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ABSTRACT

SEVERE THERMOREGULATORY DEFICIENCIES IN MICE WITH A GENE DELETION IN TITIN
CARISSA A. MIYANO

Muscular dystrophy with myositis \textit{(mdm)} mice, which carry a deletion in the muscle protein titin, shiver at a lower than expected frequency for their body size, have body temperatures that decrease below ambient temperatures of 34°C, and have reduced active muscle stiffness in vivo compared to their wild type siblings. The impairment in shivering thermogenesis could be due to the N2A deletion in the titin protein leading to more compliant muscles and lower shivering frequency. I hypothesized that the ability of \textit{mdm} mice to use the other heat production mechanism, nonshivering thermogenesis (NST), may also be impaired and contribute to their hypothermic state. To assess the response to cold exposure, body temperature and metabolic rate were measured in wild type and \textit{mdm} mice using open-flow respirometry at four ambient temperature ranges: 19-21°C, 23-25°C, 27-30°C, and 33-35°C. Following the temperature experiment, NST was maximally stimulated by administering 1.2 mg kg\textsuperscript{-1} of norepinephrine subcutaneously. In the temperature experiment, there was a significant interaction between genotype and temperature, with \textit{mdm} mice having significantly higher metabolic rates at 27-30°C and lower metabolic rates at 23-25°C compared to wild type mice. After correcting metabolic rate for Q\textsubscript{10} effects, \textit{mdm} mice had lower metabolic rates compared to size-matched \textit{Perognathus longimembris} (little pocket mouse). In addition, the capacity for NST, estimated by area underneath the metabolic response curve, was also reduced in \textit{mdm} mice compared to wild type littermates. When comparing \textit{mdm} mice to other mice with similar body mass (7g), the effects of low metabolic rate and capacity for NST were exacerbated because predicted values of metabolic rate and capacity for NST are larger for smaller animals. These results indicate that a deletion in N2A titin causes severe thermoregulatory defects at every level of thermoregulation, including NST. Direct effects of the titin mutation likely lead to the lower shivering frequency observed. Indirect effects likely lead to a lower capacity for NST and metabolism in general. Future studies should investigate effects on oxidative phosphorylation or other signaling pathways.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Defense of a constant core body temperature ($T_b$) by generating or dissipating heat is one of the most important adaptations of homeothermic mammals to maintain homeostasis in hot or cold environments. This strategy allows small animals, which have a large surface area that readily loses heat to the environment, to survive and be active during times when other animals may be hibernating or inactive (Rowland et al., 2015). Large deviations in $T_b$ can have severe consequences such as reduced enzyme efficiency, and altered diffusion capacity and membrane fluidity. These critical cellular functions can result in loss of consciousness, inability to coordinate and execute motor functions, and even death (Morrison & Nakamura, 2011). $T_b$ is maintained during cold exposure by vasoconstriction of peripheral vessels, piloerection, postural changes, shivering thermogenesis, and nonshivering thermogenesis (Hemingway, 1963). A previous study found that mice with a mutation in the giant muscle protein titin cannot maintain $T_b$ below 34°C and have a decreased tremor frequency during shivering thermogenesis (Taylor-Burt et al., 2015). In this study, we investigated the effect of the titin mutation on the other heat generating mechanism, nonshivering thermogenesis.

Nonshivering thermogenesis (NST) is a highly adaptive heat-generating mechanism that occurs through the uncoupling action of Uncoupling Protein-1 (UCP1) in brown adipose tissue of many animals, including rodents (Cannon & Nedergaard, 2004; Depocas, 1960; Golozoubova, 2006; Lowell et al., 1993; Meyer et al., 2010; Nedergaard et al., 2001; Nicholls & Locke, 1984). Like basal metabolic rate (BMR), the contribution of nonshivering thermogenesis to summit metabolism ($VO_{2\text{sum}}$) as well as $VO_{2\text{sum}}$ itself, scales with body mass (Wunder & Gettinger, 1996). Thermogenic capacity, which can be approximated by $VO_{2\text{sum}}$, provides an estimate of an animal’s ability to thermoregulate and refers to the total capacity for heat production during cold
exposure. Thermogenic capacity can be measured when both shivering thermogenesis (ST) and NST are maximally activated during acute cold exposure. The mouse, whose small body mass leads to increased levels of thermal conductance, has a higher contribution of NST to VO$_{2\text{sum}}$ to offset heat loss in comparison to larger animals (Wunder & Gettinger, 1996).

The muscular dystrophy with myositis (mdm) mouse is characterized by a 779-bp deletion in the N2A region of the titin gene (Garvey et al., 2002) and a previous study demonstrated severe thermoregulatory deficiencies (Taylor-Burt et al., 2015). Mice homozygous for the mdm mutation have a severe and progressive degeneration of skeletal muscles and exhibit a lower body mass, stiffer gait, and reduced lifespan (Garvey et al., 2002; Huebsch et al., 2005; Lopez et al., 2008). Studies have demonstrated that mdm muscle has higher passive stiffness than wild type muscle (Hessel et al., 2017; Lopez et al., 2008; Monroy et al., 2017). In addition, Taylor-Burt et al. (2015) demonstrated in vitro that mdm mice have lower active muscle stiffness and a lower tremor frequency during ST, even after Q$_{10}$ correction to account for temperature effects. It would be expected that mice with stiffer muscles would have increased tremor frequencies, therefore these results are consistent with the hypothesis that titin plays a key role in active muscle stiffness. The deficiency in shivering frequency likely led to the observed hypothermic state of mdm mice at temperatures below 34°C. The combination of increased thermal conductance and lower heat generation via ST results in an offset of heat production vs. heat loss, leading to severe thermoregulatory deficiencies in mdm mice. What is not known is whether the capacity for using the other heat generating mechanism, NST, is also impaired in mdm mice. The purpose of this study was to investigate whether impairment of NST in mdm mice contributes to their observed hypothermia in addition to ST and thermal conductance. We tested
two hypotheses: 1) metabolic rates will reach a maximum at higher ambient temperatures (T$_a$'s) than wild type mice due to the shifted thermoneutral zone (TNZ) of $mdm$ mice; and 2) the inability to defend T$_b$ cannot be explained solely by lower shivering frequencies, therefore an impairment in the other heat production mechanism, NST, is present.
Chapter 2: Materials and Methods

2.1 Mice

Animal experiments were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of Northern Arizona University. Breeding pairs of B6C3Fe a/-a-mdm mice (Mus musculus Linnaeus) from the Jackson Laboratory (Bar Harbor, ME, USA) were housed on a 14 h:10 h light:dark cycle at 23-24°C at Northern Arizona University. In this study, all animals were housed in an environmental chamber set to 34°C upon weaning and experiments were conducted during the dark phase of the light cycle when mice are active. Wild type mice were fed LabDiet 5001 Laboratory Rodent Diet and mdm mice were fed LabDiet 5LJ5 PicoLab High Energy Mouse Diet (LabDiet, St. Louis, Missouri, USA). Mdm mice were fed the high-fat-diet chow due to high mortality rates when fed standard laboratory chow. Wild type mice were housed singly or with siblings, if both were used in experiments. Each cage was equipped with bedding and enrichment.

Sample sizes for wild type and mdm mice were the following at four different temperatures unless otherwise noted: 19-21°C (n = 7 wild type, n = 5 mdm), 23-25°C (n = 6 wild type, n = 7 mdm), 27-30°C (n = 6 wild type, n = 8 mdm), and 33-35°C (n = 7 wild type, n = 8 mdm). Body mass differed significantly between genotypes (Welch’s Test, p < 0.001) with mdm mice (n = 9, 7.2 ± 0.21g) being much smaller than wild type mice (n = 7, 26.0 ± 1.82g). For statistical analysis, body mass was normally distributed but variance of residuals was unequal between groups so a Welch’s Test, whose means are weighted by the reciprocal of the group mean variances, was used to identify significant differences.
2.2 Study Design

In this study, mice underwent surgery followed by a one-week recovery period. The experimental period comprised of temperature experiments (Days 9-12) and norepinephrine (NE)-stimulated thermogenesis experiments (Figure 1).

![Study Design Diagram](image)

Figure 1: Study Design, including surgery, recovery, temperature experiments, and norepinephrine-stimulated thermogenesis.

2.3 Surgery

To measure core $T_b$, implantable recording devices were surgically placed in each mouse’s peritoneal cavity at the age of 25-30 days old. Different temperature recording devices were used due to the smaller size of the mdm mice (7.23 ± 0.21g) compared to wild type siblings (25.97 ± 4.45g). For mdm mice, a Biothermo13 Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT) tag (0.109 ± 0.030g; Biomark, Boise, ID, USA) was surgically implanted in the peritoneal cavity. The transponder recorded $T_b$ at a resolution of ±0.5°C. Wild type mice were surgically implanted with a PhysioTel TA-F10 telemetry device (1.6g; Data Sciences International, St. Paul, MN, USA) which recorded $T_b$ at a resolution of ±0.05°C. During the surgery, mice were anesthetized with isoflurane USP (MWI Veterinary Supply, Boise, ID) using a Forane Vaporizer (Ohio Medical Corporation, Gurnee, IL, USA). Anesthesia was induced by placing the mouse in a
small chamber supplied with 1-2% isoflurane-oxygen mixture. Upon unconsciousness, the mouse was transferred to a heating pad where anesthesia was administered using a nosecone that delivered a 1-2% oxygen-isoflurane mixture. Once pedal reflex was absent, the abdominal fur was clipped and scrubbed with povidone iodine and 70% ethanol. The skin and muscle were incised and bluntly dissected to expose the peritoneal cavity. The device was then placed freely inside the peritoneal cavity and the muscle and skin were closed with 3-0 Maxon absorbable monofilament suture. Buprenorphine, an analgesic agent, was administered subcutaneously (0.10 mg kg⁻¹) for 72 hours following surgery. Post-surgery recovery lasted for 7 days at 34°C before further experiments were conducted.

### 2.4 Temperature Experiments

Mice were placed in 9L metabolic cages during the experiments. Oxygen consumption (VO₂) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) production measurements were obtained using a computer controlled open-flow respirometry system (Promethion, Sable Systems, Las Vegas, NV, USA). In this system, each cage had its own gas analysis chain for respiratory gases comprising a flow controller, capacitive water vapor partial pressure analyzer, spectrophotometric CO₂ analyzer, and fuel cell O₂ analyzer. Water vapor was continuously measured and its dilution effect on O₂ and CO₂ was compensated mathematically. The flow rate of each 9L cage was 2000 ml min⁻¹ with a subsample rate of 250 ml min⁻¹, which allowed for approximately 12 complete air exchanges per hour. The gas analyzer was calibrated using 100% N₂ and a span gas with a known concentration of CO₂ mixed with N₂ prior to each set of experiments for an animal. The cages were housed inside an environmental chamber (Percival Scientific, Perry, IA, USA) so that Tₐ could be controlled and bedding was removed from each cage to prevent burrowing. Cages sat
on top of either an antennae reader or telemetry receiver (Biomark, Boise, ID, USA; Data Sciences International, St. Paul, MN, USA) to collect Tb data throughout the experiment. Tb was collected once per minute using either PhysioTel RPC-1 Receivers for the PhysioTel TA-F10 telemetry devices or HPR Plus PIT Tag Reader and Antennae for the BioTherm13 PIT tags (Data Sciences International, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA; Biomark, Boise, ID, USA). Ta was validated and recorded using a datalogger (Onset HOBO Data Logger, Bourne, MA, USA) with a resolution of ±0.14°C.

VO₂ and CO₂ were collected once per second using SableScreen v3.3.11 acquisition software, with 60 samples averaged per minute for final analysis (Sable Systems International, Las Vegas, NV, USA). VO₂ (ml min⁻¹) was recalculated to milliliters of O₂ per gram of body mass per hour for each animal and is referred to hereafter as metabolic rate. Raw data was processed using ExpeData v1.8.4 (Sable Systems International, Las Vegas, NV, USA). For the temperature experiments, a subset of 10 minutes of continuous data was chosen for analysis that met the following requirements: 1) recordings occurred after the fasting period; 2) Ta did not exceed the specified temperature range for that experiment (19-21°C, 23-25°C, 27-30°C, 33-35°C); and 3) the 10 data points for oxygen consumption (ml O₂ g⁻¹ h⁻¹) were chosen when animal movement was minimal, which was measured by BXYZ-R beam arrays (Sable Systems, Las Vegas, NV). At the coldest temperatures (19-21°C and 23-25°C), wild type mice were more active than at the higher temperatures (27-30°C and 33-35°C), therefore the lowest activity points were chosen.

All mice underwent four 4-hour (mdm) or 5-hour (wild type) temperature experiments once per day for four consecutive days. To minimize the effect of diet-induced thermogenesis,
wild type mice were fasted for two hours at the onset of the experiment and *mdm* mice were fasted for only one hour due to their fragility. All mice were weighed before and after each experiment. For calculating mass-specific metabolic rate (ml O₂ g⁻¹ h⁻¹), mass was assumed to be lost linearly during the experiment. The experimental temperatures (33-35°C, 27-30°C, 23-25°C, 19-21°C) were chosen based on a previous study which found that 34°C was the lower critical limit of the TNZ in *mdm* mice (Taylor-Burt et al., 2015). The 33-35°C temperature was used to establish resting metabolic rate for this study.

### 2.5 Q₁₀ Effects on Metabolic Rate

Because *mdm* mice have low Tₘ below 34°C (Taylor-Burt et al., 2015), it is necessary to account for differences in metabolic rate that could be due to Q₁₀ effects. Expected metabolic rate was calculated for *mdm* mice assuming a normal Tₘ of 37°C and a Q₁₀ of 2.4 (Hudson and Scott, 1978) using the following equation:

\[ MR_{\text{expected}} = MR_{\text{observed}} Q_{10}^{\left(\frac{37-T_{\text{observed}}}{10}\right)} , \]

where \( MR_{\text{expected}} \) is metabolic rate expected if Tₘ is 37°C, \( MR_{\text{observed}} \) is observed metabolic rate and \( T_{\text{observed}} \) is observed Tₘ. Once \( MR_{\text{expected}} \) was calculated, it was subtracted from \( MR_{\text{observed}} \) to estimate Q₁₀ effects and is referred to hereafter as E-O Metabolic Rate.

### 2.6 Norepinephrine-Stimulated Thermogenesis

To compare the capacity for nonshivering thermogenesis between genotypes, a norepinephrine-stimulated thermogenesis experiment was conducted using wild type (n = 6) and *mdm* mice (n = 6). Similar to the temperature experiment, mice were fasted for either 1 or 2 hours (*mdm* and wild type, respectively; Speakman, 2013) to avoid diet-induced thermogenesis.
Experiments were conducted at 33-35°C to ensure that metabolic rate increase for all mice was not due to shivering thermogenesis (Van Sant & Hammond, 2008). At the start of the experiment and following the fasting period, mice were briefly removed from the metabolic cages to administer 1.2 mg kg\(^{-1}\) of norepinephrine (Wunder & Gettinger, 1996) subcutaneously and recordings were taken for the remaining 2-3 hours of the experiment. Subsequent rise in metabolic rate after injection yielded a metabolic curve from which thermogenic capacity due to nonshivering thermogenesis was calculated by taking the integral of the increase in metabolic rate after norepinephrine injection, computed numerically using the Trapezoidal Rule. A baseline metabolic rate was calculated as the average of 10 recordings before the animal was removed from the cage and injected with norepinephrine. This was subtracted from the calculation to account for animals that had higher or lower VO\(_2\) before injection. The area calculation began with the onset of injection and ended when VO\(_2\) reached previously calculated baseline values. The duration of the metabolic curve, referred to as total effect time, as well as time to peak metabolic rate and peak metabolic rate were measured test for differences in norepinephrine response between genotypes. In addition, peak T\(_b\) and average T\(_b\) were compared between genotypes after norepinephrine injection to test whether T\(_b\) followed the same trend as metabolic rate. Peak T\(_b\) was defined as the highest 60 s average and average T\(_b\) was the average T\(_b\) during the test.

### 2.7 Thermogenic Capacity

Thermogenic capacity can be approximated by VO\(_2\) sum (Wunder & Gettinger, 1996) as:

\[
VO_2 \text{sum} = BMR + ST + NST,
\]
where \( VO_{2} \) is summit metabolism, BMR is basal metabolic rate, ST is shivering thermogenesis, and NST is nonshivering thermogenesis. \( VO_{2} \) will be referred to hereafter as thermogenic capacity. Relative contributions of ST, NST, and BMR to thermogenic capacity were calculated by rearranging the above equation. Metabolic rate during 33-35°C was used for calculations of BMR. To calculate NST, BMR was subtracted from peak metabolic rate during norepinephrine-stimulated thermogenesis (n = 6 wild type, n = 6 \( mdm \)) to parse out metabolic rate due solely to NST. Because the mice were not in a completely post-absorptive state during either experiment, NST was likely underestimated. Taylor-Burt et al. (2015) previously reported thermogenic capacity, therefore ST was calculated by subtracting peak metabolic rate during norepinephrine-stimulated thermogenesis (BMR + NST) from thermogenic capacity.

2.8 Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using JMP v12 (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, USA). Values are reported as mean ± SEM and an alpha level of 0.05 was used for all tests.

Throughout the study, the \( mdm \) group at 19-21°C had a large within-group variance, leading to unequal variances when comparing against wild type mice. Therefore, data was ranked using temperature as a blocking variable (19-21°C, 23-25°C, 27-30°C, 33-35°C). A Mixed Model ANOVA with subject nested within genotype and fixed effects of temperature and genotype was conducted for \( T_b \), metabolic rate, and \( Q_{10} \) effects data. Steel-Dwass Multiple Comparisons were used to identify significant differences between genotypes at all temperatures.

For the NE-stimulated thermogenesis data, Welch’s test for unequal variances was used to identify significant differences in peak \( T_b \), average \( T_b \), and time to peak. T tests were used for peak metabolic rate, total effect time, and NST capacity. To identify significant differences in
absolute contributions to thermogenic capacity, t tests were used to compare ST and NST between genotypes.
Chapter 3: Results

3.1 Body Temperature

*Mdm* mice exhibit hypothermic characteristics as shown by their lower $T_b$’s in comparison to wild type mice at lower $T_a$’s. There was a significant effect of genotype and temperature on $T_b$ (Mixed Model ANOVA on Ranks, $p < 0.001$) but no interaction between temperature and genotype. I found a significant effect of subject ($p < 0.05$). Post-hoc tests revealed significant differences between genotypes at all temperatures (Steel-Dwass, $p < 0.05$; Figure 2). At 19-21°C, 23-25°C, 27-30°C, and 33-35°C, I observed the following differences in $T_b$ between wild type and *mdm* mice, respectively: 8.8°C, 4.2°C, 1.9°C, and 1.4°C.
Figure 2: The relationship between $T_b$ and $T_a$ in wild type and *mdm* mice. Temperatures used were within a range of $T_a$'s beginning at the thermoneutral zone of *mdm* mice (Taylor-Burt et al. 2015) and ending at lower $T_a$'s in order to observe how well $T_b$ could be defended ($p < 0.05^*$).
3.2 Metabolic Rate

At 23-25°C, *mdm* mice begin to fail to thermoregulate, as demonstrated by significantly lower metabolic rates (Figure 3) and *T*<sub>b</sub>’s in comparison to wild type mice (Figure 2). In addition, *mdm* mice activate shivering and nonshivering thermogenesis more than wild type mice at 27-30°C, as demonstrated by their higher metabolic rate. Despite their higher metabolic rate, their *T*<sub>b</sub> remains lower than that of wild type mice.

There was a significant interaction between genotype and temperature on metabolic rate (Mixed Model ANOVA on Ranks, *p* < 0.05). Wild type and *mdm* mice did not differ significantly at 33-35°C (*p* > 0.05, Steel-Dwass Multiple Comparisons). At 27-30°C, the metabolic rate of *mdm* mice (2.4 ± 0.12 ml O<sub>2</sub> g<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) was significantly than wild type mice (1.9 ± 0.09 ml O<sub>2</sub> g<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>; Steel-Dwass Multiple Comparisons, *p* < 0.05). At 23-25°C, metabolic rates for wild type mice (3.9 ± 0.19 ml O<sub>2</sub> g<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) were significantly higher than *mdm* mice (3.1 ± 0.34 ml O<sub>2</sub> g<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>). Wild type mice (4.8 ± 0.29 ml O<sub>2</sub> g<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) were not significantly different from *mdm* mice (3.5 ± 0.68 ml O<sub>2</sub> g<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) at 19-21°C (Steel-Dwass Multiple Comparisons, *p* = 0.1939). This was likely due to the large variability at 19-21°C compared to wild type mice (Figure 4). Data points that were 1.5 times the interquartile range were excluded from the final analysis, one of which was an *mdm* outlier in the 23-25°C range.
Figure 3: The relationship between metabolic rate and ambient temperature. Temperatures used were within a range starting at the thermoneutral zone for *mdm* mice, where metabolic rate was expected to be at resting levels, to lower T_a’s at which metabolic rate was expected to increase (p < 0.05*).
Figure 4: Individual metabolic rate measurements highlight variability of *mdm* mice at colder temperatures. Points represent individuals and shapes represent genotypes.
3.3 \textbf{Q_{10} Effects on Metabolic Rate}

In general, \textit{mdm} mice had \textit{MR}_{\text{observed}} values far lower than \textit{MR}_{\text{expected}} values, with the largest differences in E-O at the lower temperatures (Figure 5). Wild type mice tended to remain close to \textit{MR}_{\text{expected}}, except at lower temperatures where \textit{MR}_{\text{observed}} was higher than predicted. The higher E-O values for wild type mice at lower temperatures are likely due to certain subject’s having higher activity thus subsequent metabolic rate at lower temperatures (observational).

A significant effect of genotype was found on E-O metabolic rate (Mixed Model ANOVA on Ranks, \(p < 0.001\)) and \textit{mdm} mice had significantly higher E-O in comparison to wild type mice at all temperatures. The largest differences in E-O were seen at the two lowest temperatures. At 23-25°C, \textit{mdm} mice (1.0 ± 0.08 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}) had significantly higher E-O in comparison to wild type mice (-0.4 ± 0.10 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}) who had higher observed values than predicted, making their E-O negative (Steel-Dwass Multiple Comparisons, \(p < 0.05\)). At the lowest temperature of 19-21°C, \textit{mdm} mice (3.0 ± 0.46 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}) fell short of their expected metabolic rate in comparison to wild type mice (0.4 ± 0.32 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}) who had higher observed values (Steel-Dwass Multiple Comparisons, \(p < 0.05\)).

Surprisingly, \textit{mdm} mice \textit{MR}_{\text{expected}} fell short of predicted metabolic rates for the size matched \textit{Perognathus longimembris} at the selected temperature ranges. Allometric relations of metabolic rate with \(T_a\) have been reported for the 8.2g \textit{Perognathus longimembris} (little pocket mouse; Chew et al., 1967). Therefore, the average temperature of each of the \(T_a\) ranges was used to predict metabolic rates of the little pocket mouse (Figure 6). For each of the temperature ranges (19-21°C, 23-25°C, 27-30°C, 33-35°C), differences in \textit{MR}_{\text{expected}} between the little pocket mouse and \textit{mdm} mice were as follows: 0.54 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}, 1.69 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}, 1.65 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}, and 0.85 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}. 
Figure 5: The relationship between expected-observed (E-O) metabolic rate and ambient temperature. The $Q_{10}$ equation was rearranged to find $MR_{expected}$ if mice had $T_b$'s of 37°C and a $Q_{10}$ of 2.4 (Hudson and Scott 1978) and it was compared with $MR_{observed}$ to investigate $T_b$ effects on metabolic rate between genotypes ($p < 0.05^*$).
Figure 6: Comparison of $\text{MR}_{\text{expected}}$ between *mdm* and *Perognathus longimembris* (little pocket mouse). Due to the small size of *mdm* mice (7.23 ± 0.21 g), $\text{MR}_{\text{expected}}$ was compared to the size-matched little pocket mouse (8.2 g; Chew et al., 1967) at the mean value of the $T_a$ ranges.
3.4 Norepinephrine-Stimulated Thermogenesis

After norepinephrine injection, wild type mice (143.9 ± 20.01 ml O2 g⁻¹ h⁻¹) had a significantly higher capacity for nonshivering thermogenesis than mdm mice (62.3 ± 22.78 ml O₂ g⁻¹ h⁻¹; t test, p < 0.05). There was no significant difference between genotypes in the time to reach peak metabolic rate (Welch’s Test, p = 0.60) or the total effect time (t test, p = 0.08; Figure 7). Wild type mice took 17.3 ± 2.20 minutes to reach peak metabolic rate and mdm mice took 22.8 ± 9.65 minutes. Total effect time for wild type and mdm mice was 66.3 ± 4.92 minutes and 48.3 ± 10.44 minutes, respectively.

Both wild type and mdm mice exhibited similar metabolic profiles following norepinephrine injection, but had significantly different peak Tₘ and average Tₘ (Figure 8). Interestingly, genotypes did not differ in peak metabolic rate reached after injection (t test, p = 0.21) with wild type mice reaching 7.2 ml O₂ g⁻¹ h⁻¹ and mdm mice reaching 6.4 ml O₂ g⁻¹ h⁻¹. However, wild type mice (39.7 ± 0.08 °C) reached a higher peak Tₘ (Welch’s Test, p < 0.05) than mdm mice (38.5 ± 0.35 °C) during the trial. In addition, wild type mice had a significantly higher average Tₘ (38.7 ± 0.24 °C) in comparison to mdm mice (37.3 ± 0.33 °C; Welch’s Test, p < 0.05).
Figure 7: Time to reach peak metabolic rate, total effect time, and area under the curve between genotypes after norepinephrine injection. *Mdm mice had a smaller area underneath the metabolic curve, therefore a lower capacity for nonshivering thermogenesis after norepinephrine injection (1.2 mg·kg⁻¹) in comparison to wild type mice (n = 6 wild type, n = 6 Mdm; p < 0.05*). The amount of time it took to reach peak metabolic rate was not significant between groups (p = 0.60) nor was the total effect time of norepinephrine on metabolic rate (p = 0.08).
Figure 8: $T_b$ and metabolic rate responses to norepinephrine in wild type and $mdm$ mice. Wild type mice had significantly higher peak $T_b$ and average $T_b$ in comparison to $mdm$ mice ($n = 6$ wild type, $n = 6$ $mdm$; Welch’s Test, $p < 0.05$). Genotypes did not differ in peak metabolic rates (t test, $p = 0.11$).
3.5 Contributions to Thermogenic Capacity

There was no difference between wild type and *mdm* mice in the contributions of BMR, ST, and NST to thermogenic capacity (Figure 9). Taylor-Burt et al. (2015) reported thermogenic capacity to be 11.1 ml O$_2$ g$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ and 10.4 ml O$_2$ g$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ for wild type and *mdm* mice respectively. As previously reported, metabolic rates recorded during the 33-35°C temperature range were not significantly different between genotypes, which was used as BMR for calculations of thermogenic capacity. ST accounted for 3.9 ± 0.17 ml O$_2$ g$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ of wild type thermogenic capacity and 3.9 ± 0.86 ml O$_2$ g$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ of *mdm* thermogenic capacity (t test, p = 0.95). In addition, there were no differences in NST contributions to thermogenic capacity for wild type (5.7 ± 0.17 ml O$_2$ g$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) and *mdm* mice (4.9 ± 0.86 ml O$_2$ g$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$; t test, p = 0.42).
Figure 9: Contributions of BMR, ST, and NST to thermogenic capacity (VO₂sum) and predicted thermogenic capacity (VO₂sum) in wild type and mdm mice. Wild type and mdm mice did not differ significantly in the contributions of BMR (p > 0.05), ST (p = 0.53), and NST (p = 0.21) to thermogenic capacity (n = 6 wild type, n = 6 mdm; t tests). Mdm mice observed thermogenic capacity from Taylor-Burt et al.’s (2015) study fell short of predicted thermogenic capacity based on body size.
Chapter 4: Discussion

In this study, I examined the capacity for nonshivering thermogenesis in _mdm_ mice to investigate whether this component of heat production at the brown adipose tissue level is impaired, in addition to the heat production mechanism at the muscular level, shivering thermogenesis (Taylor-Burt et al., 2015). I confirmed the inability of _mdm_ mice to maintain homeothermy by measuring their T_b and metabolic rate across a range of T_a’s. _Mdm_ mice had lower T_b’s at all T_a’s and lower metabolic rates at 23-25°C, compared to wild type mice.

Because _mdm_ mice could not defend their core T_b, I observed significant Q_{10} effects on metabolic rate. E-O metabolic rate was significantly higher for _mdm_ mice indicating that even if _mdm_ mice could maintain normal T_b’s, they would not be able to generate a normal metabolic rate. Therefore, size comparisons were necessary. Surprisingly, I found that predicted metabolic rates of _mdm_ mice fell short of the size-matched little pocket mouse. I also found that the capacity for nonshivering thermogenesis is significantly lower in _mdm_ mice compared to wild type mice, indicating that this component of heat generation is also impaired. The relative contributions of basal metabolic rate, shivering thermogenesis, or nonshivering thermogenesis to VO_{2sum} did not differ between wild type and _mdm_ mice. My results demonstrate that a gene deletion in titin not only results in a deficiency in shivering thermogenesis, but it impacts nonshivering thermogenesis as well, likely contributing to lower T_b, metabolic rate, and thermogenic capacity.

4.1 Body Temperature

_Mdm_ mice had significantly lower T_b’s than wild type mice, even at 33-35°C, indicating that this temperature range is near the lower critical limit of the TNZ (Figure 2). My findings
suggest that in order for *mdm* mice to have euthermic Tₘ’s similar to wild type mice, Tₐ needs to be even higher than 34-35°C, as previously reported by Taylor-Burt et al. (2015).

A reduction in Tₘ set point due to torpor, a behavioral thermoregulation strategy used by certain endotherms, is unlikely due to the pattern of metabolic rate and Tₘ observed. Torpor is induced by low Tₐ and/or depletion of metabolic fuels and is characterized by a reduction in Tₘ set point that leads to a precipitous decline in Tₘ, followed by a drop in metabolic rate (Geiser et al., 2014). During hypothermia, however, Tₘ set point is at euthermic levels, therefore Tₘ and metabolic rate drop slowly at first as thermoregulation fails and then decline rapidly once the body begins to cool. *Mdm* mice did not exhibit rapid declines in Tₘ followed by metabolic rate. Instead, I observed increases in metabolic rate upon cold exposure followed by a gradual reduction, indicating that *mdm* mice are attempting to thermoregulate but fail to keep Tₘ at euthermic levels. In addition, Hudson and Scott (1978) measured Tₘ and metabolic rate in *Mus musculus* and found that torpid mice with Tₘ’s of 32°C had metabolism 50% of what was observed at euthermic Tₘ levels. The mice in this study had similar Tₘ values of 29.3 ± 1.7 °C at 19-21°C but had higher metabolic rates of 3.5 ± 0.68 ml O₂ g⁻¹ h⁻¹ in comparison to metabolic rates of 2.0 ± 0.16 ml O₂ g⁻¹ h⁻¹ at 33-35°C. These results support the conclusions that *mdm* mice fail to thermoregulate at cold temperatures and do not adopt the behavioral strategy of hypometabolism through torpor.

Studies have shown thermoregulatory deficiencies specific to nonshivering thermogenesis in UCP1-null mice, mice with induced obesity and Type II diabetes due to leptin alterations (*ob*/ob and *db*/db), and mice with inherited effects of fatty acid oxidation. UCP1-null mice were able to acclimate and tolerate 18°C with a well-defended Tₘ that was not significantly different from wild type mice (Golozoubova, 2006). However, adaptive nonshivering
thermogenesis was significantly altered in UCP1-null mice, which is discussed in further detail later. Mice with induced rapid early-onset obesity and diabetes, termed ob/ob and db/db, have marked reductions in nonshivering thermogenesis (Yen, et al., 1974). Tb of ob/ob and db/db mice were 30 ± 1.4 °C and 26.8 ± 8 °C after 90 minutes of exposure to 4°C. This is comparable to mdm mice at 19-21°C with Tb values of 29.3 ± 1.2 °C. In addition, mice homozygous for the inactivated allele BALB/cByJ, which encodes the short chain acyl CoA dehydrogenase, have abnormal nonshivering thermogenesis (Guerra et al., 1998). In BALB/cByJ mice, Tb dropped 10°C in less than 4 h at 4°C, which is similar to mdm mice at 19-21°C.

The impact of shivering thermogenesis on maintenance of Tb can be assessed by blocking muscular activity via curare-like drugs, which competitively block the binding of acetylcholine to the motor endplates of striated muscles (Bowman, 2006; Kashimura et al., 1992). In a study that blocked 50% of shivering via curare, wild type mice were still able to maintain a Tb of 35.4 ± 0.4 °C at 4°C (Bal et al., 2012), likely due to their ability to compensate via nonshivering thermogenesis and skeletal-muscle based thermogenesis. It is difficult to compare thermoregulatory deficits of mdm mice to genetically altered mice in other studies due to 4°C being the standard cold temperature versus 19-21°C, which was used in this study. Nonetheless, the mdm mice in this study have more severe thermoregulatory defects than mice with deficits in either shivering or nonshivering thermogenesis discussed above. This is likely due to the combined defects of both shivering and nonshivering thermogenesis in mdm mice.

4.2 Metabolic Rate

Mdm and wild type mice maintained similar resting metabolic rates at temperatures of 33-35°C (2.0 ± 0.15 ml O2 g⁻¹ h⁻¹ for wild type and mdm mice; Figure 3). These values are
comparable to resting metabolic rates reported for *Mus musculus* that were fasted between 5 and 30h and had metabolic rates of 1.47 ml O$_2$ g$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ (Hudson and Scott, 1978). The mice in this study were fasted for only 2 (wild type) or 1 (mdm) hour(s) which could account for the slightly higher metabolic rates found in this study.

*mdm* mice fail to thermoregulate at temperatures below 27-30°C and are more cold-stressed than wild type mice at this temperature. This is demonstrated by their significantly higher metabolic rates compared to wild type mice (*Figure 3*). Wild type mice had comparable metabolic rates at 33-35°C and 27-30°C likely because these temperatures are near the TNZ (31-35°C ; Hudson and Scott, 1978). It is interesting that although *mdm* mice have higher metabolic rates than wild type mice at 27-30°C, there was still a significant difference in $T_b$, with *mdm* mice having lower $T_b$’s than wild type mice. These results indicate that at this temperature, *mdm* mice work harder than wild type mice to thermoregulate as evidenced by higher metabolic rates, yet they still cannot maintain as high of a $T_b$ as wild type mice. The failure to maintain a higher $T_b$ despite higher metabolic rates is likely due to increased thermal conductance of *mdm* mice.

At 23-25°C, there was a large difference in metabolic rate between *mdm* and wild type mice, with wild type mice having significantly higher metabolic rates (*Figure 3*). There were no significant differences in metabolic rates between wild type and *mdm* mice at 19-21°C, which was interesting considering $T_b$ differences were even more drastic between genotypes. This is likely due to the large standard error in metabolic rate observed with the *mdm* mice at this temperature in comparison to wild type mice.

Large differences in E-O metabolic rate combined with the little pocket mouse data demonstrated that even if *mdm* mice could properly defend $T_b$, normal metabolic rates could not be attained (*Figure 5*). Wild type and *mdm* mice differed significantly at all temperatures for E-
O metabolic rate. In general, wild type mice had MR\textsubscript{expected} values close to MR\textsubscript{observed} leading us to conclude that they had Q\textsubscript{10} values near 2.4, which is typical of \textit{Mus musculus} that are euthermic (Hudson & Scott, 1978). This was also demonstrated by the Tb data (Figure 2). \textit{Mdm} mice, in contrast, had much higher MR\textsubscript{expected} than MR\textsubscript{observed}, leading to high E-O metabolic rate. Metabolic rates of a similarly sized mouse, \textit{Perognathus longimembris} (little pocket mouse), have reported regression values during varying Ta’s (Chew et al., 1976) which was used to compare due to body mass allometrically scaling with metabolic rate (Kleiber, 1932). \textit{Mdm} mice still fall short in metabolic rate even after correcting for Q\textsubscript{10} effects in comparison to little pocket mice, especially at 23-25°C and 27-30°C with differences of 1.7 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} and 1.8 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}, respectively. Q\textsubscript{10} effects exacerbate but do not completely account for lower metabolic rates in \textit{mdm} mice even after considering their much smaller size in comparison to wild type mice.

\textbf{4.3 Nonshivering Thermogenesis}

Maximal VO\textsubscript{2} response to NE correlates well with body mass and is affected by acclimation temperature, with cold acclimated animals having higher VO\textsubscript{2} responses. Allometric relations for maximal metabolic response to norepinephrine in small mammals has been described by Wunder & Gettinger (1996) and includes a BMR component that can be used for animals acclimated to 23°C. Using this equation, the VO\textsubscript{2} response of wild type and \textit{mdm} mice to NE was predicted to be 6 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} and 11 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}, respectively. Observed maximal VO\textsubscript{2} responses to NE values for wild type and \textit{mdm} mice were 7.2 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} and 6.4 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}, which were not significantly different from one another. The animals in this study were housed at approximately 33-35°C from the time of surgery to the experiment (approximately 2 weeks), which could lead to smaller VO\textsubscript{2} responses in comparison to expected responses based on
Wunder and Gettinger’s (1996) equation. Instead, wild type mice had slightly higher than expected VO\textsubscript{2} responses and \textit{mdm} mice fell short of expected responses. \textit{Mdm} mice were euthermic for these measurements since they were conducted at 33-35°C (Figure 2), therefore, \(Q_{10}\) effects cannot explain their smaller response to NE. These comparisons provide further evidence that \textit{mdm} mice have a lower VO\textsubscript{2} response to NE than wild type mice.

Although \textit{mdm} mice have a lower capacity for nonshivering thermogenesis, their responses (Figure 7) for time to peak metabolic rate, total effect time of NE, and peak metabolic rate were similar to those of wild type mice. Peak \(T_b\) and average \(T_b\) were significantly higher in wild type mice after norepinephrine injection in comparison to \textit{mdm} mice (Figure 8). These results are consistent with the result that \textit{mdm} mice have a reduced capacity for nonshivering thermogenesis, and therefore are unable to produce as much heat as wild type mice. Similarly, they were unable to maintain a high \(T_b\) for the total trial time as evidenced by significantly lower average \(T_b\). This could have been due to their increased thermal conductance or to a depletion of metabolic fuels needed for nonshivering thermogenesis, primarily free fatty acids and glucose (Townsend & Tseng, 2014).

It is unlikely that the lower capacity of nonshivering thermogenesis in \textit{mdm} mice can be explained by complete UCP1 absence. In wild type and UCP1-null mice that were warm-acclimated to 30°C, norepinephrine evoked large increases in metabolic rate for wild type mice and small increases for UCP1-null mice (Golozoubova, 2006). The small increase seen in UCP1-null mice was attributed to either UCP1-independent adrenergic thermogenesis or a general activation of adrenergic receptors. The mice in this study did not have significantly different peak VO\textsubscript{2} response to NE compared to wild type mice (Figure 8), therefore, a solely adrenergic effect causing metabolic rate increase in \textit{mdm} is not likely. An interesting line of thought is the
possibility for decreased UCP1 expression or decreased sensitivity in brown adipose tissue to NE in mdm mice.

_Mdm_ mice are impacted at the brown adipose tissue level and it is unlikely they are affected at the sympathetic outflow level. The nonshivering thermogenesis response was measured directly from UCP1 in brown adipose tissue by mimicking a maximal sympathetic response through administration of NE. Therefore, _mdm_ mice are impacted significantly at this level. However, sympathetic outflow from neural outputs are also of interest during normal cooling-evoked thermogenesis. High-fat diet (HFD) has been shown to significantly reduce the cold-induced increase in BAT sympathetic nerve activity (SNA) and BAT thermogenesis via a vagal afferent mechanism in rats maintained on a HFD for $\geq 60$ days (Madden & Morrison, 2016) as well as basal sympathetic activation of BAT in rats after 3, 6, and 9 weeks of HFD (Sakaguchi et al., 1989). The _mdm_ mice in this study were fed HFD due to high morbidity rates associated with maintaining them on normal chow diets and they still exhibited emaciated appearances (Taylor-Burt et al., 2015) instead of obese phenotypes typical of animals fed HFD. While I cannot rule out HFD-induced dysfunction in sympathetic outflow as a contributor to decreased NST capacity, I would expect to see larger deficits in NST capacity in the _mdm_ mice due to combined effects.

Titin has been implicated as a regulator in mitochondrial respiration as well as bioenergetics. The _sallimus_ (sls) gene in drosophila, whose product is homologous to the NH2-terminal half of titin in vertebrates, has been identified as a transcription regulator of mitochondrial respiration (Jumbo-Lucioni et al., 2012). Jumbo-Lucioni et al. (2012) observed the natural variation between state 3 and state 4 mitochondrial respiration and found a direct effect of _sls_ on mitochondrial function. Homozygous _sls^d00134_ flies, which have a missing allele from
the sls gene, had 17% lower mitochondrial state 3 and 18% higher state 4 rates than controls. These results reveal that sls is a novel gene hub for regulation of mitochondrial respiration and that specific alleles of this gene can control naturally occurring variation in mitochondrial function. In addition, truncating titin variants (TTNtv) that cause genetic dilated cardiomyopathy (DCM) have been shown to alter mitochondrial bioenergetics (Verdonschot et al., 2018). In patients with TTNtv, increased expression of genes across all electron transport chain complexes as well as ATP synthase was found. These findings suggest a compensatory response of increased oxidative phosphorylation components in order to counteract limited contractile ability of cardiac tissue as an indirect effect of a titin mutation.

Defects in oxidative phosphorylation can affect BAT thermogenic activity (Kajimura & Saito, 2014). During BAT-mediated thermogenesis, UCP1 uncouples heat production from ATP synthase, therefore it is likely that defects in oxidative phosphorylation could affect this output. As mentioned above, titin can potentially modulate mitochondrial bioenergetics and transcription of oxidative phosphorylation components, and therefore could be a potential explanation for the reduced nonshivering thermogenesis capacity of mdm mice. Taylor-Burt et al. (2015) demonstrated a direct effect of titin stiffness on the rate of shivering. My results indicate that a nonshivering thermogenesis deficiency could reflect a regulatory effect of titin on metabolic processes. Whether these effects are due to titin signaling or other pathways is a question that could be explored in future work.

4.4 Thermogenic Capacity and its Components

Thermogenic capacity is significantly reduced in mdm mice compared to expected values for their body size (Taylor-Burt et al., 2015). VO2sum measured in wild type and mdm mice was
11.1 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} and 10.4 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} in comparison to predicted values of 10.5 ± 0.2 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} and 14.9 ± 0.2 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} (Taylor-Burt et al., 2015; Bozinovic & Rosenmann, 1989). Additionally, relative contributions of BMR, ST, and NST were not different between \textit{mdm} and wild type mice.

Many small mammals, including deer mice, have been shown to increase their thermogenic capacity solely by altering NST after cold acclimation (Van Sant & Hammond, 2008). While NST is regarded as the most plastic component of VO\textsubscript{2sum}, studies have shown that animals can increase their capacity for ST in addition to NST after cold acclimation (Nespolo, et al., 1999). One might hypothesize that animals with a deficiency in ST would increase their capacity for NST to offset the imbalance in heat generation. Therefore, these results are interesting in that \textit{mdm} mice have a reduced thermogenic capacity for both ST and NST. Future work should investigate whether the capacity for NST can be increased in \textit{mdm} through cold acclimation, albeit at much higher Ta’s than usually used in acclimation studies such as 27-30°C, where \textit{mdm} mice were sufficiently cold stressed (Figure 3).

My results show significant differences in metabolic rates as well as the capacity for nonshivering thermogenesis even before accounting for wild type mice having body masses approximately 4-fold higher than \textit{mdm} mice. Metabolic rate and the capacity for nonshivering thermogenesis scale allometrically with body size, as mentioned previously (Kleiber, 1932) and these comparisons allowed me determine that the severe defects in thermoregulation are not just due to body size. Comparisons between \textit{mdm} mice and the little pocket mouse demonstrated that \textit{mdm} mice do not adapt to their small body size, as shown by their smaller metabolic rates, even at thermoneutrality (Chew et al., 1967). Additionally, as animals get smaller, their contribution of NST to thermogenic capacity increases to offset the balance in increased thermal conductance.
due to increased surface area (Wunder & Gettinger, 1996). VO\textsubscript{2} responses to NE in \textit{mdm} mice were almost half the size (6.4 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}) compared to predicted values (11 ml O\textsubscript{2} g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}; Wunder & Gettinger, 1996). My findings demonstrate that \textit{mdm} mice do not adapt to their small size like other small animals and that their thermoregulatory defects are either due to direct or indirect effects of the N2A deletion in titin.

I conclude that the observed hypothermia in \textit{mdm} mice is due to contributions of multiple aspects of thermoregulation: thermal conductance, ST, and NST. Investigations of thermal conductance and thermogenic capacity provide a complete assessment of an animal’s ability to thermoregulate during cold temperatures in terms of heat loss (thermal conductance) and heat production (BMR, ST, and NST). Taylor-Burt et al. (2015) found that \textit{mdm} mice do not fail to thermoregulate solely due to small body size, which increases surface area for thermal conductance. Comparisons of \textit{mdm} mice to size-matched \textit{Baiomys taylori} showed significant differences in thermal conductance, suggesting that increased thermal conductance is due to other factors such as low levels of insulating white adipose tissue or perhaps fur quality. My results demonstrate that the rate of heat loss exceeds the rate of heat production in \textit{mdm} mice, as demonstrated by impairments in both ST (Taylor-Burt et al., 2015) and NST in addition to increased thermal conductance.

### 4.5 Conclusions

The results of this study demonstrate that not only does a deletion in N2A titin affect the rate of shivering in \textit{mdm} mice, but it also reduces thermogenic capacity and nonshivering thermogenesis. This mutation severely affects the thermoregulatory abilities of \textit{mdm} mice so that \textit{mdm} mice cannot maintain normal \textit{T\textsubscript{b}}’s below 34°C due to deficiencies in shivering.
thermogenesis, nonshivering thermogenesis, and increased thermal conductance. When comparisons are made to account for the small body size of *mdm* mice, these deficiencies are exacerbated. It is not clear how titin could modulate nonshivering thermogenesis, but it could be through an indirect role in regulating oxidative phosphorylation or other pathways. Future studies should investigate these possible links.
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