Gamma-H2AX upregulation caused by Wip1 deficiency increases depression-related cellular senescence in hippocampus

Zhi-Yong He^{a,b,c,†}, Wen-Yue Wang^{a,†}, Wei-Yan Hu^{a,b,d}, Lu Yang^a, Yan Li^a, Wei-Yuan

Zhang^a, Ya-Shu Yang^a, Si-Cheng Liu^a, Feng-Lan Zhang^a, Rong Mei^e, Da Xing^{c,*}, Zhi-

Cheng Xiao^{a,b,*}, Ming Zhang^{a,*}

^aYunnan Key Laboratory of Stem Cell and Regenerative Medicine, Institute of Molecular and Clinical Medicine, Kunming Medical University, Kunming 650500, China.

^bDepartment of Anatomy and Developmental Biology, Monash University, Melbourne 3800, Australia.

^cMOE Key Laboratory of Laser Life Science & Institute of Laser Life Science, College of Biophotonics, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510631, China.

^dSchool of Pharmaceutical Science & Yunnan Key Laboratory of Pharmacology for Natural Products, Kunming Medical University, Kunming 650500, China.

^eDepartment of Neurology, the First People's Hospital of Yunnan Province, Kunming 650032, China.

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: zhangming99@gmail.com (MZ), zhicheng.xiao@monash.edu (ZCX), or xingda@scnu.edu.cn (DX).

Supplemental Figure legends





(A) Wip1 KO mice showed declined response to the incentive stimulus of sucrose in SPT compared to their wildtype (WT) littermates (WT: 74.6 \pm 6.4%; KO: 55.5 \pm 2.9%, P < 0.01).

(B) There was a tendency to be significant when comparing the immobility time of FST between the two groups (WT: $61.7 \pm 2.1 \text{ s}$; KO: $73.8 \pm 5.8 \text{ s}$, P = 0.068), while Wip1 KO mice showed obviously increased immobility time of despaired behaviors in TST (WT: $129.7 \pm 4.5 \text{ s}$; KO: $196.6 \pm 12.7 \text{ s}$, P < 0.01).

(C) Wip1 KO mice showed shorter latency to be immobile in both FST (WT: $54.6 \pm 6.5 \text{ s}$; KO: $32.1 \pm 2.6 \text{ s}$, P < 0.01) and TST (WT: $55.7 \pm 4.8 \text{ s}$; KO: $37.8 \pm 2.3 \text{ s}$, P < 0.01) than wildtype mice did. n = 9 for each group. **: P < 0.01.

Figure S2. Effects of Wip1 knockout and fluoxetine treatment on cellular senescence of amygdala, cerebral cortex, and midbrain



(A) Representative images showing SABG-staining positive cells located in the amygdala, cerebral cortex, and midbrain areas of different groups. Wip1 KO mice and their wildtype (WT) littermates were treated with vehicle (veh.) or fluoxetine (flx.) for 2 weeks.

(B) Statistical analyses for the number of SABG staining positive cells in amygdala, cerebral cortex, and midbrain (n = 6 mice for each group). Cellular senescence in amygdala was significantly increased in the Wip1 KO plus vehicle or fluoxetine groups when compared to the WT groups (Genotype: $F_{(1, 20)}$ = 49.2, P < 0.01;Two-way ANOVA). The effects of fluoxetine treatment were not significant in amygdala (Treatment: $F_{(1, 20)}$ = 0.3; Treatment × genotype: $F_{(1, 20)}$

 $_{20)}$ = 1.1, both P > 0.3). There were no significant effects of genotype and treatment on cellular senescence in cerebral cortex (Genotype: F_(1, 20) = 3.8; Treatment: F_(1, 20) = 1; Treatment × genotype: F_(1, 20) = 1.3, all P > 0.05) and midbrain (Genotype: F_(1, 20) = 2.9; Treatment: F_(1, 20) = 0.07; Treatment × genotype: F_(1, 20) = 0.07, all P > 0.05) . **: P < 0.01 when compared to the WT + vehicle group.





(A) When compared to the control group, CUMS-exposed mice consumed significantly less amount of sucrose in SPT ($F_{(2, 24)} = 8.3$, P = 0.002, one-way ANOVA; CUMS-2 or 4 weeks *vs* the control group: both P < 0.05, Tukey's tests). (B) Mice of CUMS-exposed groups spent more immobility time in FST and TST than the control group (FST: $F_{(2, 24)} = 46.2$; TST: $F_{(2, 24)} = 34.1$, both P < 0.0001; CUMS-2 or 4 weeks *vs* the control group: P < 0.05 or 0.01). n = 9 mice for each group. *: P < 0.05; **: P < 0.01.

Figure S4. The effects of CUMS on cellular senescence of amygdala, cerebral cortex, and midbrain in wildtype mice



(A) Representative images showing SABG staining positive cells located in the amygdala, cerebral cortex, and midbrain areas. Wildtype mice of the control group were left undisturbed. The experimental groups were treated with CUMS for 2 or 4 weeks.

(B) Statistical analyses for the number of SABG staining positive cells in amygdala, cerebral cortex, and midbrain of different groups (n = 6 mice for each group). CUMS experience significantly increased cellular senescence in the amygdala ($F_{(2,15)}$ = 37.6, P < 0.01; CUMS 2 or 4 weeks *vs* Control, P < 0.05 or 0.01; Tukey's tests). However, CUMS treatment did not cause obvious increase of SABG-staining positive cells in the cerebral cortex ($F_{(2, 15)}$ = 0.3, P = 0.75) and the midbrain area ($F_{(2, 15)}$ = 0.7, P = 0.51). *: P < 0.05; **: P < 0.01 when compared to the control group.

Figure S5. Fluoxetine treatment prevented CUMS-induced reduction of hippocampal Wip1 expression in wildtype mice



(A) Illustration of Western blotting assays for the detection of Wip1 expression in hippocampus.

(B) One-way ANOVA revealed that fluoxetine treatment effectively prevented the suppressed expression of hippocampal Wip1 protein in CUMS-exposed wildtype mice ($F_{(2, 15)}$ = 20.6, P < 0.01; CUMS + fluoxetine *vs* CUMS + vehicle: P < 0.01). n = 6 samples for each group. Wip1 expression was normalized to β -actin. **: P < 0.01.