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Abstract

**Background:** Paclitaxel-induced peripheral neuropathy is a common and limiting side effect of an approved and effective chemotherapeutic agent. The cause of this nociception is still unknown.

**Methods:** To uncover the mechanism involved in paclitaxel-induced pain, we developed a *Drosophila* thermal nociceptive model to show the effects of paclitaxel exposure on third instar larvae.

**Results:** We found that paclitaxel increases pain perception in a dose-dependent manner, without overt morphological changes.

**Conclusions:** Our simple, high throughput model can be combined with genomics approaches to identify regulators of chemotherapy-induced pain to eliminate its adverse side effects.
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**Introduction**

Chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy (CIPN) is a dose-limiting side effect of many effective cancer treatments (Burton et al., 2007), and can have a lasting impact on the quality of life of cancer survivors (Hausheer et al., 2006 and Shimozuma et al., 2012). A meta-analysis of 31 studies from over 4000 chemotherapy-treated patients revealed that CIPN was prevalent in 68.1% of patients in the first month following chemotherapy, in 60% of patients at 3 months, and in 30% at 6 months or more (Seretty et al., 2014).

Paclitaxel has a potent ability to cause CIPN (Addington & Freimer, 2016; Reyes-Gibby et al., 2009). Derived from the bark of the western yew, Taxus brevifolia, it is an approved and effective treatment against breast, ovarian, lung and Kaposi sarcoma (Chang et al., 1993; Gill et al., 1999; Holmes et al., 1991; McGuire et al., 1989; Wani et al., 1971). Patients treated with paclitaxel experience side effects as early as one to three days following treatment (Lipton et al., 1989; Reyes-Gibby et al., 2009). Common symptoms are hyperalgesia, hypoalgesia, allodynia, tingling, numbness, and shooting pain (Boland et al., 2010). Paclitaxel has a direct effect on Schwann cells, promotes axonal degeneration, and can cause mitochondrial damage (André et al., 2000; Cavaletti et al., 1995; Sahenk et al., 1994), however the molecular mechanisms causing pain are still largely unknown.

While much knowledge has been gained about the genetics of pain from vertebrate systems, high throughput dissection of pain is possible using the fruit fly Drosophila melanogaster (Neely et al., 2010). When challenged with a noxious thermal stimulus, third instar larvae exhibit an aversive escape response that has been utilised to identify conserved genes required for nociception (Babcock et al., 2009; Neely et al., 2010; Tracey et al., 2003). This nociceptive response is a result of activating class IV multidendritic-dendritic arborisation (md-da) sensory neurons at the site of stimulation (Hwang et al., 2007). Previously in Drosophila, paclitaxel has been reported to be toxic in somatic cells, and causes loss of axons in peripheral nerves (Bhattacharya et al., 2012; Cunha et al., 2001). However, its effects on nociception have not yet been evaluated. Here, we examined the effects of paclitaxel exposure on the fruit fly larval nociception system, and observed a robust and dose-dependent increase in pain perception. This system is amenable to high throughput screening and genetic manipulation, and may help define why chemotherapies such as paclitaxel cause pain.

**Methods**

**Drosophila treatment**

All flies were reared at 25°C and 65% humidity over a 12-hour light-dark cycle. Six female and two male Canton S Drosophila melanogaster were mated on food medium (5.4% sucrose, 3.6% yeast, 1% agar, 1.2% nagiapin, and 0.6% propionic acid) treated with ethanol, 0 µM, 0.1 µM, 0.5 µM, 2.5 µM, 5 µM or 10 µM paclitaxel (Taxol®; Catalog No. A4393) purchased from ApexBio (Houston, USA). A stock of 1000 µM paclitaxel in ethanol was prepared and diluted in food medium accordingly to create the different drug concentrations. F0 Flies were discarded two days after mating and F1 larvae were left to grow for another three days. On the fifth day, early third instar were collected to assess nociception or dendritic morphology.

**Behavioural assay**

For the thermal nociceptive assay (Tracey et al., 2003), distilled water was added to experimental vials to soften the food and release the foraging third instar larvae. The softened, liquid food was then passed through mesh to catch the larvae to be transferred to a 100mm petri dish sprayed with distilled water. The larvae were touched laterally on abdominal segments four to six with a heat probe (soldering iron with narrow tip) set to 42°C or 46°C. The rolling response was measured in seconds with a cut-off of 10 seconds. For each drug concentration, five repeats were performed, with 30–40 larvae per repeat.

**Larvae dissection, fixation, and mounting**

Third instar larvae (w;ppk-CD4-tdGFP) were collected, washed, and placed onto a sylgard dissecting plate (Sylgard184 silicone elastomer kit, Dow Corning, Midland, MI). At least 10 larvae of each group were then dissected in HL-3 saline solution (70 mM NaCl, 5 mM KCl, 10 mM NaHCO₃, 5 mM HEPES, 115 mM sucrose, 5 mM thealose, 20 mM MgCl₂, pH 7.2). Dissected larvae were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde solution, and then washed in PBS four times. Larvae of the same genotype were then transferred to microscope slides to be mounted using Vectashield (Vector Laboratories, Burlingame, CA).

**Confocal microscopy and image analysis**

GFP-expressing class IV md-da sensory neurons were imaged on a Leica DMI-6000 inverted microscope and SP8 Basic Confocal system using 40x oil immersion lens (Leica, Wetzlar, Germany). Class IV neuron at abdominal segment 5 (A5) of each larva was imaged. 488 nm lasers for excitation were used, emission signal was captured at 500–550nm wave length, scanning speed of 400 Hz, zoom factor of 0.7, and gain of 600. Images of Z-stack sections were captured at 1024 × 1024 pixel resolution with section thickness of 0.4 µm. Z-stack images were then rendered into a maximum intensity projection using ImageJ. Total dendritic surface area was quantified using ImageJ. The experiment was conducted in a blinded manner.

**Statistical analysis**

Data are presented as mean ± SEM and compared to vehicle control. Analysis was done using GraphPad Prism 5. Statistical analysis for response time was done using Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA, followed by Dunn’s pairwise test for multiple comparisons. Statistical analysis for dendritic area percentage was done using Student’s t-test.

**Results**

Our goal here was to develop a reproducible paradigm to investigate the effects of paclitaxel on nociception in the fly larvae. Based on previous studies for toxicity (Bhattacharya et al., 2012; Cunha et al., 2001), we selected paclitaxel doses below the lethal limit (Figure 1A), and then tested larval nociception using a heat probe set to a low intensity noxious heat (42°C; Figure 1B), which is mildly nociceptive to fly larvae (Babcock et al., 2009). Our dose-response study revealed 2.5 µM paclitaxel was sufficient
Figure 1. Paclitaxel induces heat-hyperalgesia in third instar Drosophila larvae. Schematic representation of the A) experimental design and B) thermal nociceptive assay in third instar Drosophila larvae. C–D) Average nociceptive latency (in seconds) in response to a 42°C or 46°C thermal stimulus, respectively. Increased paclitaxel concentration significantly induces heat-hyperalgesia in third instar larvae at 42°C. Note concentrations higher than 10 µM paclitaxel were 100% lethal. E) Percentage response to each time point in seconds to 42°C thermal stimulus. All values represent mean ± SEM. p values were generated using Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA, followed by Dunn’s pairwise test for multiple comparisons. Significance is relative to vehicle control. Five repeats were performed for each drug concentration with roughly 30 larvae each (n = 130–180 animals).
to induce significant hyperalgesia, with a maximal hyperalgesia effect observed at 10 µM (Figure 1C). Concentrations higher than 10 µM paclitaxel were 100% lethal (not shown). Interestingly, paclitaxel did not significantly alter heat nociception latency to a 46°C heat stimulus across any of the doses (Figure 1D). Vehicle (ethanol) control and normal (no ethanol) control showed a response time of 5.71 sec (±0.23 SEM; n=173) and 5.62 sec (±0.20 SEM, n=180, not shown), respectively (42°C; Figure 1E).

At low concentrations of 0.1 µM (5.21 sec ± 0.23 SEM; n=150) and 0.5 µM (5.44 sec ± 0.26 SEM; n=131) paclitaxel did not affect response profiles, however, concentrations of 2.5 µM paclitaxel (4.22 sec ± 0.19 SEM; n=180; p<0.001) and higher altered response distribution and significantly enhanced nociceptive latency (42°C; Figure 1E). The fastest latency response was observed at 10 µM paclitaxel (3.84 sec ± 0.24 SEM; n=140; p<0.001) with a 36.6% increase in response time relative to vehicle control (Figure 1C).

To evaluate if paclitaxel exposure caused robust morphological differences in peripheral pain sensing neurons, we fed genetically labeled (w;ppk-CD4-tdGFP) larvae paclitaxel and imaged the sensory neuron structure (Figures 2A–B). Surprisingly, treating larvae with 10 µM paclitaxel did not affect dendritic area percentage compared to vehicle control (Figure C) despite significantly enhancing nociceptive sensitivity (not shown). Thus we establish that paclitaxel sensitizes larvae to heat pain via enhancing sensory neuron or higher order nociception, and not via inducing overt morphological changes.

**Dataset 1. Larval response time in seconds to 42°C heat stimulus**

http://dx.doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.13581.d19102

Paclitaxel fed larvae were touched with a 42°C heat probe and their response time was measured in seconds with a cut-off of 10 seconds. Different treatments were tested: food control, ethanol control, 0.1 µM, 0.5 µM, 2.5 µM, 5 µM, and 10 µM paclitaxel. Five repeats were performed (n = 130 - 180).

**Dataset 2. Larval response time in seconds to 46°C heat stimulus**

http://dx.doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.13581.d191023

Paclitaxel fed larvae were touched with a 46°C heat probe and their response time was measured in seconds with a cut-off of 10 seconds. Different treatments were tested: food control, ethanol control, 0.1 µM, 0.5 µM, 2.5 µM, 5 µM, and 10 µM paclitaxel. Five repeats were performed (n = 130 - 180).

![Figure 2. Paclitaxel has no effect on class IV md-da sensory neuron dendritic coverage in third instar Drosophila larvae. A–B) Confocal images of third instar ppk-CD4-tdGFP larvae following (A) vehicle control or (B) 10 µM paclitaxel treatment. Images are of class IV md-da neurons at abdominal segment A5. Images are at 40x magnification and 0.7 zoom factor. Scale bar represents 40 µm. C) Quantification of dendritic area percentage of class IV md-da sensory neurons. Values represent mean ± SEM (n = 10–11 animals).](image-url)
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This study examined the effects of Paclitaxel exposure on Drosophila larval nociception system and the authors propose that their model is suitable for high throughput screening and further mechanistic studies. The study is overall an interesting and clearly written, however, I do have the following concerns:

1. The dose response effect of thermal stimulation was only at 42 degrees. There was no discussion or explanation why this effect was not seen at 46 degrees.
2. The behavior experiment was based on thermal stimulation. I would be interested why mechanical stimulation was not chosen since mechanical sensitivity is common among patients who develop Paclitaxel induced peripheral neuropathy?
3. It is not clear to me what the timeline is between the exposure of the larvae with paclitaxel and performing microscopic studies.
4. There should be at least a short discussion about the result.

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?
Yes

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?
Yes

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?
Partly

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?
I cannot comment. A qualified statistician is required.

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?
Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?
Partly

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.

I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.
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**Author Response 09 Oct 2018**

**Greg Neely**, Dr. John and Anne Chong Lab for Functional Genomics, Camperdown, New South Wales, Australia

Thank you for your comments.

**Response to comment #1:** This effect is not seen at 46°C. At this temperature intensity, larvae respond rapidly (~1.5 seconds) and it is difficult to see even faster responses. To look for hyperalgesia, we instead lowered the heat stimulus intensity to 42°C, which is at the threshold for nociception in this system, and where nociceptive responses take on average ~5 seconds to elicit.

**Response to comment #2:** The type IV multidendritic nociceptor neurons that transduce heat nociception also transduce mechanical nociception, as these neurons are multimodal. We have tried on numerous occasions to generate reproducible data for mechanical nociception but so far in our hands this assay does not work well enough for us to feel comfortable publishing. Given the multimodal nature of type IV multidendritic nociceptor neurons, we reasoned that thermal hyperalgesia is a good readout for the overall sensitization of these sensory neurons.

**Response to comment #3:** The animals are born into paclitaxel containing food, and then early third instar are collected at day 6 to assess nociception or dendritic morphology. This information was provided in the methods, however we have further clarified this aspect.

**Response to comment #4:** We have now written a short discussion, please see discussion section.

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.
The authors characterize the thermal nociception in *Drosophila* larvae that have been cultured on a range of paclitaxel concentrations. Using a heat probe to elicit the rolling defense behavior, they find that while paclitaxel has no effect on response times with a 46°C probe, it shortens probe response times when the larvae have been grown on 2.5 µm paclitaxel or above.

The authors and readers might like to consider the following comments on and questions about the 23 Jan 2018 version.

1. The Title describes a model for studying paclitaxel-induced pain, however the assay uses a heat probe to induce pain, and paclitaxel lowers the sensitivity to the probe, thus modeling the hyperalgesia component of paclitaxel CIPN. Would the Title better serve the reader if edited to focus on this side-effect specifically?

2. In Abstract–Results, the authors write: "We found that paclitaxel increases pain perception in a dose-dependent manner, without overt morphological changes." Changing "perception" to "sensitivity" would eliminate the baggage of the former word.

3. In Abstract–Conclusions: "Our simple, high throughput model can be combined with genomics approaches to identify regulators of chemotherapy-induced pain to eliminate its adverse side effects." However, they have not established that this is high-throughput by most common definitions of the term, nor do they show anywhere in the paper that it can be combined with genomics. The Conclusions would be improved if rephrased to better reflect what the data show.

4. "High-throughput" is a phrasal adjective that requires a hyphen.

5. In Introduction it says "This system is amenable to high throughput screening" however, this is not shown in the present manuscript nor is a reference cited in support of the statement.


7. I encourage the authors to use estimation statistics instead of significance testing. This would involve presenting and discussing the effect sizes. For example, in Figure 1c, it looks like 2.5 µm paclitaxel has the effect of reducing response time by ~1.5 s.

8. It would be nice to calculate standardized effect sizes (e.g. Cohen's d) of the paclitaxel effects; this would allow the authors and readers to estimate sample sizes needed for a screen (and thus possible throughput rates).

9. In Results, the authors write "Thus we establish that paclitaxel sensitizes larvae to heat pain via enhancing sensory neuron or higher order nociception, and not via inducing overt morphological changes." Is it true that enhancing sensory neuron or higher-order nociception are the only two alternatives? If not, this sentence should be rephrased.

10. The Conclusions section reads more like an overview of future plans for the assay. Could it be rewritten to more closely address the paper’s findings?

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?
Yes

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?
Yes

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?
Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?
Partly

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?
No

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.

I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.
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**Greg Neely**, Dr. John and Anne Chong Lab for Functional Genomics, Camperdown, New South Wales, Australia

Thank you for your comments.

**Response to comment #1:** That’s a reasonable point. Since first submission, we have new data that shows our model also involves peripheral neuropathy, so taken together, we have updated the title to capture this aspect and address the reviewer’s comment. The new title is “A fruit fly model for studying paclitaxel-induced peripheral neuropathy and hyperalgesia”. We hope this is acceptable.

**Response to comment #2:** Done.

**Response to comment #3:** We have revised this section and now state “Our simple system can be applied to identify regulators of chemotherapy-induced pain”.

**Response to comment #4:** Done.

**Response to comment #5:** We have now included a reference for this statement.

**Response to comment #6:** Done.

**Response to comment #7:** We thank the reviewers for their comment and we have incorporated the estimation statistics into our analysis and added all the data points.

**Response to comment #8:** We have calculated the effect size, added it to the graphs (1C and 1D), and we have now also mentioned this in the results section. Moreover, we have changed the data representation to show all the data points.

**Response to comment #9:** Good point, this has been revised as suggested.

**Response to comment #10:** We have now added a discussion section.
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