Chem Soc Rev



REVIEW ARTICLE

5

35

40

45

50

55

1

Implications of peptide assemblies in amyloid diseases 💵

15Neurodegenerative disorders and type 2 diabetes are global epidemics compromising the quality of life of millions worldwide, with profound social and economic implications. Despite the significant differences in pathology – much of which are poorly understood – these diseases are commonly characterized by the presence of cross-β amyloid fibrils as well as the loss of neuronal or pancreatic β-cells. In this review, we document research progress on the molecular and mesoscopic self-assembly of amyloid-beta, alpha synuclein, human islet amyloid polypeptide and prions, the peptides and proteins associated with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, type 2 diabetes and prion diseases. In addition, we discuss the toxicities of these amyloid proteins based on their self-assembly as well as their interactions with membranes, metal ions, small molecules and engineered nanoparticles. Through this presentation we show the remarkable similarities and differences in the structural transitions of the amyloid proteins through primary and secondary nucleation, the common evolution from disordered monomers to alpha- helices and then to β-sheets when the proteins encounter the cell membrane, and, the consensus (with a few exceptions) that off-pathway oligomers, rather than amyloid fibrils, are the toxic species regardless of the pathogenic protein sequence or physicochemical properties. In addition, we highlight the crucial role of molecular self-assembly in eliciting the biological and pathological consequences of the amyloid proteins within the context of their cellular environments and their spreading between cells and organs. Exploiting such structure-function- of their cellular environments and their spreading between cells and organs. Exploiting such structure-function- of their cellular environments and their spreading between cells and organs. Exploiting such structure-function- of their cellular environments and their spreading between ce	10	Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/c7cs00372b	Pu Chun Ke, 🝺 a Marc-Antonie Sani, 🝺 b Feng Ding, 🝺 c Aleksandr Kakinen, 🝺 a Ibrahim Javed, 🕩 a Frances Separovic, 🕩 b Thomas P. Davis 🕩 ad and Raffaele Mezzenga 🕩 * e	10
20amyloid fibrils as well as the loss of neuronal or pancreatic β-cells. In this review, we document research progress on the molecular and mesoscopic self-assembly of amyloid-beta, alpha synuclein, human islet amyloid polypeptide and prions, the peptides and proteins associated with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, type 2 diabetes and prion diseases. In addition, we discuss the toxicities of these amyloid proteins based on their self-assembly as well as their interactions with membranes, metal ions, small molecules and engineered nanoparticles. Through this presentation we show the remarkable similarities and differences in the structural transitions of the amyloid proteins through primary and secondary nucleation, the common evolution from disordered monomers to alpha- 	15		Neurodegenerative disorders and type 2 diabetes are global epidemics compromising the quality of life of millions worldwide, with profound social and economic implications. Despite the significant differences in pathology – much of which are poorly understood – these diseases are commonly characterized by the presence of cross- β	15
25 proteins through primary and secondary nucleation, the common evolution from disordered monomers to alpha- helices and then to β-sheets when the proteins encounter the cell membrane, and, the consensus (with a few exceptions) that off-pathway oligomers, rather than amyloid fibrils, are the toxic species regardless of the pathogenic protein sequence or physicochemical properties. In addition, we highlight the crucial role of molecular self-assembly in eliciting the biological and pathological consequences of the amyloid proteins within the context of their cellular environments and their spreading between cells and organs. Exploiting such structure-function- toxicity relationship may prove pivotal for the detection and mitigation of amyloid diseases. 30	20		amyloid fibrils as well as the loss of neuronal or pancreatic β-cells. In this review, we document research progress on the molecular and mesoscopic self-assembly of amyloid-beta, alpha synuclein, human islet amyloid polypeptide and prions, the peptides and proteins associated with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, type 2 diabetes and prion diseases. In addition, we discuss the toxicities of these amyloid proteins based on their self-assembly as well as their interactions with membranes, metal ions, small molecules and engineered nanoparticles. Through this presentation we show the remarkable similarities and differences in the structural transitions of the amyloid	20
DOI: 10.1039/c7cs00372bself-assembly in eliciting the biological and pathological consequences of the amyloid proteins within the context of their cellular environments and their spreading between cells and organs. Exploiting such structure-function- toxicity relationship may prove pivotal for the detection and mitigation of amyloid diseases.30	25	Received 23rd May 2017	proteins through primary and secondary nucleation, the common evolution from disordered monomers to alpha- helices and then to β -sheets when the proteins encounter the cell membrane, and, the consensus (with a few exceptions) that off-pathway oligomers, rather than amyloid fibrils, are the toxic species regardless of the pathogenic protein sequence or physicochemical properties. In addition, we highlight the crucial role of molecular	25
30rsc.li/chem-soc-revcontrol of their cellular environments and their spreading between cells and organs. Exploiting such structure-function- toxicity relationship may prove pivotal for the detection and mitigation of amyloid diseases.30		DOI: 10.1039/c7cs00372b	self-assembly in eliciting the biological and pathological consequences of the amyloid proteins within the context	
	30	rsc.li/chem-soc-rev	of their cellular environments and their spreading between cells and organs. Exploiting such structure–function– toxicity relationship may prove pivotal for the detection and mitigation of amyloid diseases.	30

^a ARC Center of Excellence in Convergent Bio-Nano Science and Technology, Monash Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Monash University, 381 Royal Parade, Parkville, VIC 3052, Australia

^b School of Chemistry, Bio21 Institute, The University of Melbourne, 30 Flemington Rd, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia

^c Department of Physics and Astronomy, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA

^d Department of Chemistry, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK
 ^e ETH Zurich, Department of Health Science & Technology, Schmelzbergstrasse 9, LFO, E23, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland. E-mail: raffaele.mezzenga@hest.ethz.ch



Pu Chun Ke

Pu Chun Ke is a Senior Fellow at CBNS. Monash University, Australia. He was а CSIRO Distinguished Visiting Scientist (Melbourne, 2014) and tenured Associate Professor (2009–2013) and Assistant Professor (2003-2009) at Clemson University, USA. Dr Ke was recipient of the Faculty Achievement in the Sciences Award (Clemson, 2012), CAREER Award (US National Science Foundation, 2008) and LJIS Postdoctoral Fellowship in Biophysics (Burroughs Well-

come Fund through University of California, San Diego, 2001–2003). He has authored 108 papers on protein aggregation, protein corona, single
molecules, and environmental health and safety of nanomaterials, high-lighted by MRS Bulletin, Science Daily, Live Science, and Research.gov.



Marc-Antonie Sani

molecular mechanism of diseases. He has authored 57 research articles with recent work in JACS and Angewandte Chemie related to protein–lipid complex interactions.

Marc-Antoine Sani is a Research Fellow at the School of Chemistry - Bio21 Institute, The University of Melbourne. He graduated with a PhD degree from Umeå University and the University of Bordeaux in 2008. His field of expertise is Biophysics with special interest in biological solidstate NMR spectroscopy, with aim develop to in situ techniques to study living cells and elucidate the role of particular in lipids the

5

10

15

1 1. Introduction

Molecular self-assembly is a ubiquitous phenomenon across all living systems: from the polymerization of tubulins and actins

- 5 into microtubules and actin filaments, to the organization of lipids, transmembrane/peripheral proteins and ion channels into cell membranes, to the assembly of DNA and histones into chromatin fibers and solenoids, and to the aggregation of peptides and proteins intra- or extracellularly evolving from functional monomers to toxic oligomers, amyloid fibrils and 10 plaques. Fundamental to these processes are interactions
- between the molecular constituents of the assemblies, as well as interactions between the molecular constituents and their

associated chaperones, ligands, ions, molecular complexes and organizations, driven by kinetic and thermodynamic processes to elicit desirable biological functions or malfunctions and diseases.

In this review, we attempt to draw parallels from the atomic and mesoscopic structures of five major classes of amyloid proteins in self-assembly, namely, amyloid-beta (Aβ), tau, alpha-synuclein (α S), prions, and human islet amyloid polypeptide (IAPP), as well as the biological and pathological endpoints these assemblies elicit in host systems (Fig. 1). The amyloid aggregation of these peptides has been implicated in Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, prion diseases and type 2 diabetes mellitus, or generically referred to as neurodegenerative disorders and

20

25



Feng Ding is an Associate Professor of Physics at Clemson University, USA. He obtained his PhD from Boston University (2004)and worked as a postdoctoral fellow (2004-2006), research associate (2006-2008), and Research Assistant Professor (2008–2012) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill before being hired as an Assistant Professor at Clemson University (2012–2017). His research focuses on understanding the



Aleksandr Kakinen

Aleksandr Kakinen is Postdoctoral Research Fellow at CBNS, Monash University, Australia, working with Pu Chun 20 Ke and Tom Davis. While working at the National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia, he obtained his PhD degree (2014) at Tallinn 25 University of Technology, Estonia. His research interests include protein-protein interaction, protein corona, nano- and ecotoxicology. 30

Separovic

director of the Bio21 Institute

and former Head of Chemistry,

University of Melbourne. While

working at CSIRO, Sydney, she

obtained a PhD at UNSW and a

National Institutes of Health

University of Melbourne in 1996

Frances

specializes

fellowship

of

joined

in

Biophysical Chemist,

is

a

at

the

the

peptide

membranes

deputy

30

35

Award for Research Excellence (UNC, 2005), CAREER Award (US National Science Foundation, 2016) and Outstanding Young Researcher Award (Clemson, 2017).

structure, dynamics, and function interrelationship of biomolecules and molecular complexes. He was recipient of a Postdoctoral



45

50

55

Ibrahim Javed

Ibrahim Javed is a PhD student at CBNS. Monash University, Australia, working with Pu Chun Ke and Tom Davis. He obtained his PharmD from the University of Sargodha and MPhil (Pharmaceutical Chemistry) from Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan. His research is focused designing nanostructured on materials and their interfacing with proteins and other classes of *bio-macromolecules* for pharmaceutical and toxicological applications.



Frances Separovic

structures within using solid-state NMR. She is a Fellow of the Biophysical Society, ISMAR Fellow and the first female chemist elected as Fellow of the Australian Academy of Science (2012). In 2017 Frances received an **IUPAC** Distinguished Women of Chemistry/Chemical 55 Engineering award.

Frances

postdoctoral

determination

(USA).

and

35

40

45



Fig. 1 Scope of the present review, highlighting protein self-assembly, its biological and pathological implications, theranostics and prevention. Aβ: amyloid-beta; IAPP: islet amyloid polypeptide; αS: alpha-synuclein; PrP: prion protein; CD: circular dichroism spectroscopy; FTIR: Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy; ThT: thioflavin T assay; NMR: nuclear magnetic resonance; HD: hydrogen-deuterium exchange; SDSL: site directed spin labelling; EPR: electron paramagnetic resonance; TEM: transmission electron microscopy; AFM: atomic force microscopy. ER: endoplasmic reticulum; ROS: reactive oxygen species.

30

35

Q3

40

T2D that debilitate hundreds of millions of people worldwide. *In vitro*, such peptides/proteins fibrillate on the timescales of tens of minutes for IAPP to days for A β and α S, characterized by a sigmoidal kinetic curve consisting of a lag phase, an elongation phase, and a saturation phase.¹ The lag phase is where

nucleation is initiated through protein misfolding and where intrinsic seeds and/or oligomers are formed, the elongation phase corresponds to the addition of monomers to growing protofilaments, while the saturation phase is where protofilaments associate through self-assembly to render amyloid

45

50

55



Thomas P. Davis

Tom Davis is the inaugural Monash-Warwick Professor. Tom is the Director of the Australian Research Council (ARC) Centre of Excellence in Convergent Bio-Nano Science and Technology. He is an Australian Laureate Fellow. Prior to his appointment at Monash and Warwick he spent 21 years as a senior academic at the University of New South Wales in Sydney. Tom's research focuses on the application of polymer science

and nanotechnology to therapeutic applications. Tom is a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Science. He has authored 450+ peerreviewed papers and his work has been cited in excess of 29 000 times.



Raffaele Mezzenga

been internationally recognized by several distinctions such as the Biomacromolecules/Macromolecules Young Investigator Award (2013, ACS), the Dillon Medal (2011, APS), and the Young 55 Scientist Research Award (2011, AOCS).

Raffaele Mezzenga finished his PhD at EPFL Lausanne (2001) and a postdoc at UCSB Santa Barbara, before joining in 2003 the Nestlé Research Center in Lausanne. In 2005 he was hired as Associate Professor in Physics at the University of Fribourg, and he then joined ETH Zurich on 2009 as Full Professor. His research focuses on the fundamental understanding of self-assembly processes in soft condensed matter. His work has

30

35

40

45

- 1 fibrils. In addition to primary nucleation, secondary nucleation through the combination of both monomeric and aggregated species is also feasible.^{2,3} It has been suggested that the amyloid state is perhaps available to any polypeptide chain⁴⁻⁹
- 5 and represents the energetically most favorable state even compared to native proteins.¹ *In vivo*, however, the development of amyloids and plaques in the brain or pancreatic islets often takes decades, or ~10000 times longer. Such drastic differences in fibrillization may originate from the crowded
- 10 hierarchical cellular environments, where amyloid proteins are synthesized and then translocate and spread through inter- and intra-molecular assembly, chaperoned by proteins (*e.g.* insulin for IAPP) or modulated by pH and ionic strength. Accordingly, while the main purpose of this review is to highlight the
- 15 structure–function–toxicity triangle of a selected few amyloid proteins, another goal of this presentation is to draw the reader's attention from focusing exclusively on amyloid proteins to the environments of the culprits at large, which undoubtedly also contribute to the pathologies of the amyloid
- 20 diseases. Such perspective may prove beneficial to the development of mitigation strategies and theranostics against amyloidogenesis that has become increasingly perilous to modern society.

In terms of content, this review consists of 6 sections: 25 Section 1 offers an introduction to protein self-assembly and amyloid diseases; Sections 2–5 review the structure, function and toxicity characteristics of A β , tau, IAPP, α S and prions, loosely following their increasing number of amino acids (residues); Section 6 provides a summary. A β and tau, despite 30 their great contrast in chain length, both contribute to the AD pathology and hence are presented together. Although A β is slightly longer than IAPP in chain length, A β is the most studied of all amyloid proteins¹⁰ and is therefore discussed in an early section of this review.

35

2. A β , tau and Alzheimer's disease

The hallmark of Alzheimer's disease (AD) is the accumulation of toxic aggregates that impair synaptic function and induce cognitive decline. The first reported occurrence of cognitive disorder linked to AD was in 1907 by Alzheimer, who observed two types of abnormality in a brain autopsy that he attributed to be the cause of an unusual type of dementia.¹¹ The discovery of neuritic

- ⁴⁵ plaques (or miliary foci) and neurofibrillary tangles (NFTs) was immediately linked to the dystrophic neuronal process, and later $A\beta$ fibrils^{12,13} and hyperphosphorylated tau tangles¹⁴ were isolated and characterized (and proposed to cause dementia). Characterizations of the monomeric forms of the molecules
- 50 found in these neurotoxic deposits have led to greater understanding of the pathways leading to AD, with a particular focus on the structure–function relationship between aggregates and neurotoxicity. However, almost all drugs tested thus far in clinical trials have failed or shown limited impact on AD.
- 55 Tau is a neuronal protein associated with microtubules and may regulate neuron morphology. There are six main tau

1

5

10

15

20

25

30

isoforms in the brain and central nervous system (CNS). The longest human isoform has 441 residues with a high proportion of phosphorylable residues (serine and threonine) and a low proportion of hydrophobic amino acids. Tau protein in solution is considered an intrinsically disorder protein (IDP) and behaves as a random coil,¹⁵ although modifications by phosphorylation may lead to an increase in α -helix or β -sheet regions. Aggregation of totally or partially disordered proteins is associated with many neurodegenerative diseases, including AD.¹⁶ However, the molecular mechanism of aggregation and the structure of the aggregated form remain controversial. Tau is mainly an axonal protein but in AD and other tauopathies it is also present at dendritic spines and may play a toxic role. The tau hypothesis of AD considers that excessive phosphorylation of tau protein can result in the self-assembly of tangles of paired helical filaments (PHFs) and straight filaments which are involved in the pathogenesis of AD and other tauopathies. These NFTs are insoluble structures that impair axonal transport and lead to cell death. The molecular structures of PHFs and tau protein are not well defined.

NMR data¹⁷ have revealed that 343 of the 441 amino acids in tau are disordered with six segments of the sequence displaying propensity to form β -strands, three segments showing poly-Pro helices and two segments with a transient α -helix structure. In particular, aggregation of tau is believed to be strongly associated with two short residue sequences:¹⁸⁻²¹ the first in the third repeat fragment (R3, i.e. VQIVYKPVDLSKVTSKCGSLG-NIHHK) of the microtubule binding domain of tau, VOIVYK, or the mutant VQIINK, in the second repeat fragment. The aggregation of the R3 fragment has been extensively studied in the presence of polyanions, such as heparin, pointing at the formation of fibrillar structures with similar features as those assembled from pristine tau protein.22 In the absence of heparin, however, the same R3 fragment has been shown to self-assemble into giant amyloid ribbons of remarkable aspect ratios.23

The tau protein is a highly dynamic structure. An NMR study of a peptide derived from tau showed that phosphorylation stabilized the α -helix structure,²⁴ suggesting a possible higher content of α -helices in hyperphosphorylated tau in PHFs. Tau protein can form dimers, oligomers and larger aggregates and fibrils. However, in this review we focus on the A β peptide rather than tau aggregates, as greater structural details are available for the former.

2.1 Role of APP and production of Aβ

Aβ peptides are produced by an intrinsic cleavage of the amyloid precursor protein (APP) that is an integral membrane protein encoded on chromosome 21 by the APP gene.²⁵ It is accepted that patients with trisomy 21 (Down syndrome) over-express APP and develop AD-like senile plaques in their brain.^{26,27} Yet, the physiological function of APP remains uncertain, mostly because APP is part of a gene family with overlapping function (*e.g.* producing the amyloid precursor-like proteins APLP1 and APLP2) and is subject to various post-expression modifications.²⁸ Still, only APP generates the Aβ

35

40

45

50

5

10

15

20

- fragment. APP modulates critical features in brain development since APP knock-out mice are viable but exhibit reduced body weight and brain mass²⁹ with increased brain levels of copper,³⁰ cholesterol and sphingolipid.³¹ Interestingly, reintroducing the APP ectodomain, which is produced by cleavage of
- the membrane-anchored APP, improved cognitive function and synaptic density^{32,33} and acted as an apoptosis modulator through caspases activations.³⁴ The intracellular C-terminal domain also has a functional role in sorting APP and, in
 particular, the highly conserved YENPTY cytoplasmic sequence is prone to interaction with other proteins, such as X11 and

Fe65, which are postulated to regulate APP internalization.³⁵ The location and sequence of the proteolytic cleavage of APP

- are critical to AD. APP is primarily translocated to the cell surface (short residence time) where α -secretase and then γ secretase produce APPs α , p3 and AICD fragments, which are not amyloidogenic. However, when APP is relocated through endocytosis (rapid turnover due to the YENPTY sequence) into endosomes containing the β -secretase (also called BACE1) and
- 20 the γ -secretase, then APPs β , the toxic A β peptides and AICD fragments are produced (Fig. 2). BACE1 is an aspartyl protease that has optimum efficiency at pH 4.5.³⁶ Interestingly, acid pH can promote greater aggregation rate of A β peptides³⁷ due to the protonation state of the three histidines (His6, His13 and
- 25 His14), and also attenuate lysosomal degradation of Aβ peptides.³⁸ Furthermore, if APP is relocated to the trans Golgi network instead of the ER, BACE1 can produce N-truncated Aβ peptides which are prone to rapid pyroglutamylation.³⁹ These

species have been characterized as highly toxic⁴⁰ and found in intracellular, extracellular and vascular A β deposits in AD brain tissue,⁴¹ while unmodified peptides are primarily located in endosomal compartments and are eventually exocytosed into the extracellular space.

It is noteworthy that intracellular pools of Aβ peptides are pointed as the most toxic species causing the death of neurons.^{42,43} The physiological function of these A β peptides. usually 39-43 residues in length, is unconfirmed. However, during excitatory neuronal activity, an increase in excretion of A β peptides is observed⁴⁴ with the effect of downregulating excitatory synaptic transmission.⁴⁵ Thus, Aβ peptides are an important modulator of memory, since inhibition of peptide production impairs learning.⁴⁶ A β (1–40) is the most abundant Aβ isoform found in its soluble form in plasma, cerebrospinal fluid and brain interstitial fluid⁴⁷ but is also a major component in amyloid plaques. Interestingly, the level of the fastaggregating isoform $A\beta(1-42)$ is a biomarker for detecting amyloid pathologic changes in the brain and cerebral vessels⁴⁸ and, moreover, the relative $A\beta(1-42)/A\beta(1-40)$ ratio is markedly increased in AD.⁴⁹ Overall, both the concentration and location of $A\beta$ peptides are critical for brain function, thereby complicating therapeutic strategies against AD.

2.2 Atomic structures of Aβ40 & Aβ42, post-modifications and amyloid fibrils

 $A\beta$ peptides vary in length due to the multiple cleavage sites recognized by the secretases, but the most abundant species are



Fig. 2 (a) Non-amyloidogenic pathway triggered by the location of APP at the plasma membrane interface; and (b) amyloidogenic pathway induced through APP endocytosis into endosomal vesicles containing the protease BACE1. Aβ peptides are then prone to aggregation and can be either secreted extracellularly or remain in the intracellular space to target other organelles, such as mitochondria, or be degraded by proteases such as cathepsin B.



Fig. 3 (a) Aβ peptide sequence (CINEMA color code), potential post-modification sites and physicochemical properties; and (b) intramolecular interactions stabilizing the typical hairpin β-sheet structure. Red and orange dashes: molecular contacts. Blue dashes: side-chain packing.
 Green: hydrophobic residues. Black: a salt bridge. Reproduced with permission from ref. 57, copyright 2010 Nature Publishing Group.

Aβ(1-40) and Aβ(1-42), whose sequences are shown in Fig. 3.
Furthermore, Aβ peptides can be degraded by proteases such as insulin degrading enzymes,⁵⁰ neprilysin⁵¹ and cathepsin B,⁵² which render the fragments non-amyloidogenic. Aβ peptides can be subject to post-translational modifications including pyroglutamate formation (Glu3, 11 and 22),⁵³ phosphorylation
(Ser8 and 26),⁵⁴ dityrosine formation (Tyr10)⁵⁵ and oxidation (Met35)⁵⁶ (see Fig. 3).

The A β peptide primary sequence exhibits two stretches of hydrophobic residues (17–21 and 32 until C-terminus), which are predicted to adopt a β -sheet conformation.⁵⁷ Two turn regions are also predicted between residues His6 and Ser8, and between Asp23 and Asn27. Finally, the hydrophilic patches between Asp1 and Lys16 and between Glu22 and Lys28 have either β -sheet or α -helical propensity.^{58,59}

A missing piece in the AD puzzle is the secondary structures 40 of A β peptides immediately after cleavage by the γ -secretase. Firstly, β -CTF is likely to remain structured after cleavage by BACE1, at least up to the transmembrane α -helical segment that contains part of A β sequence (Ala28 until C-terminus). Secondly, cleavage by the γ -secretase occurs at intra-membrane

45 and Aβ peptides have a demonstrated affinity for lipid membranes. Thus immediate trafficking is unclear: do Aβ peptides remain in, on or away from the membrane interface? Since lipid membranes modulate the aggregation kinetics,⁶⁰ this step could play a critical role in subsequent trafficking and AD 50 pathology.

Several A β peptide structures have been compiled in the past two decades,⁶¹ with a consensus that an unstructured to β -sheet transition first occurs followed by a seeded aggregation process to form oligomeric structures that eventually proceeds to mature amyloid fibrils of 70–120 Å in diameter and an indeterminate

⁵⁵ amyloid fibrils of 70–120 Å in diameter and an indeterminate length according to electron microscopy.⁶² Determination of the

1

5

10

15

20

25

45

50

initial structure of A^β peptides in native conditions is challenging since the rapid self-aggregation rate accompanied by poor solubility prevents the application of high-resolution techniques such as solution NMR. Nevertheless, several structures of the monomeric peptides have been determined in either organic solvents (dimethylsulfoxide, hexafluoroisopropanol, trifluoroethanol), aqueous solution or detergent micelles (sodium dodecyl sulfate or SDS). In general, Aß peptides adopt helical conformations with unstructured termini and various turn regions in organic solvents,63-65 aqueous buffer66 and in membrane mimetic detergent micelles.^{67,68} Interestingly, most structural studies show that physiological pH,69 low salt concentration⁷⁰ and higher temperature⁷¹ could heavily modulate the peptide conformational transition to β -sheet structure, thereby promoting rapid self-aggregation. The α -helical conformation is proposed as a transient on-pathway intermediate during the complex amyloid fibril formation.⁷² Indeed, the multistep kinetics of amyloid assembly comprise a lag phase, during which little or no fibril material is formed, followed by an exponential growth of β -sheet-rich aggregates that propagate into amyloid fibrils.¹ Increasing evidence suggests that the native partly helical intermediates form early nucleation seeds during the lag phase.⁷³ The intramolecular interactions stabilizing the β -sheet structure are shown in Fig. 3. In both A β isoforms, the turn conformation is stabilized by hydrophobic interactions and by a salt bridge between Asp23 and Lys28. Many side chain contacts are observed, in particular between Phe19 and Ile32, Leu34 and Val36, and between pairs Gln15-Val36 and His13-Val40.57,74

Phosphorylation of Aβ peptides, however, does not modify30their primary unstructured conformation but does lead to a 5-5fold reduction in the lag phase due to a faster transition to β-5sheet structures, more efficient nucleation and a greater number of oligomeric seeds.⁷⁵ N-truncated and/or pyroglutamate-35aggregation kinetics than the corresponding full-length peptides, which suggests they could be potential seeding species35for aggregate formation. More remarkably, the pyroglutamate-40species⁷⁷ that have been demonstrated as most toxic.40

2.3 Aβ aggregation kinetics and amyloid fibril formation

Knowledge of $A\beta$ aggregation kinetics and mechanisms has been acquired mainly through *in vitro* studies using synthetic peptides. The kinetics of fibril formation depends on several intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The primary sequence of the peptide modulates the propensity to aggregate into mature fibrils. Post-modifications promote faster aggregation kinetics, as does the $A\beta(1-42)$ sequence compared to the shorter $A\beta(1-40)$ peptide. Extrinsic factors, such as interaction with lipid membranes, can have either a slowing or accelerating effect, rendering determination of a generic model nontrivial.

The lag phase is a period of slow self-aggregation and structural change, likely from helical to β -sheet structures, 55 and characterized by a combination of multiple nucleation

- and elongation phases^{2,78,79} leading to a large number of 1 oligomeric species. Primary nucleation is a fast process (milliseconds) producing the first seeds that are elongated further into fibrils by the addition of monomers. The formation of new
- aggregates is thought to be dominated by a second nucleation phase where existing fibrils are fragmented to expose new seeds either co-aggregating or recruiting monomers. Interestingly, changes in the primary nucleation rate do not affect the elongation phase while secondary nucleation and fragmenta-
- tion modify the lag and elongation phases.⁸⁰ The difference in 10 aggregation rate between the amyloid peptide species, however, may be related to their primary nucleation rate. In fact, $A\beta(1-$ 40) monomers, in comparison to $A\beta(1-42)$, exhibit a slower nucleation rate inducing (or caused by) a shift towards nuclea-
- tion on the fibril surface rather than accumulation of small 15 oligomeric species.⁷⁹ These fibril-catalyzed secondary nucleation and elongation processes could be a critical difference in relation to the trafficking and toxicity of the $A\beta$ peptide variants.⁸¹ Notably, measuring the kinetics of aggregation is challenged by the difficulty in sample preparation,⁸¹ especially 20
- with regard to starting an experiment without any preformed seeds or a controlled amount of seeds.

The elongation phase is due to the addition of oligomers/ monomers onto protofibrils (Fig. 4) or association of protofi-25 brils, in competition with fragmentation of the protofibrils. It is often typified by the half time of the aggregation reaction where monomers and protofibrils are near equimolar. However, intrinsic and extrinsic factors modulate the stability of the oligomeric species and can template seeds, thereby shifting 30

1

5

20

25

30

the kinetic rate towards primary nucleation with a faster aggregation rate. The stationary phase represents a steady state where the monomer concentration has reached an equilibrium value and the fibrils are the prevalent species. Notably, AFM studies show that fibrils of different amyloid-forming peptides with diverse macroscopic structures/polymorphism (i.e., ribbon-like versus nanotube-like packing) have a similar Young's modulus, and thus all $A\beta$ peptides are anticipated to exhibit similar mechanical strength.82

Intrinsic and extrinsic factors also play a critical role in the 10 modulation of the lag and elongation phases by changing the concentration of free monomers in solution and/or acting as seeding interfaces. The molecular factors influencing the aggregation kinetic of $A\beta$ peptides are various and difficult to assign to a particular microscopic event (primary versus secondary 15 nucleation, fragmentation, etc.), although some properties are more straightforward to correlate; for instance, the effect of pH as electrostatic interactions mediate either attraction or repulsion of the monomers.78

Mesoscopic structures of Aß amyloid fibrils 2.4

An original molecular model of $A\beta(1-40)$ fibrils⁸³ based on solid-state NMR data shows the first ~ 10 residues as structurally disordered while residues 12–24 and 30–40 adopt β -strand conformations and form parallel β-sheets through intermolecular hydrogen bonding. A bend at residues 25-29 brings the two β-sheets in contact through sidechain-sidechain interactions. The cross- β motif common to all amyloid fibrils is a double-layered structure, with in-register parallel β-sheets.⁸³

	misfolding		
35	off Pathway	Proposed Aβ toxic mechanisms	35
40	Small oligomer (toxic)	<i>Oxidative stress</i> Metal binding Energy production impairment	40
	elongation/ fragmentation	Synaptic dysfunction: Loss of electrochemical potential	
45	Amorphous 2 aggregates 9 (non-toxic) protofibril	<i>Membrane interactions:</i> Pore formation Lipid peroxidation	45
50	↓ maturation	<i>Telomerase dysfunctions</i> : DNA damage through oxidation	50
55	Fibrillar aggregates / plaques (non-toxic)	Apoptosis modulation: Caspases activation	55

Fig. 4 Aß aggregation pathways from monomer to fibril formation and their toxic outcomes.



However, several studies have shown that $A\beta$ peptides form 20 polymorphic fibrils depending on growth conditions and various oligomeric aggregates. Thus it is unlikely that amyloid fibrils formed in vitro resemble those in the brain. Tycko and co-workers⁸⁴ seeded fibril growth from brain extract and used solid-state NMR and electron microscopy to gain structural 25 details of the A β fibrils. Using tissue from two AD patients they found a single Aβ40 fibril structure for each patient emphasizing the critical role of the seeding process. The molecular structure for Aβ40 fibrils from one patient (Fig. 5) revealed differences from in vitro fibrils. The authors then proposed that 30 fibrils may spread from a single nucleation site and that

structural variations may correlate with variations in AD. In comparison with A β 40, A β 42 is more neurotoxic and their differences in behaviour may be due to intrinsic differences in structure. An atomic resolution structure of a single form of 35 Aβ42 amyloid fibrils has been derived from high field magic angle spinning NMR spectra.⁸⁵ The structure shows a dimer of Aβ42 molecules, each containing four β-strands in an S-shaped amyloid fold (Fig. 6). The dimer is arranged to form two hydrophobic cores, capped by a salt bridge at the end with a 40hydrophilic outer surface. The monomer interface within the dimer shows contacts between M35 of one molecule and L17 and Q15 of the second. Intermolecular constraints show that the amyloid fibrils are parallel in-register. Interestingly, Ishii

- and co-workers obtained a similar S-shape arrangement (Fig. 6) 45 using ultra-fast spinning solid-state NMR techniques.86 Although knowing atomic details of the fibril may be useful for drug design, nevertheless, the oligomer species are generally accepted as the toxic species.87
- 50

2.5 Extrinsic factors modulating Aβ structure, aggregation kinetic and toxicity

2.5.1 Aβ-metal interactions. The role of transition metals in AD is highly debated and a recent literature search using 55 meta-analysis and systemic review methodologies identified a widespread misconception that iron and, to a lesser degree, zinc and copper levels are increased in AD brain.⁸⁸ Metals were primarily thought to be accumulated in AD brain tissue due to positive staining but quantitative analysis failed to confirm a significant increase,⁸⁹ and more recent studies have confirmed the artefacts in quantitation due to tissue fixation prior to analysis.⁹⁰ Qualitative *ex vivo* and *in vitro* studies have demonstrated that $A\beta$ peptides recruit iron, zinc and copper with high affinity⁹¹ and, more dramatically, induce a redox complex with oxidative stress properties⁹² that may be related to the toxicity of A β peptides and has been widely accepted as a potential toxic mechanism in AD.93 Two binding sites were identified: the Met35 mediating the Fenton reaction through the electron donor sulfide group;⁹⁴ and the N-terminal region forming a chelating domain⁹⁵ of Asp1, His6, His13 and His14, 30 which undergoes a major structural rearrangement during the redox cycle of ROS production.⁹⁶ Interestingly, in vitro experiments have also shown that metal binding noticeably extends the lag time by stabilizing oligomeric and amorphous aggregates,⁹⁷ which may explain poor *in vivo* detection of the peptide amyloids. Aβ-copper complexes have also been shown to promote lipid peroxidation, in particular within the polyunsaturated chains of membrane lipids, which is another potential toxic mechanism due to neuronal membrane disruption.98

2.5.2 Aβ-membrane interactions. The role of lipids in AD was first suggested by Alzheimer when he discovered adipose inclusions and alterations of lipid composition in brain tissue.¹¹ Several classes of lipids have been investigated for their specific interactions with Aβ peptides, such as cholesterol, gangliosides or anionic phospholipids.99 The lipid membrane interface itself is proposed to be a heterogeneous nucleation site, which modulates $A\beta$ peptide folding kinetics and pathways by reducing the seeding mechanism to a two-dimensional system.^{100,101} To date, there is a consensus that lipid bilayer plays a role in A β aggregation and may be involved in neurotoxicity. Different model membranes influence the structure and size of $A\beta$ fibrils based on the charge and hydrophobicity of the membrane.60,102 Membrane-attached oligomers of A β 40 displayed a β -turn, flanked by two β -sheet regions or an anti-parallel beta-hairpin conformation by Raman

Chem Soc Rev

1

10

15

20

25



Fig. 6 Two recent solid-state NMR Aβ42 fibril structures identifying different assemblies by (left) Griffin and co-workers (PDB: 5kk3)⁸⁵ and (right) Ishii and co-workers (2MXU).⁸⁶ High similarity is apparent with the β sheet domain (purple ribbons) and the unstructured strand (gray ribbons) forming an S-shape. The hydrophobic surfaces are based on Kyte-Doolittle scale (red: hydrophobic, white: neutral, blue: hydrophilic).

40

35

55

- ¹ spectroscopy and solid-state NMR.¹⁰³ In contrast to the mature, lesstoxic A β fibrils, the membrane-attached oligomer appeared to form a β -barrel or 'porin'-like structure (also refer to Fig. 15b in Section 4 for α S), which may account for a mechanism for A β toxicity.
- ⁵ Cholesterol is proposed to be related to AD pathology although cholesterol stabilizes phospholipid bilayers against $A\beta$.¹⁰⁴ Lipid 'rafts' or domains in the membrane enriched in cholesterol and sphingolipids could modulate $A\beta$ production, aggregation and toxicity.¹⁰⁵ Sanders and co-workers¹⁰⁶ showed that the C99 segment
- 10 of APP bound to cholesterol and proposed that APP might act as a cholesterol sensor critical for the trafficking of APP to cholesterolrich membrane domains. Cholesterol increases the thickness of phospholipid bilayers and may influence the proteolytic processing of APP and proportion of Aβ40 to Aβ42 produced. Lipid membranes
- 15 are also susceptible to oxidative stress, as mentioned above as a mechanism for neurodegeneration in AD. 98

2.6 Aβ toxicity and Alzheimer's disease

The physiological markers of AD are progressive cognitive decline, synaptic loss, presence of extracellular β-amyloid plaques and intracellular neurofibrillary tangles ultimately leading to neuronal cell death and a massive brain cell mass loss. To date, there is no drug that can prevent AD neurodegeneration probably because many pathways are activated during the uncontrolled production of

- 25 Aβ peptides, although several candidates are in ongoing clinical trials. Indeed, it has been demonstrated that Aβ peptides accumulate at synapses, thereby disrupting the whole neuronal network.¹⁰⁷ More specifically, complex interactions between Aβ peptides and both synaptic ion channels and mitochondria alter their physiolo-
- 30 gical activities. Aβ peptides and, more particularly, the oligomers of Aβ have affinity for the glutamate¹⁰⁸ and acetylcholine¹⁰⁹ receptors, mediating the influx/efflux rate of critical mediators such as calcium ions. Aβ-mediated deregulation of these receptors – particularly NMDAR and AMPAR – has been linked to the impairment 35 of plasticity and degeneration of synapses during AD.¹¹⁰

The observation that $A\beta$ oligomers are able to co-localize within mitochondria has exposed another potential neurotoxic pathway.¹¹¹ $A\beta$ oligomers are able to alter the function of proteins involved in the mitochondrial fusion/fission process, which causes their fragmentation leading to the loss of neuron viability.¹¹²

- 40 their fragmentation leading to the loss of neuron viability.¹¹² Moreover, accumulation of Aβ peptides in synaptic mitochondria has been shown to decrease mitochondrial respiration and key respiratory enzyme activity, elevate oxidative stress, compromise calcium-handling capacity, and trigger apoptotic signals.^{113,114}
- 45 Finally, intracellular accumulation of Aβ peptides drastically reduces the lysosomal efficiency in removing damaged organelles and unfolded proteins, such as tau.¹¹⁵ Better understanding of the cell biology of the downstream effects of Aβ oligomers may uncover potential therapeutic targets for the prevention of AD.

50

55

2.7 Mitigation strategies and theranostics

With increased knowledge of the mechanism of fibril formation from the cleavage of APP to the kinetic modulation by extrinsic factors, several strategies to mitigate AD have emerged. Stabilizing the monomeric form of A β peptides is a direct strategy to limit the formation of oligomeric species. Peptides that 1

5

10

15

20

25

specifically interact with the pro-aggregating domains have been developed, as recently shown with a cyclopeptide, to inhibit A β amyloidogenesis.¹¹⁶ Antibody-based immunotherapy is another strategy to mitigate AD. For instance, a promising candidate, aducanumab, has been shown highly selective against aggregated A β , inducing significant reduction of insoluble and insoluble A β population and slowing clinical decline, although the outcome of ongoing phase 3 clinical trials is needed to confirm these promising observations.¹¹⁷ The affinity of A β peptides for transition metals was seen as another area for potential development of AD therapeutics, but so far chelators, such as D-penicillamine, have not produced any clinical improvement.¹¹⁸

After drugs (e.g. bapineuzumab and solanezumab) which sought to lower existing AB loads had failed, increasing attention was paid to BACE drugs that interfere with the process that creates Aβ. However, Merck recently closed its trial for the BACE inhibitor, verubecestat, in mild-to-moderate AD after concluding that the drug had little chance of success.¹¹⁹ A particular focus has been to decrease the production of apparently toxic $A\beta$ peptides by inhibiting BACE1 activity.¹²⁰ For instance, the cholesterol-rich endosomal environment, which promotes selective processing of APP by BACE1, has been pursued as a target using a membrane-anchored BACE1 transition-state inhibitor linked to a sterol moiety to generate highly effective BACE1 inhibitors.121 Treatment with BACE inhibitor IV, which does not change the APP concentration level, was shown to prevent mitochondrial abnormalities caused by AB.¹²² Reducing the activation of caspases, such as caspase 3, can improve neuronal growth and decrease abnormal tau species, which may be an interesting therapeutic pathway for the treatment of AD.¹²³

Since the approval of memantine in 2003, no new AD drug candidate has passed the FDA approval, with an alarming failure rate of 99.6%, the highest in all serious disease research programs.¹²⁴ A growing strategy in integrating therapeutics and personalized diagnostics has recently emerged as a promising route. Based on nanomedicine, small molecules – necessary to overcome prerequisite to cross the brain blood barrier – have been developed to label and simultaneously inhibit oligomerization of A β peptides.¹²⁵ The term theranostic has thus been coined to characterize these new inhibitor-biomarkers, many based on scaffolds of fluorescent probes such as ThT, to detect fibril formation *in vivo* and alter their accumulation.¹²⁶ These new strategies have been made possible by improved understanding of the assembly mechanism of A β at the molecular level, which will continue to guide rational drug design against AD.

3. IAPP and type 2 diabetes

3.1 Function of IAPP

Human islet amyloid polypeptide (IAPP, *a.k.a.* amylin) is a 37residue peptide hormone co-secreted with insulin from pancreatic β -cell islets. The IAPP physiology has been recently reviewed by Westermark *et al.*¹²⁷ Briefly, the peptide is synthesized from a 67-residue precursor peptide, proIAPP, by proteolysis and posttranslational modifications, such as the C-

30

40

45

35

50

55

20

25

30

35

40

45

50



Fig. 7 Structural studies of IAPP. (a) The primary structure of IAPP peptide. Solution NMR structures of IAPP monomers stabilized by SDS micelle at (b) pH 4.2 (PDB: 2KB8) and (c) pH 7.3 (PDB: 2L86). (d) Solution NMR structure of IAPP whose aggregation is reduced at pH 5.3, 4 °C, and 100 μM in concentration (PDB: 5MGQ). Residues 1–19 are colored purple and His18 is in sticks. The overall U-shaped IAPP fibril models are derived from experimental constraints by (e) solid-state NMR¹³⁴ and (f) X-ray crystallography of short peptides.¹³⁵ Reproduced with permission from ref. 134, copyright 2007 American Chemical Society. Reproduced with permission from ref. 135, copyright 2008 John Wiley & Sons. In panels (e and f), two peptides in the fibril cross-section are shown in sticks viewed along the fibril axis. (g) EPR constraints were applied to reconstruct the fibril model of disulfide reduced IAPP. The sub-panels A and B correspond to views along and perpendicular to the fibril axis, and sub-panels C and D are the accordingly reconstructed fibril models with two different views perpendicular to the fibril axis.¹³⁶ Reproduced with permission from ref. 136, copyright 2012 American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology.

terminal amidation and a disulfide bond formation between residues 2 and 7 (Fig. 7a).^{128,129} Both IAPP and insulin are regulated by similar factors with a common regulatory promoter motif.¹³⁰ Before secreting to the circulation, IAPP is stored

together with insulin inside the β-cell granules at high concentrations. IAPP functions as a synergistic partner of insulin to control the blood glucose level by slowing down gastric emptying, inhibiting digestive secretion, and promoting satiety.^{131,132}
IAPP is also known to play a role in bone metabolism along

with calcitonin and calcitonin gene-related peptides.¹³³ A hallmark of type 2 diabetes (T2D) is the formation of IAPPenriched amyloid plaques found in the pancreas of patients.

Insulin resistance in T2D leads to increased production of insulin and also IAPP by β-cells because of their shared synthesis and secretion pathways. Since IAPP is one of the most amyloidogenic peptides known, over-production of IAPP in β-cells promotes the accumulation of toxic aggregates. Other studies also suggested that insufficient process of proIAPP and accumulation

45 of intermediately processed peptides might promote the formation of amyloid fibrils, but the detailed molecular mechanisms remain unclear. The disease progression is marked by βcell death and loss of β-cell functions, resulting in insulin deficiency and diabetic dependence on external insulin sources. 50

3.2 Atomic structures of IAPP and IAPP amyloid fibrils

Structural characterization of IAPP monomers is extremely challenging due to the high aggregation propensity of the peptide. By reducing IAPP aggregation with detergent micelles, solution NMR studies have been used to study the structure of IAPP monomers.^{137–139} It has been shown that SDS micelles stabilize IAPP in a highly helical form (Fig. 7b–d). At low pH, the peptide assumes an extended alpha-helix. At neutral pH, the peptide has been found to form a kinked helix around residue H18. Such structural difference is likely due to the electrostatic interaction of the protonated His18 at low pH with the anionic SDS. Combing low pH, low temperature, and low peptide concentrations to hinder IAPP aggregation in solution, an NMR study has recently revealed that the N-terminus of IAPP remains alpha-helical while the C-terminus is unstructured, which is consistent with molecular dynamics (MD) simulations of isolated IAPP monomers.¹⁴⁰

The fibril aggregates of IAPPs share the same characteristic cross-beta structures of known fibrils.¹⁴¹ Although the atomic structure of full-length IAPP amyloid fibrils is not available, several model structures have been proposed based on various experimental methods. Using constraints derived from solidstate NMR, Tycko et al. proposed a U-shaped fibrils model where residues 8-17 and 26-37 form two beta-sheets (Fig. 7e).¹³⁴ Based on X-ray microcrystallography structures of two short peptides, Eisenberg et al. reconstructed a similar fibril model with main differences in the side-chain packing (Fig. 7f).¹³⁵ Recently, EPR studies of disulfide-reduced IAPP led to a different fibril model (Fig. 7g), where the peptide still adopted a U-shape with two strands separated by a longer distance.¹³⁶ The two strands in a single peptide had to be staggered with respect to each other to have the appropriated inter β -sheet packing and distances.

3.3 Mesoscopic structure of IAPP amyloids

The morphology of IAPP amyloid fibril has been studied by 55 both TEM and AFM.^{142,143} IAPP fibrils at the mesoscopic scale

5

10

15



Fig. 8 Morphology of IAPP amyloid fibrils. (a) Lateral association of ribbon-like IAPP protofibrils revealed by TEM of freeze-dried tungsten-shadowed samples. Subpanels a–d depict ribbons assembled by lateral association of 1 to 4 protofibrils. Ribbons with multiple protofibrils often crossed over in a left-handed sense at moderately regular intervals. Subpanel e corresponds to lateral assembly of protofibrils into single-layered, sheet-like arrays. Scale bar: 100 nm. (b) IAPP fibrils with coiled morphologies.^{142,143} Reproduced with permission from ref. 142, copyright 1999 Elsevier. Reproduced with permission from ref. 143, copyright 1997 Elsevier. Subpanels a and b denote coiled fibrils visualized by TEM and AFM, respectively. Arrows point to a lefthanded fibril with a 25 nm cross-over periodicity. Longer periodicities of approximately 50 nm can also be seen in both subpanels. Subpanel c shows the AFM height distribution, and d compares the 25 nm periodicity fibril in TEM and AFM. Scale bars: 100 nm in subpanels a and b and 50 nm in d.

displayed significant structural polymorphism, including ribbon-like, sheet-like and helical fibril morphologies (Fig. 8). The ribbons and sheets were formed by lateral association of 5 nm wide protofibrils (Fig. 8a). Most of the fibrils were found

5 nm wide protofibrils (Fig. 8a). Most of the fibrils were found in left-handed coil morphology with cross-over periodicities of either ~25 nm or ~50 nm (Fig. 8b). Based on these observations, Goldsbury *et al.* proposed that the building block of IAPP fibrils is the 5 nm protofibril which can either self-assemble laterally into ribbon-like or sheet-like arrays or coiled fibrils.¹⁴³ The atomic models of IAPP fibrils are consistent with these

40 3.4 IAPP toxicity and type 2 diabetes

TEM and AFM observations.

Mounting evidence suggests that IAPP aggregation and the related toxicity are associated with T2D. IAPP variants from diabetes-prone primates and cats formed amyloid aggregates readily *in vitro*, while those from diabetes-free rodents and pigs featured significantly lower aggregation propensities.¹⁴⁴ A naturally-occurring polymorphic S20G mutation rendered IAPP more aggregation prone;¹⁴⁵ and an Asian subpopulation carrying this mutation is subjected to early onset of T2D.¹⁴⁶ IAPP aggregated rapidly upon transplanting human islets into nude

50 mice, and the aggregation process occurred before the recurrence of hyperglycermia and was correlated with β-cell death.^{147,148} Transgenic mice expressing human IAPP variant started to develop diabetes.¹⁴⁹ Moreover, as with other amyloid proteins,^{150,151} IAPP amyloid aggregates are toxic to pancreatic islet cells.¹⁵² Therefore, amyloid aggregation of IAPP is related to β-cell death in T2D.¹⁵³

3.4.1 Oligomers vs. amyloids. Amyloid aggregation is a nucleation process, featuring a characteristic all-or-none sigmoidal kinetics. The final mature amyloid fibrils have been found relatively inert and have no significant cell toxicity. In contrast, freshly dissolved IAPP has been found to be highly toxic to islet cells and also cause membrane instability in vitro,¹⁵⁴ where the small and soluble aggregation intermediates of IAPP are expected to accumulate before the rapid fibril growth. IAPP oligomers have also been found to disrupt cell coupling, induce apoptosis, and impair insulin secretion in isolated human islets.¹⁵⁵ Additional evidence includes transgenic mice studies,^{149,156} where amyloid deposits were not always observed under optical microscopy in animals starting to show diabetic symptoms, and there was a lack of autocorrelation between beta cell loss and amyloid deposits in these models.¹⁵⁷ In addition, inhibition of the formation of insoluble IAPP aggregates but not oligomers by either small molecules¹⁵⁸ or proteins¹⁵⁹ did not reduce the cytotoxicity. Hence, these results among many others led to the toxic oligomer hypothesis in T2D.^{160,161}

As the aggregation intermediate species, IAPP oligomers are not well-defined and are extremely challenging to characterize due to their transient and heterogeneous nature. Many *in vitro* studies support the accumulation of helical intermediates populated along the aggregation pathway.^{162–164} It has been suggested that the N-terminal helixes of soluble IAPPs (Fig. 7d) are amphiphilic and hydrophobic interactions drive the helix association, which in turn increases the local concentration of the C-terminus containing the amyloidogenic sequence 20– 29.¹⁶⁵ Both discrete molecular simulations (DMD) of IAPP

30

35

40

45

50

55

25

2.0

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

- dimers¹⁴⁰ and X-ray crystallography study of IAPP fused to a maltose-binding protein¹⁶⁴ supported this scenario. On the other hand, ion mobility mass spectroscopy (IM-MS) combined with MD simulations pointed to a different model of early
- 5 intermediate states with beta-hairpin dimers.¹⁶⁶ The difference is possibly due to the enhanced sampling method replica exchange¹⁶⁷ used in the MD study, which reduced the free energy barrier of helix unfolding in the N-terminus. Further research is necessary to fully understand the structure and
 10 dynamics of IAPP oligomers in order to identify the toxic species and the molecular mechanism of IAPP toxicity.

15

3.4.2 The endogenous inhibition of IAPP aggregation. IAPP is highly aggregation prone and readily forms amyloid fibrils *in vitro* at μ M concentrations within hours.¹⁶⁸ However, before its secretion to the bloodstream IAPP is stored inside β -cell granules at mM concentrations for hours without apparent

formation of toxic aggregates in healthy individuals.¹⁶⁹ Therefore, the physiological environment inside β-cell granules natively inhibits the formation of toxic IAPP aggregates while
disruption to the native inhibition environment may lead to amyloid aggregation of IAPP, causing β-cell death.

Islet β -cell granules have a distinct cellular environment.¹⁷⁰ First, the pH value inside the granules is 5.5, which is below the physiological pH of 7.4. Second, β -cell granules have one of the

- 25 highest concentrations of Zn²⁺ ions in the entire human body. The high concentration of zinc in β-cell granules, maintained by a βcell-specific zinc transporter—ZnT8,¹⁷¹ is believed to be important for the efficient storage of insulin in β-cell granules: zinc coordinates the formation of insulin hexamers, which form insulin
- 30 crystals as the dense core of β-cell granules.¹⁷² Third, beside IAPP peptides β-cell granules also have other molecules in large quantities, including insulin and proinsulin C-peptide. Insulin is co-secreted with IAPP by β-cells at a ratio of ~100:1 in healthy individuals, and such a high insulin-to-IAPP ratio is reduced to
 35 ~20:1 in T2D patients.¹⁷³ The C-peptide is a part of the proinsulin sequence connecting A- and B-chains of insulin. Protease-processing of proinsulin results into mature insulin and C-peptide with an equal molar concentration inside β-cell granules.
- Low pH. Inhibition of IAPP aggregation at low pH has been observed *in vitro*. At low pH, an increase in the lag time and a decrease in the growth rate of IAPP fibrillization was observed.^{174,175} The electrostatic repulsion between IAPPs with protonated histidine18 (His18) is responsible for inhibiting the self-association of IAPP at low pH,¹⁷⁶ supported by DMD simulations of IAPP dimerization with and without protonation of His18.¹⁷⁷ However, since the pH value inside β-cell granules is close to the isoelectric point of His18^{174,178} and a significant portion of IAPP is still unprotonated, interactions of IAPP with other granule components are necessary for natively inhibiting the peptide amyloid aggregation at high concentrations.

Insulin. In vitro experiments have revealed that insulin is a potent IAPP aggregation inhibitor, which can significantly slow down aggregation at sub-stoichiometry concentrations.¹⁸⁰ Several studies, including peptide mapping,¹⁸¹ IMS-MS combined

with MD simulations,¹⁸² and DMD studies¹⁴⁰ suggested that the B-chain of insulin can bind IAPP. Computational studies with atomistic DMD simulations showed that both insulin monomers and dimers (but not the zinc-bound hexamer as the IAPPbinding interface is buried) could bind IAPP monomer and inhibit IAPP self-association by competing with the amyloidogenic regions important for aggregation, subsequently preventing amyloid aggregation (Fig. 9a and b). The preferred binding of insulin with the amyloidogenic region in the beta-strand conformation (Fig. 9a) suggests that insulin can also cap the fibril growth, consistently with the observed sub-stoichiometric inhibition of IAPP aggregation by insulin. Comparing to high zinc concentrations where insulin is insoluble in the crystal form,¹⁸³ zinc-deficiency due to loss-of-function mutations of ZnT8 shifts the insulin oligomer/crystallization equilibrium toward soluble monomers and dimers, which can efficiently inhibit IAPP aggregation and reduce T2D risk in the subpopulation carrying these mutations.¹⁸⁴ However, since IAPP is found almost exclusively in the soluble halo fraction of β -cell granules while insulin is mostly insoluble in the core, the balance of other granule components such as Zn²⁺ and/or C-peptide co-localized with IAPP appears crucial for maintaining the native state of IAPP.

Zinc. In an early study by Steiner and co-workers where ZnCl₂ was added to $\sim 250 \ \mu M$ IAPP solution, aggregation promotion was observed.¹⁸⁵ This promotion effect leveled off till $\sim 1 \text{ mM}$ zinc ion was added, but no data at higher salt concentrations was reported. In later experimental studies, IAPP aggregation inhibition was observed at low zinc concentrations (5 and 10 μM, but relatively high zinc/IAPP stoichiometry), followed by a partial recovery of aggregation at very high stoichiometry ($\sim 50-$ 100).^{186,187} A "two-site binding" model, where a high affinity binding with His18 stabilized non-aggregating oligomers but an unknown weaker secondary binding promoted amyloid fibril formation, was proposed.¹⁸⁷ However, this model cannot account for aggregation-promotion at low ion/protein stoichiometry¹⁸⁵ (e.g., in the case of 10 μ M of IAPP there was a single data point with increased aggregation at $\sim 25 \ \mu M$ of zinc¹⁸⁶). Combining DMD simulations with experimental characterizations,¹⁷⁹ Govindan et al. developed an alternative model that was consistent with the experimentally-observed concentration-dependent effect of zinc on IAPP aggregation. At low zinc/IAPP stoichiometry, the IAPP oligomers cross-linked by zinc were aggregation-prone due to high local peptide concentrations (Fig. 9c). As ion/protein stoichiometry increased, each IAPP tended to bind only one zinc ion at His18. The electrostatic repulsion between the bound zinc ions (+2e) inhibited IAPP aggregation, similarly to the low pH condition where IAPP aggregation was inhibited by protonated His18 (+1e).¹⁷⁶ With zinc concentration kept increasing, the screening effect due to high salt concentrations reduced electrostatic repulsion, and allowed for the aggregation to recover (Fig. 9d).^{186,187}

C-peptide. Without zinc binding, C-peptide is disordered in 55 water and weakly helical in trifluoroethanol (TFE) solution.¹⁸⁸



Fig. 9 Effects of β-cell granule components on IAPP aggregation. (a) A representative IAPP-insulin complex from DMD simulations,¹⁴⁰ where the amyloidogenic residues of IAPP (residues 22–29) are shown in orange. Reproduced with permission from ref. 140, copyright 2015 Nature Publishing
 Group. The residues in the B-chain of insulin important for binding IAPP are highlighted in stick representation. (b) The residues of an insulin monomer are colored according to IAPP binding frequencies (red-blue: high to low frequencies) in the structure of an insulin hexamer. The view with an 180° rotation is also presented. The residues with strong IAPP-binding are located at the insulin monomer-monomer interface.¹⁴⁰ Reproduced with permission from ref. 140, copyright 2015 Nature Publishing Group. (c) A representative IAPP tetramer with His18 (highlighted as sticks in pink) coordinated by a Zn²⁺ (blue sphere) from DMD simulations.¹⁷⁹ Reproduced with permission from ref. 179, copyright 2015 American Chemical Society. The amyloidogenic sequences from each IAPP monomer are highlighted in rainbow colors. (d) A mechanistic scheme demonstrating the dependence of IAPP aggregation on relative zinc concentration.

The peptide contains five acidic amino acids. Alanine scan coupled with MS experiments suggest that all these acidic 30 amino acids bind zinc ions and the binding is 1:1 in stoichiometry.¹⁸⁹ It has been found that zinc-binding may induce structural changes.¹⁹⁰ It was hypothesized that multiple negatively charged acidic amino acids in C-peptide allow the binding with multiple IAPP peptides, locally increasing IAPP 35 concentration and subsequently promoting IAPP aggregation. Upon binding zinc, C-peptide adopts specific secondary and tertiary structures with reduced net charges, which might bind and stabilize IAPP peptides in the aggregation-incompetent state. In addition, other granule molecules including 40 proIAPP¹⁹¹ and proInsulin may also contribute to native inhibition of IAPP aggregation and cytotoxicity in beta-cells and are

subject to future investigations.

3.4.3 IAPP-membrane interactions. It has been proposed that IAPP exerts cytotoxicity by membrane disruption.^{154,192,193}
The positively charged IAPP can bind anionic cell membranes and lipid micelles, and the peptide conformational and aggregation propensities change upon binding also depending on the membrane curvature.¹⁹² Binding of IAPP with small micelles was found to stabilize the peptide in helical conformation (Fig. 7), while absorption of IAPP on flat

- membrane accelerated the peptide aggregation.¹⁹⁴ Using a lipophilic Laurdan dye for examining MIN6 cell membranes upon exposure to freshly dissolved IAPP as well as mature amyloid fibrils, Pilkington *et al.* found that all species, 55 especially fresh IAPP, enhanced membrane fluidity and
- caused losses in cell viability.¹⁹⁵ The cell generation of ROS,

however, was the most pronounced with mature amyloid fibrils. This study suggests a correlation of cytotoxicity with changes in membrane fluidity rather than ROS production.

The exact mechanism by which IAPP oligomers disrupt the cell membrane is under active investigation. Pore formation by amyloid peptides has been suggested important for membrane disruption.¹⁹⁶⁻¹⁹⁸ The amyloid pore model is strongly supported by single channel recordings of IAPP on planar membranes.^{196,199,200} A detergent-like mechanism has also been advocated, where the mosaic-like opening and closing of transient defects within the membrane (also see Fig. 15d in Section 4 for α S) was supported by AFM studies showing largescale defects in the lipid bilayer upon prolonged exposure to IAPP.²⁰¹ However, the strong correlation between fibril formation and membrane disruption by this mechanism²⁰² is inconsistent with the toxic oligomer hypothesis. Recently, biophysical measurements in conjunction with cytotoxicity studies showed that nonamyloidogenic rat IAPP was as effective as IAPP at disrupting standard anionic model membranes under conditions where rat IAPP did not induce cellular toxicity, suggesting that there is no direct relationship between disruption of model membranes and induction of cellular toxicity.²⁰³ Therefore, the connection between IAPP cytotoxicity and membrane disruption remains inconclusive.

3.5 Mitigation strategies and theranostics

As with other amyloid diseases,^{204–206} inhibition of IAPP aggregation is an attractive therapeutic strategy to prevent β -cell 55 death²⁰⁷ and halt the progression of diabetic conditions in T2D.

25

20

40

45

35



Fig. 10 Inhibition of IAPP aggregation. (a) Left: High-throughput dynamic light scattering measurement of IAPP size distributions with and without resveratrol (2:1 ligand/IAPP ratio). Right: Distribution of IAPP aggregates of different molecular weights with and without resveratrol *in silico*. Stable IAPP/ resveratrol oligomer has the resveratrol molecules forming a nano-sized core and IAPP peptides a corona, which prevents aggregation.²³⁴ Reproduced with permission from ref. 234, copyright 2016 Nature Publishing Group. (b) Left: A typical IAPP dimer in DMD simulations. Right: Binding to a PAMAM-OH dendrimer (spheres) inhibits self-association of the amyloidogenic sequences (yellow region) between two IAPP peptides.²²⁴ Reproduced with permission from ref. 224, copyright 2016 John Wiley & Sons. The peptides are shown in cartoon representation with rainbow color from blue (N-terminus) to red (C-terminus).

Various approaches have been explored to reduce aggregationinduced IAPP cytotoxicity, through the use of peptides, peptidemimetics,²⁰⁸⁻²¹¹ small molecules,²¹²⁻²²³ and nanoparticles
(NPs).²²⁴⁻²²⁶ Non-amyloidogenic sequence variants of IAPP including rat IAPP²²⁷ have been found to inhibit the fibril formation of human IAPP,^{208,209} and the inhibition efficacies can be improved by synthesizing peptide mimetics with conformational restraints.^{210,211} Targeting the early helical intermediate states of IAPP aggregation,¹⁶²⁻¹⁶⁴ small molecule peptidomimetics^{212,213} have been designed to mimic helixes

that complementarily bind to the N-terminal helix of IAPP. Another attractive set of amyloid aggregation inhibitors are small-molecule polyphenols²²¹ such as epigallocatechin gallate
(EGCG),²²⁸ curcumin,^{219,220} and resveratrol,²²⁹ which inhibit aggregation and reduce the related cytotoxicity of IAPP²³⁰ as

well as other proteins and peptides such as $A\beta$.²³¹ These polyphenols have the advantage of being naturally occurring, and are non-toxic at moderate concentrations. Despite wellknown therapeutic benefits of small molecules,²³² however, pharmacological applications of these polyphenols are limited due to some common issues, such as their poor water solubility.²³³

Several studies have examined the anti-amyloid mechanisms of small molecules and NPs. For example, IMS-MS experiments showed that EGCG exerted an inhibitory effect on IAPP aggregation through direct binding of EGCG to the peptide²¹⁵ and alternating the aggregation pathways.²²⁸ Using simulations of the amyloidogenic segment of IAPP, resveratrol was found to bind and prevent the lateral growth of the fibril-like β -sheets.²³⁵ In another work, resveratrol was found to bind weakly to IAPP

50

55

35

40

- 1 and reduce inter-peptide contacts.²³⁶ A recent computational study showed that resveratrol altered the structure of an IAPP pentamer,²³⁷ which was modelled by the amyloid fibril structure derived from solid-state NMR.¹³⁴ By modelling the effects of
- 5 polyphenols like resveratrol and curcumin on the initial selfassociation and aggregation of IAPP in DMD simulation,²³⁴ Nedumpully-Govindan *et al.* showed that these polyphenols inhibited IAPP aggregation by promoting "off-pathway" oligomers with the hydrophobic polyphenols forming the core
- 10 (Fig. 10a). The peptides were stabilized in the aggregationincompetent helix-rich state by burying their hydrophobic residues inside the core and exposing the hydrophilic residues. Graphene oxide nanosheets displayed strong inhibition effects on IAPP aggregation and associated cytotoxicity because strong
- 15 binding affinity rendered the peptides to bind with the nanosheets rather than between themselves.²²⁵ OH-terminated polyamyloidoamine (PAMAM-OH) dendrimers inhibited IAPP aggregation and cytotoxicity, where the polymeric NPs encapsulated and stabilized monomeric IAPP in their hydrophobic
 20 interior (Fig. 10b).²²⁴ In general, these inhibitors all reduced the population of the oligomeric species, thereby reducing IAPP

²⁵ 4. Alpha-synuclein and Parkinson's disease

4.1 Function of alpha-synuclein

toxicity.

Alpha synuclein (αS) is a 140-residue small protein highly concentrated in presynaptic terminals,²³⁸ making up as much as 1% of all proteins in the cytosol of brain cells. Small traces of αS are also found in the heart, gut,²³⁹ muscles and other tissues, reminiscent of the confounding bodily distributions of Aβ and IAPP beyond their purported origins. In the intraneuronal space, αS assumes an equilibrium between an unfolded monomeric conformation and a membrane-bound

1

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

state that is rich in alpha helices.²⁴⁰ The precise physiological role of α S is unclear, but is relevant to the modulation of neurotransmitter dopamine release, ER/Golgi trafficking, and synaptic vesicles.²⁴¹ The membrane-bound α S influences lipid packing and induces vesicle clustering through physical and physicochemical interactions, while α S in the multimeric form has been shown to promote SNARE complex assembly during synaptic exocytosis.²⁴⁰

Aggregated αS mediates dopaminergic neurotoxicity *in vivo*.²⁴⁴ However, the precise mechanisms by which αS lends toxicity to host cells remain unclear. Pathologically, αS is a major component of Lewy bodies and neurites, the intracellular protein aggregates first identified by Spillantini *et al.* in 1997 (Fig. 11)²⁴² and hallmarks of Parkinson's disease (PD), Parkinson's disease dementia (PDD) and dementia with Lewy bodies (DLB). Compared with the ambiguous pathology of αS , the neuritic pathology of β and γ synuclein homologs does not appear widespread, and both neuroprotective and neurotoxic potentials of β synuclein have been reported.²⁴⁵

4.2 Atomic structures of alpha-synuclein and alpha-synuclein amyloid fibrils

The sequence of α S is encoded by the *SNCA* gene and can be divided into three distinct domains: (a) the amphipathic N-terminal domain (1–60), which contains consensus KTKEGV repeats and has alpha-helical propensity, (b) the central domain (61–95) or the non-amyloid-beta component (NAC) that is highly hydrophobic and amyloidogenic, and (c) the acidic C-terminal domain (96–140) which contains negatively charged and proline residues to afford protein flexibility but no apparent structural propensity.²⁴⁶ High resolution ion-mobility mass spectroscopy has revealed that HPLC-purified α S is autoproteolytic, giving rise to a number of small molecular weight fragments upon incubation. In particular, the fragment of residues 72–140 contains majority of the NAC region and aggregates



Fig. 11 (a) (Large image) Pigmented nerve cells containing αS-positive Lewy body (thin arrows) and Lewy neurites (thick arrow).²⁴² Reproduced with permission from ref. 242, copyright 1997 Nature Publishing Group. Small image: a pigmented nerve cell with two αS-positive Lewy bodies. Scale bar: 8 μm. (b) Hypothesized αS toxicity and spread of pathology in Parkinson's disease (PD) and Parkinson's disease dementia (PDD). UPS: ubiquitin proteasome system.²⁴³ Reproduced with permission from ref. 243, copyright 2013 Nature Publishing Group.

40

45

50

55



- Fig. 12 Landmark studies concerning the structures of αS fragments with respect to its full 140 residues consisting of N terminus, NAC and C terminus.²⁴⁸ Reproduced with permission from ref. 248, copyright 2015 Nature Publishing Group. The research teams are chronicled on the left while the employed techniques are abbreviated on the right. EPR: electron paramagnetic resonance; ssNMR: solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance; HD: hydrogen-deuterium exchange; SDSL: site directed spin labelling.
- 25 faster than full-length α S.²⁴⁷ These autoproteolytic products may serve as intermediates or cofactors in the aggregation of α S *in vivo*.

The atomic structures of fragmental and full-length αS in the fibrillar form have been elucidated over the past decade

30 (Fig. 12). Using quenched HD exchange Vilar *et al.* identified five β-strands within the fibril core comprising residues 35–96 and with solid-state NMR spectroscopy the presence of β-sheet secondary structure within the fibril core of residues 30–110.²⁴¹ This study has further detailed the mesoscopic features of αS
 35 fibrils, as we will visit in the next sub-section.

Based on micro-electron diffraction Rodriguez *et al.* revealed small crystal structures of the toxic NAC core (68–78, or NACore) and the preNAC segment (47–56) of α S, at spatial resolution of 1.4 Å (Fig. 13a).²⁴⁸ The NACore strands stacked

- 40 in-register into β-sheets. The sheets were paired, forming steric-zipper protofilaments as observed for other types of amyloido-genic proteins. Notably, each pair of the sheets contained two water molecules, and each was associated with a threonine side chain within the interface. X-ray fiber diffraction patterns
 45 further revealed a similarity of the NACore to full-length αS
- fibrils.²⁴⁸

In a more recent study, Tuttle *et al.* established the atomic structure of full-length α S fibrils based on 68 spectra, using 2D and 3D ssNMR.²⁴⁹ The fibrils were collected from cell culture and shown to adopt a β -serpentine arrangement (Fig. 13b–e). The fold exhibited hydrogen bonds in register along the fibril axis, orthogonal to the hydrogen bond geometry in a standard

Greek-key motif unseen for other fibrils (Fig. 13d).²⁴⁹ The innermost β -sheet contained amyloidogenic residues 71–82,

55 while the sidechains in the core were tightly packed (Fig. 13e). Compact residues facilitated a close backbone-

backbone interaction: A69–G93 bridged the distal loops of the 25 Greek key, and G47–A78 rendered a stable intermolecular salt bridge between E46 and K80. Hydrophobic sidechain packing among I88, A91 and F94 established the innermost portion of the Greek key. Residues 55–62 were disordered, consistent with that reported by Comellas *et al.*²⁵⁰ Collectively, the steric 30 zippers, glutamine ladder and intermolecular salt bridge contributed to the structural complexity and stability of the fibril. However, it remains uncertain whether such atomic structure reflects that of α S fibrils extracted directly from PD patients.

4.3 Mesoscopic structure of alpha-synuclein amyloids

The morphology of αS fibrils has been examined with AFM²⁵¹⁻²⁵³ and cryoelectron microscopy.²⁴¹ A hierarchical assembly model (HAM) was proposed by Inonescu-Zanetti et al.²⁵⁴ to describe the architecture of immunoglobulin lightchain protein SMA fibrils assembled from smaller subspecies and has shown general applicability to the nanoscale assemblies of A β , α S and IAPP as well as SH3 domain, lysozyme, SMA, β_2 -microglobulin and beta-lactoglobulin.^{142,251,252,255-260} Alternatively, a new packing model was proposed by Sweers et al.,²⁶¹ in attempt to reconcile the morphological and mechanical data observed for two distinct fibril species of E46K, a mutant of αS . Nonetheless, according to the HAM, protofilaments are established by the nucleated polymerization kinetic model, in which the protofilaments elongate by the addition of monomeric, partially folded intermediates to their growing ends. The protofilaments then interact with each other to form protofibrils, each consisting of twisted 2-3 protofilaments, and two protofibrils entwine to form mature fibrils and, eventually, plaques. The driving force for such stepwise assembly is both electrostatic and hydrophobic.254



Fig. 13 (a) Top and side views of the structures of NACore (orange; residues 68–78, sequence also see Fig. 12) and PreNAC segments (blue; residues 47–56, sequence also see Fig. 12). The A53T mutation in PreNAC is shown in black.²⁴⁸ Reproduced with permission from ref. 248, copyright 2015 Nature Publishing Group. (b–e) Three-dimensional structure of a full αS fibril. (b) A central monomer from residues 44 to 96 looking down the fibril axis showing the Greek-key motif of the fibril core. (c) Stacked monomers showing the sidechain alignment between each monomer down the fibril axis. (d) Residues 25 to 105 of 8 monomers displaying the β-sheet alignment of each monomer in the fibril and the Greek-key topology of the core. (e) Overlaid ten lowest energy structures, showing sidechain positions within the core. Residues 51–57 are indicated in red with side chains removed.²⁴⁹ Reproduced with permission from ref. 249, copyright 2016 Nature Publishing Group.

- The HAM model predicts the occurrence of periodicity for protofilaments and fibrils, which assume twisted morphologies. Such periodicity is driven by a balance between mechanical forces dominated by the protofilament elasticity and electrostatic forces due to the distribution of hydrophobic regions and charge along the protofilament backbone,²⁵³ as well as by the inherent chirality of constituting amino acids and β-sheets/helices of the fibrils. The average heights of αS protofilaments and fibrils were 3.8 nm and 6.5 nm, respectively,
- while the periodicity of αS fibrils ranged from 100–150 nm as determined by AFM (Fig. 14a).²⁵³ These parameters are consistent with immunoelectron microscopy of filaments extracted

from the brains of patients with DLB and multiple system 45 atrophy,²⁶² and agree with high-resolution cryoelectron microscopy where twisted protofilament of ~2 × 3.5 nm in boundaries and 120 ± 10 nm in periodicity were observed leading to the proposal of a folded α S fibril model (Fig. 14b).²⁴¹ The crosssection of individual α S monomers in the fold was trapezoid instead of circular, resulting in a two-fold increase in moment of inertia (Sweers 2012).²⁶³ Though not substantiated, such non-circular packing of monomers could also hold true for other β -sheet folded proteins.^{261,263} In addition, curly α S fibrils prepared by filtration-like steps during aggregation possessed a persistence length of 170 nm, while straight α S fibrils from



Fig. 14 (a) AFM image showing a periodicity of 100–150 nm along an α S protofibril. The peak (red arrow) to trough (blue arrow) differs by \sim 1 nm in height. (inset) A section of a protofilament with an average height of 3.8 nm.²⁵³ Reproduced with permission from ref. 253, copyright 2003 Elsevier. (b) 15 Proposed fold of an aS fibril. A monomeric aS within a protofilament (center). Incorporation of protofilaments into a straight or twisted fibril is illustrated in the left and right panel, respectively.²⁴¹ Reproduced with permission from ref. 241, copyright 2008 National Academy of Sciences.

unperturbed aggregation displayed persistence lengths of up to 140 um.²⁶⁴

4.4 Alpha-synuclein toxicity and Parkinson's

25

50

20

4.4.1 Oligomers vs. amyloids. Natively unfolded aS undergoes a transition to partially folded intermediates prior to fibril formation.²⁶⁵ Such partially folded conformations are favored by mutations²⁶⁶ or changes in pH, ionic strength and temperature and are thought to be critical intermediates in the transition to amyloid fibrils.²⁵³ Clearly, such dynamic transition has an important bearing on αS toxicity, as evidenced by a body of literature focused on 30 the complex roles of αS oligomers and amyloids.

The aggregation of αS follows a nucleation polymerization pathway involving prefibrillar species of remarkable conformational plasticity,²⁶⁷ both transient and stable. Specifically, it is postulated that as aggregation takes place in the cytoplasma or 35 in association with the cellular membrane. In the cytosol, soluble monomers interact to form unstable dimers, which develop into oligomers and, subsequently, fibrils.²⁶⁸ The current understanding concerning aS toxicity follows the narrative of the "toxic oligomer hypothesis",²⁵¹ in that the oligomeric species are more toxic than the fibrillar form, 251, 269-272 as 40similarly proposed for $A\beta^{273-279}$ and IAPP.²⁸⁰ However, due to

the different structural characteristics and aggregation rates, different cellular environments, as well as prion-like cell to cell spreading and crosstalk of proteins of different origins and pathologies, this generalization remains putative.^{281,282} 45

In an early in vitro study, Conway et al. compared the rates of disappearance of monomeric αS and appearance of fibrillar αS for wide-type and two mutant proteins A53T and A30P.²⁵¹ The differences between the trends suggested the occurrence of nonfibrillar as oligomers. Using sedimentation and gel filtration chromatography, the researchers identified spheres (range

- of heights: 2-6 nm), chains of spheres (protofibrils), and rings/ annulars (heights: ~ 4 nm) from fibrils (~ 8 nm in diameter) by AFM. For a comprehensive account of aS oligomers and their in vitro preparation protocols, readers may refer to a recent 55
 - review by van Diggelen et al.283

Using attenuated total reflection-Fourier-transform infrared (ATR-FTIR) spectroscopy Celej *et al.* revealed that isolated αS oligomers adopted an antiparallel β-sheet structure, whereas fibrils assumed a parallel arrangement.²⁸⁴ Notably, antiparallel β -sheet structures have also been reported for the oligomeric structures of A β , β_2 -microglobulin and human prion peptide PrP82–146.²⁸⁴ Such contrasting features in secondary structure between the oligomers 25 and fibrils entail differences in conformational change, affinity and mode of interaction when binding with the cell membrane, further compounded by the differences in aspect ratio and surface hydrophobicity between the two species. The toxicities of αS oligomers and amyloid protein oligomers in general have been postulated as 30 an inherent property.²⁸⁵ Unlike amyloid fibrils, the oligomers share similar structural properties^{273,286} and possess higher portions of random coils and helical structures. Consequently, the exposed hydrophobic surfaces of the oligomers could mediate interactions with intracellular proteins to trigger aberrant cellular pathways.

Celej et al. found that purified as oligomers spheroidal and polydisperse (10-60 nm), while αS fibrils were unbranched of 6-10 nm in diameter and micrometers long when examined under electron microscopy.287 These isolated oligomers were onpathway intermediates sharing the same structural motif with other prefibrillar oligomers and possessing no canonical cross-ß fibril structure.²⁸⁴ Curiously, the α S oligomers were recognized by A11 antibody, which also targeted the oligomeric but not monomeric or fibrillar forms of A β , prions, and IAPP.^{273,288}

While it remains debatable whether as oligomers are intermediates in the process of amyloid formation, or precursors to fibrils, or byproducts of fibril elongation, or associated with a pathway of aggregation different from the standard amyloid fibrillization,²⁶⁹ there is little ambiguity that αS oligomers are toxic, as validated by *in vitro* and animal models.^{272,273,289,290}

4.4.2 Alpha-synuclein-membrane interactions. Towards understanding the origin of amyloid protein toxicity, much research over the past two decades has been focused on the interactions of the proteins as well as their aggregation products with cell membranes, model lipid vesicles, or lipid rafts. This focus is especially justified for as considering its 35

40

45

15

20

- strong functional association with synaptic vesicles and its cell-to-cell spreading.²⁹¹ From a biophysical standpoint such interactions may be understood as a manifestation of the structural attributes of αS (sequence, charge and hydrophobicity), as well as the changing properties of αS from soluble and disordered monomers to soluble and less random oligomers, and to waxy and highly ordered fibrils and plaques.
- Research concerning protein-membrane interaction should take into consideration of two convoluting aspects: protein aggregation modulated by a model lipid bilayer or cell membrane, and membrane integrity perturbed by protein aggregation. Numerous studies have confirmed that lipid membranes can speed up the process of protein fibrillization due to the amphiphilicity of both interactants.^{292,293} Specifically, the N-terminal region of αS, contain-
- 15 ing 7 amphiphilic imperfect repeats each of 11-residues, can initiate electrostatic interaction with anionic lipid head groups. The NAC region of the protein can establish hydrophobic interaction with lipid fatty acyl tails to promote membrane partitioning.²⁹⁴ Upon membrane exposure, the protein concentration at the membrane
- 20 surface is abruptly increased due to the 3D to 2D transition. Consequently, protein conformational entropy is reduced to favor aggregation.^{294,295} Specifically, the rate of αS primary nucleation was enhanced by three orders of magnitude when exposed to small unilamellar vesicles (SUVs, 20–100 nm in diameter) of 1,2dimyristoyl-*sn*-glycerol-3-phospho-L-serine (DMPS).²⁹⁶

Upon adsorption onto lipid membranes, monomeric amyloid proteins adopt an α helical state, followed by a conversion to β -sheet rich oligomers and amyloid fibrils modulated by the curvature and charge of the membranes, presence of metal ions,

³⁰ peptide to lipid ratio, and ganglioside clusters, cholesterols and lipid rafts.²⁹⁹ α S assumes a fully extended α helical state coming into contact with larger vesicles, likely representative of the protein conformation *in vivo*.^{300,301} In contrast, smaller vesicles

1

5

10

15

20

25

with greater curvatures and smaller surface areas are associated with proteins in bent α helices or antiparallel helix-turn-helix conformation to maximize protein–membrane binding.²⁹³

A high peptide/lipid ratio favors protein crowding on the membrane surface to induce nucleation.³⁰² Binding of α S (isoelectric point of 4.74)³⁰³ with membranes is elevated with increased acidic phospholipid content.³⁰⁴⁻³⁰⁶ α S oligomers also show propensity for the liquid disordered phase of anionic vesicles.³⁰⁷ The exact mechanism of α S association with lipid rafts is unclear, but is linked to the high lipid packing density of anionic head groups in the rafts. Such specific binding between α S and lipid rafts may be essential to both the normal cellular function of α S and its role in PD pathology.²⁹⁹

Elevated levels of metal ions have been found in the substantia nigra of PD patients.³⁰⁸ Addition of metal cations of Cu²⁺, Fe³⁺ or Co3+ induced secondary structure in as and accelerated protein aggregation in vitro,²⁶⁵ through metal ion-mediated amyloid proteinmembrane interaction. Although Ca^{2+} (of ~ 300 µM) in the ER serves to facilitate protein folding, addition of Ca²⁺ and other heavy metal ions to monomeric as rapidly produced annular oligomers,³⁰⁹ while divalent metal ions also enabled the clustering of αS on the surfaces of anionic 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phospho(1'-rac-glycerol)/ phosphatidylcholine bilayers.³⁰⁶ It is possible that metal cations enabled the interaction of the likely charged C-terminus of aS and membranes through charge neutralization. Such strong metalhosting capacity of amyloid proteins has been utilized in entirely different contexts from amyloidogenesis, such as purification of wastewater and in vitro iron fortification using functional βlactolglobulin amyloids.310-312

The adsorption of α S has been shown to compromise 30 membrane permeability.²⁸² One mechanism proposed for such perturbation is pore formation by the protein oligomers (Fig. 15a-c).^{271,284,293,297} In combination with biochemical



Fig. 15 Proposed mechanisms of membrane damage induced by α S aggregation. (a) Projection averages of annular oligomers formed by α S mutants A53T and A30P.²⁷¹ Reproduced with permission from ref. 271, copyright 2002 Nature Publishing Group. (b) α S oligomer spans the membrane in a porinlike fashion to induce toxicity.²⁸⁴ Reproduced with permission from ref. 284, copyright 2012 Portland Press. (c) Oligomers but not monomers or fibrils induced frequent channel formation in planar lipid bilayers formed from diphytanoylphosphatidylcholine dissolved in *n*-decane in 1 M KCl, at a bias of +100 mV.²⁹⁷ Reproduced with permission from ref. 297, copyright 2009 American Chemical Society. (d) (top panel) Monomeric α S adsorbed to a lipid bilayer. (middle panel) Aggregation of α S monomers causes membrane thinning and lipid extraction. (lower panel) Further incubation results in assembly

of mature α S fibrils and disassembly of the lipid membrane.²⁹⁸ Reproduced with permission from ref. 298, copyright 2011 American Chemical Society.

55

- 1 and ultrastructural analysis, Tsigelny *et al.* revealed through MD simulations and docking that αS monomers, upon adsorption onto lipid membranes through their N-termini, assembled into homodimers of both propagating (head to head) and non-
- 5 propagating (head to tail) conformations. The propagating form docked on the membrane surface to recruit additional α S molecules, rendering pentamers and hexamers to form ringlike structures partitioning in the membrane.³¹³ Consistently, addition of stable α S oligomers has been shown to induce ion-
- 10 channel activity (Fig. 15c),²⁹⁷ while Ca²⁺ and dopamine exhibited much higher leakage rates than polymers of cytochrome *c* and fluorescein isothiocyanate–dextran from anionic vesicles in the presence of oligomeric A30P and A53T, two major α S mutations.³¹⁴ Under conditions in which vesicular membranes

¹⁵ were less stable due to the lack of counter-ion Ca²⁺, α S permeation was less size selective and monomeric α S permeated *via* a detergent-like mechanism.²⁹³

Another mechanism proposed for α S-membrane interaction is illustrated in Fig. 15d.²⁹⁸ Here the presence of a supported lipid bilayer facilitates the conversion of α S from randomly structured monomers to alpha helices (top panel), which further aggregate into oligomers and fibrils while stripping lipids off the bilayer (middle and lower panels). Membrane thinning and depolarization, changing fluidity, lipid flip–flop,

- 25 calcium leakage, and disruption of ionic homeostasis are plausible consequences of α S membrane adsorption, α S selfassembly, and α S assembly with membrane lipids, through hydrophobic and electrostatic interactions as well as lipid micellar encasing of the protein species (*i.e.*, the carpet model³¹⁵).
- 30 This mechanism is supported by experimental studies employing giant vesicles as well as reporters of ThT, calcein, Ca²⁺ and fluorescence recovery after photobleaching,^{316–319} to name a few.

In close connection with αS toxicity and αS-membrane interaction, a body of literature has revealed links between αS
 oligomers and mitochondrial dysfunction, cytoskeleton deformation, enhanced ROS production, neuroinflammation, ER stress, as well as impaired protein degradation systems.³²⁰⁻³²⁸ An analysis of wide-type αS and two mutational variants A30P and E46K interacting with synaptic-like SUVs suggested a
 mechanism by which a single αS binds to two different synaptic vesicles *via* the NAC to promote their assembly and vesicle clustering.³²⁹ In addition, promotion of SNARE-complex formation has been found to be associated with αS assembly into high-order multimers upon their binding with plasma mem-

45

50

branes, suggesting that αS may act as a SNARE chaperone at the presynaptic terminal against neurodegeneration. 240

4.4.3 Parkinson's disease, mitigation strategies and theranostics. Synucleinopathies refer to a family of neurodegenerative diseases including PD, PDD and DLB, where inclusions of Lewy bodies and neurites are located within the neuronal cells (Fig. 11a). Multiple system atrophy (MSA) is a special type of synucleinopathy, since α S-positive inclusions are found in oligodendroglia instead of in neurons. In these diseases, α S pathology in the *substantia nigra* is closely correlated with motor symptoms and death of SN dopaminergic neurons stimulates the striatum.²⁸² The PD pathology

55 nergic neurons stimulates the striatum.²⁸² The PD pathology involves progressive neuronal accumulation of aggregated α S, and

Chem Soc Rev

1

5

10

15

20

25

formation of Lewy bodies affects various functional structures throughout the human nervous system to compromise movement.³³⁰

Exogenous as fibrils seeded Lewy body- and Lewy neurite-like inclusions in cell culture models, and direct neuron to neuron aS transmission throughout the brain propagated PD-like pathology.^{291,331,332} Failure of the protein quality control systems, especially lysosomes, promoted accumulation of transmitted αS and inclusion formation. Cells exposed to neuron-derived as displayed signs of apoptosis, such as nuclear fragmentation and caspase 3 activation, both *in vitro* and *in vivo*.²⁹¹ Inoculation of α S fibrils into wide-type non-transgenic mice seeded aggregation of endogenous mouse αS and reproduced key features of the neurodegenerative cascade.²⁴⁹ A molecular level understanding of the pathological spreading of αS in PD is lacking, but growing evidence suggests its origin lies in protein self-assembly through templated seeding, where the imported as aggregates catalyze the conversion of local soluble protein molecules into their aggregated forms. A recent study has revealed regulation of motor deficits and neuroinflammation by intestinal microbiota in a PD model,²³⁹ suggesting a role for microbial signals in PD.³³³ Multiplication of the protein aggregates by recruiting additional os en route has been proposed as an additional mechanism to templated seeding, to ensure sustainable concentration of the aggregates spreading from cell to cell.³³² However, multiplication of αS at neutral pH has not been observed, pointing to the involvement of other cellular processes in enabling the prion-like αS spreading.

The ambiguities concerning the natural state, toxicity and aggregation pathway of α S have hindered the development of mitigation and theranostics against PD. The current approaches, still very much in the incubation stage, aim at exploiting the structural, functional and toxicological properties of α S, or the self-assembly of the protein and its structural and pathological characteristics for therapeutic efficacy.²⁶⁸

Stabilization of the native αS structure from misfolding is a logical strategy. This intervention may also help resolve the controversy concerning a tetrameric initial state of $\alpha S.^{334}$ One promising approach to slow down αS synucleinopathies is to limit the role of extracellular αS in disease progression, from interfering with αS secretion to neuronal uptake. Removal of αS from the extracellular space to minimize inflammations may be achieved with immunotherapy, as immunization with human aS suppressed protein aggregation and decreased neurodegeneration in transgenic mice overexpressing the protein.335-337 The use of small molecules and mutation is another feasible approach for stabilizing oligomeric species and ameliorating toxicity. The antioxidation and anti-inflammatory properties of the small molecules - often polyphenols or their structural derivatives with the capacity of interfering with protein aggregation through competing H-bonding, hydrophobic interaction and π -stacking with the protein – may counteract the toxicity elicited by the oligomeric species.³³⁸⁻³⁴⁰ The presence of small molecules and other aggregation antagonists may also reduce accessibility to the oligomers by environmental chaperones, ligands and molecular organizations, thereby driving the aggregation off pathway to halt αS pathology.

30

35

40

45

50

10

35

5. Prions and prion diseases 1

Transmissible spongiform encephalopathies (TSEs), also known as prion diseases, are a family of rare fatal neurodegenerative disorders associated with prion protein (PrP), and arise in several mammalian species by sporadic, inherited, or infectious means. Kuru, Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (CJD), Gerstmann-Straussler-Scheinker (GSS), fatal familial insomnia (FFI) and fatal sporadic insomnia (FSI) are PrP-related human disorders,341 whereas scrapie, bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) and chronic wasting disease (CWD) are known sheep,³⁴² cattle³⁴³ and cevids³⁴⁴ prion

diseases. The main characteristic symptoms of TSEs are brain vacuolation, astrogliosis and neuronal apoptosis,345,346 which are associated with accumulation of extracellular PrP amyloid deposits in the CNS.³⁴⁷⁻³⁵⁰ Despite shared sequence between cellular non-15 pathological PrP (PrP^C) and misfolded PrP (PrP^{Sc}),³⁵¹ pathological PrP^{sc} aggregates are proteinase K resistant³⁵² and have a β -enriched secondary structure. 353-355

The most distinct feature of TSEs, unique among diseases related to protein misfolding, is the infectivity of the patho-20 genic agent. Procedures that hydrolyze or modify proteins reduce scrapie infectivity, whereas procedures that alter nucleic acids have no effect.356-359 The "protein-only hypothesis" has now been widely accepted,³⁶⁰⁻³⁶³ contending that a protein structure can be replicated without the use of nucleic acids 25 and the infectious pathogen is the misfolded PrP^{Sc}.^{356,357,360–365} In addition, prion diseases progress in host without any sign of immune responses to a "foreign infectious agent".³⁴¹ When the protein requirement for infectivity was established, prions were defined as proteinaceous infectious particles that resisted 30 inactivation by procedures that modified nucleic acids.³⁴¹

Since prion pathology and infectivity³⁶⁶ are closely related to a protein existing in two different conformations, much research in the last decade has been dedicated to understanding the structures of native PrP^{C 367} and pathological Prp^{Sc}.³⁶⁸ PrP^{Sc} is believed to act as a structural template, inducing conversion of other PrP^C molecules into the pathological form.³⁴¹ Understanding PrP conformational structures is therefore essential for describing protein misfolding and the specific role of PrP in prion pathology.

5.1 Function of PrP

PrP is encoded by gene (PRNP) found in chromosome 20 (in human)³⁶⁹ and expressed in many tissues, including the brain, circulating lymphocytes, heart, kidney, skin, digestive tract, endothelia, mammary gland and muscle. The physiological role of native PrP^C remains unclear.³⁷⁰ It has been shown that the protein is involved in several cellular processes including neuroprotection against excitotoxicity and serum starvation,371 proliferation and cell-cell adhesion,^{370,372} formation of synapses³⁷³ and ligand binding.^{374,375} PrP can protect cells against heavy metal overloading and subsequent oxidative stress by binding divalent ions of copper, zinc, manganese and nickel.³⁷⁵ Due to the ability of PrP to modulate cell proliferation and apoptosis it is believed to play a role on cancer development.376 Indeed, increased PrPC level has been found in gastric cancer,377 colorectal cancer378 and skin cancer.379

A common approach to study the function of PrP is using PrP 20 knockout transgenic mice ($Prnp^{-/-}$). The major finding in $Prnp^{-/-}$ mice was the lack of developmental differences and resistance to prion diseases.³⁸⁰ However, $Prnp^{-/-}$ mice have shown cognitive abnormalities³⁷⁰ such as depressive-like behavior, anxiety-related disorders and alterations in circadian activity.381 In addition, 25 decreased spatial learning of Prnp^{-/-} mice has been noticed.³⁸² Using three Prnp knockout mice lines Firestein and colleagues found that PrP^C was important in the normal processing of sensory information by the olfactory system.³⁸³

5.2 Atomic structures of prions and prion amyloids

The atomic structures of full-length and truncated PrP^C were mostly solved by NMR.³⁸⁴⁻³⁸⁸ Notably, X-ray crystallography studies were restricted to the C-terminal domain of PrP, suggesting an intrinsic tendency of the protein to avoid crystallization.389,390

Proto-protein of human PrP (huPrP) is 253 residues long (Fig. 16a). After translation to mature form, the first 22 residues





15

10

1

5

30

- 1 are removed and the last 23 residues are cleaved off prior to the addition of a glycosyl phosphatidylinositol (GPI) anchor to Ser230. PrP is attached to the outer surface of the cellular membrane by a GPI anchor within the raft domains. The
- 5 sequence of PrP is highly conserved amongst mammals:^{391,392} human PrP shares 99.2%, 94.9% and 92.8% of identical sequences with the proteins from chimpanzee, sheep and cow, respectively.

PrP^C has two regions with distinct structural and dynamical
 properties.³⁶⁷ In mammals, depending on the organism, the N-terminus contains a variable number of amino-terminal octa-peptide repeats with sequence PHGGGWGQ. Each octarepeat is able to generate a divalent metals-binding domain *via* nitrogen atoms in the histidine imidazole side-chains.³⁹³ The N-

- 15 terminus is up to residue 120 and this region has been shown to constitute a pH-dependent folding: at pH 4.5 it is flexibly disordered,³⁹⁴ however at pH 6.2 residues 61–84 of the octarepeats adopt a loop and a β -turn like conformation.³⁸⁶ In contrast, the C-terminus of PrP^C is structured, containing three
- 20 α -helices (H1, H2 and H3) and a short, two-stranded, antiparallel β -sheet (S1, S2)³⁶⁷ (Fig. 16b). A disulphide bridge is between Cys179 and Cys214, which anchors H2 and H3 helices. This disulphide bridge is one of the major determinants of the tertiary structure of PrP. FTIR study of PrP secondary structure 25 revealed 42% of α -helices, 3% of β -sheets, 32% of turns and
 - 23% of coils, respectively.³⁹⁵

The physicochemical properties of PrP^{Sc} and PrP^{C} greatly differ. Spectroscopic measurements indicated that PrP^{Sc} contains about 34–43% of β -sheet structure,^{395,396} significantly higher than

- that of PrP^C.³⁹⁵ X-ray fiber diffraction of infectious prions revealed the presence of cross-β diffraction patterns. Meridional diffraction at 4.8 Å specified the presence of β-strands, characteristic of a stacked-sheet amyloid structure. Thus, β-enriched structure of PrP^{Sc} results from misfolding and self-assembly of protein PrP^C into
 proteinase K-resistant amyloid-like aggregates. However, the high-resolution structures of infectious prions are not yet solved, as conventional structural methods have been hindered by the large
- and insoluble aggregates of PrP.
 Several structural models of PrP^{Sc} self-assembly have been
 proposed based on information derived from biophysical techniques. Parallel left-handed β-helical structure is the model proposed by Cohen and colleagues and based on electron microscopy analysis of 2D crystals³⁶⁸ (Fig. 17a). The authors constructed a trimeric model of PrP 27–30 from a study of 119
- 45 all- β folds globular proteins. PrP 27–30 is a protease-resistant 27–30 kDa core of PrP^{sc} (Fig. 16), and it retains prion infectivity.^{353,397} According to the β -helical model the Nterminal residues of PrP 27–30 form left-handed β -helices that are horizontally stacked, whereas the C-terminus maintains α -
- 50 helical secondary structure as in native PrP^{C} . Larger aggregates are formed by vertically stacking of PrP trimers along the β helical axis (Fig. 17a).

Based on MD simulations of PrP 27–30 conformational fluctuations under amyloidogenic conditions, DeMarco and
 Daggett proposed the β-spiral model³⁹⁸ (Fig. 17b). Similarly to

the $\beta\text{-helical}$ model the C-terminal $\alpha\text{-helical}$ characteristics of

 PrP^{C} remain unchanged and natively unfolded N-terminus adopt a β -structure. The core structure is comprised of three short β -strands spanning 116–119, 129–132 and 160–164 residues.

Surewicz and colleagues proposed the in-register β -sheet model of PrP^{Sc} using site-directed spin labelling and EPR spectroscopy³⁹⁹ (Fig. 17c). In contrast to the other models, they observed that the refolding of PrP^C involved major refolding of the C-terminal α -helical region. According to this model PrP^{Sc} structure possesses no α -helices, consisting mainly of single molecules stacked on top of one another with parallel, inregister β -strands. Using MD simulations, Caughey and colleagues suggested that linear PrP^{Sc} fibrils possessed a parallel inregister β -sheet structure⁴⁰⁰ (Fig. 18e).

In addition, a number of structures have been proposed for mammalian⁴⁰¹ and fungal⁴⁰² prion protein segments. It is difficult to determine which of the proposed models is the closest to the PrP^{sc} structure, as they were established based on low-resolution experimental data. The diversity of the models could originate from the specimens used. For example, Wille and colleagues compared natural brain-delivered PrP^{Sc} and synthetic bacteria-expressed recombinant PrP (with the same sequence) amyloid structure and found substantial differences in structure, heterogeneity and infectivity.⁴⁰³ In addition, the existence of PrP tertiary structural diversity and prion strains have been experimentally proven,404-408 including the formation of new strains during the passage of prions through animals with different PrP sequences.409,410 For instance, multiple scrapie prion strains were isolated with different incubation times and neuropathology.⁴¹¹ However, these prion strains were encoded by the same PrP primary structure and were propagated in mice with the same PrP gene. Despite this, limited proteolysis generated different PrP^{Sc} fragments, suggesting that these prion strains possessed different conformations.352

5.3 Mesoscopic structures of prions

The morphology of prions has been examined with TEM^{412–414} and AFM.⁴¹⁴ Usually PrP^{Sc} isolated from brain appears as large amorphous highly insoluble aggregates (Fig. 18a). Individual prion fibrils, termed prion rods (Fig. 18b), are not always visible probably because of heavy surface glycosylation⁴¹⁵ (Fig. 18c). Each PrP monomer has up to two large sugar moieties linked to the N-terminus to obscure the fibril core. Deficiencies in glucans and GPI archorless PrP have been found suitable for analyzing the structural features of prion protofilaments (Fig. 18d), while neither glycosylation^{416,417} nor the GPI anchor^{348,418} is required for the infectivity of PrP^{Sc}.

Majority of PrP fibrils, either wild-type, anchorless, or of different strains, possess a twisted morphology. Prion fibrils can be either left-handed or right-handed,⁴¹⁴ consisting of two or more protofilaments.⁴¹² However, some fibrils also contain straight, parallel protofilaments.⁴¹⁴ In addition, fibrils occasionally resemble celery stalks or half-pipes⁴¹⁴ (Fig. 18c). In a recent study the gap previously thought to be the spacing between two protofilaments of celery stalk fibrils was assigned

15

20

10

1

5

25

30

35

45

40



Fig. 17 Structural models for the PrP^{3c} aggregates: (a) in the β-helical model the N-terminal region (90–177 residues, light green) of PrP 27–30 refolds into a β-helix motif and the C-terminal region (residues 178–230, dark green) maintains α-helical secondary structure as in native PrP^C. ³⁶⁸ Reproduced with permission from ref. 368, copyright 2004 National Academy of Sciences. (b) The β-spiral model consists of a spiralling core of extended sheets consisting of short β-strands, comprising residues 116–119, 129–132 and 160–164. The three α-helices in C-terminus maintain this conformational motif. ³⁹⁸ Reproduced with permission from ref. 398, copyright 2004 National Academy of Sciences. (c) The parallel in-register extended β-sheet model of PrP^{Sc}, where PrP^C refolds into a structure consisting mainly of β-sheets. ³⁹⁹ Reproduced with permission from ref. 399, copyright 2007 National Academy of Sciences.

45

50



Fig. 18 Electron microscopy of prion fibrils. (a) Aggregates of wild-type 22L scrapie prion aggregates.⁴¹⁴ Reproduced with permission from ref. 414, copyright 2009 Elsevier. (b) Prion rods of PrP 27–30.³⁴¹ Reproduced with permission from ref. 341, copyright 1998 National Academy of Sciences. (c) Wild type RML scrapie prion structure obscured by non-fibrillar material, while (d) anchorless RML fibril morphology was much cleaner.⁴¹⁴ Reproduced with permission from ref. 414, copyright 2009 Elsevier. (e) Celery stalk-like brain-derived GPI-anchorless 22L fibril⁴¹⁴ and proposed parallel in-register β-sheet model of PrP (90–231) octametric segment.⁴⁰⁰ Reproduced with permission from ref. 414, copyright 2009 Elsevier. Reproduced with permission from ref. 400, copyright 2014 American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. Scale bars: 100 nm.

1 to represent the trough between the major hairpins. Accordingly, an in-register β -sheet PrP amyloid model was proposed.⁴⁰⁰ The periodicity of PrP fibrils, on the other hand, ranged between 40 nm to 133 nm^{412,414,419} while the width of 5 each PrP protofilament varied from 3.1 ± 0.7 nm⁴¹⁴ to 6.9 nm.³⁶⁸

5.4 Transmission of prions

- Epidemiological transmission of PrP diseases is *via* the exposure of PrP^C to PrP^{Sc}. However, point mutations in the *PRNP* gene at K200E, D178N, L102P and V117A codons were observed in families initially diagnosed with vCJD and GSS.⁴²⁰⁻⁴²² Linear transmission in human has an early history in the fore people of Papua New Guinea who suffered from Kuru: a human variant
- 15 of PrP disease with clinical symptoms of ataxia, shivering and death within year of manifestation. Although the endemic is ceased by terminating the ritual cannibalism in 1950s, Kuru is waning gradually due to long sub-clinical incubation period *i.e.* > 50 years.⁴²³ In modern days, the inter-human transmission is
- 20 via blood transfusions as person infected with vCJD carry PrP^{Sc} load in all blood components with transmission efficiency of WBCs > platelets > RBCs > plasma and shed PrP^{Sc} in saliva, urine and other bodily fluids.^{424,425} Less common ways of transmission in humans are surgical instruments and human derived growth hormones.⁴²⁶

The clinical symptoms of PrP diseases originate from pathological changes in CNS such as vacuolization, astrogilosis and neuronal apoptosis. However, once prion replication in CNS reaches its peak, the PrP^{Sc} is disseminated centrifugally to the 30 peripheral secretory organs and lymphoid tissues. PrPSc excretes are detected in blood, urine, saliva, milk and bonemeat meal (MBM) of infected animal even at sub-clinical stage. The titre from urine and saliva of CWD infected cervid was able to reproduce infectivity in naïve cervid and transgenic mice models.⁴²⁷⁻⁴²⁹ Salivary expression can contaminate drinking 35 water and pose a risk of transmission to human and other animals.430 Scrapie infected sheep shed PrPSc in all components of colostrum and milk *i.e.* cells, cream and casein/whey proteins, which carried infectivity to lambs and dairy

- 40 products.^{431,432} The titre of infectivity per mL of milk was equivalent to 6 μg of brain homogenate from terminally scrapie-infected sheep.⁴³³ Bone and meat materials, either decaying in the soil or processed into MBM for cattle feeds, had PrP^{Sc} attached to its particles. PrP^{Sc} attached to MBM or soil particles had higher transmission efficiency.⁴³⁴ Infectivity was retained and transmissible to animals even after processor.
- was retained and transmissible to animals even after processing of MBM for biodiesel productions.⁴³⁵ Once attached to the soil particles, PrP^{Sc} not detachable *via* surfactants and soil could retain infectivity up to 19 years.^{436–438} However,
 hyperthermophilic bacteria were able to digest the PrP^{Sc} parti-

cles from soil by secreting keratins and β-sheets proteases.⁴³⁹ Rasmussen *et al.* first showed that hamster PrP^{Sc} were able to bind with wheat grass roots, from soil and brain homogenate, but neither absorbed in roots nor detected in areal parts of the plants.⁴⁴⁰ Pritzkow *et al.* used protein misfolded cyclic amplification (PMCA) as a more sensitive detection method 1

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

55

and transmitted hamster 263K PrP^{Sc} to wheat grass roots *via* infected brain homogenate, excreta, contaminated soils and direct spray of PrP on areal parts.⁴⁴¹ The 263K PrP^{Sc} were able to adsorb from the sources to the roots and travelled in the areal parts, which were further able to reproduce the infectivity in naïve hamster. Apart from the extraneous PrP^{Sc} in plants, a protein named luminidependens from *Arabidopsis thaliana* was transformed and propagated like PrP when injected in yeast cells.⁴⁴²

5.5 Conversion and replication of prions

The molecular interaction between PrP^{Sc} and PrP^C is based on self-assembly driven by hydrogen bonding and π -stacking of the tyrosine residues. Two initial models described the mechanism of PrP replication.⁴⁴³ The "template directed" model described PrP^{Sc} as the more stable but thermodynamically inaccessible form of PrP^C. In contrast, the "seeded nucleation" model described the contact of small oligomers of PrP^{Sc} with PrP^C: the seeds of PrP^{Sc} recruit PrP^C into conformationally changed form, and the growing fibril is broken down into various small seeds acting as nuclei for further recruitment. The PrPSc monomers are less stable but become stabilized when joined in the seeded oligomer form.444,445 The seeded nucleation model was supported by later experiments where small amounts of preformed PrPSc oligomers converted large quantities of PrP^C as in PMCA, where seeds shredding was induced by sonication and the conversion process was amplified.446 Makarava et al. refined the conversion phenomenon by studying the conformation switch (R and S) within single, mousehamster cross-seeded PrP amyloids and introduced the concepts of catalytic versus templated conversion and amyloid flexibility.447 Hamster PrP (S conformation), when incubated with mouse PrP monomers, catalyzed the conversion by accelerating the fibrillation rate and shortening the lag phase, but the newly formed daughter fibrils retained R conformation only. In contrast, when hamster PrP seeds were introduced to hamster PrP monomers, it accelerated fibrillation and templated the same S conformation in daughter fibrils. Molecular events occurring in template-directed PrP conversion started from π - π interaction of PrP^C and PrP^{Sc} in 6 different binding and conversion domains (BCD) of PrP. In the absence of PrP^{Sc}, when human and hamster PrP^C BCD were probed with monoclonal antibody (mAb), it resulted in structural denaturation of PrP^{C} , regional loss of tertiary structure, dissociation of β -sheets, and exposure of bityrosine regions (YYR) at α_1 and α_2 helices. The exposure of YYR regions was confirmed with binding of anti-YYR mAb in these lose regions.⁴⁴⁸ In contrast to mAb, PrP^{Sc} binding induced melting and exposure of YYR regions from β_2 - $\alpha_2,\,\alpha_2\text{--}\alpha_3$ and α_1 regions. $^{448-450}$ The exposed YYR could be the site of further PrP^C attachment and connected the oligomer and monomer.450 The loose structure induced by mAb was not able to acquire any conformation or secondary structure from mAb. However, when PrP^{Sc} oligomers induced this structural loosening, it acquired β-sheets from oligomer's hydrogen bonded backbone and stabilized the whole fibril column.447

1 5.6 Co-factors in prion assembly

Co-factors, initially recognized as "Protein X" by Prusiner, stabilize the PrP^C-PrP^{Sc} assembly and may further facilitate the spontaneous conversion of PrP^C into protease resistant form.⁴⁵¹ Biomacromolecules of polysaccharides, sphingolipids, phospholipids, cholesterol, detergents like SDS, lipopolysaccharides from bacterial membranes, and polyanions like RNA have been found to interact with PrP^C and are co-localized with PrP^{Sc} from infected animals.⁴⁵²⁻⁴⁵⁴ The interaction with co-10 factors melted the secondary structure of PrP^C and converted it into protease resistant but non-infectious β -sheet structure, differently from the β -sheets of PrP^{Sc}, even though PrP^{Sc} and co-factors exposed YYR from the same regions of PrP^C.^{449,450}

15

5.7 Transmission barriers: sequence and conformation

A transmission barrier appears when there is no clinical neuropathology of spongiform encephalopathies upon inoculation of PrP^{Sc} from infected species A into the naïve species B. The molecular etiology for the transmission barrier is attribu-20 ted to (i) difference in the sequences of host and donor PrP, (ii) conformational misfit during assembly, and (iii) post conversion maturation in host. The exact residual regions responsible for the transmission barrier are (i) 165–175 $(\beta_2\text{-}\alpha_2)$ with switches at 170 (S/N), 174 (N/T), 169 (Y/G), (ii) 138–143 (β_1 – α_1) 25

1

5

with switches at 139 (M/I) and (iii) 129 (β_1) for M/V switch (Fig. 19).⁴⁵⁵⁻⁴⁵⁸ Sheep's scrapie and cattle's BSE are intertransmissible with clinical symptoms as both are 170S homozygous. However, transmission between mice (170S) and hamster (170N) does not produce clinical disease.^{459,460} Sigurdson et al. demonstrated the 170 S/N and 174 N/T switches at the molecular level.458 Inoculation of deer scrapie PrPSc (170N, 174N) into wild type tg20 mice (170S, 174N) didn't express clinical symptoms at first passage but inoculation in rigid loop tg1020 mice (S170N, N174T) produced terminal symptoms in 10 74 days. Furthermore, hamster PrP^{sc} (170N, 174T) accelerated clinical disease in tg1020 mice (S170N, N174T) but not in tg20 mice (170S, 174N). In contrast, cattle and sheep PrP^{Sc} (170S, 174N) produced disease in tg20 mice (170S, 174N) but not in tg1020 mice (S170N, N174T).⁴⁵⁸ Similarly, 139I in humans and 15 mice PrP^{Sc} induced parallel β -sheet stacking and R conformation in fibril while 139M in hamster induced anti-parallel β sheet stacking and *S* conformation.^{447,456} The region 138–143 has been demonstrated as a steric zipper in stabilizing PrP^{Sc} fibril by hydrogen bonding between inter-monomeric β -sheets. 20 Incompatibility at the steric zipper also erects a cross-species barrier.⁴⁶¹ The tyrosine residue at 169 is responsible for initial π - π interaction between PrP^{Sc} oligomers and host PrP^C monomers and is conserved in all mammalian PrP. Eliminating tyrosine or replacing it with glycine completely blocked PrP^{Sc} 25



Fig. 19 Amino acid sequence and 3D structural comparison of β-sheet stacking from steric zones of PrP^{Sc} in different mammalian species. Superimposition of mouse (grey) and hamster (blue) PrPSc with 165-172 backbone fold (a). Amino acid sequence from 170-175 backbone region 50 (b).⁴⁶³ Reproduced with permission from ref. 463, copyright 1999 American Chemical Society. Cyan highlights human while orange highlights elk specific residues. Stick representation of steric zipper interfacing β-sheet back bone region for human (c) and both alignments of elk (d and e). X-ray crystallographic atomic structures from barrier determining steric zippers from human, mouse and hamster, side view for single β -sheet stacking (f, g and h) and top view of steric zipper (i, j and k).⁴⁵⁶ Reproduced with permission from ref. 456, copyright 2011 American Chemical Society. Sequence differences at molecular switches, defining the conformational and transmission barrier between different species (I).^{456,463} Reproduced with permission from ref. 456, copyright 2011 American Chemical Society. Reproduced with permission from ref. 463, copyright 1999 American Chemical Society. Grey and red indicate transmission and barrier while cyan at 139 presents molecular switch for parallel or anti-parallel sheet stacking in human, mouse and

hamster

50

Review Article

1

5

40

45

50

55

- interaction with PrP^C and halted the conversion.⁴⁵⁷ Another 1 molecular switch between human TSE and mad cow BSE is at 129 residue (M/V). vCJD infected human possessed 129M homologues with bovine 129M. However, 129V PrP peptide was still converted to the PrP^{Sc} form in vitro, but at a low
- efficiency. Hence the possibility of bovine 129M infecting 129V heterozygous human cannot be excluded.455,462

5.8 PrP evolution and conformational adaptation: sub-clinical 10 stages

Cross-species transmission of PrPSc infection produced no clinical symptoms in first passage due to dissimilar residual sequence and thus conformation as discussed above. However,

- the clinically silent phase led to the understanding of (i) long 15 sub-clinical stage, with no disease symptoms but undergoing PrP replication in brain, spleen and lymphoid tissues and (ii) concepts of PrPsc maturation, stability, selection and evolution.464,465 First passage of cattle BSE to human PrPSc
- transgenic mice produced only a 0.6% attack rate after 739 days 2.0 but a 75% attack rate after 639 days on second passage.⁴⁶⁶ The decrease in incubation time and increase in attack rate were also observed by passaging the inoculum in vitro with PCMA rounds, which led to the emergence of mutated and phenoty-
- pically distinct PrP strains.⁴⁶⁷⁻⁴⁶⁹ Kimberlin et al. inoculated 25 139A $\ensuremath{\text{PrP}^{\text{Sc}}}$ from mouse to hamster and then back to mouse resulting in 139H/M strain.470 Colby et al. infected mice with rPrP of different conformational stability and resulted in phenotypically different strains with different physical morpholo-
- 30 gies, shorter incubation time, higher attack rate and varying clinical pathologies.⁴⁷¹ It was hypothesized that the original inoculum consisted of different rPrP strains and upon infecting into the host, the strain having close conformational fit with host PrP replicated at a faster rate, induced the clinical disease
- and subsequently appeared in animal tissues.⁴⁷¹ Similarly, 35 Bruce et al. raised 22C natural PRNP^a strain in PRNP^b mice and ended up with 22H strain. However, upon passaging the recombinant and pure 22C strain, only 22C was resulted in the host indicating the presence of both 22C and 22H in natural
- 40 inoculum but 22H with shorted incubation time and close fit with host PrP was able to replicate at a faster rate.⁴⁷² Makarava et al. annealed hamster rPrPSc with normal hamster brain homogenate and inoculated in naïve hamster. On first passage, 50% attack was observed but all hamster succumbed to disease
- on second passage and clinical symptoms were different from 45 original rPrP^{Sc} which was used to prepare the inoculum.⁴⁶⁴ The explanation is that (i) original inoculum lacked the GPI anchor and failed to penetrate the cell to initiate neurotoxicity, (ii) conformational adaptation and stability were observed upon
- serial PCMA and (iii) rPrPSc-NBH failed to acquire co-factors, 50 which it acquired on subsequent passages in the host.⁴⁶⁴ Serial passages of donor PrPSc with host PrPC by PCMA in vivo or in vitro also changed the biochemical parameters like electrophoretic mobility, protease digestion and degree of glycosylation.⁴⁷³ The efficiency and properties of evolutionary adaptation was also found to be tissue dependant, i.e.,

occurring at a faster rate in spleen than brain and cell and brain adapting different strains.^{465,474}

5.9 Toxicity of prions and mitigation

Two and a half decades on, the mechanism of prion toxicity has been narrowed down to the distortion of neuronal cell membranes due to the assembly of PrPSc oligomers with GPI anchored PrP^C.^{475,476} Deletion of GPI anchored PrP^C from the membrane or expression of anchorless PrP^C in transgenic mice resulted a minimum infectivity or reversal of clinical symptoms 10 in infected mice, which implicated anchored PrP^C for neurotoxicity.348,477 However, the extracellular accumulation of PrP^{sc} continued as plaques as in terminally-ill wild-type mice.^{78,79} Apart from PrP^{Sc}, when anchorless PrP^C was exposed to lipid membrane or expressed in transgenic mice they 15 adhered to the membranes, underwent conformational changes into the protease resistant form, oligomerized locally, and caused membrane disruption and ion channel formation.⁴⁷⁸⁻⁴⁸⁰ Although PrP^C has a neuroprotective role against cellular stress, it also intervenes toxic signals to neuro-20 nal cell and initiates an apoptotic cascade when probed by PrP^{sc} , β -sheet conformers, yeast prions, $A\beta$ or other amyloid oligomers and even anti-PrP^C antibodies.⁴⁸¹⁻⁴⁸³ The mechanism is postulated as either through blocking the physiological binding domains of PrP^C or disruption of neuronal membranes 25 by PrP^C–PrP^{Sc} oligomer adducts.^{484,485} The adduct formed on the membrane can be internalized and disrupt endosomal trafficking or distort the local fluidity, structure and function of lipid bilayers like channel formation in GSS.^{476,486} In addition to adduct formation, PrP^{Sc} oligomers can independently 30 interact with membranes via their own GPI anchors, which they tend to develop during sequel passages.487 The oligomer form of PrP^{Sc} has been shown to be the toxic species, other than the monomers or amyloids.⁴⁸⁰ PrP^{Sc} oligomers possess the necessary hydrogen bonding backbone running up and own in the 35 column to induce conformational change in PrP^C and recruit the latter at the growing end.⁴⁴⁷ PrP^{Sc} oligomers corrupt PrP^C function and deliver a neurotoxic signal.476

Initial therapeutic strategies considered silencing of the PrP^C gene. Silencing was well tolerated in animals apart from minor disturbance in sleep cycle and electrophysiology of hippocampus.500 However, as the PrPC is associated with neuroprotection excitotoxicity outcomes are being predicted for silencing PrP^C in human.⁵⁰¹ RNA is physiologically found co-localized with PrPSc which triggered research for RNA as an anti PrP drug.⁴⁵² RNA based aptamers can bind PrP^C to prevent PrP^{Sc}-induced conversion or with PrP^{Sc} oligomers to block their activity.⁵⁰² The subsequent interaction of PrP^C with the same aptamer increases the binding efficiency due to the adaptation flexibility of PrP^{C.503} Different ways of delivering aptamer RNA across the blood brain barrier (BBB) include conjugation with transferrin, cell penetrating peptides, NPs, liposomes and dendrimer.⁵⁰³ Polyethylene glycol-conjugated polycyanoacrylate NPs were able to penetrate the brain and spleen of scrapie infected animals, however their ability to delivery therapeutic cargo and mode of interaction with PrPSc fibrils are Chem Soc Rev

35

40

45

50

55



Fig. 20 Prion diagnostics and therapeutics at the nano and medicinal chemistry fronts.^{488–499} Compilated from ref. 488–499. PrPs^c can be sensed by turning on/off the fluorescence of fluorescein-AuNPs (a), free QDs (g) or QD-FeNP sandwiches (f), or by resonance light scattering (RLS) of lipoic acid-AuNP aggregates (b). Reproduced with permission from ref. 488, copyright 2014 American Chemical Society. Quantitative sensing can be performed by Raman spectroscopy of Au nanorods (j). Reproduced with permission from ref. 495, copyright 2011 National Academy of Sciences. PrP^{Sc} can be captured by AuNPs with polyamines and sulphonates surface layers of (c) or by FeNPs with mercaptopropionic acid, aspartic acid (d) or RNA aptamer surface layers (e). Cell-bound PrP^{Sc} can be captured by aptamer–AgNP conjugates (i) while complete denaturation of PrP^{Sc} can be observed with 5G polyamine dendrimers (h). Reproduced with permission from ref. 499, copyright 2001 American Society for Microbiology.

questioned.⁵⁰⁴ Branched polyamines degraded PrP^{Sc} amyloids
to undetectable levels and reversed PrP^{Sc} toxicity in neuroblastoma cell culture (Fig. 20h).⁴⁹⁹ Pre-treatment of PrP^{Sc} amyloids with polyamines rendered them susceptible to proteolytic digestion. Tran *et al.* used polyallylamine (+) and polystyrene-sulfonate (-) as two oppositely charged polyamines for layer-bylayer coating of gold NPs (AuNPs) (Fig. 20c). The AuNPs

- translocated across the BBB, disrupted the PrP^{Sc} amyloids, and mitigated the toxicity in scrapie-infected cells. Nanomolar concentrations of AuNPs, with poly(allylamine) as the outermost layer, prolonged incubation time and delayed the disease
 onset in infected mice.⁴⁹⁷ Polyamine-based dendrimers coated
- with maltose or maltotriose stimulated PrP fibrillization at lower concentrations by breaking long fibrils into small seeds, but at higher concentrations blocked the fibrillization by stabilizing individual seeds (Fig. 20h).⁴⁹¹
- 55 NP-PrP interactions have been explored for diagnostic and sensing applications. Monothiolation of RNA aptamers makes

them a good ligand to cap AuNPs or AgNPs. These NPs then specifically interact with PrP^{sc} and sequester the latter on their surfaces. The binding of PrP^{Sc} or cell bound PrP^C is sensed in a concentration dependant manner via changes in the surface plasmon resonance or Raman signals of the AuNPs/nanorods (NRs) and aptamer ligated AgNPs (Fig. 20j).489,495 PrP binding with aptamer-conjugated NPs induces controlled aggregation which can be sensed via resonance light scattering of metal NPs aggregation (Fig. 20b).⁴⁸⁸ Henry et al. employed fluorescence turn-on and turn-off sensing for PrP detection.498 The fluorescence of fluorescein-GABA-QYQRES-COOH peptide bound to antibody-conjugated AuNPs (turned-off) was turned-on by replacing the peptide with competitive binding of PrP^{Sc} with the antibody (Fig. 20a). The fluorescence property of biotinavidin or monoclonal antibody bound quantum dots (QDs) has also been explored for the detection of PrP in vitro and in vivo (Fig. 20g).⁴⁹⁰ Xiao et al. used the dual-aptamer technique by ligating aptamer 1 on Fe magnetic NPs (MNPs) and aptamer 2

5

10

15

20

- on QDs. MNPs and QDs sandwiched PrP^{Sc} or PrP^C in between 1 and the technique was used to detect and isolate PrP by fluorescent QDs and magnetic NPs even from 0.1% infected brain homogenate (Fig. 20f).⁴⁹⁶ MNPs directly capped with
- aspartic acid or Au-mercaptopropionic acid were able to sequester PrP via carbodiimide coupling (Fig. 20d).⁵⁰⁵ Miller et al. engaged the aptamer-ligated MNPs to capture and clear PrPSc from solution. The sequestered PrP^{Sc} on MNPs were able to act as seeds in PCMA and enabled the detection and amplification of small quantities of PrP^{Sc} (Fig. 20e).⁵⁰⁶ 10

On the medicinal chemistry front, amphotericin B,^{507,508} quinacrine, dimeric analogues of statins, pyrazolones and pyridyl hydrozones are available drugs for prolonging the lifespan of PrP infected animals.493,509 Tacrolimus and astemizole reduce the PrP

- expression on cell membranes and inhibit PrPSc replication.510 15 Drug discovery for small organic molecules led to 2aminothiazoles which cap PrPSc seeds and inhibit their replication activity.⁵¹¹ Lipoic acid, an endogenous anti-oxidant compounds and when conjugated with acridine and quinolone, inhibited PrPSc
- fibril formation.494 A structure-activity relationship study of the 2.0 pyrazole derivative of carbazole led to the understanding that a tricyclic aromatic ring with hydroxyl and amino groups inhibited PrP^{Sc} fibrillization in PrP^{Sc}-infected neuronal cells.⁴⁹²

25 5.10 Prions versus other neurodegenerative disorders

Cross-seeding and mutual stimulation of amyloid fibrils have revealed possible links between AD, PD and T2D.512,513 Mougenot et al. injected the PrPSc from cattle BSE, human BSE and scrapie into mice over-expressing α S. The incubation time was reduced significantly and mice died of cerebral spongiform pathologies of PrPSc without accumulating insoluble fibrils of $\alpha S.^{514}$ AD and PD have different neuronal pathologies than PrP and their ability to transmit and infect like prions is inconclusive.^{515,516} More in vitro and in vivo cross seeding studies are necessary to elucidate the mechanisms and relationships between these diseases of different origins.

6. Summary

A survey of the literature has revealed striking similarities in the cross- β motifs of amyloid fibrils held together by H-bonding, regardless of the sequence and origin of the proteins. However, a recent study reported a cross- α amyloid structure associated with PSMa3, a 22-residue functional amyloid peptide secreted by Staphylococcus aureus for inflammatory response stimulation, human cell lysis and biofilm formation, representing a surprising departure from the common amyloid structure.⁵¹⁷

- The suprastructure of amyloid fibrils including that of all (S) $A\beta_{1-40}$ and hen egg lysozyme – has been shown as predomi-50 nantly left handed, ⁵¹⁸ originated from the inherent left-handed chirality of the (S) amino acids. However, right-handed amyloids have been reported for truncated serum amyloid A (SAA) peptides (<12 residues), resulting from the occurrence of β helices in SAA protofilaments prior to their assembly into
- fibrils.⁵¹⁹ A recent study on serum albumin amyloids, has

revealed that handedness can be inverted from left to right handed, upon lateral addition of protofilaments of amyloid fibrils of a lower hierarchical level.⁵²⁰

There is compelling evidence that amyloid proteins can spread from cell to cell and cross talk in vivo to either speed up or slow down aggregation of the host protein.^{291,519,521-523} Furthermore, aggregates of non-amyloidogenic proteins, such as bovine PI3-SH3 domain and E. coli HvpF domain, can serve as seeds to promote cytotoxicity in brain cells. This phenomenon suggests a generic origin of protein misfolding diseases resulting from the emergence of trace amounts of aggregates, either introduced intracellularly through misfolding or mutations or externally through cross seeding.²⁸⁵

The development of neurodegenerative disorders appears to be correlated with aging, where misfolding of proteins down the free energy landscape towards the amyloid state is likely prevented by metal ions (such as Ca²⁺ in the ER), molecular chaperones, ubiquitination enzymes and proteasomes, which kinetically trap the aggregating proteins off pathway.^{285,524} Compared with A β or IAPP, the tremendous plasticity of αS and PrP may originate from their much longer chain lengths and, therefore, greater populations of misfolded intermediates.

Although controversies remain, the observations that oligomers are more toxic than their fibrillar counterparts appear pervasive to amyloid proteins. In addition, oligomer-specific 25 antibody developed for $A\beta$ also bound the oligomers of IAPP, lysozyme, prion106–126, human insulin, polyglutamine and α S, suggesting a common tertiary structure²⁷³ as well as a common mechanism of pathogenesis beyond the individuality of the proteins and compositions of their molecular chaperones and 30 cellular environments. As amyloid proteins fibrillate along the kinetic pathway, both their solubility and reactivity appear to decline, consequently impacting protein self-assembly and their engagement with environmental ligands, proteins, cell membranes and organelles to elicit toxicity. While such condi-35 tions can be manipulated in vitro, such as through the regulation of temperature and pH or the introduction of metal ions, small molecules or engineered NPs, how to create in vivo conditions that prohibit trace amounts of aggregates from activating primary and/or secondary nucleation remains a 40tremendous challenge. Despite the complexity of protein structure, function and toxicity, as revealed by intensive research spanning the past two decades and highlighted in this review, protein aggregation through self-assembly and interaction with cellular environments constitutes hallmarks of neuronal and 45 pancreatic β -cell degeneration. Consequently, understanding and exploiting molecular assembly under physiological conditions could make inroads on the development of therapeutics and diagnostics against amyloid diseases.

List of abbreviations

Αβ	Amyloid-beta	
AD	Alzheimer's disease	55
AFM	Atomic force microscopy	

45

30

35

40

1	APP	Amyloid precursor protein
	ATR-FTIR	Attenuated total reflection-Fourier-transform
_	חחח	infrared
5	BBB	Blood brain barrier
	BCD	Binding and conversion domains
	DSE	Circular dichroism spectroscopy
	CID	Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease
10	CNS	Central nervous system
10	CWD	Chronic wasting disease
	DLB	Dementia with Lewy bodies
	DMD	Discrete molecular simulations
	EGCG	Epigallocatechin gallate
15	EPR	Electron paramagnetic resonance
	ER	Endoplasmic reticulum
	FFI	Fatal familial insomnia
	FSI	Fatal sporadic insomnia
	FTIR	Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy
20	GPI anchor	Glycosyl phosphatidylinositol
	GSS	Gerstmann–Straussler–Scheinker
	HAM	Hierarchical assembly model
	HD	Hydrogen–deuterium exchange
	huPrP	Human PrP
25	IAPP	Islet amyloid polypeptide
	IDP IM MS	Intrinsically disorder protein
	mAb	Monoclonal antibody
	MBM	Bone-meat meal
30	MD	Molecular dynamics
50	MNPs	Fe magnetic NPs
	NAC	Non-amyloid-beta component
	NFTs	Neurofibrillary tangles
	NMR	Nuclear magnetic resonance
35	NSF	N-Ethylmaleimide-sensitive factor
	NPs	Nanoparticles
	PD	Parkinson's disease
	PDD	Parkinson's disease dementia
	PHFs	Paired helical filaments
40	PMCA	Protein misfolded cyclic amplification
	PrP	Prion protein
	PrP ^C	Non-pathological PrP
	PrPse	Mistolded PrP
4 5	ROS	Reactive oxygen species
45	SAA	Serum amylold A
	5D5 5D5	Site directed spin labelling
	SNARF	Soluble NSE attachment protein receptor
	SSNMR	Solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance
50	SUVS	Small unilamellar vesicles
00	T2D	Type 2 diabetes
	TEM	Transmission electron microscopy
	ThT	Thioflavin T assay
	TSEs	Transmissible spongiform encephalopathies
55	UPS	Ubiquitin proteasome system
	YYR	Bityrosine regions

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the support of ARC Project CE140100036 (Davis), DP160100959 (Separovic), NSF CAREER CBET-1553945 (Ding), NIH MIRA 1R35GM119691 (Ding) and Monash Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (Ke). Davis is thankful for an Australian Laureate Fellowship from the ARC. We apologize to those whose works are not cited in this review due to the tremendous amount of the relevant literature.

References

1	T. P. J. Knowles, M. Vendruscolo and C. M. Dobson, Nat.	
	Rev. Mol. Cell Biol., 2014, 15, 384–396.	
2	S. I. A. Cohen, S. Linse, L. M. Luheshi, E. Hellstrand,	15
	D. A. White, L. Rajah, D. E. Otzen, M. Vendruscolo,	
	C. M. Dobson and T. P. J. Knowles, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.	
	U. S. A., 2013, 110 , 9758–9763.	
3	T. P. J. Knowles, C. A. Waudby, G. L. Devlin, S. I. A. Cohen,	
	A. Aguzzi, M. Vendruscolo, E. M. Terentjev, M. E. Welland	20
	and C. M. Dobson, Science, 2009, 326, 1533-1537.	
4	J. I. Guijarro, M. Sunde, J. A. Jones, I. D. Campbell and	
	C. M. Dobson, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 1998, 95,	
	4224-4228.	
5	F. Chiti, P. Webster, N. Taddei, A. Clark, M. Stefani,	25
	G. Ramponi and C. M. Dobson, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.	
	<i>A</i> ., 1999, 96 , 3590–3594.	
6	B. Urbanc, L. Cruz, S. Yun, S. V. Buldyrev, G. Bitan,	
	D. B. Teplow and H. E. Stanley, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.	
	<i>A.</i> , 2004, 101 , 17345–17350.	30
7	S. Auer, F. Meersman, C. M. Dobson and M. Vendruscolo,	
	PLoS Comput. Biol., 2008, 4, e1000222.	
8	B. N. Ratha, A. Ghosh, J. R. Brender, N. Gayen, H. Ilyas,	
	C. Neeraja, K. P. Das, A. K. Mandal and A. Bhunia, J. Biol.	
	Chem., 2016, 291 , 23545–23556.	35
9	I. W. Hamley, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2007, 46, 8128-8147.	
10	I. W. Hamley, <i>Chem. Rev.</i> , 2012, 112 , 5147–5192.	
11	A. Alzheimer, R. A. Stelzmann, H. N. Schnitzlein and	
	F. R. Murtagh, <i>Clin. Anat.</i> , 1995, 8 , 429–431.	
12	G. G. Glenner and C. W. Wong, Biochem. Biophys. Res.	40
	<i>Commun.</i> , 1984, 120 , 885–890.	
13	G. Blessed, B. E. Tomlinson and M. Roth, <i>Br. J. Psychiatry</i> ,	
	1968, 114 , 797–811.	
14	I. Grundke-Iqbal, K. Iqbal, Y. C. Tung, M. Quinlan,	
	H. M. Wisniewski and L. I. Binder, <i>Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.</i>	45
	<i>U. S. A.</i> , 1986, 83 , 4913–4917.	
15	R. Skrabana, J. Seveik and M. Novak, Cell. Mol. Neurobiol.,	
	2006, 26 , 1085–1097.	
16	J. Avila, N. Pallas, M. Bolos, C. L. Sayas and F. Hernandez,	= 0
. –	Expert Opin. Ther. Targets, 2016, 20, 653–661.	50
1/	M. D. MUKRASCH, S. BIDOW, J. KORUKOTTU, S. Jeganathan,	
	J. Biemat, U. Griesinger, E. Mandelkow and	
10	M. ZWECKSTETTEF, PLOS BIOL, 2009, /, 634.	
tδ	F. Ganguly, I. D. Do, L. Larini, N. E. LaPointe, A. J. Sercel,	

M. F. Shade, S. C. Feinstein, M. T. Bowers and J. E. Shea,

J. Phys. Chem. B, 2015, 119, 4582-4593.

55

1

5

5

15

20

25

30

40

45

50

55

- 19 W. Li and V. M. Lee, Biochemistry, 2006, 45, 15692-15701. 20 E. Mandelkow, M. von Bergen, J. Biernat and E. M. Mandelkow, Brain Pathol., 2007, 17, 83-90.
 - 21 M. von Bergen, P. Friedhoff, J. Biernat, J. Heberle,
- E. M. Mandelkow and E. Mandelkow, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2000, 97, 5129-5134.
 - 22 K. Minoura, T. M. Yao, K. Tomoo, M. Sumida, M. Sasaki, T. Taniguchi and T. Ishida, Eur. J. Biochem., 2004, 271, 545-552.
- 23 J. Adamcik, A. Sanchez-Ferrer, N. Ait-Bouziad, 10 N. P. Reynolds, H. A. Lashuel and R. Mezzenga, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2016, 55, 618-622.
 - 24 N. Sibille, I. Huvent, C. Fauquant, D. Verdegem, L. Amniai, A. Leroy, J. M. Wieruszeski, G. Lippens and I. Landrieu, Proteins, 2012, 80, 454-462.
 - 25 R. Sandbrink, C. L. Masters and K. Beyreuther, Neurobiol. Dis., 1994, 1, 13-24.
 - 26 R. E. Tanzi, A. I. McClatchey, E. D. Lamperti, L. Villa-Komaroff, J. F. Gusella and R. L. Neve, Nature, 1988, 331, 528-530.
 - 27 P. C. Burger and F. S. Vogel, Am. J. Pathol., 1973, 73, 457-476.
 - 28 D. J. Selkoe, Annu. Rev. Cell Biol., 1994, 10, 373-403.
 - 29 H. Zheng, M. Jiang, M. E. Trumbauer, D. J. Sirinathsinghji, R. Hopkins, D. W. Smith, R. P. Heavens, G. R. Dawson,
 - S. Boyce, M. W. Conner, K. A. Stevens, H. H. Slunt, S. S. Sisoda, H. Y. Chen and L. H. Van der Ploeg, Cell, 1995, 81, 525-531.
 - 30 A. R. White, R. Reyes, J. F. Mercer, J. Camakaris, H. Zheng, A. I. Bush, G. Multhaup, K. Beyreuther, C. L. Masters and R. Cappai, Brain Res., 1999, 842, 439-444.
 - 31 M. O. Grimm, H. S. Grimm, A. J. Patzold, E. G. Zinser, R. Halonen, M. Duering, J. A. Tschape, B. De Strooper, U. Muller, J. Shen and T. Hartmann, Nat. Cell Biol., 2005, 7, 1118-1123.
- 32 H. Meziane, J. C. Dodart, C. Mathis, S. Little, J. Clemens, 35 S. M. Paul and A. Ungerer, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 1998, 95, 12683-12688.
 - 33 J. M. Roch, E. Masliah, A. C. Roch-Levecq, M. P. Sundsmo, D. A. Otero, I. Veinbergs and T. Saitoh, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 1994, 91, 7450-7454.
 - 34 A. Nikolaev, T. McLaughlin, D. D. O'Leary and M. Tessier-Lavigne, Nature, 2009, 457, 981-989.
 - 35 S. Ring, S. W. Weyer, S. B. Kilian, E. Waldron, C. U. Pietrzik, M. A. Filippov, J. Herms, C. Buchholz, C. B. Eckman, M. Korte, D. P. Wolfer and U. C. Muller, J. Neurosci., 2007, 27, 7817-7826.
 - 36 R. Vassar, B. D. Bennett, S. Babu-Khan, S. Kahn, E. A. Mendiaz, P. Denis, D. B. Teplow, S. Ross, P. Amarante, R. Loeloff, Y. Luo, S. Fisher, J. Fuller,
 - S. Edenson, J. Lile, M. A. Jarosinski, A. L. Biere, E. Curran, T. Burgess, J. C. Louis, F. Collins, J. Treanor, G. Rogers and M. Citron, Science, 1999, 286, 735-741.
 - 37 O. O. Olubiyi and B. Strodel, J. Phys. Chem. B, 2012, 116, 3280-3291.
 - 38 S. Caglayan, S. Takagi-Niidome, F. Liao, A. S. Carlo, V. Schmidt, T. Burgert, Y. Kitago, E. M. Fuchtbauer,

A. Fuchtbauer, D. M. Holtzman, J. Takagi and T. E. Willnow, Sci. Transl. Med., 2014, 6, 223ra220.

- 39 J. T. Huse, K. Liu, D. S. Pijak, D. Carlin, V. M. Lee and R. W. Doms, J. Biol. Chem., 2002, 277, 16278-16284.
- 40 K. Liu, I. Solano, D. Mann, C. Lemere, M. Mercken, J. Q. Trojanowski and V. M. Lee, Acta Neuropathol., 2006, 112, 163-174.
- 41 R. Hosoda, T. C. Saido, L. Otvos, Jr., T. Arai, D. M. Mann, V. M. Lee, J. Q. Trojanowski and T. Iwatsubo, J. Neuropathol. Exp. Neurol., 1998, 57, 1089-1095.
- 42 P. Gomez-Ramos and M. Asuncion Moran, J. Alzheimer's Dis., 2007, 11, 53-59.
- 43 O. Wirths, G. Multhaup, C. Czech, V. Blanchard, S. Moussaoui, G. Tremp, L. Pradier, K. Beyreuther and T. A. Bayer, Neurosci. Lett., 2001, 306, 116-120.
- 44 J. R. Cirrito, K. A. Yamada, M. B. Finn, R. S. Sloviter, K. R. Bales, P. C. May, D. D. Schoepp, S. M. Paul, S. Mennerick and D. M. Holtzman, Neuron, 2005, 48, 913-922.
- 45 F. Kamenetz, T. Tomita, H. Hsieh, G. Seabrook, 20 D. Borchelt, T. Iwatsubo, S. Sisodia and R. Malinow, Neuron, 2003, 37, 925-937.
- 46 J. E. Morley, S. A. Farr, W. A. Banks, S. N. Johnson, K. A. Yamada and L. Xu, J. Alzheimer's Dis., 2010, 19, 441-449.
- 47 J. Ghiso and B. Frangione, Adv. Drug Delivery Rev., 2002, 54, 1539-1551.
- 48 D. Strozyk, K. Blennow, L. R. White and L. J. Launer, Neurology, 2003, 60, 652-656.
- 49 D. Scheuner, C. Eckman, M. Jensen, X. Song, M. Citron, N. Suzuki, T. D. Bird, J. Hardy, M. Hutton, W. Kukull, E. Larson, E. Levy-Lahad, M. Viitanen, E. Peskind, P. Poorkaj, G. Schellenberg, R. Tanzi, W. Wasco, L. Lannfelt, D. Selkoe and S. Younkin, Nat. Med., 1996, 2, 864-870. 35
- 50 I. V. Kurochkin and S. Goto, FEBS Lett., 1994, 345, 33-37.
- 51 N. Iwata, S. Tsubuki, Y. Takaki, K. Watanabe, M. Sekiguchi, E. Hosoki, M. Kawashima-Morishima, H. J. Lee, E. Hama, Y. Sekine-Aizawa and T. C. Saido, Nat. Med., 2000, 6, 143-150.
- 52 S. Mueller-Steiner, Y. Zhou, H. Arai, E. D. Roberson, B. Sun, J. Chen, X. Wang, G. Yu, L. Esposito, L. Mucke and L. Gan, Neuron, 2006, 51, 703-714.
- 53 T. L. Tekirian, T. C. Saido, W. R. Markesbery, M. J. Russell, D. R. Wekstein, E. Patel and J. W. Geddes, J. Neuropathol. 45 Exp. Neurol., 1998, 57, 76-94.
- 54 N. Rezaei-Ghaleh, M. Amininasab, S. Kumar, J. Walter and M. Zweckstetter, Nat. Commun., 2016, 7, 11359.
- 55 Y. K. Al-Hilaly, T. L. Williams, M. Stewart-Parker, L. Ford, E. Skaria, M. Cole, W. G. Bucher, K. L. Morris, A. A. Sada, 50 J. R. Thorpe and L. C. Serpell, Acta Neuropathol. Commun., 2013, 1, 83.
- 56 J. Naslund, A. Schierhorn, U. Hellman, L. Lannfelt, A. D. Roses, L. O. Tjernberg, J. Silberring, S. E. Gandy, B. Winblad and P. Greengard, et al., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. 55 S. A., 1994, **91**, 8378–8382.

1

5

10

15

30

25

5

10

15

20

30

- 57 M. Ahmed, J. Davis, D. Aucoin, T. Sato, S. Ahuja, S. Aimoto,
 J. I. Elliott, W. E. Van Nostrand and S. O. Smith, *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.*, 2010, 17, 561–567.
- 58 D. A. Kirschner, H. Inouye, L. K. Duffy, A. Sinclair, M. Lind
- and D. J. Selkoe, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 1987, **84**, 6953–6957.
- 59 C. Soto, M. C. Branes, J. Alvarez and N. C. Inestrosa, J. Neurochem., 1994, 63, 1191–1198.
- 60 M. A. Sani, J. D. Gehman and F. Separovic, *FEBS Lett.*, 2011, 585, 749–754.
- 61 L. C. Serpell, Biochim. Biophys. Acta, 2000, 1502, 16-30.
- 62 T. Shirahama and A. S. Cohen, J. Cell Biol., 1967, 33, 679–708.
- 63 S. Tomaselli, V. Esposito, P. Vangone, N. A. van Nuland,A. M. Bonvin, R. Guerrini, T. Tancredi, P. A. Temussi andD. Picone, *ChemBioChem*, 2006, 7, 257–267.
- 64 C. J. Barrow and M. G. Zagorski, *Science*, 1991, 253, 179–182.
- 65 O. Crescenzi, S. Tomaselli, R. Guerrini, S. Salvadori,
- A. M. D'Ursi, P. A. Temussi and D. Picone, *Eur. J. Biochem.*, 2002, **269**, 5642–5648.
 - 66 S. Vivekanandan, J. R. Brender, S. Y. Lee and A. Ramamoorthy, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.*, 2011, 411, 312–316.
- 25 67 M. Coles, W. Bicknell, A. A. Watson, D. P. Fairlie and D. J. Craik, *Biochemistry*, 1998, 37, 11064–11077.
 - 68 H. Shao, S. Jao, K. Ma and M. G. Zagorski, J. Mol. Biol., 1999, 285, 755–773.
 - 69 S. J. Wood, B. Maleeff, T. Hart and R. Wetzel, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 1996, **256**, 870–877.
 - 70 S. Narayanan and B. Reif, *Biochemistry*, 2005, 44, 1444–1452.
 - 71 J. Danielsson, J. Jarvet, P. Damberg and A. Graslund, *FEBS J.*, 2005, 272, 3938–3949.
- 35 72 Y. Fezoui and D. B. Teplow, J. Biol. Chem., 2002, 277, 36948–36954.
 - 73 A. Abedini and D. P. Raleigh, Phys. Biol., 2009, 6, 015005.
 - 74 R. Tycko, Q. Rev. Biophys., 2006, 39, 1-55.
 - 75 S. Kumar, N. Rezaei-Ghaleh, D. Terwel, D. R. Thal,
- M. Richard, M. Hoch, J. M. Mc Donald, U. Wullner,
 K. Glebov, M. T. Heneka, D. M. Walsh, M. Zweckstetter and J. Walter, *EMBO J.*, 2011, 30, 2255–2265.
 - 76 W. He and C. J. Barrow, *Biochemistry*, 1999, **38**, 10871–10877.
- 45 77 C. D'Arrigo, M. Tabaton and A. Perico, *Biopolymers*, 2009, 91, 861–873.
 - 78 P. Hortschansky, V. Schroeckh, T. Christopeit, G. Zandomeneghi and M. Fandrich, *Protein Sci.*, 2005, 14, 1753–1759.
- 50 79 G. Meisl, X. Yang, E. Hellstrand, B. Frohm, J. B. Kirkegaard, S. I. Cohen, C. M. Dobson, S. Linse and T. P. Knowles, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2014, **111**, 9384–9389.
 - 80 P. Arosio, T. P. Knowles and S. Linse, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, 17, 7606–7618.
- 55 81 G. Meisl, X. Yang, B. Frohm, T. P. Knowles and S. Linse, *Sci. Rep.*, 2016, 6, 18728.

- 82 J. Adamcik, C. Lara, I. Usov, J. S. Jeong, F. S. Ruggeri,G. Dietler, H. A. Lashuel, I. W. Hamley and R. Mezzenga,*Nanoscale*, 2012, 4, 4426–4429.
- 83 A. T. Petkova, Y. Ishii, J. J. Balbach, O. N. Antzutkin,
 R. D. Leapman, F. Delaglio and R. Tycko, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2002, **99**, 16742–16747.
- 84 J. X. Lu, W. Qiang, W. M. Yau, C. D. Schwieters,
 S. C. Meredith and R. Tycko, *Cell*, 2013, 154, 1257–1268.
- M. T. Colvin, R. Silvers, Q. Z. Ni, T. V. Can, I. Sergeyev,
 M. Rosay, K. J. Donovan, B. Michael, J. Wall, S. Linse and
 R. G. Griffin, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2016, 138, 9663–9674.
- 86 Y. Xiao, B. Ma, D. McElheny, S. Parthasarathy, F. Long, M. Hoshi, R. Nussinov and Y. Ishii, *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.*, 2015, 22, 499–505.
- 87 D. M. Walsh, I. Klyubin, J. V. Fadeeva, M. J. Rowan and
 D. J. Selkoe, *Biochem. Soc. Trans.*, 2002, 30, 552–557.
- 88 M. Schrag, C. Mueller, U. Oyoyo, M. A. Smith and W. M. Kirsch, *Prog. Neurobiol.*, 2011, 94, 296–306.
- 89 B. Hallgren and P. Sourander, *J. Neurochem.*, 1960, 5, 307–310.
- 90 M. Schrag, A. Dickson, A. Jiffry, D. Kirsch, H. V. Vinters and W. Kirsch, *Biometals*, 2010, 23, 1123–1127.
- 91 A. I. Bush, W. H. Pettingell, G. Multhaup, M. D. Paradis, J. P. Vonsattel, J. F. Gusella, K. Beyreuther, C. L. Masters and R. E. Tanzi, *Science*, 1994, **265**, 1464–1467.
- 92 W. R. Markesbery, Arch. Neurol., 1999, 56, 1449–1452.
- 93 A. I. Bush, Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol., 2000, 4, 184-191.
- 94 D. A. Butterfield and R. Sultana, J. Amino Acids, 2011, 2011, 198430.
- 95 L. E. Cassagnes, V. Herve, F. Nepveu, C. Hureau, P. Faller and F. Collin, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2013, **52**, 11110–11113.
- 96 S. Parthasarathy, B. Yoo, D. McElheny, W. Tay and Y. Ishii, J. Biol. Chem., 2014, 289, 9998–10010.
- 97 S. Keskitalo, M. Farkas, M. Hanenberg, A. Szodorai,
 L. Kulic, A. Semmler, M. Weller, R. M. Nitsch and 35
 M. Linnebank, *Front. Aging Neurosci.*, 2014, 6, 237.
- 98 D. G. Smith, R. Cappai and K. J. Barnham, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 2007, **1768**, 1976–1990.
- 99 G. P. Eckert, W. G. Wood and W. E. Muller, *Curr. Protein Pept. Sci.*, 2010, **11**, 319–325.
- 100 C. Aisenbrey, T. Borowik, R. Bystrom, M. Bokvist, F. Lindstrom, H. Misiak, M. A. Sani and G. Grobner, *Eur. Biophys. J.*, 2008, 37, 247–255.
- 101 R. Bystrom, C. Aisenbrey, T. Borowik, M. Bokvist,
 F. Lindstrom, M. A. Sani, A. Olofsson and G. Grobner, *Cell* 45 *Biochem. Biophys.*, 2008, 52, 175–189.
- 102 D. K. Weber, J. D. Gehman, F. Separovic and M. A. Sani, *Aust. J. Chem.*, 2012, **65**, 472–479.
- 103 D. Bhowmik, K. R. Mote, C. M. MacLaughlin, N. Biswas,
 B. Chandra, J. K. Basu, G. C. Walker, P. K. Madhu and
 S. Maiti, ACS Nano, 2015, 9, 9070–9077.
- 104 T. L. Lau, J. D. Gehman, J. D. Wade, C. L. Masters,
 K. J. Barnham and F. Separovic, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 2007, **1768**, 3135–3144.
- 105 D. A. Hicks, N. N. Nalivaeva and A. J. Turner, Front. 55 Physiol., 2012, 3, 189.

Review Article

30

40

20

25

10

1

30

45

Chem Soc Rev

1

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

- 106 A. J. Beel, C. K. Mobley, H. J. Kim, F. Tian, A. Hadziselimovic, B. Jap, J. H. Prestegard and C. R. Sanders, *Biochemistry*, 2008, 47, 9428–9446.
- 107 P. N. Lacor, M. C. Buniel, L. Chang, S. J. Fernandez,
- Y. Gong, K. L. Viola, M. P. Lambert, P. T. Velasco,
 E. H. Bigio, C. E. Finch, G. A. Krafft and W. L. Klein,
 J. Neurosci., 2004, 24, 10191–10200.
 - 108 O. Garaschuk, R. Schneggenburger, C. Schirra, F. Tempia and A. Konnerth, *J. Physiol.*, 1996, **491**(Pt 3), 757–772.
- 10 109 H. Y. Wang, D. H. Lee, M. R. D'Andrea, P. A. Peterson, R. P. Shank and A. B. Reitz, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2000, 275, 5626–5632.
 - 110 E. M. Snyder, Y. Nong, C. G. Almeida, S. Paul, T. Moran, E. Y. Choi, A. C. Nairn, M. W. Salter, P. J. Lombroso, G. K. Gouras and P. Greengard, *Nat. Neurosci.*, 2005, 8, 1051–1058.
- 111 C. A. Hansson Petersen, N. Alikhani, H. Behbahani,
 B. Wiehager, P. F. Pavlov, I. Alafuzoff, V. Leinonen,
 A. Ito, B. Winblad, E. Glaser and M. Ankarcrona, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2008, **105**, 13145–13150.
- 112 M. Manczak, M. J. Calkins and P. H. Reddy, *Hum. Mol.*20 *Genet.*, 2011, 20, 2495–2509.
 - 113 H. Du, L. Guo, S. Yan, A. A. Sosunov, G. M. McKhann and S. S. Yan, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2010, **107**, 18670–18675.
- 114 M. D'Amelio, V. Cavallucci, S. Middei, C. Marchetti,
 S. Pacioni, A. Ferri, A. Diamantini, D. De Zio, P. Carrara,
 L. Battistini, S. Moreno, A. Bacci, M. Ammassari-Teule,
 H. Marie and F. Cecconi, *Nat. Neurosci.*, 2011, 14, 69–76.
 - 115 Z. Berger, B. Ravikumar, F. M. Menzies, L. G. Oroz, B. R. Underwood, M. N. Pangalos, I. Schmitt, U. Wullner,
 - B. O. Evert, C. J. O'Kane and D. C. Rubinsztein, *Hum. Mol. Genet.*, 2006, **15**, 433–442.
 - 116 G. Wen, W. Qin, D. Chen, Y. Wang, X. Yue, Z. Liu, Y. Cao, J. Du, B. Zhou and X. Bu, *Chem. Commun.*, 2017, 53, 3886–3889.
- 35 117 J. Sevigny, P. Chiao, T. Bussiere, P. H. Weinreb, L. Williams, M. Maier, R. Dunstan, S. Salloway, T. Chen, Y. Ling, J. O'Gorman, F. Qian, M. Arastu, M. Li, S. Chollate, M. S. Brennan, O. Quintero-Monzon, R. H. Scannevin, H. M. Arnold, T. Engber, K. Rhodes, J. Ferrero, Y. Hang, A. Mikulskis, J. Grimm, C. Hock, R. M. Nitsch and
 - A. Sandrock, *Nature*, 2016, **537**, 50–56.
 - 118 R. Squitti, D. Lupoi, P. Pasqualetti, G. Dal Forno, F. Vernieri, P. Chiovenda, L. Rossi, M. Cortesi, E. Cassetta and P. M. Rossini, *Neurology*, 2002, 59, 1153–1161.
- Q4 119 J. Carroll, *Science*, 2017, DOI: 10.1126/science.aal0759.
 - 120 R. Vassar, P. H. Kuhn, C. Haass, M. E. Kennedy, L. Rajendran, P. C. Wong and S. F. Lichtenthaler, *J. Neurochem.*, 2014, **130**, 4–28.
- L. Rajendran, A. Schneider, G. Schlechtingen, S. Weidlich, J. Ries, T. Braxmeier, P. Schwille, J. B. Schulz, C. Schroeder, M. Simons, G. Jennings, H. J. Knolker and K. Simons, *Science*, 2008, 320, 520–523.
- 122 X. Wang, B. Su, S. L. Siedlak, P. I. Moreira, H. Fujioka, 55 Y. Wang, G. Casadesus and X. Zhu, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.*
 - *S. A.*, 2008, **105**, 19318–19323.

- 123 W. Noble, C. Garwood, J. Stephenson, A. M. Kinsey, D. P. Hanger and B. H. Anderton, *FASEB J.*, 2009, **23**, 739–750.
- 124 J. L. Cummings, T. Morstorf and K. Zhong, *Alzheimer's Res. Ther.*, 2014, **6**, 37.
- 125 H. Fu, M. Cui, L. Zhao, P. Tu, K. Zhou, J. Dai and B. Liu, *J. Med. Chem.*, 2015, **58**, 6972–6983.
- 126 M. L. Bolognesi, A. Gandini, F. Prati and E. Uliassi, *J. Med. Chem.*, 2016, **59**, 7759–7770.
- 127 P. Westermark, A. Andersson and G. T. Westermark, *Physiol. Rev.*, 2011, **91**, 795–826.
- 128 L. Marzban, G. Trigo-Gonzalez, X. Zhu, C. J. Rhodes, P. A. Halban, D. F. Steiner and C. B. Verchere, *Diabetes*, 2004, 53, 141–148.
- 129 J. Wang, J. Xu, J. Finnerty, M. Furuta, D. F. Steiner and C. B. Verchere, *Diabetes*, 2001, 50, 534–539.
- 130 M. S. German, L. G. Moss, J. Wang and W. J. Rutter, *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, 1992, **12**, 1777–1788.
- 131 T. A. Lutz, Physiol. Behav., 2006, 89, 465-471.
- 132 A. Young, Adv. Pharmacol., 2005, 52, 99-121.
- 133 D. Naot and J. Cornish, *Bone*, 2008, **43**, 813-818.
- 134 S. Luca, W.-M. Yau, R. Leapman and R. Tycko, *Biochem-istry*, 2007, **46**, 13505–13522.
- 135 J. J. W. Wiltzius, S. A. Sievers, M. R. Sawaya, D. Cascio, D. Popov, C. Riekel and D. Eisenberg, *Protein Sci.*, 2008, 17, 1467–1474.
- 136 S. Bedrood, Y. Li, J. M. Isas, B. G. Hegde, U. Baxa,
 I. S. Haworth and R. Langen, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2012, 287, 5235–5241.
- 137 S. M. Patil, S. Xu, S. R. Sheftic and A. T. Alexandrescu, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2009, **284**, 11982–11991.
- 138 R. P. R. Nanga, J. R. Brender, S. Vivekanandan and A. Ramamoorthy, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 2011, **1808**, 2337–2342.
- 139 D. C. R. Camargo, K. Tripsianes, K. Buday, A. Franko,
 C. Göbl, C. Hartlmüller, R. Sarkar, M. Aichler,
 G. Mettenleiter, M. Schulz, A. Böddrich, C. Erck,
 H. Martens, A. K. Walch, T. Madl, E. E. Wanker,
 M. Conrad, M. H. d. Angelis and B. Reif, *Sci. Rep.*, 2017,
 7, 44041.
- 140 P. Nedumpully-Govindan and F. Ding, *Sci. Rep.*, 2015, 5, 8240.
- 141 O. Sumner Makin and L. C. Serpell, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2004, 335, 1279–1288.
- 142 C. Goldsbury, J. Kistler, U. Aebi, T. Arvinte and G. J. S. Cooper, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 1999, **285**, 33–39.
- 143 C. S. Goldsbury, G. J. S. Cooper, K. N. Goldie, S. A. Müller,
 E. L. Saafi, W. T. M. Gruijters, M. P. Misur, A. Engel,
 U. Aebi and J. Kistler, *J. Struct. Biol.*, 1997, **119**, 17–27.
- 144 S. Chakraborty, B. Chatterjee and S. Basu, *Biophys. Chem.*, 2012, **168–169**, 1–9.
- 145 S. Sakagashira, H. J. Hiddinga, K. Tateishi, T. Sanke, T. Hanabusa, K. Nanjo and N. L. Eberhardt, *Am. J. Pathol.*, 2000, 157, 2101–2109.
- 146 S. Seino and M. Study Group of Comprehensive Analysis of Genetic Factors in Diabetes, *Diabetologia*, 2001, 44, 55 906–909.

45

50

20

25

30

35

40

- 147 P. Westermark, D. L. Eizirik, D. G. Pipeleers, C. Hellerström and A. Andersson, *Diabetologia*, 1995, 38, 543–549.
- 148 J. Udayasankar, K. Kodama, R. L. Hull, S. Zraika, K. Aston-
- 5 Mourney, S. L. Subramanian, J. Tong, M. V. Faulenbach, J. Vidal and S. E. Kahn, *Diabetologia*, 2009, **52**, 145–153.
 - 149 J. Janson, W. C. Soeller, P. C. Roche, R. T. Nelson,
 A. J. Torchia, D. K. Kreutter and P. C. Butler, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 1996, 93, 7283–7288.
- 10 150 B. A. Yankner, L. R. Dawes, S. Fisher, L. Villa-Komaroff, M. L. Oster-Granite and R. L. Neve, *Science*, 1989, 245, 417–420.
 - 151 B. A. Yankner, L. K. Duffy and D. A. Kirschner, *Science*, 1990, **250**, 279–282.
- 15 152 A. Lorenzo, B. Razzaboni, G. C. Weir and B. A. Yankner, *Nature*, 1994, **368**, 756–760.
 - 153 A. Lorenzo and B. A. Yankner, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.*, 1996, 777, 89–95.
 - 154 J. Janson, R. H. Ashley, D. Harrison, S. McIntyre and P. C. Butler, *Diabetes*, 1999, **48**, 491–498.
 - 155 R. A. Ritzel, J. J. Meier, C.-Y. Lin, J. D. Veldhuis and P. C. Butler, *Diabetes*, 2007, **56**, 65–71.
 - 156 W. P. S. Wong, D. W. Scott, C.-L. Chuang, S. Zhang, H. Liu, A. Ferreira, E. L. Saafi, Y. S. Choong and G. J. S. Cooper, *Diabetes*, 2008, 57, 2737–2744.
 - 157 A. E. Butler, J. Janson, W. C. Soeller and P. C. Butler, *Diabetes*, 2003, 52, 2304–2314.
 - 158 J. J. Meier, R. Kayed, C.-Y. Lin, T. Gurlo, L. Haataja, S. Jayasinghe, R. Langen, C. G. Glabe and P. C. Butler, *Am. J. Physiol.: Endocrinol. Metab.*, 2006, **291**, E1317–1324.
 - 159 E. H. Pilkington, Y. Xing, B. Wang, A. Kakinen, M. Wang,
 T. D. Davis, F. Ding and P. C. Ke, *Sci. Rep.*, 2017, DOI: 10.1038/s41598-017-02597-0.
 - 160 L. Haataja, T. Gurlo, C. J. Huang and P. C. Butler, *Endocr. Rev.*, 2008, **29**, 303–316.
 - 161 S. Zraika, R. L. Hull, C. B. Verchere, A. Clark, K. J. Potter, P. E. Fraser, D. P. Raleigh and S. E. Kahn, *Diabetologia*, 2010, 53, 1046–1056.
 - 162 J. A. Williamson and A. D. Miranker, *Protein Sci.*, 2007, **16**, 110–117.
 - 163 J. A. Williamson, J. P. Loria and A. D. Miranker, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2009, **393**, 383–396.
 - 164 J. J. W. Wiltzius, S. A. Sievers, M. R. Sawaya and D. Eisenberg, *Protein Sci.*, 2009, 18, 1521–1530.
- 45 165 P. Cao, A. Abedini and D. P. Raleigh, *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, 2013, 23, 82–89.
 - 166 N. F. Dupuis, C. Wu, J.-E. Shea and M. T. Bowers, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2011, 133, 7240–7243.
 - 167 Y. Okamoto, J. Mol. Graphics Modell., 2004, 22, 425-439.
- 50 168 S. B. Padrick and A. D. Miranker, *Biochemistry*, 2002, **41**, 4694–4703.
- Q5 169 J. C. Hutton, *Diabetologia*, 32, 271–281.
 - 170 A. S. DeToma, S. Salamekh, A. Ramamoorthy and M. H. Lim, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2012, **41**, 608–621.
- 55 171 F. Chimienti, A. Favier and M. Seve, *Biometals*, 2005, 18, 313–317.

- 172 K. Lemaire, M. A. Ravier, A. Schraenen, J. W. M. Creemers, R. Van de Plas, M. Granvik, L. Van Lommel, E. Waelkens, F. Chimienti, G. A. Rutter, P. Gilon, P. A. in't Veld and F. C. Schuit, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2009, 106, 14872–14877.
- 173 R. L. Hull, G. T. Westermark, P. Westermark and S. E. Kahn, *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.*, 2004, **89**, 3629–3643.
- 174 S. Jha, J. M. Snell, S. R. Sheftic, S. M. Patil, S. B. Daniels, F. W. Kolling and A. T. Alexandrescu, *Biochemistry*, 2014, 53, 300–310.
- 175 L. Khemtémourian, E. Doménech, J. P. F. Doux,
 M. C. Koorengevel and J. A. Killian, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*,
 2011, 133, 15598–15604.
- 176 A. Abedini and D. P. Raleigh, *Biochemistry*, 2005, 44, 16284–16291.
- 177 P. Nedumpully-Govindan, D. B. Jemec and F. Ding, J. Chem. Inf. Model., 2015, 56(6), 1042–1052.
- 178 J. C. Hutton, *Biochem. J.*, 1982, **204**, 171–178.
- 179 P. Nedumpully-Govindan, Y. Yang, R. Andorfer, W. Cao and F. Ding, *Biochemistry*, 2015, 54, 7335–7344.
- 180 J. L. Larson and A. D. Miranker, J. Mol. Biol., 2004, 335, 221–231.
- 181 S. Gilead, H. Wolfenson and E. Gazit, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2006, 45, 6476–6480.
- 182 A. C. Susa, C. Wu, S. L. Bernstein, N. F. Dupuis, H. Wang,
 D. P. Raleigh, J.-E. Shea and M. T. Bowers, *J. Am. Chem.* 25 Soc., 2014, 136, 12912–12919.
- 183 G. Dodson and D. Steiner, Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol., 1998, 8, 189–194.
- 184 J. Flannick, G. Thorleifsson, N. L. Beer, S. B. R. Jacobs, N. Grarup, N. P. Burtt, A. Mahajan, C. Fuchsberger, 30 G. Atzmon, R. Benediktsson, J. Blangero, D. W. Bowden, I. Brandslund, J. Brosnan, F. Burslem, J. Chambers, Y. S. Cho, C. Christensen, D. A. Douglas, R. Duggirala, Z. Dymek, Y. Farjoun, T. Fennell, P. Fontanillas, T. Forsén, S. Gabriel, B. Glaser, D. F. Gudbjartsson, C. Hanis, T. Hansen, A. B. Hreidarsson, K. Hveem, E. Ingelsson, B. Isomaa, S. Johansson, T. Jørgensen, M. E. Jørgensen, S. Kathiresan, A. Kong, J. Kooner, J. Kravic, M. Laakso, J.-Y. Lee, L. Lind, C. M. Lindgren, A. Linneberg, G. Masson, T. Meitinger, K. L. Mohlke, A. Molven, A. P. Morris, S. Potluri, 40 R. Rauramaa, R. Ribel-Madsen, A.-M. Richard, T. Rolph, V. Salomaa, A. V. Segrè, H. Skärstrand, V. Steinthorsdottir, H. M. Stringham, P. Sulem, E. S. Tai, Y. Y. Teo, T. Teslovich, U. Thorsteinsdottir, J. K. Trimmer, T. Tuomi, J. Tuomilehto, F. Vaziri-Sani, B. F. Voight, J. G. Wilson, M. Boehnke, 45 M. I. McCarthy, P. R. Njølstad, O. Pedersen, T. D. C. Go, T. d.-G. Consortium, L. Groop, D. R. Cox, K. Stefansson and D. Altshuler, Nat. Genet., 2014, 46, 357-363.
- 185 P. Westermark, Z.-C. Li, G. T. Westermark, A. Leckström and D. F. Steiner, *FEBS Lett.*, 1996, **379**, 203–206.
- 186 J. R. Brender, K. Hartman, R. P. R. Nanga, N. Popovych, R. de la Salud Bea, S. Vivekanandan, E. N. G. Marsh and A. Ramamoorthy, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2010, **132**, 8973–8983.
- 187 S. Salamekh, J. R. Brender, S.-J. Hyung, R. P. R. Nanga,
 S. Vivekanandan, B. T. Ruotolo and A. Ramamoorthy, 55
 J. Mol. Biol., 2011, **410**, 294–306.

10

15

20

50

1

10

20

30

50

1

5

10

15

- 1 188 C. E. Munte, L. Vilela, H. R. Kalbitzer and R. C. Garratt, *FEBS J.*, 2005, **272**, 4284–4293.
 - 189 Z. Keltner, J. A. Meyer, E. M. Johnson, A. M. Palumbo, D. M. Spence and G. E. Reid, *Analyst*, 2010, **135**, 278–288.
 - 190 A. W. Giebink, P. A. Vogel, W. Medawala and D. M. Spence, *Diabetes*, 2013, **29**, 44–52.
 - 191 F. Meng, A. Abedini, B. Song and D. P. Raleigh, *Biochemistry*, 2007, **46**, 12091–12099.
 - 192 J. R. Brender, S. Salamekh and A. Ramamoorthy, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2012, **45**, 454–462.
 - 193 L. Khemtémourian, J. A. Killian, J. W. M. Höppener and M. F. M. Engel, *Exp. Diabetes Res.*, 2008, **2008**, 421287.
 - 194 J. A. Hebda and A. D. Miranker, Annu. Rev. Biophys., 2009, 38, 125–152.
- 15 195 E. H. Pilkington, E. N. Gurzov, A. Kakinen, S. A. Litwak, W. J. Stanley, T. P. Davis and P. C. Ke, *Sci. Rep.*, 2016, **6**, 21274.
 - 196 T. A. Mirzabekov, M. C. Lin and B. L. Kagan, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 1996, **271**, 1988–1992.
 - 197 N. B. Last, E. Rhoades and A. D. Miranker, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2011, **108**, 9460–9465.
 - 198 M. Anguiano, R. J. Nowak and P. T. Lansbury, *Biochemistry*, 2002, **41**, 11338–11343.
 - 199 Y. Hirakura, W. W. Yiu, A. Yamamoto and B. L. Kagan, *Amyloid*, 2000, 7, 194–199.
- 25 200 A. Quist, I. Doudevski, H. Lin, R. Azimova, D. Ng,
 B. Frangione, B. Kagan, J. Ghiso and R. Lal, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2005, **102**, 10427–10432.
 - 201 J. D. Green, L. Kreplak, C. Goldsbury, X. Li Blatter, M. Stolz, G. S. Cooper, A. Seelig, J. Kistler and U. Aebi, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2004, 342, 877–887.
 - 202 M. F. M. Engel, L. Khemtémourian, C. C. Kleijer, H. J. D. Meeldijk, J. Jacobs, A. J. Verkleij, B. de Kruijff, J. A. Killian and J. W. M. Höppener, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2008, **105**, 6033–6038.
- 35 203 P. Cao, A. Abedini, H. Wang, L.-H. Tu, X. Zhang,
 A. M. Schmidt and D. P. Raleigh, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.* S. A., 2013, 110, 19279–19284.
 - 204 F. E. Cohen and J. W. Kelly, Nature, 2003, 426, 905-909.
- 205 T. Klabunde, H. M. Petrassi, V. B. Oza, P. Raman,
 J. W. Kelly and J. C. Sacchettini, *Nat. Struct. Biol.*, 2000,
 7, 312–321.
 - 206 H. Wang, M. L. Duennwald, B. E. Roberts, L. M. Rozeboom,Y. L. Zhang, A. D. Steele, R. Krishnan, L. J. Su, D. Griffin,S. Mukhopadhyay, E. J. Hennessy, P. Weigele,
- B. J. Blanchard, J. King, A. A. Deniz, S. L. Buchwald,
 V. M. Ingram, S. Lindquist and J. Shorter, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2008, **105**, 7159–7164.
 - 207 F. Meng, A. Abedini, A. Plesner, C. T. Middleton,
 K. J. Potter, M. T. Zanni, C. B. Verchere and
 D. P. Raleigh, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2010, 400, 555–566.
 - 208 A. Abedini, F. Meng and D. P. Raleigh, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2007, **129**, 11300–11301.
 - 209 D. Sellin, L.-M. Yan, A. Kapurniotu and R. Winter, *Biophys. Chem.*, 2010, **150**, 73–79.
- 55 210 L.-M. Yan, A. Velkova, M. Tatarek-Nossol, E. Andreetto and A. Kapurniotu, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2007, 46, 1246–1252.

- 211 L.-M. Yan, M. Tatarek-Nossol, A. Velkova, A. Kazantzis and
 A. Kapurniotu, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2006, 103, 2046–2051.
- 212 I. Saraogi, J. A. Hebda, J. Becerril, L. A. Estroff,
 A. D. Miranker and A. D. Hamilton, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2010, **49**, 736–739.
- 213 J. A. Hebda, I. Saraogi, M. Magzoub, A. D. Hamilton and A. D. Miranker, *Chem. Biol.*, 2009, 16, 943–950.
- 214 F. Meng, A. Abedini, A. Plesner, C. B. Verchere and D. P. Raleigh, *Biochemistry*, 2010, **49**, 8127–8133.
- 215 L. M. Young, J. C. Saunders, R. A. Mahood, C. H. Revill, R. J. Foster, L. H. Tu, D. P. Raleigh, S. E. Radford and A. E. Ashcroft, *Nat. Chem.*, 2015, 7, 73–81.
- 216 H. Noor, P. Cao and D. P. Raleigh, *Protein Sci.*, 2012, **21**, 373–382.
- 217 C. Zelus, A. Fox, A. Calciano, B. S. Faridian, L. A. Nogaj and D. A. Moffet, *Open Biochem. J.*, 2012, **6**, 66–70.
- 218 L.-H. Tu, H. Noor, P. Cao and D. P. Raleigh, ACS Chem. Biol., 2014, 9, 1632–1637.
- 219 M. Daval, S. Bedrood, T. Gurlo, C.-J. Huang, S. Costes, 20
 P. C. Butler and R. Langen, *Amyloid*, 2010, 17, 118–128.
- 220 S. Sparks, G. Liu, K. J. Robbins and N. D. Lazo, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.*, 2012, **422**, 551–555.
- 221 B. Cheng, H. Gong, X. Li, Y. Sun, X. Zhang, H. Chen, X. Liu,
 L. Zheng and K. Huang, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.*, 25 2012, 419, 495–499.
- 222 S. Rigacci, V. Guidotti, M. Bucciantini, M. Parri, C. Nediani, E. Cerbai, M. Stefani and A. Berti, *J. Nutr. Biochem.*, 2010, 21, 726–735.
- 223 R. Mishra, D. Sellin, D. Radovan, A. Gohlke and R. Winter, 30 *ChemBioChem*, 2009, **10**, 445–449.
- 224 E. N. Gurzov, B. Wang, E. H. Pilkington, P. Chen, A. Kakinen, W. J. Stanley, S. A. Litwak, E. G. Hanssen, T. P. Davis, F. Ding and P. C. Ke, *Small*, 2016, **12**, 1615–1626.
- 225 P. Nedumpully-Govindan, E. N. Gurzov, P. Chen, 35
 E. H. Pilkington, W. J. Stanley, S. A. Litwak, T. P. Davis,
 P. C. Ke and F. Ding, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2016, 18, 94–100.
- 226 C. Cabaleiro-Lago, F. Quinlan-Pluck, I. Lynch,K. A. Dawson and S. Linse, *ACS Chem. Neurosci.*, 2010, 1, 279–287.
- 227 C. T. Middleton, P. Marek, P. Cao, C.-c. Chiu, S. Singh,
 A. M. Woys, J. J. de Pablo, D. P. Raleigh and M. T. Zanni, *Nat. Chem.*, 2012, 4, 355–360.
- 228 D. E. Ehrnhoefer, J. Bieschke, A. Boeddrich, M. Herbst, 45
 L. Masino, R. Lurz, S. Engemann, A. Pastore and
 E. E. Wanker, *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.*, 2008, 15, 558–566.
- A. R. A. Ladiwala, J. C. Lin, S. S. Bale, A. M. Marcelino-Cruz,
 M. Bhattacharya, J. S. Dordick and P. M. Tessier, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2010, 285, 24228–24237.
- 230 R. Mishra, B. Bulic, D. Sellin, S. Jha, H. Waldmann and R. Winter, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2008, **47**, 4679–4682.
- 231 F. Yang, G. P. Lim, A. N. Begum, O. J. Ubeda, M. R. Simmons, S. S. Ambegaokar, P. P. Chen, R. Kayed, C. G. Glabe, S. A. Frautschy and G. M. Cole, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 55 2005, 280, 5892–5901.

50

10

25

35

45

50

1

5

- 232 C. Adessi and C. Soto, *Curr. Med. Chem.*, 2002, 9, 963–978.
 233 A. C. Santos, F. Veiga and A. J. Ribeiro, *Expert Opin. Drug Delivery*, 2011, 8, 973–990.
- 234 P. Nedumpully-Govindan, A. Kakinen, E. H. Pilkington,
- 5 T. P. Davis, P. Chun Ke and F. Ding, *Sci. Rep.*, 2016, 6, 19463.
 - 235 P. Jiang, W. Li, J. E. Shea and Y. Mu, *Biophys. J.*, 2011, **100**, 1550–1558.
 - 236 F. Lolicato, A. Raudino, D. Milardi and C. La Rosa, *Eur. J. Med. Chem.*, 2015, **92**, 876–881.
 - 237 Q. Q. Wang, L. L. Ning, Y. Z. Niu, H. X. Liu and X. J. Yao, J. Phys. Chem. B, 2015, 119, 15–24.
 - 238 L. Maroteaux, J. Campanelli and R. Scheller, *J. Neurosci.*, 1988, **8**, 2804–2815.
- 15 239 T. R. Sampson, J. W. Debelius, T. Thron, S. Janssen, G. G. Shastri, Z. E. Ilhan, C. Challis, C. E. Schretter, S. Rocha, V. Gradinaru, M.-F. Chesselet, A. Keshavarzian, K. M. Shannon, R. Krajmalnik-Brown, P. Wittung-Stafshede, R. Knight and S. K. Mazmanian, *Cell*, 2016, 167, 1469–1480.
 - 240 J. Burré, M. Sharma and T. C. Südhof, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* U. S. A., 2014, **111**, E4274–E4283.
 - 241 M. Vilar, H.-T. Chou, T. Lührs, S. K. Maji, D. Riek-Loher, R. Verel, G. Manning, H. Stahlberg and R. Riek, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2008, **105**, 8637–8642.
 - 242 M. G. Spillantini, M. L. Schmidt, V. M. Y. Lee, J. Q. Trojanowski, R. Jakes and M. Goedert, *Nature*, 1997, 388, 839–840.
- 243 D. J. Irwin, V. M. Y. Lee and J. Q. Trojanowski, *Nat. Rev.*30 *Neurosci.*, 2013, 14, 626–636.
 - 244 M. Periquet, T. Fulga, L. Myllykangas,
 M. G. Schlossmacher and M. B. Feany, *J. Neurosci.*, 2007, 27, 3338–3346.
 - 245 L. Stefanis, *Cold Spring Harbor Perspect. Med.*, 2012, 2, a009399.
 - 246 A. Villar-Piqué, T. Lopes da Fonseca and T. F. Outeiro, *J. Neurochem.*, 2016, **139**, 240–255.
 - 247 C. Vlad, K. Lindner, C. Karreman, S. Schildknecht, M. Leist, N. Tomczyk, J. Rontree, J. Langridge, K. Danzer,
- 40 T. Ciossek, A. Petre, M. L. Gross, B. Hengerer and M. Przybylski, *ChemBioChem*, 2011, **12**, 2740–2744.
 - 248 J. A. Rodriguez, M. I. Ivanova, M. R. Sawaya, D. Cascio, F. E. Reyes, D. Shi, S. Sangwan, E. L. Guenther, L. M. Johnson, M. Zhang, L. Jiang, M. A. Arbing,
 - B. L. Nannenga, J. Hattne, J. Whitelegge, A. S. Brewster,
 M. Messerschmidt, S. Boutet, N. K. Sauter, T. Gonen and
 D. S. Eisenberg, *Nature*, 2015, 525, 486–490.
 - 249 M. D. Tuttle, G. Comellas, A. J. Nieuwkoop, D. J. Covell,D. A. Berthold, K. D. Kloepper, J. M. Courtney, J. K. Kim,A. M. Barclay, A. Kendall, W. Wan, G. Stubbs,
 - C. D. Schwieters, V. M. Y. Lee, J. M. George and C. M. Rienstra, *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.*, 2016, **23**, 409–415.
- 250 G. Comellas, L. R. Lemkau, A. J. Nieuwkoop, K. D. Kloepper, D. T. Ladror, R. Ebisu, W. S. Woods,
 A. S. Lipton, J. M. George and C. M. Rienstra, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2011, 411, 881–895.

- 251 K. A. Conway, S.-J. Lee, J.-C. Rochet, T. T. Ding,
 R. E. Williamson and P. T. Lansbury, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2000, 97, 571–576.
- 252 J.-C. Rochet, K. A. Conway and P. T. Lansbury, *Biochemistry*, 2000, **39**, 10619–10626.
- 253 R. Khurana, C. Ionescu-Zanetti, M. Pope, J. Li, L. Nielson, M. Ramírez-Alvarado, L. Regan, A. L. Fink and S. A. Carter, *Biophys. J.*, 2003, 85, 1135–1144.
- 254 C. Ionescu-Zanetti, R. Khurana, J. R. Gillespie, J. S. Petrick,
 L. C. Trabachino, L. J. Minert, S. A. Carter and A. L. Fink, 10 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 1999, 96, 13175–13179.
- 255 J. D. Harper, C. M. Lieber and P. T. Lansbury, *Chem. Biol.*, 1997, 4, 951–959.
- 256 W. B. Stine, S. W. Snyder, U. S. Ladror, W. S. Wade,
 M. F. Miller, T. J. Perun, T. F. Holzman and G. A. Krafft, 15
 J. Protein Chem., 1996, 15, 193–203.
- 257 H. K. L. Blackley, G. H. W. Sanders, M. C. Davies,
 C. J. Roberts, S. J. B. Tendler and M. J. Wilkinson, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2000, **298**, 833–840.
- 258 A. K. Chamberlain, C. E. MacPhee, J. Zurdo, 20
 L. A. Morozova-Roche, H. A. Hill, C. M. Dobson and
 J. J. Davis, *Biophys. J.*, 2000, **79**, 3282–3293.
- 259 N. M. Kad, N. H. Thomson, D. P. Smith, D. A. Smith and S. E. Radford, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2001, **313**, 559–571.
- 260 J. Adamcik, J.-M. Jung, J. Flakowski, P. De Los Rios, G. Dietler25 and R. Mezzenga, *Nat. Nanotechnol.*, 2010, 5, 423–428.
- 261 K. K. M. Sweers, I. M. J. Segers-Nolten, M. L. Bennink and V. Subramaniam, *Soft Matter*, 2012, 8, 7215–7222.
- 262 R. A. Crowther, S. E. Daniel and M. Goedert, *Neurosci. Lett.*, 2000, **292**, 128–130.
- 263 K. K. M. Sweers, M. L. Bennink and V. Subramaniam, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, 2012, **24**, 243101.
- 264 G. Bhak, S. Lee, J. W. Park, S. Cho and S. R. Paik, *Biomaterials*, 2010, **31**, 5986–5995.
- 265 V. N. Uversky, J. Li and A. L. Fink, J. Biol. Chem., 2001, 276, 35 10737–10744.
- 266 L. Xu, B. Ma, R. Nussinov and D. Thompson, *ACS Chem. Neurosci.*, 2017, **8**, 837–849.
- 267 A. Deleersnijder, M. Gerard, Z. Debyser and V. Baekelandt, *Trends Mol. Med.*, 2013, **19**, 368–377.
- 268 H. A. Lashuel, C. R. Overk, A. Oueslati and E. Masliah, *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, 2013, **14**, 38–48.
- 269 N. Lorenzen, S. B. Nielsen, A. K. Buell, J. D. Kaspersen,
 P. Arosio, B. S. Vad, W. Paslawski, G. Christiansen,
 Z. Valnickova-Hansen, M. Andreasen, J. J. Enghild,
 J. S. Pedersen, C. M. Dobson, T. P. J. Knowles and
 D. E. Otzen, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2014, 136, 3859–3868.
- 270 L. Giehm, D. I. Svergun, D. E. Otzen and B. Vestergaard, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2011, **108**, 3246–3251.
- 271 H. A. Lashuel, D. Hartley, B. M. Petre, T. Walz and 50P. T. Lansbury, *Nature*, 2002, 418, 291.
- 272 B. Winner, R. Jappelli, S. K. Maji, P. A. Desplats, L. Boyer, S. Aigner, C. Hetzer, T. Loher, M. Vilar, S. Campioni, C. Tzitzilonis, A. Soragni, S. Jessberger, H. Mira, A. Consiglio, E. Pham, E. Masliah, F. H. Gage and R. Riek, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2011, 108, 4194–4199.

30

40

5

40

5

20

25

- 273 R. Kayed, E. Head, J. L. Thompson, T. M. McIntire, S. C. Milton, C. W. Cotman and C. G. Glabe, *Science*, 2003, **300**, 486–489.
 - 274 D. M. Walsh and D. J. Selkoe, *J. Neurochem.*, 2007, **101**, 1172–1184.
 - 275 L. M. Luheshi, G. G. Tartaglia, A.-C. Brorsson, A. P. Pawar,
 I. E. Watson, F. Chiti, M. Vendruscolo, D. A. Lomas,
 C. M. Dobson and D. C. Crowther, *PLoS Biol.*, 2007, 5, e290.
 276 C. M. Dobson, *Nature*, 2003, 426, 884–890.
- 10 277 S. Lesné, M. T. Koh, L. Kotilinek, R. Kayed, C. G. Glabe, A. Yang, M. Gallagher and K. H. Ashe, *Nature*, 2006, 440, 352–357.
 - 278 C. Nilsberth, A. Westlind-Danielsson, C. B. Eckman, M. M. Condron, K. Axelman, C. Forsell, C. Stenh,
- J. Luthman, D. B. Teplow, S. G. Younkin, J. Naslund and L. Lannfelt, *Nat. Neurosci.*, 2001, 4, 887–893.
 - 279 S. L. Bernstein, N. F. Dupuis, N. D. Lazo, T. Wyttenbach,
 M. M. Condron, G. Bitan, D. B. Teplow, J.-E. Shea,
 B. T. Ruotolo, C. V. Robinson and M. T. Bowers, *Nat. Chem.*, 2009, 1, 326–331.
 - 280 L. Haataja, T. Gurlo, C. J. Huang and P. C. Butler, *Endocr. Rev.*, 2008, **29**, 303–316.
 - 281 P. Krotee, J. A. Rodriguez, M. R. Sawaya, D. Cascio, F. E. Reyes, D. Shi, J. Hattne, B. L. Nannenga, M. E. Oskarsson, S. Philipp, S. Griner, L. Jiang, C. G. Glabe, G. T. Westermark, T. Gonen and D. S. Eisenberg, *eLife*, 2017, 6, e19273.
 - 282 H. Roberts and D. Brown, *Biomolecules*, 2015, 5, 282–305.
 - 283 F. van Diggelen, A. W. J. W. Tepper, M. M. Apetri and
 - D. E. Otzen, Isr. J. Chem., 2017, DOI: 10.1002/ijch.201600116.
- 30 284 María S. Celej, R. Sarroukh, E. Goormaghtigh, Gerardo D. Fidelio, J.-M. Ruysschaert and V. Raussens, *Biochem. J.*, 2012, 443, 719–726.
 - 285 M. Bucciantini, E. Giannoni, F. Chiti, F. Baroni, L. Formigli, J. Zurdo, N. Taddei, G. Ramponi, C. M. Dobson and M. Stefani, *Nature*, 2002, **416**, 507–511.
 - 286 B. Bolognesi, J. R. Kumita, T. P. Barros, E. K. Esbjorner,
 L. M. Luheshi, D. C. Crowther, M. R. Wilson,
 C. M. Dobson, G. Favrin and J. J. Yerbury, ACS Chem. Biol.,
 2010, 5, 735-740.
- 40 287 L. C. Serpell, J. Berriman, R. Jakes, M. Goedert and R. A. Crowther, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2000, 97, 4897–4902.
 - 288 C. G. Glabe, J. Biol. Chem., 2008, 283, 29639-29643.
- K. M. Danzer, D. Haasen, A. R. Karow, S. Moussaud,
 M. Habeck, A. Giese, H. Kretzschmar, B. Hengerer and M. Kostka, *J. Neurosci.*, 2007, 27, 9220–9232.
 - 290 D. P. Karpinar, M. B. G. Balija, S. Kügler, F. Opazo,
 N. Rezaei-Ghaleh, N. Wender, H.-Y. Kim,
 G. Taschenberger, B. H. Falkenburger, H. Heise,
- A. Kumar, D. Riedel, L. Fichtner, A. Voigt, G. H. Braus,
 K. Giller, S. Becker, A. Herzig, M. Baldus, H. Jäckle,
 S. Eimer, J. B. Schulz, C. Griesinger and M. Zweckstetter, *EMBO J.*, 2009, 28, 3256–3268.
 - 291 P. Desplats, H.-J. Lee, E.-J. Bae, C. Patrick, E. Rockenstein,
- 55 L. Crews, B. Spencer, E. Masliah and S.-J. Lee, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2009, **106**, 13010–13015.

- 292 A. Relini, O. Cavalleri, R. Rolandi and A. Gliozzi, *Chem. Phys. Lipids*, 2009, **158**, 1–9.
- 293 S. M. Butterfield and H. A. Lashuel, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2010, 49, 5628–5654.
- 294 C. Aisenbrey, T. Borowik, R. Byström, M. Bokvist,
 F. Lindström, H. Misiak, M.-A. Sani and G. Gröbner, *Eur. Biophys. J.*, 2008, 37, 247–255.
- 295 J. A. Hebda and A. D. Miranker, *Annu. Rev. Biophys.*, 2009, 39, 125–152.
- 296 C. Galvagnion, A. K. Buell, G. Meisl, T. C. T. Michaels, 10
 M. Vendruscolo, T. P. J. Knowles and C. M. Dobson, *Nat. Chem. Biol.*, 2015, 11, 229–234.
- 297 H.-Y. Kim, M.-K. Cho, A. Kumar, E. Maier, C. Siebenhaar,
 S. Becker, C. O. Fernandez, H. A. Lashuel, R. Benz, A. Lange and M. Zweckstetter, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2009, 131, 15 17482–17489.
- 298 N. P. Reynolds, A. Soragni, M. Rabe, D. Verdes, E. Liverani, S. Handschin, R. Riek and S. Seeger, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2011, **133**, 19366–19375.
- 299 D. L. Fortin, M. D. Troyer, K. Nakamura, S.-i. Kubo, 20
 M. D. Anthony and R. H. Edwards, *J. Neurosci.*, 2004, 24, 6715–6723.
- 300 E. R. Georgieva, T. F. Ramlall, P. P. Borbat, J. H. Freed and D. Eliezer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2008, **130**, 12856–12857.
- 301 A. J. Trexler and E. Rhoades, *Biochemistry*, 2009, 48, 25 2304–2306.
- 302 P. T. Wong, J. A. Schauerte, K. C. Wisser, H. Ding, E. L. Lee, D. G. Steel and A. Gafni, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2009, **386**, 81–96.
- 303 A. M. Morris and R. G. Finke, Biophys. Chem., 2009, 140, 9-15.
- 304 L. Kjaer, L. Giehm, T. Heimburg and D. Otzen, *Biophys. J.*, 30 2009, 96, 2857–2870.
- 305 D. P. Smith, D. J. Tew, A. F. Hill, S. P. Bottomley, C. L. Masters, K. J. Barnham and R. Cappai, *Biochemistry*, 2008, 47, 1425–1434.
- 306 A. P. Pandey, F. Haque, J.-C. Rochet and J. S. Hovis, 35 Biophys. J., 2009, 96, 540–551.
- 307 B. D. van Rooijen, M. M. A. E. Claessens and V. Subramaniam, *FEBS Lett.*, 2008, **582**, 3788–3792.
- 308 E. C. Hirsch, J. P. Brandel, P. Galle, F. Javoy-Agid and Y. Agid, *J. Neurochem.*, 1991, 56, 446–451.
- 309 D. L. Pountney, N. H. Voelcker and W. P. Gai, *Neurotoxic. Res.*, 2005, 7, 59–67.
- 310 S. Bolisetty and R. Mezzenga, *Nat. Nanotechnol.*, 2016, **11**, 365–371.
- 311 Y. Shen, L. Posavec, S. Bolisetty, F. M. Hilty, G. Nyström, 45
 J. Kohlbrecher, M. Hilbe, A. Rossi, J. Baumgartner, M. B. Zimmermann and R. Mezzenga, *Nat. Nanotechnol.*, 2017, DOI: 10.1038/nnano.2017.58.
- 312 G. Wei, Z. Su, N. P. Reynolds, P. Arosio, I. W. Hamley,
 E. Gazit and R. Mezzenga, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2017, DOI: 50 10.1039/C6CS00542J.
- 313 I. F. Tsigelny, P. Bar-On, Y. Sharikov, L. Crews, M. Hashimoto, M. A. Miller, S. H. Keller, O. Platoshyn, J. X. J. Yuan and E. Masliah, *FEBS J.*, 2007, 274, 1862–1877.
- 314 M. J. Volles and P. T. Lansbury, *Biochemistry*, 2002, **41**, 55 4595–4602.

5

10

30

35

- 315 B. Bechinger and K. Lohner, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta, Biomembr.*, 2006, **1758**, 1529–1539.
- 316 J. Kiskis, I. Horvath, P. Wittung-Stafshede and S. Rocha, *Q. Rev. Biophys.*, 2017, 50.
- 317 H. Chaudhary, A. N. D. Stefanovic, V. Subramaniam and M. M. A. E. Claessens, *FEBS Lett.*, 2014, 588, 4457–4463.
 - 318 E. Monsellier, L. Bousset and R. Melki, *Sci. Rep.*, 2016, 6, 19180.
- 319 A. Iyer, N. Schilderink, M. M. A. E. Claessens and V. Subramaniam, *Biophys. J.*, 2016, **111**, 2440–2449.
- 320 L. Devi, V. Raghavendran, B. M. Prabhu, N. G. Avadhani and H. K. Anandatheerthavarada, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2008, **283**, 9089–9100.
- 321 E. S. Luth, I. G. Stavrovskaya, T. Bartels, B. S. Kristal and 15 D. J. Selkoe, *I. Biol. Chem.*, 2014, **289**, 21490–21507.
 - 322 L. Chen, J. Jin, J. Davis, Y. Zhou, Y. Wang, J. Liu, P. J. Lockhart and J. Zhang, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.*, 2007, **356**, 548–553.
 - 323 N. Cremades, S. I. Cohen, E. Deas, A. Y. Abramov, A. Y. Chen,
- A. Orte, M. Sandal, R. W. Clarke, P. Dunne, F. A. Aprile, C. W. Bertoncini, N. W. Wood, T. P. Knowles, C. M. Dobson and D. Klenerman, *Cell*, 2012, **149**, 1048–1059.
 - 324 E. Junn and M. M. Mouradian, *Neurosci. Lett.*, 2002, **320**, 146–150.
- 25 325 D.-H. Choi, A. C. Cristóvão, S. Guhathakurta, J. Lee, T. H. Joh, M. F. Beal and Y.-S. Kim, *Antioxid. Redox Signaling*, 2012, **16**, 1033–1045.
 - 326 H. A. Lashuel, B. M. Petre, J. Wall, M. Simon, R. J. Nowak,
 T. Walz and P. T. Lansbury Jr, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2002, 322, 1089–1102.
 - 327 J. J. M. Hoozemans, E. S. van Haastert, D. A. T. Nijholt,A. J. M. Rozemuller and W. Scheper, *Neurodegener. Dis.*, 2012, 10, 212–215.
 - 328 H. Snyder, K. Mensah, C. Theisler, J. Lee, A. Matouschek and B. Wolozin, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2003, **278**, 11753–11759.
 - 329 G. Fusco, T. Pape, A. D. Stephens, P. Mahou, A. R. Costa,
 C. F. Kaminski, G. S. Kaminski Schierle, M. Vendruscolo,
 G. Veglia, C. M. Dobson and A. De Simone, *Nat. Commun.*,
 2016, 7, 12563.
- 330 L. S. Forno, *J. Neuropathol. Exp. Neurol.*, 1996, 55, 259–272.
 331 A. Recasens, B. Dehay, J. Bové, I. Carballo-Carbajal, S. Dovero, A. Pérez-Villalba, P.-O. Fernagut, J. Blesa, A. Parent, C. Perier, I. Fariñas, J. A. Obeso, E. Bezard and M. Vila, *Ann. Neurol.*, 2014, 75, 351–362.
- 45 332 M. Iljina, G. A. Garcia, M. H. Horrocks, L. Tosatto, M. L. Choi, K. A. Ganzinger, A. Y. Abramov, S. Gandhi, N. W. Wood, N. Cremades, C. M. Dobson, T. P. J. Knowles and D. Klenerman, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2016, **113**, E1206–E1215.
- 50 333 H. Malkki, Nat. Rev. Neurol., 2017, 13, 66-67.
 - 334 T. Bartels, J. G. Choi and D. J. Selkoe, *Nature*, 2011, 477, 107–110.
 - 335 O. Marques and T. F. Outeiro, Cell Death Dis., 2012, 3, e350.
- 336 E. Masliah, E. Rockenstein, A. Adame, M. Alford, L. Crews,
 55 M. Hashimoto, P. Seubert, M. Lee, J. Goldstein, T. Chilcote,
 D. Games and D. Schenk, *Neuron*, 46, 857–868.

- 337 E. Valera and E. Masliah, *Pharmacol. Ther.*, 2013, **138**, 311–322.
- 338 S. Di Giovanni, S. Eleuteri, K. E. Paleologou, G. Yin, M. Zweckstetter, P.-A. Carrupt and H. A. Lashuel, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2010, 285, 14941–14954.
- 339 M. Masuda, N. Suzuki, S. Taniguchi, T. Oikawa, T. Nonaka, T. Iwatsubo, S.-i. Hisanaga, M. Goedert and M. Hasegawa, *Biochemistry*, 2006, 45, 6085–6094.
- 340 Y. Porat, A. Abramowitz and E. Gazit, *Chem. Biol. Drug Des.*, 2006, **67**, 27–37.
- 341 S. B. Prusiner, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 1998, 95, 13363–13383.
- 342 Z. Huang, S. B. Prusiner and F. E. Cohen, *Folding Des.*, 1996, 1, 13–19.
- 343 P. N. Campbell, *IUBMB Life*, 2005, 57, 273–276.
- 344 C. J. Sigurdson and A. Aguzzi, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 2007, 1772, 610–618.
- 345 D. Westaway, C. Cooper, S. Turner, M. Da Costa,
 G. A. Carlson and S. B. Prusiner, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 1994, **91**, 6418–6422.
- 346 J. Mastrianni, F. Nixon, R. Layzer, S. J. DeArmond and S. B. Prusiner, *Neurology*, 1997, **48**, A296.
- 347 P. Westermark, M. D. Benson, J. N. Buxbaum, A. S. Cohen,
 B. Frangione, S.-I. Ikeda, C. L. Masters, G. Merlini,
 M. J. Saraiva and J. D. Sipe, *Amyloid*, 2005, 12, 1–4.
- B. Chesebro, M. Trifilo, R. Race, K. Meade-White, C. Teng,
 R. LaCasse, L. Raymond, C. Favara, G. Baron, S. Priola,
 B. Caughey, E. Masliah and M. Oldstone, *Science*, 2005, 308, 1435.
- 349 A. Aguzzi, Science, 2005, 308, 1420.
- 350 A. Aguzzi and M. Heikenwalder, *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.*, 2006, 4, 765–775.
- 351 I. V. Baskakov, G. Legname, M. A. Baldwin, S. B. Prusiner and F. E. Cohen, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2002, 277, 21140–21148.
- 352 R. A. Bessen and R. F. Marsh, J. Virol., 1994, 68, 7859–7868. 35
- 353 M. P. McKinley, R. K. Meyer, L. Kenaga, F. Rahbar,
 R. Cotter, A. Serban and S. B. Prusiner, *J. Virol.*, 1991, 65, 1340–1351.
- 354 M. Sunde and C. C. Blake, Q. Rev. Biophys., 1998, 31, 1-39.
- 355 K.-W. Leffers, H. Wille, J. Stöhr, E. Junger, B. Prusiner 40 Stanley and D. Riesner, *Biol. Chem.*, 2005, **386**, 569.
- 356 J. G. Safar, K. Kellings, A. Serban, D. Groth, J. E. Cleaver,
 S. B. Prusiner and D. Riesner, *J. Virol.*, 2005, 79, 10796–10806.
- 357 B. Caughey and G. S. Baron, *Nature*, 2006, 443, 803–810. 45
- 358 L. Manuelidis, Virulence, 2013, 4, 373-383.
- 359 F. O. Bastian, Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med., 1979, 103, 665-669.
- 360 J. S. Griffith, Nature, 1967, 215, 1043-1044.
- 361 S. B. Prusiner, Annu. Rev. Microbiol., 1989, 43, 345-374.
- 362 C. Soto and J. Castilla, Nat. Med., 2004, 10, 63-67.
- 363 K. Abid and C. Soto, *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.*, 2006, **63**, 2342–2351.
- 364 M. Stefani and C. M. Dobson, J. Mol. Med., 2003, 81, 678-699.
- 365 V. Novitskaya, O. V. Bocharova, I. Bronstein and 55
 I. V. Baskakov, J. Biol. Chem., 2006, 281, 13828–13836.

1

5

10

15

20

25

30

5

10

40

50

- 366 R. Chiesa, P. Piccardo, E. Quaglio, B. Drisaldi, S. L. Si-Hoe, M. Takao, B. Ghetti and D. A. Harris, J. Virol., 2003, 77, 7611-7622.
- 367 K. Wüthrich and R. Riek, Adv. Protein Chem., 2001, 57, 55-82.
- 368 C. Govaerts, H. Wille, S. B. Prusiner and F. E. Cohen, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2004, 101, 8342-8347.
- 369 R. S. Sparkes, M. Simon, V. H. Cohn, R. E. Fournier, J. Lem, I. Klisak, C. Heinzmann, C. Blatt, M. Lucero and T. Mohandas, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 1986, 83, 7358-7362.
- 370 R. Linden, V. R. Martins, M. A. M. Prado, M. Cammarota, I. Izquierdo and R. R. Brentani, Physiol. Rev., 2008, 88, 673-728.
- 371 F. Llorens and J. A. del Río, Prion, 2012, 6, 245-251. 15
- 372 A. Aguzzi, M. Heikenwalder and M. Polymenidou, Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol., 2007, 8. Q6
 - 373 J. Kanaani, S. B. Prusiner, J. Diacovo, S. Baekkeskov and G. Legname, J. Neurochem., 2005, 95, 1373-1386.
- 374 D. R. Brown, K. Qin, J. W. Herms, A. Madlung, J. Manson, 20 R. Strome, P. E. Fraser, T. Kruck, A. von Bohlen, W. Schulz-Schaeffer, A. Giese, D. Westaway and H. Kretzschmar, Nature, 1997, 390, 684-687.
- 375 M. Prčina, E. Kontseková and M. Novák, Acta Virol., 2015, 59, 179-184. 25
 - 376 M. Mehrpour and P. Codogno, Cancer Lett., 2010, 290, 1 - 23.
 - 377 J. Du, Y. Pan, Y. Shi, C. Guo, X. Jin, L. Sun, N. Liu, T. Qiao and D. Fan, Int. J. Cancer, 2005, 113, 213-220.
- 30 378 Q.-Q. Li, Y.-P. Sun, C.-P. Ruan, X.-Y. Xu, J.-H. Ge, J. He, Z.-D. Xu, Q. Wang and W.-C. Gao, Cancer Sci., 2011, 102, 400-406.
 - 379 M. de Wit, C. R. Jimenez, B. Carvalho, J. A. M. Belien, P. M. Delis-van Diemen, S. Mongera, S. R. Piersma,
- M. Vikas, S. Navani, F. Pontén, G. A. Meijer and 35 R. J. A. Fijneman, Gut, 2012, 61, 855-864.
 - 380 H. Büeler, A. Aguzzi, A. Sailer, R. A. Greiner, P. Autenried, M. Aguet and C. Weissmann, Cell, 1993, 73, 1339-1347.
 - 381 A. D. Steele, S. Lindquist and A. Aguzzi, Prion, 2007, 1, 83-93.
 - 382 J. R. Criado, M. Sánchez-Alavez, B. Conti, J. L. Giacchino, D. N. Wills, S. J. Henriksen, R. Race, J. C. Manson, B. Chesebro and M. B. A. Oldstone, Neurobiol. Dis., 2005, 19, 255-265.
- 383 C. E. Le Pichon, M. T. Valley, M. Polymenidou, 45 A. T. Chesler, B. T. Sagdullaev, A. Aguzzi and S. Firestein, Nat. Neurosci., 2009, 12, 60-69.
 - 384 R. Riek, S. Hornemann, G. Wider, M. Billeter, R. Glockshuber and K. Wuthrich, Nature, 1996, 382, 180-182.
 - 385 R. Zahn, A. Liu, T. Lührs, R. Riek, C. von Schroetter, F. López García, M. Billeter, L. Calzolai, G. Wider and K. Wüthrich, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2000, 97, 145 - 150.
- 55 386 R. Zahn, P. Güntert, C. von Schroetter and K. Wüthrich, J. Mol. Biol., 2003, 326, 225-234.

- 387 L. Calzolai and R. Zahn, J. Biol. Chem., 2003, 278, 35592-35596.
- 388 L. Calzolai, D. A. Lysek, P. Güntert, C. von Schroetter, R. Riek, R. Zahn and K. Wüthrich, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2000, 97, 8340-8345.
- 389 A. Pastore and A. Zagari, Prion, 2007, 1, 185-197.
- 390 K. J. Knaus, M. Morillas, W. Swietnicki, M. Malone, W. K. Surewicz and V. C. Yee, Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol., 2001, 8, 770-774.
- 391 F. Wopfner, G. Weidenhöfer, R. Schneider, A. von Brunn, S. Gilch, T. F. Schwarz, T. Werner and H. M. Schätzl, J. Mol. Biol., 1999, 289, 1163-1178.
- 392 E. Rivera-Milla, B. Oidtmann, C. H. Panagiotidis, M. Baier, T. Sklaviadis, R. Hoffmann, Y. Zhou, G. P. Solis, C. A. O. Stuermer and E. Málaga-Trillo, FASEB J., 2005, 15 DOI: 10.1096/fj.05-4279fje.
- 393 G. L. Millhauser, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem., 2007, 58, 299-320.
- 394 D. G. Donne, J. H. Viles, D. Groth, I. Mehlhorn, T. L. James, F. E. Cohen, S. B. Prusiner, P. E. Wright and H. J. Dyson, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 1997, 94, 13452-13457.
- 395 K. M. Pan, M. Baldwin, J. Nguyen, M. Gasset, A. Serban, D. Groth, I. Mehlhorn, Z. Huang, R. J. Fletterick and F. E. Cohen, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 1993, 90, 10962-10966.
- 396 J. Safar, P. P. Roller, D. C. Gajdusek and C. J. Gibbs, J. Biol. 25 Chem., 1993, 268, 20276-20284.
- 397 M. P. McKinley and S. B. Prusiner, Int. Rev. Neurobiol., 1986, 28, 1-57.
- 398 M. L. DeMarco and V. Daggett, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2004, 101, 2293-2298.
- 399 N. J. Cobb, F. D. Sönnichsen, H. McHaourab and W. K. Surewicz, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2007, 104, 18946-18951.
- 400 B. R. Groveman, M. A. Dolan, L. M. Taubner, A. Kraus, R. B. Wickner and B. Caughey, J. Biol. Chem., 2014, 289, 24129-24142.
- 401 M. R. Sawaya, S. Sambashivan, R. Nelson, M. I. Ivanova, S. A. Sievers, M. I. Apostol, M. J. Thompson, M. Balbirnie, J. J. W. Wiltzius, H. T. McFarlane, A. O. Madsen, C. Riekel and D. Eisenberg, Nature, 2007, 447, 453-457.
- 402 C. Wasmer, A. Lange, H. Van Melckebeke, A. B. Siemer, R. Riek and B. H. Meier, Science, 2008, 319, 1523-1526.
- 403 H. Wille, W. Bian, M. McDonald, A. Kendall, D. W. Colby, L. Bloch, J. Ollesch, A. L. Borovinskiy, F. E. Cohen, S. B. Prusiner and G. Stubbs, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. 45 A., 2009, 106, 16990-16995.
- 404 A. G. Dickinson, V. M. H. Meikle and H. Fraser, J. Comp. Pathol., 1968, 78, 293-299.
- 405 M. E. Bruce and A. G. Dickinson, J. Gen. Virol., 1987, 68, 79-89.
- 406 R. A. Bessen and R. F. Marsh, J. Gen. Virol., 1992, 73, 329-334.
- 407 L. Monari, S. G. Chen, P. Brown, P. Parchi, R. B. Petersen, J. Mikol, F. Gray, P. Cortelli, P. Montagna and B. Ghetti, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 1994, 91, 2839-2842.
- 408 J. Collinge and A. R. Clarke, Science, 2007, 318, 930-936.

20

30

35

40

50

55

10

1

5

20

25

40

50

- 409 M. R. Scott, D. Groth, J. Tatzelt, M. Torchia, P. Tremblay,S. J. DeArmond and S. B. Prusiner, *J. Virol.*, 1997, 71, 9032–9044.
- 410 R. H. Kimberlin, C. A. Walker and H. Fraser, *J. Gen. Virol.*, 1989, **70**, 2017–2025.
- 411 H. Fraser and A. G. Dickinson, J. Comp. Pathol., 1973, 83, 29–40.
- 412 P. A. Merz, R. A. Somerville, H. M. Wisniewski and K. Iqbal, *Acta Neuropathol.*, 1981, 54, 63–74.
- 413 S. B. Prusiner, M. P. McKinley, K. A. Bowman, D. C. Bolton,
 P. E. Bendheim, D. F. Groth and G. G. Glenner, *Cell*, 1983,
 35, 349–358.
 - 414 V. L. Sim and B. Caughey, Neurobiol. Aging, 2009, 30, 2031–2042.
- 15 415 R. J. Kascsak, R. Rubenstein, P. A. Merz, R. I. Carp, N. K. Robakis, H. M. Wisniewski and H. Diringer, *J. Virol.*, 1986, **59**, 676–683.
 - 416 E. Neuendorf, A. Weber, A. Saalmueller, H. Schatzl, K. Reifenberg, E. Pfaff and M. H. Groschup, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2004, 279, 53306–53316.
 - 417 G. Zanusso, A. Polo and A. Farinazzo, *et al.*, *Arch. Neurol.*, 2007, **64**, 595–599.
 - 418 P. A. Lewis, F. Properzi, K. Prodromidou, A. R. Clarke, J. Collinge and G. S. Jackson, *Biochem. J.*, 2006, **395**, 443–448.
 - 419 M. J. Stack, A. M. Aldrich, A. D. Kitching and A. C. Scott, *Res. Vet. Sci.*, 1995, **59**, 247–254.
 - 420 K. Hsiao and S. B. Prusiner, Neurology, 1990, 40, 1820.
 - 421 S. B. Prusiner, Arch. Neurol., 1993, 50, 1129-1153.
- 30 422 D. Gajdusek, Eur. J. Epidemiol., 1991, 7, 567–577.
 - 423 J. Collinge, J. Whitfield, E. McKintosh, J. Beck, S. Mead,
 D. J. Thomas and M. P. Alpers, *Lancet*, 2006, 367, 2068–2074.
 - 424 S. McCutcheon, A. R. A. Blanco, E. F. Houston, C. de Wolf,
- B. C. Tan, A. Smith, M. H. Groschup, N. Hunter,
 V. S. Hornsey and I. R. MacGregor, *PLoS One*, 2011,
 6, e23169.
 - 425 O. Andréoletti, C. Litaise, H. Simmons, F. Corbière,
 S. Lugan, P. Costes, F. Schelcher, D. Vilette, J. Grassi and
 C. Lacroux, *PLoS Pathog.*, 2012, 8, e1002782.
 - 426 D. J. Bonda, S. Manjila, P. Mehndiratta, F. Khan,
 B. R. Miller, K. Onwuzulike, G. Puoti, M. L. Cohen,
 L. B. Schonberger and I. Cali, *Neurosurg. Focus*, 2016,
 41, E10.
- 45 427 C. K. Mathiason, J. G. Powers, S. J. Dahmes, D. A. Osborn, K. V. Miller, R. J. Warren, G. L. Mason, S. A. Hays, J. Hayes-Klug and D. M. Seelig, *Science*, 2006, **314**, 133–136.
 - 428 C. K. Mathiason, S. A. Hays, J. Powers, J. Hayes-Klug,J. Langenberg, S. J. Dahmes, D. A. Osborn, K. V. Miller,R. J. Warren and G. L. Mason, *PLoS One*, 2009, 4, e5916.
 - 429 N. J. Haley, D. M. Seelig, M. D. Zabel, G. C. Telling and E. A. Hoover, *PLoS One*, 2009, 4, e4848.
 - 430 C. DeJoia, B. Moreaux, K. O'Connell and R. A. Bessen, *J. Virol.*, 2006, **80**, 4546–4556.
- 55 431 T. Konold, S. J. Moore, S. J. Bellworthy and H. A. Simmons, *BMC Vet. Res.*, 2008, **4**, 14.

- 432 C. Ligios, C. J. Sigurdson, C. Santucciu, G. Carcassola,G. Manco, M. Basagni, C. Maestrale, M. G. Cancedda,L. Madau and A. Aguzzi, *Nat. Med.*, 2005, 11, 1137–1139.
- 433 C. Lacroux, S. Simon, S. L. Benestad, S. Maillet, J. Mathey,S. Lugan, F. Corbière, H. Cassard, P. Costes andD. Bergonier, *PLoS Pathog.*, 2008, 4, e1000238.
- 434 C. J. Johnson, D. McKenzie, J. A. Pedersen and J. M. Aiken, J. Toxicol. Environ. Health, Part A, 2011, 74, 161–166.
- 435 C. E. Bruederle, R. M. Hnasko, T. Kraemer, R. A. Garcia, M. J. Haas, W. N. Marmer and J. M. Carter, *PLoS One*, 2008, 10 3, e2969.
- 436 M. W. Miller, *Emerging Infect. Dis.*, 2004, 10, 1003–1006.
- 437 G. Georgsson, S. Sigurdarson and P. Brown, *J. Gen. Virol.*, 2006, **87**, 3737–3740.
- 438 S. E. Saunders, J. C. Bartz and S. L. Bartelt-Hunt, *Environ.* 15 *Sci. Technol.*, 2009, **43**, 5242.
- 439 K. Tsiroulnikov, H. Rezai, E. Bonch-Osmolovskaya,
 P. Nedkov, A. Gousterova, V. Cueff, A. Godfroy,
 G. Barbier, F. Métro and J.-M. Chobert, *J. Agric. Food Chem.*, 2004, 52, 6353–6360.
- 440 J. Rasmussen, B. H. Gilroyed, T. Reuter, S. Dudas, N. F. Neumann, A. Balachandran, N. N. Kav, C. Graham, S. Czub and T. A. McAllister, *Prion*, 2014, 8, 136–142.
- 441 S. Pritzkow, R. Morales, F. Moda, U. Khan, G. C. Telling,E. Hoover and C. Soto, *Cell Rep.*, 2015, 11, 1168–1175.
- 442 Y. O. Chernoff, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 2016, 113, 6097–6099.
- 443 S. Brandner, M. A. Klein, R. Frigg, V. Pekarik, P. Parizek,A. Raeber, M. Glatzel, P. Schwarz, T. Rülicke andC. Weissmann, *Exp. Physiol.*, 2000, 85, 705–712.
- 444 A. Aguzzi and M. Polymenidou, Cell, 2004, 116, 313-327.
- 445 A. Aguzzi and A. M. Calella, *Physiol. Rev.*, 2009, **89**, 1105–1152.
- 446 C. Soto, L. Estrada and J. Castilla, *Trends Biochem. Sci.*, 2006, **31**, 150–155.
- 447 N. Makarava, V. G. Ostapchenko, R. Savtchenko and I. V. Baskakov, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2009, **284**, 14386–14395.
- 448 L. Li, W. Guest, A. Huang, S. S. Plotkin and N. R. Cashman, *Protein Eng., Des. Sel.*, 2009, **22**, 523–529.

449 G. Legname, Prion, 2012, 6, 37-39.

- 450 E. Paramithiotis, M. Pinard, T. Lawton, S. LaBoissiere,V. L. Leathers, W.-Q. Zou, L. A. Estey, J. Lamontagne,M. T. Lehto and L. H. Kondejewski, *Nat. Med.*, 2003, 9, 893–899.
- 451 K. Kaneko, L. Zulianello, M. Scott, C. M. Cooper,
 A. C. Wallace, T. L. James, F. E. Cohen and 45
 S. B. Prusiner, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 1997, 94, 10069–10074.
- 452 J. C. Geoghegan, P. A. Valdes, N. R. Orem, N. R. Deleault, R. A. Williamson, B. T. Harris and S. Supattapone, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2007, 282, 36341–36353.
- 453 I. V. Baskakov and L. Breydo, *BBA, Mol. Basis Dis.*, 2007, 1772, 692–703.
- 454 B. Caughey, Br. Med. Bull., 2003, 66, 109-120.
- 455 M. Bishop, P. Hart, L. Aitchison, H. Baybutt, C. Plinston,
 V. Thomson, N. Tuzi, M. Head, J. Ironside and R. Will, 55 Lancet Neurol., 2006, 5, 393–398.

1

5

25

30

35

40

50

5

10

15

5

25

- 1 456 M. I. Apostol, J. J. Wiltzius, M. R. Sawaya, D. Cascio and D. Eisenberg, *Biochemistry*, 2011, **50**, 2456.
 - 457 T. D. Kurt, C. Bett, N. Fernández-Borges, S. Joshi-Barr, S. Hornemann, T. Rülicke, J. Castilla, K. Wüthrich,
 - A. Aguzzi and C. J. Sigurdson, *J. Neurosci.*, 2014, **34**, 1022–1027.
 - 458 C. J. Sigurdson, K. P. R. Nilsson, S. Hornemann, G. Manco, N. Fernández-Borges, P. Schwarz, J. Castilla, K. Wüthrich and A. Aguzzi, *J. Clin. Invest.*, 2010, **120**, 2590–2599.
- 10 459 A. F. Hill and J. Collinge, *Trends Microbiol.*, 2003, **11**, 578–584.
 - 460 C. Thuring, J. Erkens, J. Jacobs, A. Bossers, L. Van Keulen,
 G. Garssen, F. Van Zijderveld, S. Ryder, M. Groschup and
 T. Sweeney, *J. Clin. Microbiol.*, 2004, 42, 972–980.
- 461 E. M. Jones and W. K. Surewicz, *Cell*, 2005, 121, 63–72.
 462 M. Jones, *Emerging Infect. Dis.*, 2009.
 - 463 H. Liu, S. Farr-Jones, N. B. Ulyanov, M. Llinas, S. Marqusee,
 D. Groth, F. E. Cohen, S. B. Prusiner and T. L. James, *Biochemistry*, 1999, 38, 5362–5377.
- 20 464 N. Makarava, G. G. Kovacs, O. Bocharova, R. Savtchenko, I. Alexeeva, H. Budka, R. G. Rohwer and I. V. Baskakov, *Acta Neurol.*, 2010, **119**, 177–187.
 - 465 V. Béringue, L. Herzog, E. Jaumain, F. Reine, P. Sibille,A. Le Dur, J.-L. Vilotte and H. Laude, *Science*, 2012, 335, 472–475.
 - 466 D. Padilla, V. Béringue, J. C. Espinosa, O. Andreoletti,
 E. Jaumain, F. Reine, L. Herzog, A. Gutierrez-Adan,
 B. Pintado and H. Laude, *PLoS Pathog.*, 2011, 7, e1001319.
- 467 J. Castilla, D. Gonzalez-Romero, P. Saá, R. Morales, J. De
 Castro and C. Soto, *Cell*, 2008, **134**, 757–768.
 - 468 E. A. Asante, J. M. Linehan, M. Desbruslais, S. Joiner, I. Gowland, A. L. Wood, J. Welch, A. F. Hill, S. E. Lloyd and J. D. Wadsworth, *EMBO J.*, 2002, 21, 6358–6366.
 - 469 J. D. Wadsworth, E. A. Asante, M. Desbruslais,
- J. M. Linehan, S. Joiner, I. Gowland, J. Welch, L. Stone,
 S. E. Lloyd and A. F. Hill, *Science*, 2004, 306, 1793–1796.
 - 470 R. H. Kimberlin, S. Cole and C. A. Walker, *J. Gen. Virol.*, 1987, **68**, 1875–1881.
- 471 D. W. Colby, K. Giles, G. Legname, H. Wille, I. V. Baskakov,
 40 S. J. DeArmond and S. B. Prusiner, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2009, **106**, 20417–20422.
 - 472 M. E. Bruce, Br. Med. Bull., 2003, 66, 99-108.
 - 473 M. A. Barria, G. C. Telling, P. Gambetti, J. A. Mastrianni and C. Soto, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2011, **286**, 7490–7495.
- 45 474 J. Li, S. Browning, S. P. Mahal, A. M. Oelschlegel and C. Weissmann, *Science*, 2010, 327, 869–872.
 - 475 B. Caughey, G. S. Baron, B. Chesebro and M. Jeffrey, Annu. Rev. Biochem., 2009, 78, 177–204.
 - 476 A. Aguzzi and J. Falsig, Nat. Neurosci., 2012, 15, 936-939.
- 50 477 G. Mallucci, A. Dickinson, J. Linehan, P.-C. Klöhn, S. Brandner and J. Collinge, *Science*, 2003, **302**, 871–874.
 - 478 R. Bahadi, P. V. Farrelly, B. L. Kenna, J. I. Kourie,
 F. Tagliavini, G. Forloni and M. Salmona, *Am. J. Physiol.: Cell Physiol.*, 2003, 285, C862–C872.
- 55 479 N. Sanghera and T. J. Pinheiro, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 2002, **315**, 1241–1256.

- 480 S. Simoneau, H. Rezaei, N. Salès, G. Kaiser-Schulz, M. Lefebvre-Roque, C. Vidal, J.-G. Fournier, J. Comte, F. Wopfner and J. Grosclaude, *PLoS Pathog.*, 2007, 3, e125.
- 481 U. K. Resenberger, A. Harmeier, A. C. Woerner, J. L. Goodman, V. Müller, R. Krishnan, R. M. Vabulas, H. A. Kretzschmar, S. Lindquist and F. U. Hartl, *EMBO J.*, 2011, **30**, 2057–2070.
- 482 J. W. Um, H. B. Nygaard, J. K. Heiss, M. A. Kostylev, M. Stagi, A. Vortmeyer, T. Wisniewski, E. C. Gunther and S. M. Strittmatter, *Nat. Neurosci.*, 2012, **15**, 1227–1235.
- 483 R. Linden, V. R. Martins, M. A. Prado, M. Cammarota, I. Izquierdo and R. R. Brentani, *Physiol. Rev.*, 2008, 88, 673–728.
- 484 M. Kristiansen, P. Deriziotis, D. E. Dimcheff, G. S. Jackson,
 H. Ovaa, H. Naumann, A. R. Clarke, F. W. van Leeuwen,
 V. Menéndez-Benito and N. P. Dantuma, *Mol. Cell*, 2007,
 26, 175–188.
- 485 L. Westergard, H. M. Christensen and D. A. Harris, *BBA, Mol. Basis Dis.*, 2007, **1772**, 629–644.
- 486 M. Jeffrey, G. McGovern, C. M. Goodsir and L. González, 20
 Brain Pathol., 2009, 19, 1–11.
- 487 B. Caughey, Trends Biochem. Sci., 2001, 26, 235-242.
- 488 H.-J. Zhang, Y.-H. Lu, Y.-J. Long, Q.-L. Wang, X.-X. Huang,
 R. Zhu, X.-L. Wang, L.-P. Liang, P. Teng and H.-Z. Zheng,
 Anal. Methods, 2014, 6, 2982–2987.
- 489 L. Zhan, L. Peng and C.-Z. Huang, *Chin. Sci. Bull.*, 2014, **59**, 964–970.
- 490 P. Sobrova, I. Blazkova, J. Chomoucka, J. Drbohlavova, M. Vaculovicova, P. Kopel, J. Hubalek, R. Kizek and V. Adam, *Prion*, 2013, 7, 349–358.
- 491 M. F. Ottaviani, M. Cangiotti, L. Fiorani, A. Fattori, T. Wasiak, D. Appelhans and B. Klajnert, *Curr. Med. Chem.*, 2012, 19, 5907–5921.
- 492 T. Kimura, J. Hosokawa-Muto, K. Asami, T. Murai and K. Kuwata, *Eur. J. Med. Chem.*, 2011, **46**, 5675–5679.
- 493 A. Gallardo-Godoy, J. Gever, K. L. Fife, B. M. Silber,
 S. B. Prusiner and A. R. Renslo, *J. Med. Chem.*, 2011, 54, 1010.
- 494 S. Bongarzone, H. N. A. Tran, A. Cavalli, M. Roberti, M. Rosini, P. Carloni, G. Legname and M. L. Bolognesi, *ChemMedChem*, 2011, 6, 601–605.
- 495 R. A. Alvarez-Puebla, A. Agarwal, P. Manna, B. P. Khanal, P. Aldeanueva-Potel, E. Carbó-Argibay, N. Pazos-Pérez, L. Vigderman, E. R. Zubarev and N. A. Kotov, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2011, **108**, 8157–8161.
- 496 S. J. Xiao, P. P. Hu, X. D. Wu, Y. L. Zou, L. Q. Chen, L. Peng,
 J. Ling, S. J. Zhen, L. Zhan and Y. F. Li, *Anal. Chem.*, 2010,
 82, 9736–9742.
- 497 H. N. A. Tran, F. Sousa, F. Moda, S. Mandal, M. Chanana,
 C. Vimercati, M. Morbin, S. Krol, F. Tagliavini and 50
 G. Legname, *Nanoscale*, 2010, 2, 2724–2732.
- 498 J. Henry, A. Anand, M. Chowdhury, G. Coté, R. Moreira and T. Good, *Anal. Biochem.*, 2004, 334, 1–8.
- 499 S. Supattapone, H. Wille, L. Uyechi, J. Safar, P. Tremblay,
 F. C. Szoka, F. E. Cohen, S. B. Prusiner and M. R. Scott, 55 *J. Virol.*, 2001, 75, 3453–3461.

30

35

40

45

5

10

25

30

35

40

45

50

1

- 500 A. Rangel, N. Madroñal, R. Gavín, F. Llorens, L. Sumoy, J. M. Torres, J. M. Delgado-García and J. A. Del Río, *PLoS* One, 2009, 4, e7592.
 - 501 H. Khosravani, Y. Zhang, S. Tsutsui, S. Hameed, C. Altier,
- 5 J. Hamid, L. Chen, M. Villemaire, Z. Ali and F. R. Jirik, J. Cell Biol., 2008, **181**, 551–565.
 - 502 S. Weiss, D. Proske, M. Neumann, M. H. Groschup, H. A. Kretzschmar, M. Famulok and E.-L. Winnacker, *J. Virol.*, 1997, 71, 8790–8797.
- 10 503 A. S. Boese, A. Majer, R. Saba and S. A. Booth, *Expert Opin.* Drug Discovery, 2013, **8**, 1265–1284.
 - 504 P. Calvo, B. Gouritin, I. Brigger, C. Lasmezas, J.-P. Deslys,
 A. Williams, J. P. Andreux, D. Dormont and P. Couvreur,
 J. Neurosci. Methods, 2001, 111, 151–155.
- 15 505 G. K. Kouassi, P. Wang, S. Sreevatan and J. Irudayaraj, Biotechnol. Prog., 2007, 23, 1239–1244.
 - 506 M. B. Miller and S. Supattapone, *J. Virol.*, 2011, **85**, 2813–2817.
 - 507 A. Mangé, O. Milhavet, H. E. M. McMahon, D. Casanova and S. Lehmann, *J. Neurochem.*, 2000, **74**, 754–762.
 - 508 A. Mangé, N. Nishida, O. Milhavet, H. E. M. McMahon,
 D. Casanova and S. Lehmann, J. Virol., 2000, 74, 3135–3140.
- 509 A. Mangé, N. Nishida, O. Milhavet, H. E. McMahon,
 D. Casanova and S. Lehmann, *J. Virol.*, 2000, 74, 3135–3140.
 - 510 Y. E. Karapetyan, G. F. Sferrazza, M. Zhou, G. Ottenberg, T. Spicer, P. Chase, M. Fallahi, P. Hodder, C. Weissmann and C. I. Lasmézas, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2013, **110**, 7044–7049.

- 511 S. Ghaemmaghami, B. C. May, A. R. Renslo and S. B. Prusiner, *J. Virol.*, 2010, **84**, 3408–3412.
- 512 M. E. Oskarsson, J. F. Paulsson, S. W. Schultz, M. Ingelsson, P. Westermark and G. T. Westermark, *Am. J. Pathol.*, 2015, **185**, 834–846.
- 513 K. Ono, R. Takahashi, T. Ikeda and M. Yamada, *J. Neurochem.*, 2012, **122**, 883–890.
- 514 A.-L. J. Mougenot, A. Bencsik, S. Nicot, J. Vulin, E. Morignat,
 J. Verchère, D. Bétemps, L. Lakhdar, S. Legastelois and
 T. G. Baron, *J. Neuropathol. Exp. Neurol.*, 2011, **70**, 377–385.
- 515 C. W. Olanow and S. B. Prusiner, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.* A., 2009, **106**, 12571–12572.
- 516 M. Beekes, A. Thomzig, W. J. Schulz-Schaeffer and R. Burger, *Acta Neurol.*, 2014, **128**, 463–476.
- 517 E. Tayeb-Fligelman, O. Tabachnikov, A. Moshe, 15
 O. Goldshmidt-Tran, M. R. Sawaya, N. Coquelle, J.P. Colletier and M. Landau, *Science*, 2017, 355, 831–833.
- 518 N. Rubin, E. Perugia, M. Goldschmidt, M. Fridkin and L. Addadi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2008, **130**, 4602–4603.
- 519 N. Rubin, E. Perugia, S. G. Wolf, E. Klein, M. Fridkin and
 L. Addadi, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2010, 132, 4242–4248.
- 520 I. Usov, J. Adamcik and R. Mezzenga, *ACS Nano*, 2013, 7, 10465–10474.
- 521 S.-J. Lee, P. Desplats, C. Sigurdson, I. Tsigelny and E. Masliah, *Nat. Rev. Neurol.*, 2010, **6**, 702–706.
- 522 K. Jackson, G. A. Barisone, E. Diaz, L.-w. Jin, C. DeCarli and F. Despa, *Ann. Neurol.*, 2013, **74**, 517–526.
- 523 I. Horvath and P. Wittung-Stafshede, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* U. S. A., 2016, 113, 12473–12477.
- 524 A. Horwich, J. Clin. Invest., 2002, 110, 1221-1232.

35

40

45

50

55

30

20