowheads denote trigeminal ganglia, long thin arrows with open arrowheads indicate anterior lateral line ganglia, long thick arrows with open arrowheads point to posterior lateral line ganglia. Open arrowheads indicate statoacoustic ganglia and closed arrowheads point to developing neuromasts of the anterior lateral line. ov, otic vesicle. Scale bar (A, B), 100µm; (C-J), 25µm.
### 3.2.4 Summary of eya expression sites in the early zebrafish

#### Table 4

Expression domains of eya1, eya2 and eya4 during the first three days of development. eya1 expression is based on Sahly et al. (1999) and Peter Andermann (personal communication). Only the presence (+) or absence (-) of transcripts has been noted. ? indicates uncertain expression due to limitations of the whole mount in situ hybridization technique.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segmentation period</th>
<th>10hpf</th>
<th>12/13hpf</th>
<th>17/18hpf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eya1</td>
<td>eya2</td>
<td>eya4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-placodal field</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adenohypophyseal placode</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olfactory placode</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trigeminal placode</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trigeminal ganglion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otic placode/vesicle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statoacoustic ganglion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ant. lateral line placode</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ant. lateral line ganglion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos. lateral line placode</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos. lateral line ganglion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral line primordia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second day of embryonic development</th>
<th>24hpf</th>
<th>36hpf</th>
<th>48hpf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eya1</td>
<td>eya2</td>
<td>eya4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adenohypophysis</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olfactory organ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otic vesicle</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statoacoustic ganglion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ant. lateral line placode</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ant. lateral line ganglion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos. lateral line placode</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos. lateral line ganglion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primordia</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuromasts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>branchial arches</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somites</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pectoral fin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third day of embryonic development</th>
<th>60hpf</th>
<th>72hpf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eya1</td>
<td>eya2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olfactory organ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otic vesicle</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statoacoustic ganglion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ant. lateral line ganglion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos. lateral line ganglion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuromasts</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>branchial arches</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Results – Part II

Besides the identification, sequence and expression pattern analysis of a gene, its functional activity is of significant interest. The function of eya gene family members in zebrafish is not well known yet. Therefore, loss- and gain-of-function effects were investigated by Morpholino-antisense oligonucleotide and in vitro synthesised mRNA injection methods in the zebrafish embryo.

3.3 Loss-of-function of eya2 and eya4

3.3.1 Targeting genes of interest

To understand the molecular function of eya genes within sensory organ development and disease, the zebrafish eya1/dog-eared (dog) mutation, was cloned and characterized by Whitfield (1996). Further sequence analysis revealed three single point mutations, which were located in the splice donor sequence of putative exon 10. On the basis of morpholino oligonucleotide (MO) injections, complementary to the primary RNA, the eya1 gene could be identified as being responsible for the dog-eared phenotype [Kozlowski, 2005].

This study also shows, that eya1 mRNA start-site morpholinos, which inhibit the translation of the whole eya protein, do not show any detectable effects in the manipulated embryos. In contrast, microinjection of eya1 mRNA correctly spliced at the exon10-intron 10 splice junction phenocopies the dog-eared mutation. This splice junction is located immediately upstream of the eya homology region, resulting in a truncated eya protein, which only lacks the highly conserved eya domain. Based on these findings eya2 and eya4 splice-site morpholinos were designed for the following “knock-down” experiments.

To target the gene of interest with splice-site blocking MO, it is necessary to determine the exon/intron structure. Then, a 25-mer MO complementary to the corresponding splice donor site can be designed. The exon/intron structure of eya2 has been determined by comparing the obtained cDNA sequence with the respective genomic DNA sequence deposited in Gene bank (accession number BX005392). Subsequently, an eya2 antisense MO (5'-TTGGTTTCTACCTGTGTG-3') complementary to the exon4/intron4 splice donor site was designed (Fig. 26), as well as a corresponding control oligonucleotide containing 5 mismatches. Based on comparison of the eya4 cDNA sequence with the genomic DNA sequence for zebrafish eya4, deposited in GeneBank (CR759830), the exon11/intron11 splice donor site was chosen to design an eya4 antisense MO (5'-CCATCCGAACATACCTCAAGGTAC-3') (Fig. 27) and the corresponding mismatch control MO.

Following Kozlowski (2005), who obtained detectable results by injecting 20ng of MOeya1, approximately 20 ng were injected in 1-16 cell stage wildtype embryos.

4 Coding regions of a gene.
5 Noncoding regions of a gene (intervening regions)
3.3.2 In situ detection of apoptotic cells by TUNEL assay in loss-of-function embryos

KOZLOWSKI's study (2005) has also shown an increased, apoptosis-mediated level of cell death in the developing otic vesicle of dog-eared embryos, detected by the terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase-mediated nick end labelling (TUNEL) assay. To investigate whether a higher quantity of apoptotic cells can also be observed in eya2 and/or eya4 “knock-down” zebrafish, with MOeya2 and MOeya4 injected embryos were detected by using the TUNEL assay.

Within normal zebrafish development, the first apoptotic cells in sensory structures appear during the second day of development. Most sensory tissues show a specific period of intense apoptosis throughout a limited time frame (Fig. 28). Although the amount of apoptotic cells varies among individuals of the same age, the location, pattern and timing of apoptotic cells are consistent. Additionally there can be huge differences between batches of offsprings obtained from each breeding event.

To unravel any effects on apoptotic cell behaviour in the manipulated embryos, TUNEL-positive cells were counted in eya2 and/or eya4 expressing sensory structures at the time these structures undergo normal programmed cell death in the wildtype embryo. Therefore TUNEL-positive cells were counted in the olfactory organ, the trigeminal and anterior lateral line ganglion and the otic vesicle at 27 hpf. To detect effects on sensory structures, which are not yet developed at 27 hpf, like the neuromasts of the
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anterior and posterior lateral line, TUNEL-positive cells were also counted at a later stage of development, at 54 hpf. Additionally, apoptotic cells were counted in the olfactory organ and the otic vesicle where programmed cell death still occurs at this stage (Fig. 28).

Cells were counted for each sensory structure of 40 injected embryos, which were obtained from two separate experiments. Data are presented as mean value profile counts and +/- standard deviation. As internal control uninjected wildtype embryos as well as mismatch morpholino injected embryos were also detected by the TUNEL assay to exclude the possibility of non-specific labelling. To determine if or which sensory structures were affected, double staining with TUNEL assay and the monoclonal antibody zn-12 were performed.

<table>
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<th>≤ 72 hpf</th>
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</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28  Time frame of apoptosis in sensory organs. Earliest apoptosis events happen at around 24 hpf within the lens, olfactory placode, the trigeminal ganglion and the otic vesicle. The first apoptotic cells in the anterior lateral line ganglion are detectable at around 30 hpf, in the neuromasts at around 36 hpf. At first apoptosis stops in the lens, trigeminal and anterior lateral line ganglion at around 48 hpf. In the olfactory organ, the otic vesicle and the neuromasts apoptosis can still be observed after 72 hpf [ZAKERI, 1993; COLE & ROSS, 2001; own observations]

3.3.2.1 Effects of eya2 “knock-down“ on the sensory structures

In the eya2MO injected embryos, initial phenotypic characterisations have not shown any morphological defects or differences from the wildtype siblings. Subsequently, apoptotic cell death was examined at 27 hpf and 54 hpf. At the stage of 27 hpf knock-down embryos show an increased number of TUNEL-positive cells, which is restricted to the region of the trigeminal ganglion and the anterior lateral line ganglion (Fig. 30 A,B,C,D). Quantitative analysis reveals an increase of 41% of TUNEL-positive cells in the trigeminal ganglion and 62,5% in the anterior lateral line ganglion (Fig. 29 A,C). In contrast, no differences between knock-down and control embryos could be detected in the olfactory placode or in the otic vesicle. At this stage neuromast development has just started, so no apoptotic cells could be distinguished in neuromasts at all. The occurrence of cell death events has changed at 54 hpf. Apoptosis arises in the olfactory placode, otic vesicle and neuromasts of the anterior and the posterior lateral line. Exclusively in the olfactory organ, an enhancement of apoptotic cells can be identified. An increase of 100% was detected (Fig. 29B,D; Fig. 30E,F).
### Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Olfactory organ</th>
<th>Trigeminal ganglion</th>
<th>Anterior lateral line ganglion</th>
<th>Otic vesicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOeya2</td>
<td>6,0 ± 0,5</td>
<td>23 ± 1,0</td>
<td>20,8 ± 2,2</td>
<td>5,3 ± 0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mM MOeya2</td>
<td>7,1 ± 1,0</td>
<td>15,3 ± 0,8</td>
<td>11,9 ± 1,3</td>
<td>5,3 ± 0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT sibling</td>
<td>7,2 ± 0,8</td>
<td>16,2 ± 1,2</td>
<td>12,8 ± 2,5</td>
<td>5,5 ± 0,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Olfactory organ</th>
<th>Otic vesicle</th>
<th>Neuromasts ant. lateral line</th>
<th>Neuromasts pos. lateral line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOeya2</td>
<td>24,5 ± 4,9</td>
<td>11,2 ± 1,1</td>
<td>4,1 ± 2,7</td>
<td>3,3 ± 2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mM MOeya2</td>
<td>11,1 ± 2,2</td>
<td>10,8 ± 0,8</td>
<td>4,0 ± 0,9</td>
<td>3,1 ± 1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT sibling</td>
<td>12,2 ± 1,6</td>
<td>12,7 ± 2,2</td>
<td>2,8 ± 1,7</td>
<td>2,8 ± 1,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 29

Apoptosis in the sensory organs at 27 hpf (A, C) and 54hpf (B, D) in eya2 MO injected embryos. Number of apoptotic cells is the mean followed by the standard deviation. Graphs showing the numbers of apoptotic cells in the different sensory structures of eya2MO injected embryos, eya2mMO injected embryos and wildtype siblings. allg, anterior lateral line ganglion; gV, trigeminal ganglion; NM, neuromast; olf, olfactory organ; ov, otic vesicle.
Figure 30  
Increased apoptotic cell death in eya2 loss-of-function embryos. Whole-mount in situ detection of TUNEL-positive cells (blue) in wildtype siblings (A, C, E) and in eya2MO injected embryos (B, D, F). (A, B) Wildtype sibling and eya2MO embryos additionally stained with the monoclonal zn12 antibody. Dissected embryos are shown anterior left, dorsal to the top. The stages are indicated in hours post fertilization (hpf) in each panel. Scale bar: A, B 100µm, C-F 50µm.
3.3.2.2 Effects of eya4 “knock-down“ on the sensory structures

The TUNEL assay of eya4MO injected embryos reveals an exceeding amount of apoptotic cells in the anterior lateral line ganglion at 27 hpf (Fig. 32) Counts of apoptotic cells in this sensory structure have verified an increase of 130% in the anterior lateral line ganglion. At this stage of development, no intensification of apoptosis could be detected in the olfactory placode, the trigeminal ganglion or the otic vesicle (Fig. 31A,C). At 54 eya4MO injected embryos do not show any alterations in the sensory structures, except in the neuromasts of the anterior lateral line, where the number of detected TUNEL-positive cells is increased by 143% (Fig. 31B,D). To confirm this observation, 96 hours old embryos were examined by DASPEI staining, revealing that neuromasts seem to be smaller (have fewer haircells) than normal, particularly in the neuromasts MI1 and D1, while it appears that the neuromast OC1 lacks completely (Fig. 33).
A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Olfactory organ</th>
<th>Trigeminal ganglion</th>
<th>Anterior lateral line ganglion</th>
<th>Otic vesicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOeya4</td>
<td>4,4 ± 0,8</td>
<td>14,9 ± 2,3</td>
<td>19,2 ± 2,8</td>
<td>5,5 ± 0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mMOMeya4</td>
<td>4,4 ± 0,5</td>
<td>12,2 ± 2,5</td>
<td>7,8 ± 0,3</td>
<td>4,6 ± 0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT sibling</td>
<td>4,2 ± 0,7</td>
<td>14,1 ± 1,6</td>
<td>8,3 ± 1,6</td>
<td>4,4 ± 0,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Olfactory organ</th>
<th>Otic vesicle</th>
<th>Neuromasts ant.lateral line</th>
<th>Neuromasts pos.lateral line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOeya4</td>
<td>12,2 ± 1,6</td>
<td>9,0 ± 1,3</td>
<td>7,3 ± 2,1</td>
<td>2,9 ± 1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mMOMeya4</td>
<td>10,8 ± 1,1</td>
<td>9,2 ± 0,9</td>
<td>3,0 ± 1,2</td>
<td>3,1 ± 1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT sibling</td>
<td>11,5 ± 0,7</td>
<td>9,5 ± 1,25</td>
<td>2,9 ± 1,4</td>
<td>3,0 ± 1,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31 Apoptosis in the sensory organs at 27 hpf (A, C) and 54hpf (C, D) in eya4 MO injected embryos. Number of apoptotic cells is the mean followed by the standard deviation. Graphs showing the numbers of apoptotic cells in the different sensory structures of eya4MO injected embryos, eya4mMO injected embryos and wildtype siblings. allg, anterior lateral line ganglion; gV, trigeminal ganglion; NM, neuromast; olf, olfactory organ; ov, otic vesicle.
Figure 32  Increased apoptotic cell death in *eya4* loss-of-function embryos. (A-D) Whole-mount *in situ* detection of TUNEL-positive cells (blue) in wildtype siblings (A, C) and in *eya4*MO injected embryos (B, D). (C, D) Wildtype sibling and *eya2*MO embryos additionally stained with the monoclonal zn12 antibody. Dissected embryos are shown anterior left, dorsal to the top. The stages are indicated in hours post fertilization (hpf). Scale bar: A, B 50µm, C, D 100µm.

Figure 33  The anterior lateral line in *eya4* knock-down embryos. Confocal images of live embryos stained with the vital dye DASPEI showing hair cells in the neuromasts of the anterior lateral line (yellow dots). In *eya4*MO injected embryos the neuromasts have fewer hair cells than normal, strongly reduced are the haircells of the neuromasts Mi1 (*3) and D1 (*2), the neuromast OC1 (*1) is completely missing. Scale bar: 200µm.
3.4 Gain-of-function of eya1, eya2 and eya4

3.4.1 Effects of ectopic eya1, eya2 and eya4 detected by the TUNEL assay

To obtain further information about the function of eya and its importance within the process of apoptosis in normal development, overexpression experiments were conducted. If the loss of eya function is responsible for an increased level of apoptosis, possibly the gain of eya function can reduce programmed cell death. Studies in Drosophila have shown, that the overexpression of eyes absent causes the development of ectopic eyes.

Based on these findings in vitro synthesised eya1, eya2 or eya4 mRNA was injected into 1-16 cell stage wildtype zebrafish embryos as described before. As internal control in vitro synthesised mRNA encoding green fluorescent protein (GFP) was coinjected, which allows to observe the distribution of the injected mRNA by fluorescence microscopy (488nm). Approximately 0,15ng of eya mRNA and 0,5ng of GFP mRNA was injected.

To observe effects of ectopic eya expression, TUNEL-positive cells were counted in the lens, a sensory structure normally is not expressing any of the eya genes. To determine if ectopic eya expression actually influences apoptotic behaviour, the number of apoptotic cells should be reduced in the lens after overexpression of eya genes. Numbers of TUNEL-positive cells were counted in 27 hpf old embryos for two reasons. Apoptosis in the zebrafish lens starts to be active at around 20 hpf, peaks between 24 hpf and 30 hpf. At this point in time the process of programmed cell death can be manipulated. Furthermore in vitro synthesised mRNA stability is limited to the early stages of development. Within the embryonic development the firstly injected mRNA concentration weakens with every cell division event, therefore to obtain reliable results investigated embryos should not be older than 30 hpf. Cell were counted for each lens of 60 injected embryos, which were obtained from three separate experiments. Data are presented as mean value profile counts and +/- standard deviation.

Neither of the investigated embryos, which were injected with eya1, eya2 or eya4 have shown any morphological distinct features. Whereas the TUNEL assay of each, eya1, eya2 and eya4 reveals a reduced number of TUNEL-positive cells in the lens (Fig. 35A-F). In ectopic eya1 expressing embryos apoptosis in the lens was reduced by 17%. Gain of function of eya2 reveals a reduction of 28% and ectopic expressed eya4 shows a 35% reduction (Fig. 34). Besides the decrease in the lens, no other effect on apoptotic-mediated cell death was observed.
### Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>eya1</th>
<th>eya2</th>
<th>eya4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syn.mRNA</td>
<td>6.9 ± 2.5</td>
<td>9.9 ± 1.5</td>
<td>6.1 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT sibling</td>
<td>8.3 ± 1.9</td>
<td>13.7 ± 2.5</td>
<td>9.3 ± 1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 34
Ectopic *eya1*, *eya2* and *eya4* expression reduces TUNEL-positive cells in the lens at 27hpf. (A) Number of the apoptotic cells is the mean followed by the standard deviation. (B) Graphs showing the numbers of apoptotic cells in the lens for each ectopically expressed *eya* gene and wildtype sibling controls.

#### Figure 35
Decreased apoptotic cell death in ectopic *eya1*, *eya2* and *eya4* expressing embryos at 27 hpf. Whole-mount *in situ* detection of TUNEL-positive cells. Dissected embryos are shown anterior to the left, dorsal up. The lens is outlined with a black dotted line. Scale bar, 50µm.
4 Discussion – Part I

4.1 Conservation of eya2, eya3 and eya4 sequences in vertebrates

The present results indicate that the zebrafish eya2, eya3, and eya4 are homologues of the *Drosophila eyes absent* gene and moderately conserved proteins within the vertebrates. Sequence analysis indicated with Eya4 as the strongest conserved member of the eya gene family, while Eya3 revealed the lowest level of identity.

Comparison of the predicted amino acid sequences of the zebrafish eya genes and the corresponding mammalian Eya proteins revealed the eya-typical, highly conserved C-terminal domain and the variable N-terminal domain with, an overall identity of 64%(mouse) / 62%(human) for the eya2 protein, 48%/58% for the eya3 protein and 74%/73% for the eya4 protein. The characteristical, in the C-terminal located eya homology region (eyaHR) shows an identity of 79-90% between the zebrafish and the mammalian proteins. A second, but shorter homology region (ED2) was found in the N-terminal, although it is less identical between zebrafish and mammalian than the eyaHR (35%/eya3; 48/40%/eya2; 72%/eya4)

The N-terminal region of the predicted protein of all three eya proteins in zebrafish is proline-serine-threonine-rich, as demonstrated previously for the mammalian Eya1-3 proteins by XU 1997). Furthermore contain the eyaHRs of all zebrafish eya proteins two signature motifs characteristic of the haloacid dehalogenase (HAD) hydrolase, which are responsible for the enzymatic activity of Eya proteins [TOOTLE, 2003]. While both motifs in the eya3 protein are 100% identical between zebrafish and mammalian, motif III in eya2 and eya4 differs among the Eya proteins because of the amino acid substitutions.

4.2 Alternatively spliced transcript variants

Amino acid alignments of the deduced zebrafish eya cDNAs lead to the identification of eya2 and eya4 as alternatively spliced transcript variants. Alternative gene splicing is a post-transcriptional modification in which a single gene can code for multiple proteins. Gene splicing enables a single gene to increase its coding capability, allowing the synthesis of protein isoforms that are structurally and functionally distinct. Thus, it is an important reason for protein diversity. The most common known gene splicing mechanism occurs in exon-intron borders of the pre-mRNA, mostly in the N-terminal region. Thereby including or excluding exon(s) from the final gene transcript leading to extended or shortened mRNA variants [BRETT, 2001; BLACK, 2003]. Alternatively spliced transcripts have been found in the *Drosophila eya absent* [BONINI, 1993; BONINI, 1998], in the human Eya1 [ABDELHAK, 1997], and in the human Eya4 [BORSANI, 1999]. Specific splice variants may causes diseases, disorders, or pathological conditions.
However not any insertion or gap can be assumed to be an exon, which in general spans multiple amino acids. Additions or substitutions of only an insignificant number of amino acids can be assumed as results of the alignment program, determine the highest analogy between compared amino acids.

An alternative selection of promoters is another method of splicing in the 5'UTR produces an alternative N-terminus domain in proteins. The zebrafish eya2 clone can be assumed to be a splice variant containing an alternative promoter. Comparison with mammalian Eya2 proteins revealed that the translated zebrafish eya2 protein lacks the first 70 amino acids. That is a splicing event in the 5'UTR generated an isoform with alternative ATG start codon. Indeed, a similar splice variant was found in another murine eya2 transcript [GeneBank accession number U81603; ZIMMERMANN, 1997], confirming this assumption.

Amino acid alignments of zebrafish eya4 cDNA clone revealed a gap of 28 amino acids in the N-terminal region in the zebrafish protein. However, in two of four compared mammalian Eya4 transcripts, in the murine Eya4 protein and in the human Eya4 protein isoform II, a similar lack of amino acids was found. Additionally in the zebrafish this gap is located at the exon4-intron4 border of the pre-mRNA. For those reasons it can be assumed, that the zebrafish eya4 cDNA clone is an alternatively spliced transcript.

The N-terminal region of the zebrafish eya3 cDNA clone contains 12 insertions; four of those span ten or more amino acids, suggesting these insertions are exons. Corresponding transcripts were not found in mammalian homologues, therefore it is difficult to decide if this zebrafish eya3 cDNA clone is a definite splice variant. The eya3 cDNA clone may also be a mutation or inappropriate splicing event, resulting in a genetic dysfunction. The physiological activity of splice variant products and the original protein may be the same, completely different, or even absent. When a variant and the original sequence have the same or opposite activity, they may differ in various properties not directly connected to biological activity, such as temporal pattern of expression and up or down regulation mechanisms [BRETT, 2001; BLACK, 2003]. This thesis has shown that no expression of the eya3 gene can be found in the zebrafish at all. The function of the eya3 protein in zebrafish may be overtaken by another gene or utterly dispensable. Eventually the zebrafish eya3 gene is about a pseudo-gene, a gene without any activity, at least in the teleosts.
4.3 Comparison of Eya2 and Eya4 expression during early vertebrate development

Similar overlapping and unique expression sites of Eya genes are found in different vertebrates like the zebrafish, *Xenopus* [DAVID, 2001; KRIEBEL, 2007], chicken [MISHIMA, 1998] and mouse [ABDELHAK, 1997; DUNCAN, 1997; XU, 1997; ZIMMERMANN, 1997; BORSANI, 1999] (Tab. 6).

4.3.1 Eya2 and Eya4 expression in the cranial placodes and their derivates

Although progress has been made in recent years to identify the molecular players that mediate placode specification, induction and patterning, the processes that initiate placode development are still not well understood. A defining feature for eya2 and eya4 is their combined expression in many ectodermal cranial placodes and placode derivates. Eya2 is expressed in various ectodermal placodes like the trigeminal, lateral line as well as otic placodes, and their derivates. Early placodal eya4 expression could only be found in the otic placode. Though eya2 is expressed in the otic placode as well as in the delaminating cells forming the statoacoustic ganglion, no expression could be found in differentiated neurons of the ganglion itself. Instead the statoacoustic ganglion reveals an abundant expression of eya4. Thus, while eya2 is both placodal and neuronal expressed, eya4 expression is, apart from the otic placode, restricted to fully differentiated cells.

Comparison of the two novel zebrafish eya genes with the zebrafish eya1 gene [SAHLY, 1999] reveal overlapping expression of two or all eya genes in various sensory structures. However eya1 expression occurs already in the pre-placodal field, consequently earlier than eya2 and eya4 during the embryonic development. Therefore it has to be assumed, that eya1 is upstream of eya2 and eya4. Similar expression of eya2 and eya1 is shown in different cranial placodes, like the olfactory, branchial and otic placodes. However, either of them has a unique expression site, eya2 is exclusively expressed in the trigeminal placode, eya1 in the adenohypophyseal placode. Apart from the trigeminal ganglion, in all differentiated cranial structures eya2 and/or eya4 are coexpressed with eya1 (Tab. 5).

Murine Eya2 expression is found in various ectodermal cranial placodes and ganglia, among others in the trigeminal placode and ganglion. Therefore it can be assumed that the unique expression site of Eya2 in the trigeminal placode and ganglion is conserved between zebrafish and mice. No murine Eya2 expression is described for the otic placode or the differentiated otic vesicle. That is while eya2 is expressed in the otic placode and its derivates, even though for a short period, this expression site got lost completely in higher vertebrates. Similar to the zebrafish eya4 gene, the murine Eya4 is, except of the nasal placod, restricted to differentiated cells. However, both the zebrafish and the murine Eya4 gene has one placodal expression site, the otic placode and the nasal placode respectively. After differentiating events the murine Eya4 is expressed in the nasal pit and the otic vesicle. The nasal expression of Eya4 is a new expression feature of the murine Eya4 homologue.

The early expression of Eya2 in chicken is almost identical with the zebrafish. Eya2 can be detected in the nasal pit, the epibranchial placodes and ganglia and the trigeminal ganglia. Like the murine and zebrafish Eya2 gene, chicken Eya2 is neither expressed in the early lens placode nor in the optic
vesicle. Although partial sequences for chicken Eya1, Eya3 Eya4 genes are known, there is no information about any expression domains reported yet.

These results suggest that cranial Eya2 expression sites are highly conserved within the vertebrates and that it is a specific gene marker for the trigeminal placode and ganglion in zebrafish, mouse and chicken. One exception presents the Xenopus Eya1 homologue, which is expressed in the trigeminal ganglion. The Eya1 expression in the cranial placodes of Xenopus is widespread and corresponds to the combined zebrafish eya1 and eya2 as well as the combined murine Eya1 and Eya2 expression sites. This suggests a complementary evolutionary loss of expression domains in the two different lineages [FORCE, 1999; DAVID, 2001]. In both zebrafish and mice the expression of Eya4 is strongly limited within the cranial placodes, but furthermore restricted to differentiated cells.

In Drosophila eyes absent is known as being essential for proper eye development. Apart from the mammalian Eya1 gene, no vertebrate Eya1, Eya2 or Eya4 gene is expressed in the developing eye. However, eyes absent gene expression in the optic placode as well as in the optic vesicle has been described for the Xenopus and murine Eya3 gene (Tab. 6).

### 4.3.2 Eya2 and Eya4 expression in the inner ear and lateral line

The development of the zebrafish inner ear commences during somitogenesis with the formation of the otic placode. The otic placode is an expression site of eya2 as well as eya4, although their expression is less prominent than the expression of eya1, which is abundant in the whole placodal tissue. However, expression of each zebrafish eya gene in the otic placode starts at the same time around 12/13 hpf. After formation of the otic vesicle all three zebrafish eya genes are expressed in the ventral wall, although eya2 expression is limited to the posterior ventral edge. While at these early stages of development eya4 expression is restricted to the anterior ventral part of the otic vesicle, during further formation it extends within the inner ear. The ventral wall of the otic vesicle gives rise to the neurons of the maculae and the statoacoustic ganglion. In contrast, neither of the zebrafish eya genes are expressed in the dorsal part of the otocyst, where the walls of the semicircular canal system and cristae rise from. While eya4 is expressed in four of the five otic sensory structures, the anterior macula and the anterior, posterior and lateral cristae, after differentiation of the otocyst until at least 72 hpf. Contrary eya2 expression is restricted to the area of the posterior macula. Furthermore is the expression of eya2 temporary limited, ending at 48 hpf. This results reveal the otocyst as a major expression site of eya4 and eya1, whereas eya2 expression is less prominent (Tab. 7). A similar restriction of Eya2 expression in the otic vesicle is described in mice embryos, where expression is concentrated on the ventromedial wall of the otocyst. However, contrary to the zebrafish eya2 gene murine Eya2 expression is also visible in the adjacent statoacoustic ganglion. [Xu, 1997]. Like the murine Eya4, the murine Eya2 gene reveals an additional expression site (Tab. 6).

The lateral line sensory system, which is an exclusive structure of fishes and amphibians, is a major expression site of zebrafish eya2, eya4 as well as eya1. In the pre- and postotic lateral line placodes eya2 and eya1 expression occurs at early stages around 12 hpf, followed by expression of eya4 in the differentiated neuronal cells and their compaction into lateral line ganglia around 17/18 hpf.
Expression of *eya2* and *eya4* as well as *eya1* continues in both migrating primordia and neuromasts, whereas it is almost identically in intension as well as duration. In Xenopus *Eya1* is known to be expressed in the lateral line, although its expression sites are not described in detail yet [DAVID, R, 2001]

### 4.3.3 *Eya2* and *Eya4* expression in the somites and the pectoral fin

No *eya2* expression was found in the somites at all, whereas *eya4* can be detected transiently between 20 hpf and 26 hpf. For this period it is coexpressed with *eya1*, which is abundantly expressed in the somites between 12 hpf and 28 hpf. At this time the somites have already formed, they but off from the cranial end of presomitic mesoderm at 10 hpf [BORYCKI & EMERSON, 2000]. Therefore it can be assumed that no *eya* gene is part of the initial process of condensation and epithelialisation of somite precursor cells. By 24 hpf expression of both *eya4* and *eya1* becomes restricted to the cells of the ventrolateral side of the four somites, which are migrating to the forming pectoral fin buds from 24 hpf until 36 hpf. Therefore *eya* expression in the somites rather can be linked to specified but undifferentiated myogenic precursor cells. The pectoral fin itself expresses *eya2*, *eya4* as well as *eya1* mRNA transcripts between 36 hpf and 48 hpf. Contrary to the zebrafish *eya* genes, whose expression follows somitogenesis, in avian (*Eya2*) and mammalian (*Eya1, Eya2, Eya4*) embryos *Eya* gene expression is also reported for the presomitic mesoderm. This expression continues during further development and can be observed in the developing wing/limb including the dermomyotome, migrating muscle precursors and tendons.
Table 5  Zebrafish eya gene family members with unique and identical expression during early embryonic development.

**eya genes with unique expression in sensory organ development**

→ Adenohypophysis (eya1)
→ Trigiminal placode (V) (eya2)

**eya genes with overlapping expression in sensory organ development**

→ Branchial arches (eya1, eya2)
→ Olfactory placode (eya1, eya2)
→ Lateral line placode (eya1, eya2)
→ Lateral line ganglia (eya1, eya2, eya4)
→ Statoacoustic ganglion (VIII) (eya1, eya4)
→ Otic placode(eya1, eya2, eya4)
→ Lateral line primordia (eya1, eya2, eya4)
→ Neuromasts (eya1, eya2, eya4)
→ Somites (eya1, eya4)
→ Pectoral fin bud (eya1, eya2, eya4)
Table 6: Comparison of eya expression domains of genes from Xenopus (*Xeya1; Xeya3* [DAVID, 2001; KRIEBEL, 2007]), mouse (*mEya1; mEya2; mEya3; mEya4* [DUNCAN, 1997; XU, 1997, ZIMMERMANN, 1997; BORSANI, 1999]) and chicken (*cEya2* [MISHIMA, 1998]) and zebrafish. * Cranial ganglia; (+) Presence/ (-) absent of transcripts in the described structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression sites</th>
<th>zfeya2</th>
<th>zfeya4</th>
<th>Xeya1</th>
<th>meya1</th>
<th>meya2</th>
<th>meya3</th>
<th>meya4</th>
<th>ceya2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PNS*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adenohypophyseal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lens</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epibranchial</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olfactory</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trigeminal (gV)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral line anterior**</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral line posterior**</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statocoustic (gVII)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primordia**</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuromastc**</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-neural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somites</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pectoral fin**</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limb***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wing***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Evolution of Eya

A phylogenetic similarity tree, based on eyaHRs of in this thesis compared Eya homologues, discloses the relatedness within the Eya gene family. According to this, two gene duplications (exact copies of a gene) happened within vertebrate evolution, in which the vertebrate Eya1 and Eya3 genes duplicated at first at about the time of the fly/vertebrate divergence. At this time other Drosophila genes related in sequence to eyes absent have not been identified. It seems that no duplicated genes exist in Drosophila and that the divergence observed in vertebrates occurred subsequent to the fly/vertebrate division [LYNCH & CONERY, 2000]. So far the murine Eya1 and Eya3 gene are the only Eya genes, that are expressed in the eye anlage combined with the sequence analysis have been performed in this work may verify the closest relationship between the Drosophila eyes absent and the vertebrate Eya1 and Eya3 gene. Phylogenetic analysis indicates that the vertebrate Eya1 gene was duplicated to the Eya4 gene as well as the Eya3 gene was duplicated to Eya2. Duplicated genes can have overlapping expression and redundant function or undergo a period of changes that enables functional diversification to create two different genes. For this reason, highly conserved and redundant as well as unique expression sites are found along all vertebrate Eya genes. There is a high rate of gene duplication along evolution that is accompanied by a high rate of gene loss in a relatively short period after gene duplication [LYNCH & CONERY, 2000]. This may be the case within the zebrafish eya3 cDNA clone analysed in this thesis.

4.5 Eya genes – important player in evolutionary conserved gene networks

The conservation of sequences and expression patterns across species is highly suggestive of functional conservation. Therefore, expression analysis and comparison in different model organisms can help to identify gene functions.

In the zebrafish otic placode and its derivates a various number of genes of different gene families have been found, including the two novel genes eya2 and eya4. For further understanding of the character of these two zebrafish genes, it is useful to compare their expression patterns with potential antagonists in the otic vesicle at different stages of development. Candidates, that were chosen for comparison were eya1 [SAHLY, 1999], six1 [BEssRARD, 2004], six4.1, six4.2 [KOBAYASHI, 2000], dachA, dachB and dachC [HAMMOND, 2002], based on previous studies, which revealed that these genes have distinct and partially overlapping expressions in the zebrafish inner ear (Tab. 7).

The transcriptional coactivator and tyrosine phosphatase eyes absent is vital for eye development in Drosophila. Furthermore, vertebrate homologues were identified in mouse and human, which are also expressed in the developing eye (Eya1). This led to the assumption, that eya gene homologues may function in aspects of vertebrate eye development like they do in flies, even though these visual organs are morphologically distinct, the molecular mechanisms that underlie their development are remarkably conserved. [QUIRING, 1994; ZUKER, 1994]. Earlier molecular evidences suggest that placode induction is a multi-step process, in which each individual placode is induced at different times by a different combination of genes and tissues, often as part of a signalling network. Signalling networks
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have increased in complexity during evolution as a result of gene duplication events and the incorporation of redundant or compensatory signalling events. Many proteins in these networks have modular and conserved protein interaction domains that are quite vague in biochemical assays. It is well documented, that eya proteins do not bind to DNA, but they are characterised by a highly conserved protein/protein-binding domain.

In *Drosophila*, the Eya domain participates in protein/protein-binding with the Six protein to form a transcriptional complex in which Eya provides the transactivation function while Six provides the DNA binding activity. This transcriptional interaction is essential for eya nuclear translocation [Oliver, 1995; Otbo, 1998; Otbo, 1999; Esteve & Bovolent, 1999; Relaix & Buckingham, 1999; Kobayashi, 2000; Kawakami, 2000; Ikeda, 2002]. All six gene family members are characterised by two conserved domains, the SIX domain, which mediates protein-protein interactions, and a homeobox DNA-binding domain [Seo, 1999; Kawakami, 2000]. The *Six1* gene has been described as being crucial for the development of many tissues and plays an important part in regulating cell proliferation [Cheyette, 1994; Dozier, 2001; Carlv, 2002; Ozaki, 2004]. In addition, studies in mice have revealed that the *Six1* transcription factor operates as both activator and repressor, depending upon their specific cofactors [Li, 2003].

However, Eya can also bind to other proteins than Six. Recent protein interaction studies in *Drosophila* identified Dach proteins as potential Eya-binding partners [Kawakami, 1996; Kawakami, 2000; Hammond, 2002; Giot, 2003]. Analysis in *Drosophila* have positioned Dach genes downstream of Six and Eya genes. Additionally, Dach genes have also been shown to have discrete protein-protein interactions with Eya as well as Six during development of various organs. In *Drosophila dach* synergises with *eya* to increase the size of ectopic eyes when both are expressed together, suggesting *dach* may recruit the transcriptional activator activity of *eya* to promote target genes. A repressor complex between *six1* and *dach* has also been described that might switch from being a repressor to an activator through the function of Eya protein phosphatase [Li, 2003].

The interactions among these genes have been worked out in most detail for Drosophila eye development, in which their homologues, *eyeless* (*Pax*), *sine oculis* (*Six*), *eyes absent* (*Eya*) and *dachshund* (*Dach*), are critical for eye development. As a regulatory network of genes, *eyeless* binds directly to the *eyes absent* promoter region and regulates *sine oculis*, while both activate or suppress *dachshund* expression, including positive feedback regulation of each others expression [Chen, 1997, Halder, 1998, Pignoni, 1997; Niimi, 1999; Wawersik & Maas, 2000]. Similar gene networks among these gene families have also been found to function in vertebrate organ development like in the cranial ganglia, otic vesicle, kidney and limb, though this network is more complex in vertebrates, which have multiple orthologs of each fly gene [Oliver, 1995; Xu, 1997; Caubit, 1999; Davis, 1999]. Therefore, when their respective homologous genes were found to be expressed in overlapping patterns in vertebrates, it might be suggested that these factors might operate in a similar regulatory network.
Table 7  Comparison of eya1, eya2, and eya4 zebrafish genes with several other marker genes showing overlapping expression sites in the developing ear. 1 SAHLY et al. (1999), PETER ANDERMANN (personal communication); 2 BESSARAB et al. (2004); 3 KOBAYASCHI et al. (2000); 4 HAMMOND et al. (2002); a, additional expression sites described by Marcus Eich (unpublished); b, additional expression sites described by Denis Denter (unpublished).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene of expression</th>
<th>Expression sites in the inner ear</th>
<th>Timewindow of expression (hpf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eya1</td>
<td>ventral domain: +; medial domain: -; dorsal domain: -</td>
<td>24 – 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eya2</td>
<td>ventral domain: +; medial domain: -; dorsal domain: -</td>
<td>24 – 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eya4</td>
<td>ventral domain: +; medial domain: -; dorsal domain: -</td>
<td>24 – 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six1</td>
<td>ventral domain: +; medial domain: +; dorsal domain: +</td>
<td>24 – 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six4.1</td>
<td>ventral domain: +; medial domain: +a; dorsal domain: -</td>
<td>24 – 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six4.2</td>
<td>ventral domain: +; medial domain: +; dorsal domain: +a</td>
<td>24 – 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dachaA</td>
<td>ventral domain: -; medial domain: +; dorsal domain: +</td>
<td>24 – 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dachaB</td>
<td>ventral domain: -; medial domain: +; dorsal domain: +</td>
<td>24 – 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dachaC</td>
<td>ventral domain: +; medial domain: +b; dorsal domain: +</td>
<td>24 – 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the stage of 24 hpf all three eya genes, all six genes and all member of the dacha gene family are expressed in the otic vesicle, in unique and overlapping sites. Transcripts of all three eya genes were found in the ventral wall of the otic vesicle, although the expression of eya1 is widely spread along the whole ventral site, while eya2 and eya4 are restricted to the anterior and posterior maculae respectively. A similar situation was found in six gene expression, where six1 is expressed in the complete ventral wall, while six4.1 and six4.2 expression could only be detected at the anterior ventral edge. Contrary to eya and six, expression of dachaA was described to be in the dorsal and medial wall of the otic vesicle, extending to regions of the anterior and posterior maculae. While the expression of dachaB is distinct in both maculae, dachaC expression can be detected through the whole otic vesicle, at the ventral, medial as well as dorsal wall. With the exception of dachaC, all compared genes are expressed in the maculae, although eya2 expression exclusively occurs in the posterior macula. Furthermore the posterior macula does not express six4.1 and six4.2. In the other sensory patches, the cristae, the gene expression is more limited. Eya4, six1 and dachaB show overlapping expression in anterior, lateral and posterior cristae. Six4.1 is only expressed in the lateral crista.
The semicircular canal primordia express all three members of the *six* gene family, *dachA* and *dachB* as well as *eya1* and *eya4*. The comparison exposed distinct overlapping expression patterns in the otic vesicle of various members the *eya*, *six* and *dach* transcription factor gene families, including the two novel *eya* genes, *eya2* and *eya4*. These findings assume that the Pax-Six-Eya-Dach signaling network may also be responsible to regulate otic development in zebrafish. However, the regulatory relationship among these genes seems to be different in the various sensory patches of the ear. Except of *eya2* and *dachC* all genes may act together during anterior macula formation (Fig. 34A), while just *six1*, *eya1* and *eya2* as well as *dachA* and *dachB* could cooperate in the development of the posterior macula (Fig. 34B). *Six1* and *six4.1*, *eya4* and *dachB* seem to interact in regulating the development of the cristae (Fig. 34C), while the formation of the semicircular canals appears to be regulated by the three *six* genes, *eya1*, *eya4*, *dachA* and *dachC* (Fig. 34D). The three zebrafish *eya* genes have both discrete and overlapping expression patterns in the otic vesicle, suggesting that their functions may not be fully redundant, although detailed studies of knockout combinations remain to be performed.

![Figure 36](image)

**Figure 36** Model of possible regulation and feedback regulation between *eya*, *six* and *dach* genes in different sensory structures of the developing vertebrate otic vesicle based on in situ hybridised expression patterns. Shown are the (A) anterior macula, (B) posteriori macula, (C) cristae and (D) semicircular canals.
Discussion – Part II

In *Drosophila* a mutation in any of the compared genes leads to the absence or reduction of the eye, while ectopic expression of *eya* along with either *sine oculis* or *dachshund* is capable of inducing ectopic eyes [BONINI, 1993; BONINI, 1997; CHEN, 1997; MARDON, 1994; PIGNONI, 1997] Previous genetic studies of *Drosophila eyes absent* and of its vertebrate homologues *Eya1-Eya4* have revealed important roles for these genes in cell survival and differentiation, particularly during tissue specification [BONINI, 1993; BONINI, 1998; XU, 1997; XU 1999]. Furthermore, the partial or complete loss of the compound eye in the *Drosophila eyes absent* loss-of-function mutant is associated with inappropriate apoptosis.

In the zebrafish *eya1*–/– (*dog-eared*) mutants morphological defects of the otic vesicle becomes faintly visible at around 48 hpf. During further development the *dog-eared* phenotype turns out to be more obvious. At 72hpf the otic vesicle is significantly smaller. Sensory structures deriving from the pre- and postotic placodes are similarly affected. The size and number of lateral line neuromasts are reduced in zebrafish *dog-eared* mutants [WHITFIELD, 1996; KOZLOWSKI, 2005]. In addition to the morphological anomalies, *eya*–/– zebrafish embryos reveal an increased level of apoptosis, which firstly can be observed at around 24 hpf in the migrating primordia of the posterior lateral line as well as in the ventral region of the developing otocyst. This is 24 hours before first aberrations in the phenotype become visible [KOZLOWSKI, 2005].

### 4.5 The loss of *eya* promotes apoptosis

While the *dog-eared* phenotype shows distinct anomalies, morphological differences are barely or not visible in *eya2* and *eya4* loss-of-function zebrafish embryos. No phenotypic alterations can be detected in the MOeya2 phenotype, while at 96 hpf the anterior lateral line neuromasts in MOeya4 embryos are slightly smaller and the neuromast OC1 is absent. Based on findings of increased levels of cells undergoing programmed cell death in *dog-eared* mutations [KOZLOWSKI, 2005], *eya2* and *eya4* knock-down embryos were analysed with the TUNEL assay to unravel if these genes have a similar effect on apoptotic cell behaviour in the sensory anlagen of the embryo.

At 27 hpf TUNEL-positive cells were counted in the otic vesicle, olfactory organ, the trigeminal and anterior lateral line ganglion in MO and mismatchMO embryos as well as in wildtype siblings. COLE and ROSS (2001) have shown that all listed structures are undergoing the process of programmed cell death at this stage except for the trigeminal ganglion (Fig. 28). In their study, they investigated embryos at the stage of 24 hpf and 30 hpf. At 24 hpf they could not detect any apoptotic cells in the trigeminal ganglion, while at 30 hpf TUNEL-positive cells were found in this structure. However, in this work apoptotic cells in the trigeminal ganglion could be detected already at 27 hpf. Presumably the process of programmed cell death in the trigeminal ganglion starts between 24 hpf and 27 hpf.
MOeya2 embryos reveal an increased level of apoptotic cells in the trigeminal ganglion (41%) and in the anterior lateral line ganglion (62.5%), which are distinct expression sites of eya2. No differences have been seen in the olfactory organ and the otic vesicle. Because the trigeminal ganglion is an exclusive expression site of eya2, the increase of TUNEL-positive cells in this structure has to be viewed as a direct consequence of the loss of eya2 function. Although eya2 is expressed in the otic vesicle, even though weakly, no effect on apoptotic behaviour could be observed in the ear. The loss of eya2 function do not seem vitally important. Another explanation could be the presumption that eya genes are highly redundant and can compensate each others functions. The otic vesicle is a highly distinct expression site of eya1, which potentially can cover the loss of eya2 function. This assumed redundancy of eya1 and eya2 would also explain why no differences could be detected in the olfactory organ, where both genes are expressed at this stage of development. Although both genes are expressed in the anterior lateral line ganglion, it seems that the loss of eya2 function can not be rescued by eya1. On the other hand WHITFIELD et al. (1996) have shown that in the dog-eared mutant the anterior lateral ganglion does not show an increased number of TUNEL-positive cells. This is confirmed by the observation, that the homeobox gene and neuronal marker tlxA is properly expressed in the ganglion and does not reveal any size reductions [KÖZLOWSKI, 2005]. Possibly, eya2 can compensate the loss of eya1 in the anterior lateral line ganglion. However the anterior lateral line is also an expression site of eya4. Therefore it has to be assumed that either eya2 or eya4 or both save the loss of eya1 function.

Like the loss of eya2, the loss of eya4 function causes a highly increased level of apoptosis (130%) in the anterior lateral line ganglion at 27 hpf. Based on the assumption of a high redundancy among eya2, eya4 and eya1 in zebrafish, it can be anticipated eya2 and/or eya4 can rescue eya1, but they can not compensate each others function. Beside in the anterior lateral ganglion no other effects on apoptotic cell behaviour was seen in eya4 loss of function embryos. In the otic vesicle it may be a similar situation like in the loss of eya2. Either eya4 function is not vitally important or its function can be covered by another eya gene, in this case eya1. Eya4 is neither expressed in the olfactory organ nor the trigeminal ganglion, therefore an effect on programmed cell death was not expected.

At 54 hpf apoptosis was investigated in the otic vesicle, olfactory organ, and the neuromasts of the anterior and posterior lateral line in MO and mismatchMO embryos as well as in wildtype siblings. At this stage, all these structures undergo programmed cell death in wildtype embryos (Fig. 28) [COLE & ROSS, 2001].

Except for the olfactory organ, no differences could be detected within the sensory structures in eya2 knock-down embryos and wildtype siblings. Because eya2 is no longer expressed in the otic vesicle at this point of time, the loss of function does not affect programmed cell death in the inner ear. In contrast, eya2 is expressed in the neuromasts of both the anterior and posterior lateral line. Nevertheless, the loss of eya2 function does not have any effect on apoptotic activity in here. The neuromasts are also major expression sites of eya4 as well as of eya1. It appears that eya1 and/or eya4 can compensate the loss of eya2 in the anterior and posterior neuromasts. The olfactory organ revealed an increased number of TUNEL-positive cells (100%). It is uncertain if eya1 is expressed in
the olfactory organ at this stage. Distinct expression can be seen at 48 hpf, but it is absent at 60 hpf. In addition, KOZLOWSKI et al. (2005) have shown that the apoptotic activity in dog-eared embryos does not have any effects in this sensory structure. This suggests two possible interpretations: either the olfactory organ is a distinct expression site of eya2 at this stage of embryonic development, consequently the loss could not be compensated by another eya gene, or both, eya1 and eya2 are expressed in overlapping patterns but eya1 can not rescue the loss of eya2 function. MOeya4 injected embryos do not show any increase of apoptotic activity in olfactory organ or the otic vesicle. In contrast to the loss of eya2, the loss of eya4 function leads to an increased level of apoptosis in the anterior neuromasts (143%), but not in those of the posterior lateral line. DASPEI staining has shown that the neuromasts are smaller, one neuromasts is even absent. In dog-eared mutants DASPEI staining reveals a similar situation. The anterior neuromasts are consistently smaller, and some of them are absent. Contrary to the loss observed in eya4 "knock-downs", in dog-eared the neuromasts of the posterior lateral line are mostly absent [WHITFIELD, 1996]. It can be supposed, that both eya1 and eya4 are vitally important for proper development of the lateral line neuromasts, therefore the deficit of one of them can not be compensated by the other eya gene.

Eya4 is not expressed in the olfactory organ, which explains why no differences in apoptotic behaviour could be observed. Indeed the otic vesicle is a major expression site of eya4, although only in differentiated sensory structures at later stages. The inner ear in dog-eared mutants show both an increased level of apoptosis throughout the whole otic vesicle as well as morphological defects. While the apoptosis can be detected already at 24 hpf, defects in the phenotype emerge at later stages around 48 hpf and more distinct at 72 hpf. Most dog-eared embryos reveal absent hair cells in the three cristae, in rare cases 2-3 hair cells in one of the three cristae could be detected. For that reason eya1 does not seem to be required to differentiate hair cells, but rather for maintenance or survival of the hair cells [KOZLOWSKI, 2005]. Contrary, neither eya2 nor eya4 reveal any morphological aberrations or increased apoptotic activity in the inner ear. Eya1 seems to be capable to compensate the deficit of both genes. Consequently, each gene for itself does not seem to be vitally important during ear development. However, eya4 expression in the ear lasts at least until 72 hpf. Therefore it's possible that the loss of eya4 function may have consequences at later stages of development.

These findings in MOeya2 as well as MOeya4 injected embryos show, that the loss of a single eya gene triggers apoptosis-mediated cell death. More precisely the loss of the eyaHR is responsible for the inappropriate programmed cell death. The used splice-site morpholinos truncated the protein immediately upstream of the eya domain, therefore just the highly conserved eya region is missing in the MO injected embryos, instead of the whole gene sequence. The loss of the eyaHR, the protein/protein binding domain, prevents eya from interacting with six or dach and being transported into the nuclei. These findings of inappropriate cell death support the leading hypothesis proposes that eya represses programmed cell death. It is assumed that the loss of eya proteins exerts a dominant-negative effect. Dominant-negative mutations have an altered gene product that acts negatively to the wild-type allele. This usually occurs when the truncated protein product still interacts with the same elements as the wild-type product, but is lacking some aspects of its functions. These mutations are characterised by a dominant or semi-dominant phenotype. Dominant negative mutations often result in autosomal dominant diseases. The fact that Branchio-Oto-Renal syndrome is an autosomal dominant
disease caused by a mutation in the human Eya1 protein supports the view that a dominant negative mechanism is responsible for the eya mutant phenotype. The loss of eya function in zebrafish is less severe than the loss of eyes absent in Drosophila. This is due to the fact that gene duplications in vertebrates subdivided ancestral functions amongst two or more redundant homologous genes. Nevertheless, even though the three zebrafish eya genes have many overlapping expression sites they can not save each others function without any exceptions. The functional redundancy seems to be limited and variable among genes as well as structures. Therefore, double and triple knock-down experiments of eya1, eya2 and eya4 would be of interest, to obtain further information of the role and importance of eya genes in vertebrates.

4.6 The gain of eya function repress apoptosis

The Drosophila eyeless (ey) was the first gene shown to be capable of directing ectopic eye formation [HALDER, 1995]. Drosophila eyeless derives its name from the “eyeless” phenotype that is caused by the loss of function of the ey gene. Ey is a homologue of the vertebrate Pax6 transcription factor, which contains two DNA-binding motifs: a paired box and homeobox [QUIRING, 1994]. Ey function is required for the expression of downstream genes, like eya, six and dach. This “transcriptional hierarchy” is not absolute, ectopic expression of downstream members of the network can also induce ectopic eye tissue and the expression of the upstream gene eyeless via regulatory feedback loops [BONINI, 1997, SHEN & MARDON, 1997]. Both eya and dach were shown to be capable of directing ectopic eye formation by themselves. However, eya combined with ey, dach or six were more effective, generating larger and more frequent ectopic eyes in Drosophila [BONINI 1997, CHEN, 1997, PIGNONI, 1997].

In contrast to the fly, it is not known yet, if ectopic expression of eya genes have a similar effect in the zebrafish. Therefore, gain-of-function experiments were performed, by injecting embryos with in vitro synthesised eya1, eya2 or eya4 mRNA. According to the knock-down experiments, programmed cell death in eya1, eya2 or eya4 overexpressing embryos were detected with the TUNEL assay. Gain of function effects can be detected in structures that are not expressing the respective gene in the wildtype. Therefore, the lens, as a non-eya expressing sensory structure, provides an appropriated tissue to unravel if ectopic expression of eya genes affects apoptotic cell behaviour in the sensory anlagen.

Unlike in Drosophila, ectopic eya1, eya2, or eya4 expression in zebrafish embryos reveals no phenotypic anomalies at 27 hpf. However detection of apoptotic cells has shown reduced numbers of TUNEL-positive cells in the lens of eya1 (17%), eya2 (28%) as well as eya4 (35%) mRNA injected embryos. These findings reveal that the overexpression of a single eya gene can reduce naturally occurring programmed cell death in ectopically eya expressing structures. However it is not capable of inducing the development of ectopic sensory structures usually expressing eya. This could be for the same reason that the loss of a single eya gene has not the same severe effect in zebrafish like in Drosophila. By the duplication of genes, functions, which are essential for the development of ectopic structures or tissues, were separated. Furthermore studies in Drosophila have shown that overexpression experiments of eya are more effective in combination with other transcription factors.
like six or dach [BONINI 1997, CHEN, 1997, PIGNONI, 1997]. Therefore, as in loss of function studies, combined overexpression experiments of all three eya genes and eya combined with six or dach could be helpful for a better understanding of eya genes and their function during zebrafish development.

4.7 Eya regulates programmed cell death

The results of the present study demonstrate that eyes absent genes influence the process of programmed cell death in both directions. The numbers of cells undergoing apoptosis are higher in eya2 and eya4 loss-of-function embryos than in wild-type siblings. Contrary, gain of eya1, eya2 or eya4 function results in a reduced amount of apoptosis-mediated dead cells. These outcomes are in partial agreement with the before reported loss-of-eya1 functional studies in Drosophila and mouse, where increased apoptosis was detected in various organs during embryonic development. Additionally, the present study has shown successfully that eyes absent is not just able to promote apoptosis, but also to reduce apoptotic cellular death. KRIEBEL et al. identified a vertebrate member of the Eya family in Xenopus, Xeya3, which is expressed in the anterior neural plate, including the eye field. Overexpression of Xeya3 creates immense enlargements of brain and retinal tissues, mainly caused by overproliferation of neural precursor cells. On the other hand, suppression of Xeya3 function induces local apoptosis within the sensorial layer of the anterior neuroectoderm. These data also reveal an active role of the eya genes in controlling apoptosis.

Apoptosis is a major factor in organ and tissue development, it is highly conserved and follows morphologically distinct patterns. These highly stereotyped morphological changes seem to be under the strict control of a strictly regulated cellular program. While cellular programs, which control apoptosis are well investigated, the signalling pathways triggering apoptosis are less clear yet. Genes of the cell death pathway encode for proteins functioning in three different ways, as regulators, adapters, or effectors to repress or support apoptosis [VAUX & KORSMEYER, 1999]. The functional signification of these findings is that eya genes seem to act as such regulators. Both eya1, eya2 and eya4 loss-of-function embryos reveal an enhanced apoptosis, while the gain-of-function in these genes reduces levels of apoptosis. These results support the concept that inappropriate changes in the steady state levels of Eya proteins regulate programmed cell death during development by activating or repressing apoptosis. However the precise role of these developmental regulators in controlling programmed cell death is still unresolved.

Gene duplication is a prominent mechanism generating redundant genes. Redundancy provides a protective effect against deleterious mutations, therefore natural selection might be involved in generating and maintaining partial redundancy. Expression pattern analysis of the zebrafish eya2 and eya4 genes as well as comparisons with zebrafish eya1 [SAHLY, 1999] have shown widely overlapping embryonic expression of all three genes. Therefore it can be assumed, that the specific morphological changes in the dog-eared embryos, in contrast to the widespread expression of eya1, are the consequence of functional redundancy between these three eya gene family members.
5 Conclusions and Perspectives

Combining these findings with *Xenopus* [DAVID, 2001; KRIEBEL, 2007], chicken [MISHIMA, 1998], mouse [XU, 1997; BORSANI, 1999] and human [ABDELHAK, 1997; ZIMMERMANN, 1997], it has become clear that the *Eya* genes are highly conserved among vertebrates. Sequence analysis have revealed a prominent level of amino acid identity, whereas expression pattern comparison demonstrated both overlapping as well as redundant expression of all three genes among all model organisms.

Within the early zebrafish inner ear development *eya2* and *eya4* proteins are part of the regulatory Pax-Six-Eya-Dach gene network. However the regulation of these genes depending on their binding activity with other transcription factors of this network remains unclear yet.

Consistent with the published observations of an increased level of apoptosis mediated cell death in zebrafish *eya1* (*dog-eared*) mutations, an increase level of apoptosis was also found in zebrafish embryos with loss of *eya2* or *eya4* function. However the by loss of function affected region are not identical, but differ from each other depending on the respective expression sites. Though only the sensory structures are pretentious by a higher rate of cell death in the embryos with loss of *eya* function. Furthermore ectopically expressed *eya* proteins reduce the number of cells undergo programmed cell death.

The zebrafish *eya* genes are a useful marker to study placodal and neuronal development of cranial sensory structures in the developing zebrafish embryo. Further work addressing the relationship between the different *eya* gene family members as well as its role within the regulatory Pax-Six-Eya-Dach gene network will contribute substantially to understand the early sensory organ and the inner ear in particular development.
6 Summary

Developmental biology addresses how cells are organised into functional structures. Therefore it is crucial to understand the molecular basis for processes in development by studying the expression and function of relevant genes and their relationship to each other. A gene function can be studied by expression pattern analysis and comparison, creating a loss-of-function situation, in which the change in developmental processes is examined in the absence of a functional gene product, or in gain-of-function studies, where a gene product is ectopically upregulated. This thesis describes the characterisation of three novel members of the Eya gene family in zebrafish (Danio rerio), eya2, eya3 and eya4. A detailed analysis of expression pattern and misfunction studies in zebrafish embryos provides information about possible functions of these genes.

Sequence analysis of the zebrafish eya2, eya3 and eya4 proteins have revealed two highly conserved domains; the eya homology region (eyaHR) and eya domain 2 (ED2). Moreover all three eya proteins contain sequence motifs equivalent to the haloacid dehalogenase (HAD) superfamily of phosphohydrolases, recently described for mammalian Eya proteins by LI (2003); RAYAPUREDDI (2003) and TOOTLE (2003). Therefore zebrafish eya 2-4 proteins function as transcriptional co-factors which possess protein phosphatase activity. Alignments of the deduced amino acid sequences revealed a high conservation of both its phosphatase and transcription factor activity and identified significant homologies with their mammalian counterparts, as well with the Drosophila eya protein.

As a first step towards a functional analysis of the eya gene family during sensory organ development, with focus on the inner ear, the expression patterns of the three zebrafish eya genes were analysed and compared. Expression pattern analysis was carried out by RNA in situ hybridisation. While no eya3 transcripts are detected in the early embryo, both eya2 and eya4 are expressed in distinct patches within the cranial placodes and their derivates, otic vesicle, and in primordia and neuromasts of the lateral line system. Eya2 expression is observed in the olfactory and trigeminal placodes and the placodes of several cranial ganglia. Eya4 transcripts are found in some of the corresponding cranial ganglia and in developing somites.

Eya proteins are part of an evolutionary conserved network of interacting proteins which also include Six (sine oculis) and Dach (dachshund) proteins. This network functions in various vertebrate organ development processes, among others the otic vesicle. They form transcriptional complexes that either activate or repress target genes, depending on the context in which they act. The intrinsic protein phosphatase activity of Eya is capable of switching the function of Six-Dach complexes from repression to activation, thereby regulating genes encoding growth control and signalling molecules required for precursor cell proliferation. For more detailed analysis of the eya gene during inner ear development, expression patterns of three zebrafish eya (1,2,4) genes, three six (1,4.1,4.2) genes, and three dach (A,B,C) genes during otic development in zebrafish embryos were compared. The data obtained indicates that the various members of the three gene families investigated subdivide the otic vesicle in regions with characteristic patterns of co-expression, indeed unique expression sites were also detected. Therefore a high level of functional redundancy among these genes can be assumed, although exclusive gene expression sites suggest that the functions are not completely redundant.
The significance and biological relevance of this observation is tested by overexpression experiments and the analysis of gene knock-down experiments by using in vitro synthesised eya1, eya2, and eya4 mRNA as well as antisense eya2 and eya4 Morpholino oligonucleotides respectively injected into zebrafish embryos. Ectopically upregulated function of eya1, eya2 and eya4 revealed a reduced level of apoptosis-mediated cell death, while the loss-of-function of eya2 and eya4 triggers programmed cell death. These results maintain the idea of apoptosis affective activity, which was described for the loss-of-function for eyes absent in Drosophila, zebrafish (eya1/dor-eared) and mouse(Eya’), as a general function of eya gene relatives.
7 Methods

7.1 Zebrafish maintenance

Zebrafish were maintained under standard laboratory conditions WESTERFIELD (1993). From pair wise mating embryos were collected and staged by hours post fertilisation (hpf). Embryos were kept in 1x Embryomedium (EM) at 28,5°C. For microinjection experiments development was delayed by incubating the embryos at RT immediately after fertilization. When embryos were allowed to develop beyond 20 hpf, 0.003% phenylthiourea (PTU) was added to 1x EM to prevent melanisation. After 24 hpf embryos were dechorionated and fixed at desired stage for at least 4 h at RT or o/n at 4°C in 4% PFA. For dehydration and permeabilisation they were transferred to 100% methanol for 2 h at –20°C.

7.2 Molecular biological methods and Immunohistochemistry

If not otherwise stated, all methods were performed according to SAMBROOK and RUSSELL (2001). DNA/RNA concentration and purity was verified through agarose gelelectrophoresis and photometric quantification. Used concentrations and amounts of all preparations are shown below. Amounts of restriction enzyme used depended on the specific units/µl of each enzyme and should amount to 1-2 units per µg plasmid DNA.

7.2.1 Preparation of Plasmid DNA

7.2.1.1 Transformation

To obtain probes for in situ hybridisation or synthetic mRNA for microinjections sufficient template DNA had to be generated by transforming bacteria (E. coli DH-5α competent cells) with the respective plasmids. Therefore competent cells (stored at –80°C) were thawed on ice. 20ng/µl plasmid DNA were added to the bacteria and incubated on ice for 10min. Subsequently, cells were incubated at 42°C for 2min. This “heat shock” causes the bacterial cells to open their membranes and insert the plasmid. Transformed cells were added to LB-media (1:10) and incubated at 37°C while rocking at 250rpm on a shaker. Afterwards the cell culture was plated on LB-agar dishes and incubated o/n at 37°C. Because the plasmids carry resistance to the antibiotic ampicillin, LB-agar plates were supplied with ampicillin (1:1000), to make sure that just transformed bacteria grow.

7.2.1.2 Mini-Preparation

After transformation, DNA was isolated by Mini-Preparation using alkaline lysis. Therefore, single bacteria colonies were picked and transferred into 5ml LB-media/ampicillin (1:1000) and incubated o/n at 37°C/250rpm. To harvest bacteria cells, the overnight cell cultures were centrifuged for 5min at 4°C/14.000rpm. DNA preparation was carried out as follows. The obtained pellets were resuspended in 150µl SI. 2 volumes SII were added to the samples, inverted and incubated for 2min on ice. Another 1½ volume SIII was added, inverted and incubated for 5min on ice. Subsequently, the samples were
centrifuged for 7 min at 4°C/14,000 rpm and the supernatants transferred. The DNA was purified by phenol-chloroform-extraction (1 volume phenol-chloroform-isoamylalkohol (25:24:1)) and precipitated by using 100% isopropanol. The obtained pellets was washed with 70% ethanol and resuspended in 50 μl RNase-free H₂O.

### 7.2.2 Sequencing

To confirm that the provided clones are indeed three different homologs of the *Drosophila eyes absent* gene, the purified plasmid DNA was commercially sequenced by Sequence Laboratories, Göttingen. Using Advantage Read affords the reading of around 900 base pairs. If required, appropriate primer oligonucleotides were identified (designed by biomers.net and Roth, Karlsruhe) to run further Advantage Reads to obtain the whole DNA sequence. All sequences were sequenced from their 5’- and 3’- ends.

### 7.2.3 Subcloning

#### 7.2.3.1 Dephosphorylation pCS2+/ EcoRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vector DNA</td>
<td>0.5 μg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctic-phosphatase buffer</td>
<td>1 μl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctic-phosphatase</td>
<td>1 μl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNase-free H₂O</td>
<td>to a final volume of 10 μl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37°C 20 min</td>
<td>Heat inactivation 65°C 5 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.2.3.2 Ligation of Eya4/EcoRI; pCS2+/EcoRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linearised template pCS2+</td>
<td>100 ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linearised template eya4</td>
<td>200 ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4-DNA-ligase buffer</td>
<td>1 μl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4-DNA-Ligase</td>
<td>1 μl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNase-free H₂O</td>
<td>to a final volume of 10 μl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT 10 min</td>
<td>Heat inactivation 65°C 10 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.4 In vitro Transcription

#### 7.2.4.1 Linearisation of plasmid DNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plasmid DNA</td>
<td>10 μg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate 10x buffer</td>
<td>3 μl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(depending on the buffer 10x BSA</td>
<td>3 μl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific restriction enzyme (20u/μl)</td>
<td>x μl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNase-free H₂O</td>
<td>to a final volume of 30 μl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37°C 2h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linearised DNA was purified by phenol-chloroform-extraction using Gel-Lock-Tubes (Eppendorf) and ethanol precipitation (1/10 volume 3M Na-acetate, pH 5.2.; 3 volume ice-cold 100% ethanol). Obtained DNA pellet was washed with ice-cold 70% ethanol and diluted in RNase-free H₂O to an optimal final concentration of 1µg/µl.

### 7.2.4.2 Synthesis of single-stranded RNA probes by In Vitro Transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linearised template DNA</td>
<td>1µg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5x transcription buffer</td>
<td>4µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100mM dithiothreitol DTT</td>
<td>2µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNase inhibitor (20u/µl)</td>
<td>2µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10x NTP-DIG/FLU-Mix</td>
<td>2µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA-dependent RNA polymerase (~ 10u/µl)</td>
<td>xµl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNase-free H₂O</td>
<td>to a final volume of 20µl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37°C 2h
add 2µl DNase for 15min at 37°C
RNA precipitation: ½ volume 7.5M NH₄-acetate; ice-cold 100% ethanol.
Obtained RNA pellet was washed with ice-cold 70% ethanol and diluted in Hyb⁺ to an optimal final concentration of 5ng/µl.

### 7.2.4.3 Synthesis of Capped RNA by In Vitro Transcription

To synthesize in vitro capped mRNA the Ambion mMessage mMachine kit (Ambion) SP6 and the RNeasy Cleanup Mini kit (Qiagen) were used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linearised template DNA</td>
<td>1-1,5µg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10x transcription buffer</td>
<td>2µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x ribonucleotide Mix</td>
<td>10µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10x Enzyme Mix</td>
<td>2µl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNase-free H₂O</td>
<td>to a final volume of 20µl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.5 Whole-Mount in situ Hybridisation (ISH)

ISH is a convenient technique to detect the localisation of target mRNA in tissue or embryo by visualizing the transcription of the gene of interest. This method allows very sensitive detection of RNA transcripts and an excellent spatial resolution [STREIT & STERN 2001]. In Zebrafish it is, in most cases, applied on whole-mount embryos, using digoxigenin-labeled antisense RNA probes and the alkaline phosphatase (AP) detection method [WILKINSON 1998]. Patterns of gene expression can then be compared by microscope images, providing two-dimensional information; high-quality results has been shown by THISSE et al. (1993) in situ hybridisation was carried out as described by WESTERFIELD (1993) with slightly modifications.
For permeabilisation fixed embryos were rehydrated in 75%, 50%, 25% Methanol/PBS and washed 4x 5 min in PBT. Embryos older then 24 hpf were digested with proteinase K (final concentration: 2,5µg/µl in PBT) according to age (24 hpf/5min; 48 hpf/10min; > 60 hpf/20min) and refixed in 4% PFA for 20 min at RT followed by further washing steps in PBT. For pre-hybridisation the embryos were transferred in prewarmed Hybridisation buffer (Hyb+) at least 1 h at 65°C. After Hyb+ was replaced by also prewarmed RNA-probe (~ 1,5µg) in 300 µl Hybridisation buffer the embryos were incubated o/n at 65°C. The probe was washed and embryos washed 1x 10 min in 50% Hybridisation buffer/ 2x SSCT, in 25% Hybridisation buffer/ 2x SSCT and in 2x SSCT and 2x 30 min in 0.2x SSCT at 65°C. Afterwards embryos were washed 1x 5 min in 0,15x SSCT/ 25% PBT, 0,1% SSCT/ 50% PBT, 0,05% SSCT/ 75% PBT and in PBT, blocked in PBT plus blocking reagent (2% serum, 2 mg/ml BSA) for 1-2 h at RT and incubated o/n at 4°C in α-DIG-AP (1:4000 dilution in PBT + 2% FCS, 2 mg/ml BSA). Embryos were rinsed 5x 15 min in PBT and equilibrated 3x 15 min in alkaline phosphatase (AP) buffer. For detection embryos were stained with BM Purple substrate. Reaction was stopped by several washings with PBT. Subsequently embryos were refixed in 4% PFA o/n and stored in PBT at 4°C.

7.2.6 Whole-Mount double in situ Hybridisation (DISH)

For double ISH, embryos were hybridised with probe mix (DIG-labelled and FLU-labelled RNA-probes) and processed as described above. After BM Purple staining embryos were rinsed in PBT, refixed in 4% PFA o/n at 4°C and washed in PBT again. Embryos were treated with 100mM glycine-Cl, pH 2.2 for 10 min at RT to remove the alkaline phosphatase-coupled α-DIG antibody, washed 5x 5min in PBT, blocked for 1 h at RT and incubated o/n at 4°C in α-FLU-AP (1:2000 dilution in PBT + 2% FCS, 2 mg/ml BSA). Instead of using BM Purple for detection freshly prepared FastRed substrate was used. After staining embryos were treated like described before.

7.2.7 Flourescent Whole-Mount in situ Hybridisation (FISH)

FISH was carried out by using the Flourscent in situ hybridisation TSA (Tyramide Signal amplification) kit (Invitrogen). Until the antibody incubation step the protocol is similar to the one used for regular ISH was processed. Instead of the AP conjugate a α-DIG-POD antibody (1:50 dilution in PBT + 2% FCS, 2 mg/ml BS) was used. Embryos were incubated at 4°C o/n and washed the following day all day and over night in PBT with at least 8 changes. For fluorescent staining the embryos were transferred for 10-15 min to TSA staining buffer (1:100 tyramide in reaction buffer + peroxidase) and subsequently rinsed several times for a few hours in PBT.

7.2.8 Immunohistochemistry on in situ hybridised embryos

In some case, it’s useful to combine the detection of a RNA transcript by in situ hybridisation with the detection of a particular antigen by using a specific antibody.

In situ hybridised and refixed embryos were washed 2x 5 min in PBT, 1x5 min in H2O, permeabilised in prechilled acetone for 7 min at –20°C, washed 1x5 min H2O, 2x5 min in PBT, blocked in 10% FCS in PBT for 1 h at RT. Antibody incubations were performed as follows: Primary monoclonal zn12 antibody incubation (1:250 dilution in 10% FCS-PBT) o/n at 4°C. Embryos were washed 4x 30 min in
10% FCS-PBT at RT, and incubated o/n at 4°C in preabsorbed secondary biotinylated α-mouse IgG antibody (diluted 1:10000 in 10% FCS-PBT). After several washes in 10% FCS-PBT immunohistochemical staining was carried out with preincubated AB complex (ABC Kit Vector Laboratories), DAB substrate, and hydrogen peroxide (Vector Laboratories). Reaction was stopped by several washes with PBT, embryos refixed in 4% PFA o/n, and stored in PBT at 4°C.

7.2.9 DASPEI

DASPEI (2-(4-(Dimethylaminostyryl)- 1 –methyl-pyridinium iodid; Fluka BioChemika) is an easy and fast method, to mark haircells of surface neuromasts. 96-hour old larvae were covered in 1mM DASPEI for about 15 min and washed carefully in EM several times. For observation under the compound scope embryos were anaesthetised in tricane [WESTERFIELD, 1993] and mounted in methylcellulose in a depression slide.

7.2.10 Detection of Apoptotic Cells in Whole Mounts

Apoptosis is a form of cell death that eliminates compromised or superfluous cells. The employed ApopTag® Peroxidase In Situ Apoptosis Detection Kit detects apoptotic cells in situ by labelling and detecting DNA strand breaks by the TUNEL (terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase (TdT) -mediated dUTP end labelling) assay. The enzyme TdT catalyses a template-independent addition of nucleotide triphosphates to the 3'-OH ends of double-stranded or single-stranded DNA. These DNA fragments are typically localized in morphologically identifiable nuclei and apoptotic bodies. DNA fragments labelled with an α-DIG-AP antibody and have been detected by using BM purple substrate [ZAKERI, 1993; WILKINSON 1998].

To permeabilise fixed embryos they were rehydrated in a methanol/PBT series (75%, 50%, 25%) for 5 min each, washed 3x 5 min in PBT and incubated in proteinase K (final concentration: 10µg/ml in PBT) at RT according to age like described above. Then washed twice for a few seconds in PBT, postfixed in 4% PFA for 20 min at RT, washed 5x 5min in PBT, and postfixed for 10 min with prechilled ethanol/acetate (2:1) at −20°C followed by 3 further washes with PBT. For the terminal transferase reaction embryos were incubated for 1 h at RT in 75µl (1 drop) equilibration buffer. To prepare working strength TdT enzyme the reaction buffer was added to the TdT enzyme in a ratio of 2:1. Equilibration buffer was replaced by working strength solution and embryos incubated at 37°C o/n. Reaction was stopped by washing in stop/wash buffer (1 ml stop/wash buffer in 34 ml dH2O) for 3-4 h at 37°C. For detection embryos were washed 3x 5 min in PBT at RT, blocked with 2mg/ml BSA/5% FCS/ PBT for 1 h at RT and incubated for 2 h at RT with α-DIG-AP in2mg/ml BSA/5% FCS/ PBT (1:2000). Subsequently embryos were washed all day and o/n with 2mg/ml BAS in PBT with at least 8 changes of blocking buffer. Embryos were equilibrated 3x 5 min in alkaline phosphatase (AP) buffer and stained with NBT/BCIP. Reaction was stopped by several washings with PBT. Embryos were refixed in 4% PFA o/n and stored in PBT at 4°C.
7.3 Embryological methods

7.3.1 Microinjection

Microinjections are used to investigate the role of a gene during development by overexpression or misexpression of the gene of interest. To obtain a gain-of-function phenotype, synthetic mRNA was injected. To knock down gene function by gene-specific inhibition of mRNA translation, antisense morpholino oligonucleotides (MO) have been used. For injection experiments, the embryos were transferred into injection dishes immediately after spawning at the 1-cell stage. Injection dishes were prepared with 1% agarose in EM filled in petri dishes. Furrows were formed by placing a mold on top of the agarose while it cooled down [Kimmel ZebrafishBook]. To hold embryos in place for injection, they were aligned along the furrows. Surplus medium was sucked off so that surface tension of the remaining medium kept the embryos in place in the furrows. During the 1-cell up to the 8-cell stage, RNA was injected through the chorion into the yolk or the embryonic cell. Although it is preferable to inject directly into the blastomeres, RNA injected into the yolk will move into the cytoplasm via cytoplasmatic streaming [Mullins, 2005]. All injections were done using a Transjector 5246 (Eppendorf). The injected volume was usually 2 nl, adjusted by changing the pulse duration and/or strength.

7.3.1.1 Morpholino (MO)

Morpholino phosphorodiamidate oligonucleotides (morpholinos, MPs) have been used successfully in zebrafish [Nasevicius & Ekker, 2000] and Xenopus [Heasman, 2000] to knock down gene function by gene-specific inhibition of mRNA translation [Ekker, 2000]. These are chemically modified oligonucleotides that bind to and block translation of mRNA in vitro, in tissue culture cells [Summerton, 1999] and in vivo [Heasman, 2000]. In addition to their ability to block cytosolic processes, MO can enter the nucleus [Partridge, 1996]. They function through an RNase-H-independent mechanism by obstructive translation initiation and their high mRNA affinity and specificity makes in vivo targeting highly predictable and reduces non-specific effects. MO can act in two ways. Those who are designed to the 5’ UTR or early coding sequences function by blocking cytosolic processes. MO designed to overlap splice sides can modify pre-mRNA splicing in the nucleus [Draper et al. 2001].

Based on the eya2 and eya 4 exon/intron structure 25-mer antisense splice side MO were designed. For eya2 a morpholino were designed complementary to the exon4/intron4 splice junction (eya2MO: 5’-TTGGTTTTTCTCACCTGTGTG-3’) as well as a mismatch morpholino, a morpholino sequence containing 5 mispaired nucleotide (eya2mMO: 5’-TTcGTTcTTTTgTCACCTcTGTcTG-3’). For eya4 the exon11/intron11 splice junction were used to design a morpholino (eya4MO: 5’-CCATCCGAACACATACCTCAGTGTCAC-3’) just as the mismatch morpholino (eya4mMO: 5’-CcATCCcAAgATACCTgAAGGTgAC-3’). Morpholino oligonucleotides were dissolved in water at the concentration of 160 mg/ml. The resulting stock solution was diluted in Danieau solution and phenolred to working concentration of 10 ng/nl, injected volume was approximately 2 nl. All Morpholinos were obtained from Gene Tools, LLC.
7.3.1.2 synthetic mRNA

To synthesize in vitro capped mRNA of eya1, eya2, eya4 and GFP was diluted in Danieau solution and phenolred to a final concentration of 120ng/µl for eya1, eya2 and eya4 RNA. For internal control 80 ng/µl of GFP mRNA was coinjected and visualised before fixation. Injected volume was approximately 2nl.

7.4 Sectioning and microscopy

7.4.1 Mounting

Embryos can be mounted in glycerol or dehydrated and mounted in DPX Mountant. Glycerol causes less shrinking, but is not as effective as clearing agent. Except for the TSA labelled embryos glycerol mounting was used for all performed stainings.

7.4.1.1 Glycerol mounting

For whole-mount photography fixed embryos were transferred from PBS into glycerol. For analysis at higher magnifications, embryos were de-yolked and mid-sagittally hand-sectioned using a razor blade sliver fitted into a needle holder. The embryos were transferred into a glycerol droplet on a microscope slide. A coverslip was placed on top and gently pressed down until the embryo is flattened but not squished (Flat-Mounts). Flat-mounted embryos were observed and photographed under differential interference contrast (DIC) optics using a Zeiss Axiophot. Imaging DASPEI examined embryos a 589nm filter were used.

7.4.1.2 DPX mounting

Deyolked embryos were dehydrated through an increasing ethanol/PBS series: 30%, 50%, 70% (10min each), 2x 100% (10min each) ethanol and cleared in 66% benzyl alcohol/ 33% benzyl/ benzoate. For mounting the embryos were picked up and placed in a drop of DPX mountant (Fluka BioChemica) on a bridged coverslip (see below). A new coverslip was gently lowered on top and rolled until the embryo was in the desired position. For documentation of mounted embryos a Leica MZ FLIII, 488nm was used.

7.4.1.3 Araldite Sectioning

Embryos were embedded into araldite (Polyscienc). To this end they were dehydrated through a ascending ethanol/PBS series: 25%, 50%, 75% (10min each), 100% (1x 15min and 1x 30min) and washed in acetone for 15 min. The acetone was replaced by fresh acetone and embryos were washed for another 30min. Subsequently embryos were incubated in a mixture of 50% araldite and 50% acetone for 48 h at RT. Embryos were carried over into small chambers, covered completely with 100% araldite, and polymerised for 24 h at 60°C. 10µm slices were sectioned using a microtom (Leica JUNG RM 2055). Small drops of water were set up on with ethanol precleaned slides. Each slice was transferred to a single drop of water on top of a precleaned microscope slide. After evaporation of the water slides were covered with 100% araldite and a coverslip was placed on top. For polymerisation
slides were incubated for 24 h at 60°C. Sections were analysed and photographed under differential interference contrast (DIC) optics using a Zeiss Axiophot.
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9 Appendix

9.1 Abbreviations

SI units and symbols of standard multiples (m, µ, l, etc.) are not listed. Additional abbreviations are introduced and explained in the text.

ant.     anterior
AP     alkaline phosphatase
ATP     Adenosine-tri-phosphate
bp     base pairs
BOR     Branchio-Oto-Ranal syndrome
BSA     bovine serum albumin
dach     dachshund
DIC     differential interference contrast
DIG     digoxysgenin
DISH     double in situ hybridisation
DNA     desoxyribonucleic acid
dpf     days post fertilisation
ED2     eya domain2
EM     embromedium
eya     eyes absent
eyaHR     eya-homologous region
FCS     foetal calf serum
FISH     fluorescent in situ hybridisation
FLU     flourescein
GFP     green flourescent protein
HAD     haloacid dehalogenase superfamily
hpf     hours post fertilisation
Hyb+/-     hybridisation buffer
ISH     in situ hybridisation
mMO     mispaired antisense morpholino oligonucleotid
MO     antisense morpholino oligonucleotides
o/n     over night
ORF     open reading frame
pax     paired box
PBS(T)     phosphate buffer saline (+ Tween 20)
PFA     paraformaldehyde
post.     posterior
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RNA      ribonucleic acid
rpm     rotation per minute
RT     room temperature
six     sine oculis
som     somites
SSC(T)     sodiumchloride/sodiumcitrate buffer (+ Tween20)
UTR     untranslated region
WT     wildtyp

9.2 Equipment

Cameras
EHD kamPro 04* SVHS CCD-Camera
Hamamatsu Digital Camera
Leica DM RBE
Q Imaging Retiga 1300i SCI Tech
Canon Typ Powershot G5

Centrifuges
Eppendorf Centrifuge 5415D
Hermeline Z233 MK-2
Sigma lab centrifuge 3K10
Thermo Electron Corporation RC5B

Injection
Bachhofer micromanipulator
Eppendorf Sterile Femtotips II
Eppendorf Transjector 5246

Microscopes
Flou TM
Leica MZ FLIII
Leica TCS SP
Zeiss Axioskop
Zeiss Axioskop 2 plus
Stemi SV11 Apo

Microtom
Leica JUNG RM 2055

Photometer
Thermo Electron Corporation BioMate3

Speedvac
Bachhofer Vacuum concentrator
9.3 Material

9.3.1 Fish strains
Wildtyp-strains: Darmstadt inbred lines derived from pet store fish; longfin; leopard (Tübingen)

9.3.2 Bacterial strains
E. coli XL1-Blue; DH5α

9.3.3 Chemicals, Buffer, Media, Solutions
All chemicals were obtained from Boehringer (Mannheim), Fluka (Buchs), Merck (Darmstadt), Peqlab (Erlangen), Roche (Mannheim), Roth (Karlsruhe), Sigma (Deisenhofen).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical / Buffer</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>100 mM Tris-HCL pH 9.5; 50 mM MgCl₂; 100 mM NaCl; 0.2% Tween-20; 0.2% Triton-X 100; Levamisol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10x PBS</td>
<td>137 mM NaCl; 27 mM KCl; 83 mM Na₂HPO₄; 15 mM KH₂PO₄ to pH 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20x SSC</td>
<td>Stock solution: 3 M NaCl; 0.3 M Na-Citrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>Stock solution: 100 mg/ml dH₂O (\text{Dilution 1:1000})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASPEI</td>
<td>(2-(4-(Dimethylaminostyryl)-1-methyl-pyridinium iodid; Fluka BioChemika) in EM to saturated solution, final dilution 1:3 in EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyb-</td>
<td>50-65 % formamid; 5x SSC; 0.1% Tween 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyb+</td>
<td>Hyb- + citric acid to pH 6.0; heparin 50 μg/ml; totula RNA 0.5 mg/ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-media</td>
<td>0.5 % yeast extract; 1% trypton; 200 mM NaCl to pH 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylcellulose</td>
<td>4% in EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBT/BCIP</td>
<td>3.5 μl BCIP, 4.5 ml NBT in 1 ml AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleotid (NTP)-Mix</td>
<td>10 mM ATP; 10 mM CTP; 10 mM GTP; 7.5 mM UTP; 2.5 mM dig-/flu-UTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBT</td>
<td>0.1% Tween-20 in PBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFA</td>
<td>4% Paraformaldehyde in 1x PBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50x PTU</td>
<td>(Phenylthiocarbamide, 1-phenyl-2-thiourea) 0.15% in dH₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricaine</td>
<td>Stock solution: 400 mg Ethyl 3-aminobenzoate methanesulfonic acid (sigma); 97.9 ml dH₂O; 2.1 ml 1 M Tris (pH 9) to pH 7 (\text{Dilution 1:20 in EM})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB-agar</td>
<td>15 g agar to 1000 ml LB-medium, ampicillin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10x EM</td>
<td>5 M NaCl; 1 M KCl; 1 M Na₂HPO₄; 1 M KH₂PO₄; 1 M CaCl₂; 1 M MgSO₄; 1% HEPES; pH 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x EM</td>
<td>0.1% Methylene blue in 1x EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danieau solution</td>
<td>58 mM NaCl, 0.7 mM KCl, 0.4 mM MgSO₄, 0.6 mM Ca(NO₃)₂, 5.0 mM HEPES pH 7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BCIP 50mg/ml in 100% DMF (Dimethylformamid)
Fish water 4% see salt in dH2O + NaHCO3 to adjust pH to 6.5 – 7.5
NBT 75mg/ml in 70% DMF (Dimethylformamide)
Phenolred 2% in dH2O
Proteinase K Stock solution: 20mg/ml
Dilution 1:4000 in PBT

9.3.4 “KITS” & dyes

All kits and dyes were obtained from Ambion (USA), Chemicon (UK), Invitrogen (Karlsruhe), Polyscience (Switzerland), Qiagen (Hilden), Roche (Mannheim), Sigma (Deisenhofen), Vector Laboratories (USA).

Ambion mMMESSAGE mMACHINE® SP6
ApopTag® Peroxidase In Situ Detection Kit
Flourescent in situ hybridisation using TSA
PeroxidaseVECTASTAIN Elite ABC-KIT (mouse IgG)
Poly/Bed 812/Araldite 502 mini kit
QIAquick® Gel Extraction Kit
RNeasy® Mini Kit

BM Purple AP Substrat, precipitating
Fast Red RTR/Naphthol AS-MX Tablets
NBT/BCIP Stock Solution
Diaminobenzidin, HRP-Staining Solution (DAB)

9.3.5 Antibodies

If not otherwise stated, all antibodies were obtained from Invitrogen (Karlsruhe and Roche (Mannheim).

Anti-Digoxigenin-AP, Fab fragments (Sheep IgG) (Roche)
Anti-Fluorescein-AP, Fab fragments (Sheep IgG) (Roche)
Digoxigenin-11-UTP (Roche)
Fluorescein-12-UTP (Roche)
Zn-12 Isotope: Mab Zn-12 (IgGl, k) (provided by M. MARUSiCH, University of Oregon, USA)

9.3.6 Enzymes

All enzymes (EcoRI; BamHI; HindIII; NotI; PstI; PvuII) were obtained from New England Biolabs (Schwalbach), RNA-Polymerases (T3; T4; T7) and DNase from Promega (Mannheim).
9.3.7 Plasmides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insert/ size</th>
<th>Vector/ size</th>
<th>Resistance</th>
<th>antisense probe</th>
<th>Referenz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eya2 / 2,5kb</td>
<td>pCS2+ / 4,1kb</td>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>NotI/T7</td>
<td>RAIBLE et al. unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eya3 / 2,4kb</td>
<td>PCS2+ / 4,1kb</td>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>NotI/T7</td>
<td>RAIBLE et al. unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eya4 / 2,5kb</td>
<td>pBSK+/- / 2,9kb</td>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>EcoRI/T7</td>
<td>RAIBLE et al. unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eya4 / 2,5kb</td>
<td>pCS2+ / 4,1kb</td>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>NotI/T7</td>
<td>RAIBLE et al. unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krox20 / 1,9kb</td>
<td>pBKS+/− / 2,9kb</td>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>TstI/T3</td>
<td>JOWETT et al., 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pax2.1^6 / 2,6kb</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>HindIII/T7</td>
<td>KRAUSS et al., 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFP / 2,9kb</td>
<td>pCS2+ / 4,1kb</td>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>NotI/T7</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* pCS2+ -construct generated in David Raible’s Laboratory by Josette Ungos (University of Washington, Seattle, USA).

9.3.8 pCS2+ vector

Due to the fact that capped mRNAs generated from CS2+-vectors, which include the SV40 polyA site, are more stable than conventional capped mRNAs when injected into embryos, pCS2+ is the vector of choice for the generation of expression constructs. CS2+ is a multipurpose expression vector. It contains a strong enhancer/promoter (simian CMV IE94) followed by a polylinker and the SV40 late polyadenylation site. A SP6 promoter is present at the 5’-end of the polylinker I region, allowing in vitro synthesis of sequences cloned into this region. The CS2+ vector also includes a T7 promoter in reverse direction between the polylinker and the SV40 polyA site for probe synthesis, as well as a second polylinker after the SV40 polyA site to provide several possible sites to linearise the vector for SP6 transcription. The vector backbone is derived from pBluescript II KS+.

Figure 37  pCS2+ vector (DAVID RAIBLE Laboratory, University of Washington, USA).

^6 Synonym [zf-a]
### 9.3.9 Primer

All primer were obtained from biomers.net and Roth (Karlsruhe).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer (P)</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>bp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P^{1st}$ eya2 antisense</td>
<td>5’ AGAGAAACAGCCTCCCGGAGTCTTGCCG 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{2nd}$ eya2 antisense</td>
<td>5’ TAATATTGTAGGACGTCATGCTGTATCCCC 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{1st}$ eya2 sense</td>
<td>5’ CGCAGTGCGATGGGAAAGCTGAGAGGCGG 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{2nd}$ eya2 sense</td>
<td>5’ ATCTGTGGCTGACGAGCTCTCAAGCAGCC 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{1st}$ eya3 antisense</td>
<td>5’ GCAAAAAGGGTAGCTTTGATGATGGTGGCG 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{2nd}$ eya3 antisense</td>
<td>5’ GTTTCGATGGAGGAAACGTCACCCAGGCG 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{1st}$ eya3 sense</td>
<td>5’ ACCTCACAGATCTACCAAGGAAGGCTATCCGG 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{2nd}$ eya3 sense</td>
<td>5’ GACGCTCCCCAACCCTGCTGCCGCGC 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{1st}$ eya4 antisense</td>
<td>5’ GACATTGTGACGCTTGAGCATATTATCCGG 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{2nd}$ eya4 antisense</td>
<td>5’ CTTGATGAAGGCAAGCAGTGTCAGTGTCGC 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{1st}$ eya4 sense</td>
<td>5’ CCGTGAAGTCACCAAGGAGCTCTGGGCTGG 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P^{2nd}$ eya4 sense</td>
<td>5’ ATCAGCTGCAGGACCCCATCATGACAGGCG 3’</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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