

Standards of Mouse Model Phenotyping

*Edited by
Martin Hrabé de Angelis, Pierre Chambon,
and Steve Brown*



**WILEY-
VCH**

WILEY-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA

**Standards of
Mouse Model Phenotyping**

*Edited by
Martin Hrabé de Angelis,
Pierre Chambon,
and Steve Brown*

Standards of Mouse Model Phenotyping

*Edited by
Martin Hrabé de Angelis, Pierre Chambon,
and Steve Brown*



**WILEY-
VCH**

WILEY-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA

The Editors

Prof. Dr. Martin Hrabé de Angelis

GSF National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
Ingolstädter Landstraße 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Prof. Dr. Pierre Chambon

Université Louis Pasteur
Institute of Genetics
67404 Illkirch Cedex
France

Prof. Dr. Steve Brown

Medical Research Council
MRC Mammalian Genetics Unit
Harwell, Oxfordshire OX11 ORD
UK

All books published by Wiley-VCH are carefully produced. Nevertheless, authors, editors, and publisher do not warrant the information contained in these books, including this book, to be free of errors. Readers are advised to keep in mind that statements, data, illustrations, procedural details or other items may inadvertently be inaccurate.

Library of Congress Card No.: applied for
British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <<http://dnb.ddb.de>>.

© 2006 WILEY-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

All rights reserved (including those of translation into other languages). No part of this book may be reproduced in any form – by photoprinting, microfilm, or any other means – nor transmitted or translated into a machine language without written permission from the publishers. Registered names, trademarks, etc. used in this book, even when not specifically marked as such, are not to be considered unprotected by law.

Typesetting: primustype Hurler GmbH, Notzingen

Printing: betz-Druck GmbH, Darmstadt

Binding: J. Schäffer GmbH, Grünstadt

Cover: Grafik-Design Schulz, Fußgönheim

Printed in the Federal Republic of Germany

Printed on acid-free paper

ISBN-13: 978-3-527-31031-9

ISBN-10: 3-527-31031-2

Foreword

Mutations with an effect on coat color or behavior were recorded by mouse fanciers well before the science of Genetics was established. They were curiosities, occurring by chance at very low frequency, and their main advantage was to make the mouse an even more interesting pet animal with many phenotypic variations that could be produced in different combinations by breeding.

Over the last century, mouse geneticists, especially the most sagacious, collated and studied a great variety of mutations, many of them exhibiting neuromuscular, eye or skeletal defects and abnormal fur or coat colors. These mutations were discovered either spontaneously, in the nucleus of inbred strains, or as side-products of the many experiments that were undertaken to assess the genetic risks associated with the use of nuclear radiations. All have been extremely helpful, contributing for example, to the development of the genetic map. A few of these mutants have also been used as animal models for human diseases while others, such as the nude or SCID mice, which can both permanently accept a variety of grafts including xenografts, were and still are used as tools for research in immunology or oncology.

More recently, by taking advantage of the exceptional mutagenic activity of ethylnitroso-urea, programs aimed at the mass-production of new mutations have been undertaken in several laboratories worldwide. With such on-going programs, mutations are no longer rare events occurring spontaneously, but random hits still occur in the mouse genome. Their phenotypes can be studied in great detail but the characterization of the molecular defect will necessarily follow (forward genetics).

With the development of highly efficient techniques of genetic engineering in pluripotent embryonal stem cells (ES cells) and the availability of a nearly complete sequence of the mouse genome, the situation has changed dramatically. Here again, large projects involving a network of laboratories have been undertaken with the aim of producing a very large number of knockout mutations, ideally one in every gene of the mouse genome, and it is likely that these projects will reach their goal within the next five years. Geneticists will then have at their disposal a collection of ES cell libraries, with up to 20,000 genes potentially inactivated. Any genetic defect can then be accurately identified but the main problem will then be to describe the phenotype of the mutant mice as precisely and comprehensively as possible.

The reason for developing such projects is quite clear: producing many mutations and phenotyping them very precisely is the best and most logical way of as-

sessing the function of the genes in the mouse genome. Indeed, when a gene becomes non-functional after a mutation has occurred, careful comparison of the mutant and normal phenotype in addition to taking into account the molecular defect generated by the mutational event, is an excellent (not to say the best) method of assessing the function(s) of the gene in question. In short, the production of new mutations and the precise phenotyping of the mutant genotype are the two sides of the same coin.

Geneticists have worked out many strategies for the efficient production of new mutations in the mouse genome using either chemical mutagenesis or gene trapping or gene targeting but until recently phenotyping was not their main concern and as a result has received less attention. In other words, whilst it was technically possible to inactivate almost any gene in the mouse genome, there was limited scientific interest in the subsequent analysis of the resulting phenotype as the relevance of any data thus obtained was thought to be questionable. Indeed, many knockouts produced over the last 10 years in genes which were thought to be extremely important, were reported to be phenotypically “normal” to the great surprise of their creators!

There is a wide range of difficulties associated with the process of phenotyping. Although it is easy to detect and describe a cerebellar defect in the mouse or a disorder which leads to the animal losing its fur after a few days, it is more difficult to detect an inner ear defect with a relatively late onset or a very subtle degenerative disorder of the retina and it is virtually impossible to detect the phenotype of certain mutations in genes involved in the innate mechanisms of defense unless a specific challenge test is carried out to reveal the mutation. The situation is even more complex when modifier genes in the genetic background interact with the pathology of the mutant allele.

This book, edited by Professor Martin M. Hrabe de Angelis in cooperation with Steve Brown and Pierre Chambon, is original and the timing of its publication is opportune. It consists of 13 chapters, all written by expert scientists who are members of the EUMORPHIA consortium and work in different research institutes across Europe. This volume describes in detail a series of screens known as EMPReSS (European Mouse Phenotyping Resource for Standardized Screens) that encompass more than 150 standard operating procedures (SOPs) covering all the main body systems of the mouse.

This book will definitely be of major interest to those creating or using a variety of mutant mice and the authors must be warmly thanked for this initiative.

April 2006

Jean Louis Guénet

Table of Contents

1	Characterizing Hearing in Mice	1
	<i>Karen P. Steel</i>	
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Behavioral Tests of Hearing	2
1.3	Physiological Tests of Hearing	4
1.4	Anatomy of the Ear	7
1.5	Conclusions	12
	Acknowledgements	13
2	Molecular Phenotyping: Gene Expression Profiling	15
	<i>Johannes Beckers</i>	
2.1	Why this Screen? Medical and Biological Relevance	15
2.2	Examples: Diseases of Mouse and Man	17
2.3	Diagnostic Methods: History and State of the Art	18
2.4	Technical Requirements for Screening Protocols (Short): First and Second Line Approaches	20
2.5	Logistics (Whom, When, How Many, Why)	20
2.5.1	Choice of Platform	20
2.5.2	Biological Samples	22
2.6	Trouble Shooting	23
2.6.1	Preparation of Hybridization Target	24
2.6.2	Critical Issues of Chip Hybridization	27
2.6.3	Image Processing and Array Design	30
2.7	Short-term Outlook	31
3	Screening for Bone and Cartilage Phenotypes in Mice	35
	<i>Helmut Fuchs, Thomas Lisse, Koichiro Abe, and Martin Hrabé de Angelis</i>	
3.1	Introduction	35
3.1.1	The Skeleton	35
3.1.2	Skeletal Development in the Embryo	36
3.1.3	Growth and Maintenance of Bone and Cartilage	36
3.1.4	Diseases Involving Cartilage and Bone	38
3.1.5	The Mouse as a Model for Skeletal Diseases	41
3.2	Screening Protocols	42

3.2.1	Morphological Analysis	42
3.2.1.1	Protocol	43
3.2.2	X-Ray Analysis	44
3.2.2.1	General	44
3.2.2.2	Imaging	45
3.2.2.3	X-Ray Analysis	45
3.2.2.4	Protocol	46
3.2.3	DXA-Analysis	47
3.2.3.1	General	47
3.2.3.2	Advantages	48
3.2.3.3	Disadvantages	48
3.2.3.4	Small Animal Applications	49
3.2.3.5	Precision and Accuracy	49
3.2.3.6	Considerations	50
3.2.3.7	Protocol	51
3.2.4	Biochemical Bone Markers	51
3.2.4.1	Clinical Utility of Biochemical Markers of Bone Turnover in Small Animals	51
3.2.4.2	Mouse Markers of Bone Turnover/Metabolism and Hormonal Regulation	53
3.2.4.3	Variability/Sensitivity/Sample Choice	58
3.2.4.4	Which Markers Should be Used During the Screen?	58
3.2.5	Advanced Small Animal Imaging Techniques	59
3.2.5.1	pQCT	59
3.2.5.2	μ CT	61
3.2.5.3	μ MRI	63
3.2.5.4	Whole-mount Skeletal Preparations	65
3.2.5.5	Histomorphometry	66
3.2.5.6	Miscellaneous	72
3.2.5.7	Order of the Tests	74
3.3	Conclusion	76
	List of Abbreviations	78
	Appendix	85
	μ CT Volumetric Data Processing	85
	MRI Principles	85
4	Clinical Chemical Screen	87
	<i>Martina Klempt, Birgit Rathkolb, Bernhard Aigner, and Eckhard Wolf</i>	
4.1	Introduction	87
4.1.1	Relevance of the Screen	87
4.1.2	Biology and Medical Application	88
4.1.2.1	Biology of Clinical Chemical Parameters	88
4.1.2.2	Medical Application	88
4.2	Diseases in Mouse and Humans	89
4.2.1	Diagnostic Impact of Clinical Chemistry	89
4.2.2	Clinical Chemistry in Selected Disorders	91

4.2.2.1	Hypercholesterolemia	91
4.2.2.2	Albuminuria	91
4.2.2.3	Acute Myeloid Leukemia (AML)	92
4.3	Clinical Chemistry as Diagnostic Tool	93
4.3.1	History	93
4.3.2	State of the Art	94
4.4	Technical Requirements and Screening Protocols	94
4.4.1	Technical Requirements	94
4.4.1.1	Blood Collection	94
4.4.1.2	Sample Preparation	95
4.4.1.3	Sample Analysis	96
4.4.2	Screening Protocols	99
4.4.2.1	Primary Screen	99
4.4.2.2	Secondary Screen	100
4.4.2.3	Tertiary Screen	100
4.5	Logistics of the Screen	102
4.5.1	General Considerations	102
4.5.2	Lessons from ENU Mutants	103
4.6	Trouble Shooting	104
4.6.1	Factors Interfering <i>In Vivo</i>	105
4.6.2	Factors Interfering <i>In Vitro</i>	105
4.7	Short-term Outlook	105
5	Exploration of Metabolic and Endocrine Function in the Mouse	109
	<i>Marie-France Champy, Carmen A. Argmann, Pierre Chambon, and Johan Auwerx</i>	
5.1	General Introduction	109
5.1.1	Investigating a Mouse with Endocrine and Metabolic Dysfunction	109
5.1.2	Principles of Endocrine and Metabolic Testing	110
5.1.3	Strain in Relation to Mouse Models of Metabolic Disease	110
5.2	Evaluation of Energy Homeostasis	112
5.2.1	Body Weight and Food Intake	112
5.2.2	Energy Expenditure by Indirect Calorimetry	114
5.2.3	Cold Test	114
5.2.4	Exercise Test	115
5.2.5	Lean and Fat Composition of the Body	116
5.3	Evaluation of Standard Clinical Chemistry Blood Parameters	117
5.4	Evaluation of Glucose Homeostasis	117
5.4.1	HOMA (Homeostasis Assessment Model)	118
5.4.2	Meal Tolerance Test (MTT)	118
5.4.3	Intra-Peritoneal or Oral Glucose Tolerance Test (IPGTT or OGTT)	118
5.4.4	Intra-Peritoneal Insulin Sensitivity Test (IPIST)	120
5.4.5	Glucose Clamps	120
5.4.6	Utilization of Glucose by Individual Tissues	121
5.4.7	Insulin Secretion Test	122
5.5	Measurement of Serum Lipids and Lipoprotein Parameters	123

5.5.1	Serum Lipid Parameters	124
5.5.2	Isolation of Plasma Lipoprotein	124
5.5.3	Apolipoproteins	125
5.6	Measurement of Hormones	126
5.7	Reproduction and Fertility	128
5.8	Bile Acids	128
5.9	Post-Mortem Analysis and Histology	130
5.10	Molecular Imaging	132
	Acknowledgements	132
6	Behavioral and Neurological Phenotyping in the Mouse	135
	<i>Valter Tucci, Gonzalo Blanco and, Patrick M. Nolan</i>	
6.1	Introduction	135
6.2	Human Neurological and Psychiatric Disorders	136
6.2.1	Neurodegenerative Disorders	137
6.2.2	Mental Retardation Syndromes	138
6.2.3	Disorders Affecting Social Behavior	139
6.2.3.1	Anorexia	139
6.2.3.2	Autism	139
6.2.4	Mood Disorders: Depression, Manias and Schizophrenia	140
6.2.5	Anxiety	141
6.2.6	Neuromuscular Disorders, Myopathies and Neuropathies	142
6.3	Behavioral and Neurological Phenotyping in the Mouse	143
6.3.1	Neurological and Neuromuscular Function	144
6.3.2	Learning and Cognition	145
6.3.3	Social Behavior	146
6.3.4	Emotionality in Mice	147
6.3.5	Processing Sensory Information in Mice	148
6.3.6	Endophenotypes	149
6.4	Behavioral and Neurological Screening Protocols in the Mouse	151
6.4.1	Screens for Neurological and Neuromuscular Function	153
6.4.1.1	Primary Screens	153
6.4.1.2	Secondary Screens	154
6.4.2	Screens for Motor Function	155
6.4.2.1	Primary Screens	155
6.4.2.2	Secondary Screens	156
6.4.3	Screens for Learning and Cognitive Function	157
6.4.3.1	Primary Screens	157
6.4.3.2	Secondary Screens	157
6.4.4	Screens for Social Behavior	158
6.4.4.1	Primary Screens	158
6.4.4.2	Secondary Screens	159
6.4.5	Screens for Emotionality	160
6.4.5.1	Primary Screens	160
6.4.5.2	Secondary Screens	161
6.4.6	Screens for Central Processing of Sensory Information	162

6.4.6.1	Primary Screens	162
6.4.6.2	Secondary Screens	163
6.4.7	Supportive Screens	164
6.4.7.1	Biochemical Measurements	164
6.4.7.2	Histopathology	164
6.4.7.3	Re-testing of Aged Mice	165
6.5	Implementation of Behavioral and Neurological Phenotypic Analysis	165
6.5.1	Gene-driven Approach (Reverse Genetics)	165
6.5.2	Phenotype-driven Approach (Forward Genetics)	166
6.5.3	Phenotype-driven Screens: A Short Guideline	166
6.5.4	Environmental and Genetic Influences on Mutant Behavior	167
6.5.5	Standardization of Screening	168
6.6	Outlook	168
6.6.1	Use of Imaging Technology	169
6.6.2	Investigation of Complex Traits in Compound Mutants: Sensitized Screens	169
6.6.3	Use of Reporter Strains	170
7	Cardiovascular Disorders: Insights into <i>In Vivo</i> Cardiovascular Phenotyping	177
	<i>Laurent Monassier and André Constantinesco</i>	
7.1	Introduction	177
7.2	<i>In Vivo</i> Imaging for Mouse Cardiovascular Phenotyping: Interests and Limits	178
7.2.1	Echography	178
7.2.2	Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)	178
7.2.3	Single Photon Emission Computed Tomography (SPECT)	182
7.2.4	Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Imaging	183
7.2.5	X-Ray Computed Tomography (CT)	184
7.2.6	Limitations in Studies Using Contrast Agents: Particular Aspects of Nuclear-based Imaging	185
7.3	Exploring the Heart in Living Animals	187
7.3.1	Anatomy	187
7.3.1.1	Systolic Function and Hemodynamics	188
7.3.1.2	Global Systolic Function	188
7.3.1.3	Regional Function	189
7.3.1.4	Diastolic Function	189
7.3.1.5	Impaired Myocardial Relaxation Pattern	190
7.3.1.6	Restrictive Filling Pattern	190
7.3.1.7	Myocardial Perfusion, Metabolism and Gene Expression Imaging	190
7.3.1.8	Cardiac Conduction and Arrhythmias	191
7.3.1.9	Exploring the Great Arteries	193
7.3.1.10	Exploring Microvessels	194
7.4	A Scheme for Identifying the Main Cardiovascular Disorders in Genetically-modified Mice	194

8	Phenotyping of Host–Pathogen Interactions in Mice	201
	<i>Andreas Lengeling, Werner Müller, and Rudi Balling</i>	
8.1	Introduction	201
8.2	Looking Back and Forward: History and State-of-the-Art of Mouse Infection Phenotyping and Studies of Genetic Infection Susceptibility	202
8.3	The Impact of Mouse Genetics on the Understanding of Human Infectious Diseases	205
8.4	Phenotyping at the GBF-Mouse Infection Challenge Platform (ICP)	207
8.4.1	Screening Protocols	208
8.4.1.1	Infection with <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i>	208
8.5	Practical Guidelines	212
8.5.1	Growing Log-phase Cultures of <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> EGD for Mouse Infection	212
8.5.2	Infection of Mice with <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> EGD	212
8.5.3	Quantification of Bacterial Growth in Spleen and Liver after <i>L. monocytogenes</i> Infection	213
8.5.4	Troubleshooting	214
8.6	Outlook	214
	Acknowledgement	215
9	Animal Models of Nociception	221
	<i>Ildikó Rácz and Andreas Zimmer</i>	
9.1	Introduction	221
9.2	Ethical Considerations	222
9.3	General Considerations	223
9.4	Assays for Acute Pain Thresholds	224
9.4.1	Thermal Stimuli	224
9.4.1.1	Tail-flick Test	224
9.4.1.2	Hargreaves Test	225
9.4.1.3	Hot-plate Test	226
9.4.2	Mechanical Stimuli	227
9.4.2.1	The Tail- and Paw-pressure Test	227
9.4.2.2	Von Frey Filament Test	227
9.5	Tonic and Visceral Pain Models	228
9.5.1	The Writhing Test	228
9.5.2	The Formalin Test	229
9.6	Hyperalgesia and Allodynia	230
9.6.1	Hyperalgesia and Allodynia Caused by Neuropathic Pain	230
9.6.1.1	Chronic Constriction Injury Model	231
9.6.1.2	Segmental Spinal Nerve Ligation Model	231
9.6.2	Hyperalgesia and Allodynia Caused by Tissue Inflammation	232
9.6.2.1	Determination of Mechanical Allodynia and Thermal Hyperalgesia	232
9.7	Stress-induced Analgesia	233

10	Mouse Phenotyping: Immunology	237
	<i>Svetoslav Kalaydjiev, Tobias J. Franz, and Dirk H. Busch</i>	
10.1	Introduction	237
10.2	Diagnostic Methods	239
10.2.1	Antibody-based Techniques	239
10.2.2	Cellular Immunity Techniques	240
10.2.3	Molecular Genetic Techniques	241
10.3	Immunological Phenotyping at the German Mouse Clinic	242
10.4	Screening Protocols	245
10.4.1	FACS for Leukocyte Subpopulations	246
10.4.1.1	Reagents and Equipment	246
10.4.1.2	Procedure	246
10.4.2	Bead Array for Immunoglobulin Concentrations	247
10.4.2.1	Reagents and Equipment	247
10.4.2.2	Procedure	247
10.4.3	ELISA for Autoantibodies	248
10.4.3.1	Reagents and Equipment	248
10.4.3.2	Procedure	248
10.5	Troubleshooting	249
10.6	Outlook	249
11	Phenotyping Allergy in the Laboratory Mouse	253
	<i>Thilo Jakob, Francesca Alessandrini, Jan Gutermuth, Gabriele Köllisch, Anahita Javaheri, Antonio Aguilar, Martin Mempel, Johannes Ring, Markus Ollert, and Heidrun Behrendt</i>	
11.1	Introduction	253
11.2	Phenotyping Different Forms of Allergic (Hypersensitivity) Reactions	255
11.2.1	Immediate Type Hypersensitivity (Type I)	256
11.2.1.1	Total IgE Baseline Levels in Laboratory Mice	256
11.2.1.2	Allergen-specific IgE	257
11.2.1.3	Passive Cutaneous Anaphylaxis (PCA)	259
11.2.1.4	Allergic Airway Inflammation, BAL, Body Plethysmography	262
11.2.1.5	Impact of Different Sensitization and Challenge Protocols on Parameters of Allergen-induced Airway Inflammation	265
11.2.2	Immune Complex Mediated Hypersensitivity (Type III, Arthus Reaction)	267
11.2.2.1	Reverse Passive Cutaneous Arthus Reaction	268
11.2.3	Delayed Type Hypersensitivity (Type IV)	270
11.2.3.1	Local Lymph Node Assay	270
11.2.3.2	Contact Hypersensitivity Assay	273
11.2.4	Granulomatous Hypersensitivity (Type V)	275
11.2.4.1	Experimental Protocol for Type V Hypersensitivity	275
11.3	General Considerations, Logistics and Outlook	276

12	Eye Disorders	283
	<i>Claudia Dalke, Oliver Puk, Angelika Neuhäuser-Klaus, Jack Favor, and Jochen Graw</i>	
12.1	Introduction	283
12.2	Medical and Biological Relevance of Eye Disorders	283
12.3	Eye Disorders in Mouse and Man	284
12.3.1	Mutations Affecting Early Eye Development Leading to Anophthalmia or Microphthalmia	284
12.3.2	Cataracts	285
12.3.3	Retinal Dysfunction and Degeneration	286
12.3.4	Glaucoma	286
12.4	Diagnostic Methods	287
12.4.1	History	287
12.4.2	Routine Methods	288
12.4.2.1	Fundoscopy	289
12.4.2.2	Electroretinography (ERG)	289
12.4.2.3	The Visual Tracking Drum or Optomotor Drum	291
12.4.2.4	Measurement of Intraocular Pressure	292
12.4.2.5	Histological Analysis	292
12.4.3	Methods in Development	292
12.4.3.1	The Scheimpflug Camera	292
12.4.3.2	Length of the Axis	293
12.4.3.3	Measurement of Intraocular Pressure	295
12.4.4	Future Combinations of First and Secondary Screens for Vision Phenotyping	296
12.5	Screening Protocols	296
12.5.1	Slit Lamp	297
12.5.2	Funduscopy Using an Ophthalmoscope	297
12.5.3	Electroretinography (ERG)	298
12.5.4	The Optokinetic Drum	300
12.6	Logistics	301
12.6.1	Slit Lamp	301
12.6.2	Ophthalmoscope	302
12.6.3	ERG	302
12.6.4	The Optokinetic Drum	302
12.7	Troubleshooting	302
12.7.1	Slit Lamp	302
12.7.2	Ophthalmoscope	303
12.7.3	ERG	303
12.7.4	The Optokinetic Drum	304
12.8	Outlook	304
	Acknowledgments	304

13	EUMORPHIA and the European Mouse Phenotyping Resource for Standardized Screens (EMPreSS)	309
	<i>Steve Brown, Heena Lad, Eain Green, Georgios Gkoutos, Hilary Gates, Martin Hrabé de Angelis, and members of the EUMORPHIA consortium</i>	
13.1	Introduction	309
13.2	The EUMORPHIA Project	309
13.2.1	Project Structure	310
13.3	Using Mouse Models	311
13.4	European Mouse Phenotyping Resource for Standardized Screens (EMPreSS)	312
13.4.1	Development of the SOPs	312
13.4.2	Review	313
13.4.3	Validation of SOPs	314
13.5	Ontologies and Structure of the Empress Resource	315
13.6	The EMPreSS Browser	316
13.7	Future Work	317
	Acknowledgments	317
Index		321

Preface

The speed with which information regarding mammalian genomes has accumulated over the last few years is remarkable. Yet, despite this wealth of information, its immediate use in the diagnosis and therapy of human diseases is limited since only a small fraction of mutations causing congenital malformations or other human diseases has been identified.

Animal models are essential to the understanding of the genetics and pathogenesis of human diseases. The mouse is intensively used as a model system because of its similarity to humans in genome organization, development, biochemical pathways, and physiology. Mouse models have been the key to unraveling several fundamental scientific findings which are important for understanding the molecular mechanisms underlying human diseases in addition to the development and testing of drugs and therapies. Specific advantages of the mouse as a model system include:

- The genome is 90% identical to the human genome.
- It is possible to alter the genome in the mouse using gene-driven and phenotype-driven approaches and to produce models of human diseases, including genetic diseases.
- Alteration of the mouse genome may also produce changes in the normal functioning of organs, systems, and behavior, giving insight into the mechanisms behind their normal function and possible treatments for malfunction.
- The mouse model is used for drug screening and testing of therapies, including gene delivery and gene therapy.

The bottleneck in the process of establishing suitable mouse models is quite often appropriate phenotyping. From my own experience as a postdoctoral fellow, phenotypic analysis of “my” mouse mutants were focused on very specific organ systems and their function.

This strategy was successful and unraveled several important functional aspects of genes but at the same time I was not able to detect additional phenotypic alterations in the very same mouse model. These additional alterations were caused by the pleiotropic effect of the gene of interest. I simply missed additional alterations because I did not look for them or because of the lack of equipment and experience in specific methods used in other areas of research.

Triggered by this experience and the expertise in phenotype-driven forward genetics screens the idea of the German Mouse Clinic was born. The German

Mouse Clinic is a unique platform for the comprehensive standardized phenotyping of mouse lines. Fourteen laboratories specializing in different areas of research, work under one roof and measure over 240 parameters in every mouse line and as a result many new findings have emerged. For almost all lines, including well-known mutant mouse lines, new phenotypes have been identified. This confirms the power and feasibility of standardized comprehensive phenotyping.

The German Mouse Clinic works in close collaboration with pan-European projects such as EUMORPHIA and EUMODIC. Together with my colleagues Steve Brown and Pierre Chambon we were able to bring together experts in the field of mouse functional genomics to assemble a book that presents a wide set of standardized phenotyping assays in 13 research fields.

This book should be seen as a starting point rather than as an end-product since mouse phenotyping will be developed further over the coming years and additional chapters and research fields such as “genome–environment interaction” might be added in future editions.

Implementation of the “German Mouse Clinic” led to a unique platform for comprehensive phenotyping. Baselines for more than 240 parameters have been established, and “Proof of Principle” has been shown in several mouse lines; for example, through the GMC an additional severe metabolic disorder was demonstrated in the mouse line ABE17 which was previously known only as a neurological model for prion disease. Comprehensive phenotyping was essential in the discovery of this additional feature, which will impact upon the interpretation of affected pathways. Japan, the USA, and other countries in Europe are implementing organizations similar to the GMC, underlining the need for these enterprises. The realization of the GMC was only possible with substantial financial support from the NGFN and the GSF. The GMC has already produced important scientific results through the isolation and characterization of various mouse models. In the lung function screen, we have built a unique database of reference values regarding the phenotypic variance of respiratory function in inbred mouse strains. We have been able to detect strong inter-strain variance (e. g. a factor of 3 for lung compliance), and a high genetic-to-total variance suggests a significant genetic contribution to phenotypic variability. Mouse strains with an obviously unfavorable lung function, which should be prone to lung diseases, may serve as ideal animal models.

However, the phenotypic analysis of mouse mutants is often focused on the individual research interests of the particular laboratory or limited to specific tests because of the lack of equipment and experience of specific methods in other research areas.

In order to take better advantage of the existing mutant mouse lines and to provide the scientific community with a platform for systematic, standardized, and comprehensive phenotyping of mouse models, we have established the German Mouse Clinic (GMC) at the GSF in Munich. We have brought together experts from different institutions (Universities of Bonn, Marburg, Munich (TU and LMU), GBF) to work side by side in one building. Within NGFN 1, the coordinating team of the GMC and the GMC staff built up the German Mouse Clinic in a concerted effort (the set-up of the laboratories, establishment of a unique and comprehensive

primary screen, standardization of methods, etc). Because the GMC is unique in its concept and organization, it sets standards for SOPs and comprehensive analysis of mouse models. The phenotyping platform covers the research areas of dysmorphology, behavior, neurology, ophthalmology, clinical chemistry, immunology, allergy, nociception, molecular phenotyping, lung function, energy metabolism, and pathology and is well equipped with the newest technologies (e. g. microcomputer tomography, blood auto-analyzer). We offer phenotypic analysis on the basis of scientific collaboration and have the facilities to house guest scientists in dedicated guest laboratories.

Neuherberg, April 2006

Martin Hrabé de Angelis

List of Contributors

Koichiro Abe

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Bernhard Aigner

Ludwig-Maximilians-University
Institute of Molecular Animal Breeding
and Biotechnology
Feodor-Lynen-Str. 25
81377 Munich
Germany

Antonio Aguilar

Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany
and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Francesca Alessandrini

Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany
and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Carmen A. Argmann

Institut de Génétique et de Biologie
Moléculaire et Cellulaire
CNRS/INSERM/Université
Louis Pasteur
67404 Illkirch
France

Johan Auwerx

Institut Clinique de la Souris
BP10142
67404 Illkirch Cedex
France
and
Institut de Génétique et de Biologie
Moléculaire et Cellulaire
CNRS/INSERM/Université
Louis Pasteur
67404 Illkirch
France

Rudi Balling

German Research Centre
for Biotechnology
Mascheroder Weg 1
38124 Braunschweig
Germany

Johannes Beckers

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Heidrun Behrendt

Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany
and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Gonzalo Blanco

MRC Mammalian Genetics Unit
Harwell
Didcot
Oxfordshire OX11 0RD
UK

Steve Brown

MRC Mammalian Genetics Unit
Harwell
Oxfordshire OX11 0RD
UK

Dirk H. Busch

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany
and
Technical University Munich
Institute for Medical Microbiology,
Immunology and Hygiene
Frankfurter Str. 107
81675 Munich
Germany

Pierre Chambon

Institut Clinique de la Souris
BP10142
67404 Illkirch Cedex
France

Marie-France Champy

Institut Clinique de la Souris
BP10142
67404 Illkirch Cedex
France

André Constantinesco

Service de Biophysique et Médecine
Nucléaire
CHU de Hautepierre
1 av. Molière
67098 Strasbourg
France

Claudia Dalke

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Jack Favor

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Tobias J. Franz

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Helmut Fuchs

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Hilary Gates

MRC Mammalian Genetics Unit
Harwell
Oxfordshire OX11 0RD
UK

Georgios Gkoutos

MRC Mammalian Genetics Unit
Harwell
Oxfordshire OX11 0RD
UK

Jochen Graw

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Eain Green

MRC Mammalian Genetics Unit
Harwell
Oxfordshire OX11 0RD
UK

Jan Gutermuth

Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany
and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Martin Hrabé de Angelis

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

and
Technical University Munich
Experimental Genetics
Am Hochanger 8
85350 Freising
Germany

Thilo Jakob

Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany

and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Anahita Javaheri

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

and
Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany

and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Svetoslav Kalaydjiev

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Martina Klempt

Ludwig-Maximilians-University
Institute of Molecular Animal Breeding
and Biotechnology
Feodor-Lynen-Str. 25
81377 Munich
Germany

Gabriele Köllisch

Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany

and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Heena Lad

MRC Mammalian Genetics Unit
Harwell
Oxfordshire OX11 0RD
UK

Andreas Lengeling

Junior Research Group Infection
Genetics
German Research Centre
for Biotechnology
Mascheroder Weg 1
38124 Braunschweig
Germany

Thomas Lisse

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Martin Mempel

Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany
and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Laurent Monassier

Mouse Clinical Institute
CNRS
INSERM
Université L. Pasteur de Strasbourg
67404 Illkirch Cedex
France

Werner Müller

German Research Centre
for Biotechnology
Department of Experimental
Immunology
Mascheroder Weg 1
38124 Braunschweig
Germany

Angelika Neuhäuser-Klaus

GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Institute of Human Genetics
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Patrick M. Nolan

MRC Mammalian Genetics Unit
Harwell
Didcot
Oxfordshire OX11 0RD
UK

Markus Ollert

Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany
and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Oliver Puk

GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Institute of Developmental Genetics
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Ildikó Rácz

University of Bonn
Laboratory of Molecular Neurobiology
Life & Brain Center
Sigmund-Freud-Str. 25
53125 Bonn
Germany

Birgit Rathkolb

GSF – National Research Centre
for Environment and Health
Institute of Experimental Genetics
German Mouse Clinic
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany
and
Ludwig-Maximilians-University
Institute of Molecular Animal Breeding
and Biotechnology
Feodor-Lynen-Str. 25
81377 Munich
Germany

Johannes Ring

Technical University Munich
ZAUM – Center for Allergy
and Environment
Biedersteiner Str. 29
80802 Munich
Germany
and
GSF – National Research Center
for Environment and Health
Division of Environmental
Dermatology
and Allergy GSF/TUM
Ingolstädter Landstr. 1
85764 Neuherberg
Germany

Karen P. Steel

Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute
Wellcome Trust Genome Campus
Hinxton
Cambridge CB10 1SA
UK

Valter Tucci

MRC Mammalian Genetics Unit
Harwell
Didcot
Oxfordshire OX11 0RD
UK

Eckhard Wolf

Ludwig-Maximilians-University
Institute of Molecular Animal Breeding
and Biotechnology
Feodor-Lynen-Str. 25
81377 Munich
Germany

Andreas Zimmer

University of Bonn
Laboratory of Molecular Neurobiology
Life & Brain Center
Sigmund-Freud-Str. 25
53125 Bonn
Germany

1

Characterizing Hearing in Mice

Karen P. Steel

1.1

Introduction

Hearing impairment is very common in humans. One child in 1000 is born with a significant hearing impairment, and another one in 1000 develops progressive hearing loss during the first few years of life [1]. Age-related progressive hearing loss affects large numbers of people, and by the age of 70 years, more than half of the UK population has a 25-dB or greater hearing impairment, sufficient to benefit from wearing a hearing aid [2]. Hearing impairment often causes serious communication problems in sufferers, with much resulting social and economic isolation from the rest of the community.

Deafness is a very heterogeneous disorder, with a wide range of causes. This makes it difficult to study directly in humans. Many different genes are known to be involved in deafness. For example, for non-syndromic human deafness, over 80 loci have been defined and 30 genes identified [3], and Online Mendelian Inheritance in Man lists over 400 distinct syndromes including deafness as a feature. In most clinical collections reported, *GJB2* mutations are a major contributor (for example, associated with 33% of severe or profound familial childhood deafness in the UK, [4]), but the vast majority of other cases, including most later-onset progressive hearing loss cases, have no molecular diagnosis. There are probably several hundred genes involved in deafness in humans, any one of which can be mutated and cause deafness in an individual. Mouse mutations are available for a relatively small proportion of these genes. Around 200 mouse mutants with some sort of auditory system defect have been described [5, 6] but despite the rapid progress in identifying genes underlying deafness over the past few years, many deafness genes have not yet been identified in mouse or human. More mouse mutants with hearing or balance defects will give us access to more of the molecules critical for normal hearing, as well as more candidate genes for deafness in humans.

In addition to single-gene causes of deafness, minor variations in multiple different genes (genetic background) can also interact to make a person more or less likely to develop hearing loss as they get older, and twin, sib and family studies have demonstrated a range of heritabilities up to around 0.5 for age-related hearing loss [7–9]. Noise, drugs and infections can all contribute to hearing impairment, but

these will interact with the particular gene variants carried by an individual to influence the degree of damage. For example, the A1555G mutation of the human mitochondrial genome makes carriers highly susceptible to ototoxic drug-induced deafness [10], and there are several mouse mutations that predispose the carriers to noise-induced hearing loss [11–14]. Genetics is therefore an important factor in hearing impairment.

Mice are excellent models for human deafness. The structure and function of the auditory system is very similar in the two species. The range of pathological features observed in deaf mice appears to be very similar to the pathology in human deafness, although it is inevitably much more difficult to investigate the development of the pathology in humans than it is in an animal model like the mouse. Not surprisingly, the same genes appear to underlie deafness in the two species. There are many examples where the mouse deafness gene has been identified by positional cloning and this has led very rapidly to the finding of mutations in the orthologous human gene in people with inherited deafness. Similarly, genes found to be involved in human deafness often give essentially the same phenotype when mutated in the mouse. Comparisons of mouse and human genes involved in deafness are given in a useful website edited by Zheng and Johnson [6].

Sensory deficits are often difficult to detect in a mutant mouse, yet are of obvious importance in human disease as well as influencing behavioral phenotypes of newly-created mutant mice. Complete deafness (for example deafness, *Tmc1^{dm}*), rapidly progressive blindness (for example retinal degeneration, *Pde6brd*) or specific anosmias can go undetected for generations because of the lack of overt signs that are obvious to those handling the mice. Many standard inbred strains carry mutations causing sensory defects, complicating assessment of new mutations created on these backgrounds. For example, *Pde6brd* is carried in C3H strains, C57BL mice show a specific inability to detect the smell of isovaleric acid, and many inbred strains such as C57BL and DBA carry mutations contributing to progressive hearing loss [15–18]. In this chapter, I focus on ways of characterizing the hearing ability of mouse mutants, including simple screening methods. This is not intended to be a comprehensive catalog of all the ways that the auditory system could be studied, but simply highlights the major approaches that might be considered.

1.2

Behavioral Tests of Hearing

Although there have been a few reports of conditioned behavioral tests for hearing, mice are very difficult to train, and tests like these reflect other features in addition to sensory function. However, a simple test for hearing is to elicit a Preyer reflex. This is a flick backwards of the pinna upon hearing a sharp sound, and in young mice with very good hearing, this is sometimes part of a startle response in which the whole body of the mouse jumps. The mice often stay still for a second after the first exposure, but with repeated exposures, they usually stop responding. The Preyer reflex is a suprathreshold response, not an indication of normal thresholds, so it can be used to pick out non-responding mice that have a severe or profound