

cAMP-induced A β production and its role in the expression of LTP

C. Rebosio¹, R. Ricciarelli², D. Rivera², M.A. Pronzato², U.M. Marinari², D. Puzzo³, O. Arancio⁴, E. Fedele¹

¹Dept. of Pharmacy, Section of Pharmacology and Toxicology, University of Genoa, Italy

²Dept. of Experimental Medicine, Section of General Pathology, University of Genoa, Italy

³Dept. of Bio-Medical Sciences, Section of Physiology, University of Catania, Italy

⁴Dept. of Pathology and Cell Biology, Taub Institute for Research on Alzheimer's Disease and the Aging Brain, Columbia University, New York, USA

Cyclic adenosine monophosphate (cAMP) is essential for the expression of LTP, the electrophysiological substrate of learning and memory¹. Many studies have shown that pharmacological and genetic manipulations of the cAMP/PKA/CREB pathway influence hippocampal late LTP and long-term memory^{2,3}. Specifically, inhibition of PDE4-mediated cAMP breakdown enhances LTP and improves memory^{4,5}.

Recent data indicate that amyloid beta 42 (A β ₄₂), besides playing a pathogenic role in Alzheimer's disease, also exerts physiological functions in the brain. Indeed, picomolar concentrations of A β ₄₂, normally produced in the brain, potentiate hippocampal LTP and improve memory, while A β ₄₂ depletion does the opposite^{6,7}.

Since LTP is dependent on both cAMP and A β ₄₂, we investigated the neurochemical relationships between these two signaling molecules.

Our results show that increasing cAMP in mouse N2a cells, stably expressing WT human APP695, with rolipram (ROL 0.1–10 μ M), 8Br-cAMP (1 μ M–1mM) or forskolin (FSK 1 μ M–10 μ M) caused the enhancement of APP and A β ₄₂ levels. The same results were obtained with 6-MB-cAMP (1–100 μ M) but not with 8-pCPT-2-O-Me-cAMP-AM (0.01–25 μ M), indicating that the cAMP effects were mediated by PKA but not by EPAC. Moreover, we also found that the increase of APP and A β ₄₂ induced by 1 μ M FSK or by the PKA activator 6-MB-cAMP (100 μ M) was blocked by the protein synthesis inhibitor cycloheximide (80 μ g/ml), but not by the transcription inhibitor actinomycin D (4 mg/ml); accordingly, no changes of APP mRNA were detected in response to FSK or to 6-MB-cAMP.

The effects of cAMP could be reproduced in the hippocampus as treatment of rat hippocampal slices with ROL (100 μ M), FSK (100 μ M) or 6-MB-cAMP (100 μ M) resulted in a significant increase of APP and A β ₄₂ levels.

In order to understand the downstream mechanisms involved in the cAMP-mediated, PKA-dependent regulation of APP synthesis and A β ₄₂ production, we studied whether hnRNP-C and FMRP, two RNA binding proteins involved in APP expression, could be the cAMP effectors. Using RNA immunoprecipitation and silencing techniques, we found that neither hnRNP-C nor FMRP are necessary for cAMP to stimulate APP translation. In fact, FSK-induced cAMP accumulation was not associated with an increase of APP mRNA in the hnRNP-C immunocomplex, and hnRNP-C or FMRP knocking down did not alter the APP/A β response to FSK. Furthermore, the effects of FSK were not affected by blocking the PKA-activated PPA2, which has been demonstrated to provoke FMRP degradation. In future studies, we will investigate the role of other factors that are involved in the post transcriptional regulation of APP mRNA, such as nucleolin⁸, RCK/p54⁹, IRP1¹⁰, and miRNA¹¹.

Finally, we investigated the functional relationships between cAMP and A β in LTP. In WT mice, a weak tetanic stimulation of the Schaffer collateral pathway elicited LTP in CA1 neurons that was reinforced by perfusion of hippocampal slices with 100 nM ROL for 20 min before stimulation. On the contrary, the effect of ROL was absent in slices obtained from APP KO mice or in slices obtained from WT animals and treated with anti-A β antibodies (JRF/rAb2, 4 μ g/ml; M3.2, 4 μ g/ml).

Our data demonstrate that the second messenger cAMP controls APP expression and revealed a novel cAMP/PKA/APP/A β pathway that plays a key role in the expression of LTP.

References

1. Kandel ER. *Mol Brain* 2012;5:14
2. Wu ZL et al. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1995;92:220
3. Nguyen PV, Kandel ER *Learn Mem* 1997;4:230
4. Reneerkens A et al. *Psychopharmacology* 2009;202:419
5. Bruno O et al. *Br J Pharmacol* 2011;164:2054
6. Puzzo D et al. *J Neurosci* 2008;28:14537
7. Puzzo D et al. *Ann Neurol* 2011;69:819
8. Zaidi S.H. et al. *J Biol Chem* 1995;270:17292

9. Broytman O et al. *Neurobiol Aging* 2009;30:1962
10. Cho H.H. et al. *J BiolChem* 2010;285: 31217
11. Smith P. et al. *J Neurochem*2011;116:240

This work was supported by grants from CARIGE, Alzheimer's Association and University of Genoa.