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Abstract

There are numerous human diseases that are associated with the formation of toxic protein aggregates. Activating the heat shock response (HSR) - and thus generally restoring the disturbed protein homeostasis in such diseases - has often been suggested as a therapeutic target. Yet, most data on activating the HSR or its downstream targets in mouse models of diseases associated with aggregate-formation have been rather disappointing. However, the human chaperonome consists of many more heat shock proteins (HSPs) that are not regulated by the HSR. In this review, we summarize the existing literature on a set of aggregation diseases and discovered that each of them can be ‘barcoded’ by a different set of HSPs, each of which can rescue specific aggregation types. Many of these effective HSPs are not regulated by the HSR and some have now also demonstrated effectiveness in mouse models. Interestingly, several of these ‘non-canonical’ HSPs also cause diseases when mutated (so-called chaperonopathies), which are also discussed in this review.
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Introduction

Many heat shock protein (HSP) family members are known to function as molecular chaperones, meaning that they stabilize and assist in the correct folding of nascent polypeptides.\(^1\) In addition to their role in *de novo* protein folding, HSPs are involved in various aspects of proteome maintenance, including macromolecular complex assembly, protein transport and degradation, as well as aggregate dissociation and refolding of stress-denatured proteins. Under normal cellular conditions, HSP levels match the overall level of protein synthesis. Under stress-induced conditions, mature proteins unfold and exceed the capacity of chaperone networks to prevent aggregation. This type of acute proteotoxic stress induces a regulated response resulting in increased expression of some HSPs to rebalance protein homeostasis.

The human genome encodes for more than 100 different HSPs in 7 different families: HSPH (Hsp110), HSPC (Hsp90), HSPA (Hsp70), DNAJ (Hsp40), HSPB (small Hsp), the human chaperonin families HSPD/E (HSP60/HSP10) and CCT (TRC), plus several regulatory co-factors.\(^2\) In terms of their regulation, the HSP family members can also be categorized into three groups: 1) constitutively expressed, but not induced by stress; 2) constitutively expressed and induced upon stress; and 3) induced only upon stress.\(^3\) Besides their differential regulation, the various HSPs also show a large degree of functional diversities with respect to client specificity and client processing.\(^4\) These functional differences may be very important when investigating their potential relevance for diseases in which cells are chronically exposed to proteins that are prone to form toxic protein aggregates. Examples of such diseases are polyglutamine diseases, Parkinson’s disease, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis and Alzheimer’s disease. This review discusses how these diseases can actually be ‘barcoded’ by a different set of HSPs that can rescue their disease-specific aggregations.
The cellular functions of HSPs

HSPs and de novo protein folding

The general organization of co-translational folding is highly conserved throughout evolution. Ribosome binding chaperones (e.g., nascent-chain-associated complex and specialized Hsp70/HSPAs) first interact with the nascent polypeptide, followed by a second set of HSPs that do not have a direct affinity for the ribosome (the classical Hsp70/HSPA system). The Hsp70/HSPA family is the central component of the cellular network of molecular chaperones and folding catalysts (Fig. 1A). Hsp70/HSPA proteins are involved in a wide range of protein quality control functions (PQC), including de novo protein folding, refolding of stress-denatured proteins, protein transport, membrane translocation and protein degradation. Hsp70/HSPAs never function alone; they require Hsp40/DNAJ proteins and nucleotide exchange factors (NEFs) as partners. DNAJ proteins bind and deliver client proteins to the Hsp70/HSPA system, upon which the client protein and DNAJ function together thereby stimulating HSPA to hydrolyze ATP, leading to high substrate affinity of HSPA. Following ATP-hydrolysis, NEFs such as BAG-1, HSPBP1 and HSPH, bind HSPA and induce ADP-ATP exchange, leading to substrate release. DNAJs thus mainly confer client specificity to the Hsp70/HSPA machine, but can also affect the fate of HSPA clients, whereas NEFs seem to be mainly involved in client fate (Fig. 1A).4,5 The DNAJ/HSPA system might also receive clients from small Hsp/HSPB proteins. HSPB chaperone activity does not need ATP. However, direct interaction with ATP-dependent chaperones like HSPA promotes the release of the bound substrate and subsequent refolding.6,7

Proteins that cannot be completely folded by Hsp70/HSPA machines are transferred to, or handled independently by, the chaperonins or the Hsp90/HSPC system (Fig. 1A).8,9 Substrate transfer to Hsp90/HSPC protein is mediated by the HSP organizing protein (HOP), which uses multiple tetratricopeptide repeat domains to form a bridge between HSPA and HSPC.5,10 While the handoff from Hsp70 to chaperonins remains unclear in mammals, work in the prokaryotic system has begun to reveal some interesting possibilities. For example, it has been shown that Hsp70/DnaK binds the M domain of ClpB to recruit DnaK-bound substrates to the chaperonin.11
Figure 1. Model of actions and interactions of the HSP network required for normal protein folding and refolding upon acute stress (A) or during chronic stress (B). A) HSP families constitute a large group of chaperones that interact with
non-native proteins, assisting their correct protein folding. HSPs are constitutively expressed, but their expression level can increase under stress condition. They are mainly divided into five groups: small HSP (HSPB), Hsp70 (HSPA), Hsp90 (HSPC) and chaperonin families HSP60/HSP10 (HSPD/E) and TRiC (CCT). During de novo protein folding and for the refolding of stress-denatured, unfolded proteins, the functional cooperation of different HSPs is primarily aimed at the structural stabilization of native proteins for (re)folding, but—in case of failure—also can assist client degradation through the Ubiquitin-Proteasome System (UPS) or the autophagy-lysosome pathway. The central component of the chaperone network and folding catalysts is the Hsp70/HSPA family. DNAJs hydrolyze ATP (bound to HSP70/HSPA) to ADP increasing the affinity of its substrate-binding domain for unfolded proteins. Nucleotide exchange factor (NEF) proteins remove ADP and substitute ATP, reducing HSP70/HSPA’s substrate binding affinity, allowing release of the folded protein. Proteins that are unable to utilize HSPAs for folding are transferred to the chaperonin or the HSPC system. B) In case of chronic stress, due to expression of misfolded proteins, folding attempts might be particularly unsuccessful and a HSP network that rather functions in protein unfolding, disaggregation, and specific targeting of the mutant, misfolded or even aggregated proteins for degradation is required.

HSPs and acute proteotoxic stress conditions

Cells are constantly challenged by a variety of changes to their environment. Acute stress conditions, such as heat shock, cause many proteins to become unfolded. The accumulation of stress-denatured proteins increases the risk of aggregate formation. In addition to their role in co-translational folding, the constitutively expressed HSP members might also assist in aggregate protection and refolding of stress unfolded proteins (Fig. 1A). However, it has been shown in yeast that the stress-inducible cytosolic members of the families, which are strongly upregulated by heat shock factor-1 (HSF-1), become more important under such conditions. Next to this transcriptional response, HSPB proteins represent an even more rapid response to environmental stresses (Fig. 1A). Several HSPB-members are rapidly and transiently phosphorylated, whereby their oligomeric state is dynamically altered and their protective activities are activated. These protective activities include prevention of cytoskeletal collapse and chaperoning of soluble proteins, which can enhance protein refolding or support client degradation.

In parallel to the HSF-1 regulated heat shock response (HSR) in the cytosol, interconnected pathways in different cellular compartments also respond to acute cellular stress, including the unfolded protein response (UPR) in the endoplasmic reticulum and the mitochondria. Each pathway not only induces the transcriptional up-regulation of genes that enhance refolding capacity but
also the expression of HSP members assisting in degradation of unfolded proteins through the proteasome and lysosome-mediated pathways, together protecting cells from stress.\textsuperscript{15-16}

**HSPs and chronic stress conditions**

Protein aggregation hallmarks a high number of chronic diseases\textsuperscript{17} that can either be loss-of-function or toxic gain-of-function disorders. Loss-of-function diseases, including cystic fibrosis and Gaucher’s disease, are typically caused by recessive mutations leading to inefficient folding of the mutated proteins and their consequent degradation or dysfunction (Fig. 1B).\textsuperscript{18} Of note, in recessive diseases, the HSF-1-regulated HSPs can promote some refolding of (metastable) mutant proteins, thereby displaying disease-rescuing potential.\textsuperscript{19} In addition, chaperone inhibition, resulting in less recognition of the mutant peptides and their degradation, has been shown to be protective in such diseases.\textsuperscript{20} Toxic gain-of-function diseases, on the other hand, are often manifested by the formation of intracellular and/or extracellular deposits of aggregated proteins, as will be further discussed below.\textsuperscript{3,17,21} These aggregates are often fundamentally different from those formed during acute stress as they initially are formed without being sensed by the (acute) stress responses in the cells. Moreover, unlike in response to acute stress where proteins are unfolded, proteins in chronic stress are intrinsically misfolded and can generally not be refolded but must be disposed of (Fig. 1B). This could imply that different HSPs might be crucial –or rate limiting– for the protection in chronic diseases than for acute stress. Below, we will focus on toxic gain-of-function diseases and provide an overview of the literature on HSPs that could prevent aggregation or/toxicity of the disease-associated proteins. Because we aim to identify HSPs that might be rate-limiting factors for aggregate prevention and thus targets for intervention in these diseases, we will mainly discuss effects of HSP-overexpression and not include studies on down-regulation of HSPs. On the contrary, HSP down-regulation is often associated with toxicity and lethality and can result in disease itself (Table 1). In addition this review therefore will provide an overview on aggregation diseases that are caused by mutations in HSPs, thereby illuminating the ‘barcode’ for the role of HSPs in chronic aggregation diseases from two sites: the prevention of toxic gain-of-function diseases and their role in causing disease themselves.
HSPs and proteinopathies

There are numerous human diseases that are associated with the aggregation of a single dominant peptide or protein. Examples of such diseases include proteinopathies such as polyglutamine diseases, Parkinson’s disease, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, and Alzheimer’s disease. The monogenic forms of neurodegenerative proteinopathies are rare, and are generally histopathologically indistinguishable from their corresponding sporadic forms, making it likely that both forms share a final common pathway. Protein aggregates are either found inside (e.g. tau tangles) or outside neurons in the extracellular space (e.g. amyloid-β-plaques in AD).

Aggregates are caused by proteins that become destabilized either by mutations changing their native state (e.g. SOD1 in ALS) or quantity (α-synuclein), by the elongation of a certain domain (e.g. huntingtin), or by domain truncations (TDP-43). Aggregates range from extremely dense amyloidogenic aggregates with β-sheet cores (huntingtin, ataxin-3, amyloid-β) to more amorphous aggregates (α-synuclein, SOD1, TDP-43). While it is still debated whether the small oligomers or the large inclusions are more toxic, the overall evidence from model systems strongly suggests that aggregate prevention generally results in disease-amelioration. Therefore, this review focuses on aggregate prevention by HSPs and will reveal that each of these proteinopathies shows a different ‘signature’ or ‘barcode’ of rescue depending either on the HSR or individual HSPs. Such a ‘barcode’ provides a platform for a rational design of disease-specific therapeutic strategies. For each disease, evidence was categorized into 4 levels (Fig. 2): in vitro (lowest level), cell studies, non-mammalian model systems and mammals (highest level). Furthermore, evidence in Fig. 2 was graded according to their specific effects: prevention of aggregate formation (black), buffering of toxic effects caused by diseased protein (gray), and absence of protective effects (white).

Polyglutamine diseases (polyQ)

In polyQ diseases, the polyglutamine tract is elongated beyond a certain threshold. The transcribed polyQ peptide fragments are thought to be the initiators of amyloid fibrils and have a strong propensity to assemble into highly ordered polymers extremely rich in β-sheet structure, thereby creating SDS
PolyQ expansions in huntingtin (Htt), ataxins, and in the androgen receptor (AR) have been associated with mainly dominant, late onset, toxic gain-of-function diseases, such as Huntington’s disease (HD), Spinocerebellar ataxias (SCA) and Spinal bulbar muscular atrophy (SBMA). All these diseases are associated with severe motor problems and/or muscle atrophy. Both age of onset and protein aggregation propensity are strongly associated with the length of the polyQ expansion, further suggesting that aggregate formation is at the basis of disease.

In cells and non-mammalian model organisms, activation of the acute HSR pathways often reduced the extent of polyQ aggregation. Overexpression of HSF-1 usually lead to fewer but larger polyQ aggregates in cells. In agreement with this finding, chemical up-regulation of the HSR in cells and non-mammalian animal organisms reduced a number of dysfunctions caused by polyQ overexpression (Fig. 2). Although overexpression of HSF-1 in muscle tissue of the R6/2 mouse model for HD increased life span, there were only small effects on aggregates, implying that effects were compensatory and did not affect the underlying toxic gain-of-function. Chemical up-regulation of the HSR by the use of Hsp90/HSPC-inhibitors in the R6/2 mouse model lead to transient beneficial effects, which disappeared during disease progression. Moreover, Hsp90/HSPC-inhibition lead to accelerated degradation of soluble polyQ-Htt, which was apparently independent of HSR activation, but was most likely due to pleiotropic effects associated with the inhibition of Hsp90/HSPC instead. The strong effects of Hsp90/HSPC-inhibitors on SBMA -but not HD- therefore suggest that HSF-1-activation and thereby up-regulation of the HSR is insufficient to modulate polyQ diseases in general. Protective effects of Hsp90/HSPC-inhibitors, if found, are therefore most likely due to HSF-1 unrelated effects. The up-regulation of individual members from HSF-1-regulated HSP families (e.g. HSPA1A, DNAJB1, HSPB1) was effective in preventing polyQ aggregation or the associated toxicity in vitro and in cellular models (Fig. 2). However, in comparative screens using larger polyQ expansions the HSR-regulated HSPs were usually rather ineffective as compared to non-canonical HSPs. Some effects
of Hsp70/HSPA overexpression on polyQ toxicity were reported in *Drosophila melanogaster* (Fig. 2). However, these effects were not associated with aggregate reduction, suggesting that the observed protection was due to compensation of effects downstream of aggregate formation, as for instance the loss of normal protein quality control functions due to entrapment of key chaperones, such as DNAJB1. Yet, this loss of protein quality control is apparently not at the heart of disease in mammals, as restoration of protein quality control by HSP70 overexpression did not delay diseases-progression in the R6/2 Huntington mouse model. The same is true for the canonical small Hsp HSPB1. Although an earlier report suggested a small delay of Htt-toxicity in R6/2 mice, HSPB1 was rather inefficient in delaying aggregation in cells and might thus have some compensatory effects that slightly delay disease in simple model organisms but are insufficient in mammals (Fig. 2).

In dedicated screens for members of the HSP families that might be better suppressors of polyQ aggregation, a number of very effective HSPs were identified (DNAJB2, DNAJB6, DNAJB8, HSPB6, HSPB7, HSPB8, HSPB9). Interestingly, most of them were not, or only marginally regulated by HSF-1 and were not effective in stimulating substrate-refolding after an acute stress. Instead, these HSPs were associated with degradation of clients through the proteasomal and autophagic degradation routes. Moreover, whereas DNAJB6, HSPB7, and HSPB8 delayed aggregation in *drosophila*, DNAJB2 was the first HSP that demonstrated a protective effect on aggregate formation, functional endpoints, and survival in mice (Fig. 2). Interestingly, our preliminary data regarding transgenic overexpression of DNAJB6 indicate even larger protective effects in the R6/2 mice. The effectiveness of these non-canonical HSPs in cells, non-mammalian model organisms and mice might be related to their ability to prevent initiation of aggregate formation or to their ability to assist aggregate clearance through autophagy, a finding which would be consistent with the distinguished role autophagy plays in proteinopathies.

In a nutshell, the HSR and individual HSF-1-regulated HSP members have marginal and mainly compensatory effects in polyQ diseases. In contrast, other members of the HSP families that can prevent aggregate initiation or dispose of aggregates might have potential as targets for therapy in polyQ diseases.
Figure 2. Summary of literature regarding the effects of activating either the cytosolic heat shock response (HSR/HSF-1) or overexpressing the indicated HSPs of the diverse families on proteinopathies. For each disease evidence was categorized into 4 levels: In vitro (A), cell studies (B), non-mammalian model systems (C) and mammals (D). Evidence was further graded according to their specific effects on the disease proteins: prevention of aggregate formation (black), buffering of toxic effects caused by diseased protein (gray), and absence of effects (white). See text for further explanation.

Abbreviations: polyQ – polyglutamine diseases; Htt – huntingtin; SCA – spinocerebellar ataxia; AR – androgen receptor; PD – Parkinson’s disease; -syn - -synuclein; ALS – amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; AD – Alzheimer’s disease; A - Amyloid- ; 990 – HSP990; AMCL – arimoclomol; GA – geldanamycin; CLST – celastrol; RA – radicicol; PU – PU-H71
About 5-10% of PD cases are monogenic and can either result in a loss-of-function or a toxic gain-of-function. The most commonly occurring disease-causing mutations are in the mitochondria-associated genes Parkin (PARK2), PINK1 (PARK6), and DJ-1 (PARK7). Mutations in these genes are recessively inherited and usually result in a loss-of-function affecting mainly mitochondrial function and turnover. On the contrary, a toxic gain-of-function phenotype resulting in PD is caused by rare dominantly inherited mutations and multiplications in the SNCA (PARK1, PARK4) and LRRK2 (PARK8). This review will focus on these rare toxic gain-of-function mutations.

Mutations in or multiplications of SNCA lead to increased oligomerization of its transcript α-synuclein, which is an intrinsically disordered protein. This enhanced oligomerization increases the tendency of α-synuclein to form β-sheet structures and eventually fibrous amyloidogenic inclusions, called Lewy bodies and Lewy neurites. LRRK2 is a kinase that is involved in the phosphorylation of α-synuclein. Mutations in LRRK2 are thought to promote α-synuclein expression, aggregation, and toxicity, thereby increasing the propensity of α-synuclein to self-aggregate.

Like in polyQ diseases, genetic or chemical activation of HSF-1 can temporarily compensate for LRRK2 and α-synuclein toxicity in cells and drosophila (Fig. 2). Although individual HSPs such as DNAJA1, DNAJB2, HSPB2/HSPB3, HSPB6 and HSPB8 inhibited α-synuclein aggregation in vitro, none of them were proven to be effective in cells yet (Fig. 2). HSPB1 and HSPB5 were effective in preventing α-synuclein aggregation in vitro, in cells and in drosophila, but were never reported to be successful in mice. The overexpression of only HSPA1 could inhibit α-synuclein aggregation in vitro, and decrease α-synuclein toxicity in cells and in drosophila. HSPA1 overexpression in mice did show some protective
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effects, however the data is still disputed (Fig. 2).\textsuperscript{50,51} Like it is the case for polyQ diseases, neither Hsp70/HSPA1, nor any other canonical HSP could prevent aggregate formation or reduce aggregate size and quantity.

All this data taken together would suggest that compensation for loss of normal protein quality control by sequestration of HSPs into aggregates plays a more important role in PD than it does in polyQ diseases. In line with this notion, a study on α-synuclein in mice showed that transgenic overexpression of HSPA5 delayed disease onset without affecting cytosolic protein aggregation. Since HSPA5 is an ER-resident Hsp70/HSPA and is not expressed in the cytoplasm of the cell, its mode of action must be indirect. Instead of directly affecting aggregate formation, HSPA5 most likely compensates for downstream consequences of aggregation and thereby delays disease onset.\textsuperscript{52}

To conclude, the biophysical nature and intracellular localization of α-synuclein aggregates are clearly different from aggregates in polyQ diseases.\textsuperscript{26,53} Expression of (mutant) α-synuclein rapidly activates HSF-1, whereas polyQ expression either does not activate HSF-1 at all, or only transiently and very late in disease.\textsuperscript{26,53} The potential HSP suppressors of PD thus seem to differ from that of polyQ diseases, thereby resulting in a different HSP barcode for potential treatment targets (Fig. 2).

\textbf{Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS)}

About 5\% of ALS cases are currently categorized as dominant monogenic ALS; the most commonly occurring mutations being in SOD1, TDP-43, and FUS.\textsuperscript{54,55} Clinically, sporadic and monogenic ALS are nearly indistinguishable, as SOD1 and TDP-43 positive inclusions are present in both forms of disease, thereby implying a final common pathway.\textsuperscript{56} About 166 mutations in SOD1 have been associated with monogenic ALS. Although SOD1 mutations were initially thought to cause disease via a loss of wild-type SOD1 function, SOD1-knockout mice displayed no phenotype.\textsuperscript{57} Instead, the overexpression of mutant SOD1 lead to disease, hence implying that the mutant gained a toxic function.\textsuperscript{54,58} Mutations in SOD1 indeed structurally destabilize the protein, thereby increasing its aggregation propensity, which eventually results in amyloid fibril-formation.\textsuperscript{59} Mutations in TDP-43, a RNA processing protein usually shuttling between the nucleus and cytoplasm of the cell, render the protein aggregation-prone, which leads to the formation of dense round or filamentous aggregates in the cytoplasm alongside stress.
Mutations in FUS, another protein involved in RNA metabolism, also result in large globular and elongated cytoplasmic inclusions. Nevertheless, FUS-related ALS is defined as an atypical form because TDP-43 positive aggregates are not part of the pathology, which is why this review will not discuss this FUS-related ALS.

Treatment of *drosophila* with the Hsp90/HSPC-inhibitor 17-AAG reduced the eye-degeneration-phenotype in a TDP-43-model. In addition, treatment of the SOD1-G93A mouse model with 17-AAG not only delayed age of symptom onset, but also increased life-span. However, these protective effects were not reproducible in the SOD1-G37R or the SOD1-G85R mouse model. These contradictive results indicate that protein aggregation and toxicity mechanisms might depend on the exact kind of mutation, and therefore result in a different barcode of HSPs for each SOD1-mutation.

Regarding the effects of individual HSPs on SOD1 aggregation and toxicity, data in cell lines expressing mutant SOD1 suggest protective effects of HSPA1, DNAJB1, DNAJB2, HSPB1 and HSPB8 (Fig. 2). Furthermore, HSPB8 alleviated TDP-43 aggregation and toxicity in cells and HSPA1A reduced TDP43-associated eye degeneration in *drosophila* (Fig. 2). The intracranial injection of SOD1-G93A mice with HSPA1 was also protective, whereas long-term effects of HSPB1 overexpression in mice were absent, although this is disputed.

To conclude, except for the aforementioned Hsp90/HSPC-inhibitors, none of the discussed HSPs resulted in long-term rescue or had direct effects on SOD1-aggregates (Fig. 2). Moreover, it is not clear whether the effects of the Hsp90/HSPC-inhibitors are due to the elevation of HSF-1-regulated HSPs, or whether they are due to the broad effects these inhibitors exert on cell homeostasis. In summary, the barcode of HSPs that protect against ALS is still very limited.

**Alzheimer’s disease (AD)**

The most commonly occurring form of AD is sporadic late onset AD. In contrast, only about 1-2% of AD cases display an early onset and are due to autosomal dominant mutations in amyloid precursor protein (APP), presenilin 1 (PSEN1), or presenilin 2 (PSEN2) (Guerreiro et al., 2012). Although intracellular tangles, consisting of hyperphosphorylated tau and extracellular amyloid-β (Aβ) plaques are present in both sporadic and monogenic AD, it is still unclear how toxicity in
AD proceeds. It is disputed as to whether amyloid-β aggregation leads to cellular stress and results in tau-hyperphosphorylation and aggregation (Amyloid cascade hypothesis), or tau-hyperphosphorylation and aggregation precede amyloid-β accumulation (tau-axis-hypothesis). Here, we will provide an unbiased summary on the effects of HSPs on both, Aβ- and tau-related aggregation.

Amyloid-β peptides are the result of APP-cleavage via one of two pathways: a non-amyloidogenic pathway that leads to the generation of Aβ40, or an amyloidogenic pathway that results in the generation of Aβ42. AD-related mutations in APP usually affect the ratio or properties of these different amyloid-β species. Similarly, mutations in PSEN1 and PSEN2, which are rate-limiting components of the g-secretase complex in the amyloidogenic pathway, result in increased generation of the more fibrillogenic Aβ42.

HSF-1-injection into an APP rat model increased neuronal health and reduced Aβ plaque-load, similarly, genetic overexpression of HSF-1 in APP mice diminished soluble Aβ-levels. In line with these findings, treatment of APP-mice with the HSF-1 activator celastrol slightly decreased Aβ-plaque load (Fig. 2).

In vitro, it was shown that HSPA1 and HSPA5, HSPC1, HSPA1/DNAJB1, as well as HSPB1, HSPB5, HSPB6 and HSPB8 slow down Aβ-aggregation (Fig. 2). Furthermore, purified DNAJB1, HSPB1, HSPB5 and HSPB8 protect cells from extracellular Aβ-toxicity when co-incubated. However, considering that HSPs are intracellular proteins, whereas Aβ-plaques are generally considered to be extracellular, the relevance of such findings could be debated. Interestingly, evidence stating that intracellular Aβ-aggregation might precede extracellular plaque formation is accumulating, which increases the relevance of findings indicating that HSPs are able to prevent the initiation of aggregation in cells.

Although there is no cellular data available yet, these findings might explain why transgenic overexpression of HSPA1 and HSPB1 had protective effects in mouse models for Aβ. However, it is questionable whether Aβ-aggregation was directly affected by HSPA1 overexpression in transgenic mice, or whether the observed protective effects were due to more general compensatory effects of HSPA1.

Another protein that has been associated with neuronal death in AD is tau. Tau is an unstructured and dynamic protein that is normally involved in stabilization of microtubules, but becomes hyperphosphorylated and detaches from microtubules under stress conditions. This detachment results in
microtubular collapse and in the aggregation of tau into well-ordered and periodic
protein deposits.\textsuperscript{68,77}

In cells, the HSF-1 activator HSF1A reduced tau aggregation by increasing
proteasomal degradation of tau.\textsuperscript{78} Likewise, Hsp90/HSPC directed drugs, like
geldanamycin, enhanced clearance of tau from cells, thereby reducing its toxicity
(Fig. 2). Moreover, the HSF-1 activator radicicol and the GA derivative 17-AAG
alleviated tau toxicity in \textit{drosophila} larvae (Fig. 2).

Multiple HSPs alleviated tau toxicity in cells, including HSPA8, HSPA1,
Hsp90s/HSPC, DNAJA1 and HSPB1 (Fig. 2). In addition, HSPB1 rescued
behavioral defects in a mouse model for tauopathy.\textsuperscript{79} However, there are no
studies investigating the role of the other HSPs in mammals available yet.

To conclude, interpreting the data about the effects of HSPs on AD needs
to be done with great caution for two main reasons: Firstly, it is not yet known
whether AD is initiated by intracellular (tau or A\textsubscript{\beta}) or extracellular (A\textsubscript{\beta})
aggregates. Secondly, although extracellularly added or leaked HSPs might affect
toxicity of A\textsubscript{\beta}-plaques, it is still unclear how intracellular overexpression of HSPs
can have direct effects on toxicity in AD, thereby limiting proper interpretation of
the barcode of HSPs for AD.

**Different aggregation diseases have a different HSP barcode**

Although all diseases discussed here are toxic gain-of-function aggregation
diseases, the barcode of HSPs with protective potential clearly differs depending
on the disease (Fig. 2). This variability strongly suggests that the
neurodegenerative proteinopathies discussed in this review are biochemically and
biologically distinct. Since all proteinopathies might impede on overall protein
homeostasis, simply rescuing the overall folding capacity by activation of the
complete (acute) HSR (Fig. 1A), or expression of individual components thereof
might lead to some protective effects. However, these effects are generally small
and transient, and do not actually affect aggregate formation of the specific
diseased proteins themselves. Instead, the effects of the HSR might compensate
for entrapment of chaperones and/or other components into aggregates (e.g.
certain crucial transcription factors). The underlying toxicity of the aggregates
themselves is likely to go beyond these effects on protein homeostasis and will
furthermore directly impair other functions, such as axonal transport, organelle
dynamics (physical obstruction or cytoskeletal collapse) and membrane integrity.
Assuming that aggregation indeed is the reason for toxicity in all these diseases, each proteinopathy requires specific HSPs that either directly prevent aggregation (initiation) or that recognize early aggregate intermediates and target these for degradation. These HSPs are likely to be found amongst the “non-canonical HSPs”, many of which have not been fully explored yet for each of these diseases.

Chaperonopathy: The case of “Sick” HSPs

So far we have highlighted how HSPs might act as a first line of defense in preventing proteinopathies. Sometimes however, HSPs themselves are mutated, leading to several pathological conditions, termed chaperonopathies.\textsuperscript{80–82} Although the term chaperonopathy was initially used to include any putative alteration in the expression, post-translational modifications or localization of chaperones, this review will only discuss genetically inherited mutations in the HSPs that are the direct causative factor to a specific disease (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Mutation</th>
<th>Inheritance</th>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Chaperone mediated rescue</th>
<th>Refs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hsp60/HSPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG13</td>
<td>V72I in SPG13;</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Hereditary Spastic Paraplegia</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Bross et al., 2008; Hansen et al., 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chromosome 2q33.1;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c.292G&gt;A/p.V98I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mthHSP60</td>
<td>D29G</td>
<td>Recessive</td>
<td>Hypomyelinating leukodystrophies HMLs; MitCHAP-60 disease</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Magen et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT/TRIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTy/MKKS</td>
<td>20p12 in MKKS gene; H84Y, A242S</td>
<td>Recessive</td>
<td>McKusick-Kaufman Syndrome (MKS)</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Stone et al., 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein</td>
<td>Mutation Description</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT/MKKS</td>
<td>MKKS locus BBS6, BBS10, BBS12</td>
<td>Recessive Bardet-Biedel Syndrome (BBS)</td>
<td>Stone et al., 2000; Katsanis et al., 2000; Slavotinek et al., 2000; Stoetzel et al., 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT delta/MKKS</td>
<td>C450Y in CCT delta</td>
<td>Recessive Hereditary Sensory Neuropathy (HSN): Charcot-Marie-Tooth (CMT), Hereditary Motor &amp; Sensory neuropathy (HMSN)</td>
<td>Lee et al., 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hs40/DNAJ</td>
<td>DNAJB2 (HSJ1)</td>
<td>Splice mutation in HSJ1 gene</td>
<td>Blumen et al., 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recessive Distal Hereditary Motor Neuropathy (dHNN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNAJB6</td>
<td>F93L, F89I, P96R</td>
<td>Sarparanta et al., 2012; Harms et al., 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dominant Limb-Girdle Muscular Dystrophy type 1D (LGMD1D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNAJC5</td>
<td>c.346_348 delCTC, c.344T&gt;G, p.Leu116del, p.Leu115Arg</td>
<td>Noskova et al., 2011; Velinov et al., 2012; Cadieux-Dion et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dominant Autosomal dominant-adult-onset neuronal ceroid lipofuscinosis (ANCL) or Kuf's disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNAJC6</td>
<td>p.Q734X; c.801-2 A&gt;G</td>
<td>Edvardson et al., 2012; Koroğlu et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recessive Juvenile Parkinsonism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNAJC19</td>
<td>IVS5-16G; c.300delA</td>
<td>Davey et al., 2006; Ojala et al., 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recessive Dilated cardiomyopathy with ataxia (DCMA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNAJC29</td>
<td>c.3484 G&gt;T, p.E1162X; c.11,707C&gt;T, p.R 3903X in SACS; T3702A</td>
<td>Bouchard et al., 1998; Engert et al., 2000; Bouhal et al. 2011; Gregianin et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recessive Spastic ataxia of Charlevoix-Saguenay (ARSACS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Hsp/HSPB</th>
<th>Dominant; Recessive (L99M)</th>
<th>Williams Syndrome; Charcot-Marie-Tooth Disease 2 (CMT2), Distal Hereditary Motor Neuropathy (dHMN)</th>
<th>HspB8 mediated rescue for P182L mutation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HspB3 R7S</td>
<td>Recessive</td>
<td>Motor Neuropathy</td>
<td>NV (Kolb et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HspB8 K141E, K141N, K141T</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Distal Hereditary Motor Neuropathy (dHMN); Charcot-Marie-Tooth Disease 2 (CMT2)</td>
<td>NV (Irobi et al., 2004; Tang et al., 2005; Nakhro et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Chaperonopathies**

NV: Not verified

Genetic chaperonopathies described so far only concern members of the HSPB, DNAJ and chaperonin families, as well as some chaperone co-factors (Table 1). No genetic chaperonopathies are associated with the Hsp70/HSPA or Hsp90/HSPC family members, either because of functional redundancy within these families or because they are crucial to the central chaperone machinery such that functional mutations are incompatible with life.
Summary of HSPs for which mutations are described that lead to either recessive (grey boxes) or dominant (black boxes) chaperonopathies categorized in Neuropathy, Myopathy or Retina related diseases (Cataracts). The mutations in HSPs involved in both recessive and dominant diseases have been shaded with both colors (grey and black).


Disease-wise, genetic chaperonopathies can be categorized into neuropathies (hereditary spastic paraplegia, motor neuropathy, distal hereditary motor neuropathy), myopathies (dilated cardiomyopathy leukodystrophy, desmin related myopathy, mitochondrial myopathy, muscular dystrophy), or retina and eye lens related diseases (congenital cataracts). Although some chaperonopathies are recessive (and thus probably related to loss-of-function of the chaperone), most were found to be dominant, as is especially the case for the HSPBs (Table 1). We have “barcoded” these HSP-associated chaperonopathies depending on their disease type and inheritance (Fig. 3).

**Hsp60/HSPD and TRiC/CCT related chaperonopathies**

A mutation in the Hsp60/HSPD chaperone system has been linked to an autosomal dominant disease known as hereditary spastic paraplegia 13 (SPG13).

---

**Figure 3. Overview of Chaperonopathies caused by mutations in Heat Shock Proteins.** Summary of HSPs for which mutations are described that lead to either recessive (grey boxes) or dominant (black boxes) chaperonopathies categorized in Neuropathy, Myopathy or Retina related diseases (Cataracts). The mutations in HSPs involved in both recessive and dominant diseases have been shaded with both colors (grey and black).

The mutation V72I leads to reduced chaperonin activity, which can be attributed to haploid insufficiency due to incorporation of functionally deficient Hsp60/HSPD subunits.\textsuperscript{83,84} Another chaperonopathy involving Hsp60/HSPD is a recessive mitCHAP-60 disease, where mutations lead to entropic destabilization of the Hsp60/HSPD oligomer and causes its premature disassembly. This renders Hsp60/HSPD incapable to fulfill its normal function and thus results in disease.\textsuperscript{85}

The Hsp60/HSPD complex resides in mitochondria, however a comparable eukaryotic chaperonin system known as TRiC/CCT is present in the cytosol and is mainly involved in tubulin and actin folding. Mutations in TRiC/CCT subunits might affect its complex formation and thereby its ability to bind and fold tubulin and actin. As cytoskeletal integrity is crucial in axonal transport, this might explain why such mutants primarily affect functionality of long axons thus leading to sensory neuropathies.\textsuperscript{86}

**DNAJ related chaperonopathies**

There are four recessive chaperonopathies associated with members of the DNAJ family (Table 1). The first one concerns a DNAJB2 mutation that causes Distal Hereditary Motor Neuropathy (dHMN) due to progressive degeneration of motor neurons in the spinal cord.\textsuperscript{87} DNAJB2 has several clients and possesses degradation-related functions.\textsuperscript{88,89} The DNAJB2 (splice) mutant has lost its ability to handle its natural clients, which therefore eventually aggregate and form intracellular inclusions.\textsuperscript{87}

The second recessive disease caused by mutations in DNAJ concerns DNAJC29. DNAJC29-mutations lead to cerebellar ataxia with peripheral neuropathy referred to as ARSACS.\textsuperscript{90} Although the normal function of DNAJC29 is not well understood, roles in mitochondrial dynamics and in recruitment of HSPA for the mediation of ataxin-1 degradation have been suggested.\textsuperscript{91,92} In turn, a recently found ARSACS causing mutation (T3702A) resides in the ubiquitin-binding domain of this protein.\textsuperscript{93} However, also mutations outside this domain can lead to disease, of which it is yet unclear if/how this could lead to loss-of-function.

Mutations in DNAJC19 have been identified to cause an autosomal recessive cardiomyopathy.\textsuperscript{94,95} DNAJC19 normally plays a crucial role in mitochondrial import,\textsuperscript{96} implying that deficiency causes disease via mitochondrial defects.
More recently, mutations in DNAJC6 were found to be associated with juvenile-onset Parkinsonism.\textsuperscript{97,98} DNAJC6/Auxilin is a neuron-specific protein which assists Hsc70/HSPA8 in mediating clathrin-coated vesicle disassembly and thus plays a role in synaptic vesicle recycling.\textsuperscript{99,100} Mutations in DNAJC6 are predicted to lead to a truncated version of the protein, which fails to support Hsc70/HSPA8 in its normal function.

Next to these recessive diseases, two DNAJ-related chaperonopathies are dominantly inherited (Table 1) and could either cause disease through haploinsufficiency, by dominant negative effects or via a toxic gain-of-function. Mutations in DNAJB6 are associated with limb-girdle muscular dystrophy type 1D, all of which are found in the glycine-phenylalanine region (G/F). The molecular mechanism underlying the disease has been suggested to be due to a loss-of-function, resulting in protein accumulations and autophagic pathology in muscle fibers.\textsuperscript{101,102} This reduced chaperone function might be due to haploinsufficiency, but as DNAJB6 is present in cells as polydispersed complexes, mutants might also exert dominant negative effects on the wild-type protein.

Mutations in DNAJC5 cause an autosomal dominant neurodegenerative disease, named Kuf’s disease or adult onset neuronal ceroid lipofuscinosi. Normally, DNAJC5 is found in synaptic vesicles and involved in polymerization of dynamin.\textsuperscript{103} Dysfunction of DNAJC5 due to mutations in the crucial lysine position leads to its reduced palmitoylation and hence abnormal sorting and localization of DNAJC5 with ER and Golgi markers.\textsuperscript{104} This leads to decreased levels of DNAJC5 in the brain of diseased individuals, meaning that the disease is most likely caused by haploinsufficiency.

**HSPB related chaperonopathies**

Mutations in several members of the HSPB family, irrespective of the member involved, are found in highly conserved amino acid residues or in the $\alpha$-crystallin domain, which specifies this family of HSPBs.\textsuperscript{8} The $\alpha$-crystallin domain is required for intra/inter-molecular interactions and the stabilization of homo- and hetero-oligomer formations of the HSPB members. As HSPBs are highly expressed in muscles and have a role in cytoskeleton stability,\textsuperscript{105,106} mutations usually affect the cells axonal transport (neurological and sensory disorders) and contractile functions (muscular disorders).
The presence of many of the dominant HSPB mutants in protein aggregates, implies that they might have acquired a toxic gain-of-function similar to the proteins in proteinopathies (Fig. 2). There is indeed biochemical evidence that some mutants, such as the P182L mutant of HSPB1, R49C and R116C of HSPB4, and R120G, Q151X and 464delCt of HSPB5 are intrinsically unstable and might thus cause disease by forming aggregates (toxic gain-of-function). However, it must be noted that the presence of HSPBs in aggregates could also be due to a loss-of-function, reflecting their failed attempt to handle a client with whom they subsequently co-aggregate.

Evidence for haploinsufficiency, at least for HSPB1 mutations, is suggested by findings implying that reduced levels of HSPB1 lead to damage in sensory and motor neurons, that can be rescued by ectopic expression of HSPB1. Partial evidence for haploinsufficiency has also been provided for HSPB8 mutants, which have lost the HSPB8 chaperone-like activity to deal with aggregation-prone polyQ proteins and cause Charcot Marie Tooth disease.

Moreover, considering that HSPBs are known to form oligomers with other members of the same family, it is possible that HSPB mutants could affect the function of other HSPBs via dominant negative effects. HSPB8 mutants for example have an abnormally high affinity for endogenous HSPB1, thus potentially impairing HSPB1 or HSPB1-HSPB8 complex function. Similarly, certain HSPB1 mutants affect endogenous HSPB8, leading to loss of HSPB8-HSPB1 complex formation. Furthermore, abnormal interaction of the R116C-HSPB4 mutant with HSPB5 and HSPB1 has been reported.

Therefore, not only a toxic gain-of-function (aggregation) might be responsible for HSPB-related chaperonopathies, but also a loss-of-function, which might be either direct, due to the mutation, or indirect, due to sequestration of wild-type HSPBs by the mutated HSPB forms. In addition, alteration of HSPB-oligomerization properties and interactions with other HSPB members and/or haploinsufficiency may play a role in HSPB-related chaperonopathies.

**Chaperone intervention to rescue chaperonopathies**

Different HSPs have a role in anti-aggregation of various proteinopathies (Fig. 2). However, whether other HSPs might be able to rescue chaperonopathies has been scarcely studied. A few reports suggest this could indeed be possible: Firstly, aggregation caused by some HSPB5 mutants could be prevented by
overexpression of wild-type HSPB1,118,119 BAG3120 and wild-type HSPB8.121 Secondly, aggregation associated with the expression of the P182L-HSPB1 mutant in cell models was significantly reduced by the overexpression of wild-type HSPB8.122 Whether such rescues are due to prevention of the formation of toxic aggregates containing mutant HSPB or whether they reflect a compensation for loss of (redundant) HSPB functions remains to be elucidated.

Overall conclusions and future perspectives

The finding of different ‘barcodes’ for the rescue of specific aggregation diseases suggests that, although loss of protein homeostasis with aging might contribute to disease initiation (e.g., by HSF-1 abrogation, restoring general protein homeostasis or components thereof), its rescue is insufficient for long term protection in most dominantly inherited proteinopathies. Chronic expression of these aggregation-prone proteins in fact often does not trigger activation of the HSR until late in disease. By then, aggregates might have already sequestered chaperones and thereby disturbed normal protein homeostasis, resulting in cell death. In earlier stages of disease, protein aggregates could already affect neuronal and muscular cell function (even without causing cell death) by altering functions such as axonal transport, organelle dynamics and plasma membrane (receptor) function, without directly impairing protein homeostasis. It has been shown in several mouse models for HD that reversible functional impairments precede neuronal cell loss.123 However, in cellular and simple animal models, such functional defects could be missed and cell death-related effects (including disturbances in protein homeostasis) might prevail, which would explain the observed rescue by the activation of the HSR or by the overexpression of its individual components. However, these HSR-related effects usually do not coincide with aggregate prevention and therefore do not lead to significant (long term) effects in mammalian animal models.

The human genome encodes for many more HSP members, several of which are not regulated by the acute HSR. Although not yet studied intensively, our review clearly shows that some of these “non-canonical” members can specifically rescue aggregation caused by the distinct proteonopathies, some of which have now also been demonstrated to be effective in mouse models. Interestingly though, several of these “non-canonical” HSPs also cause
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Chaperonopathies if mutated (DNAJB2, DNAJB6, HSPB8). This not only indicates that these HSPs have essential PQC functions, but furthermore suggests that their effects on proteinopathies might not be an artifact of their overexpression, but rather reflect an augmentation of their natural function.

A potential worry in all HSP overexpression or boosting studies is that it leads to network adaptations (which would annihilate long-term effectiveness) or to multiple side effects, including increasing carcinogenesis, as was demonstrated for the manipulation of HSF-1 activity. While network adaptations are to be expected upon manipulation of the driving forces of chaperone machinery (e.g. Hsp90/HSPC or Hsp70/HSPA), such effects might be less likely for those components that only steer the specificity of these machines (e.g. HSPBs or DNAJs). Although we found no evidence for DNAJB6 effects on the chaperone network, it remains important to further investigate whether (long-term) overexpression of DNAJB6 or other proteinopathy-rescuing HSPs might have side effects.

Finally, only limited comparative data on the potential rescue of the non-HSR regulated HSPs and the various proteinopathies or chaperonopathies are available. There still might be many novel suppressors of specific diseases to be uncovered, which would further barcode these diseases. This would not only help to find therapeutic targets for intervention, but would also help with understanding differences and similarities between the toxic mechanisms underlying the various proteinopathies.
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