Determination of Genetic Mutation Profile of *drpr* Gene in *Drosophila melanogaster* using Coupled real time PCR-High Resolution Melting Analysis

Ahmad Mu'arif, Rudi Arfiansyah, Tri Puspita Roska, Herlina Rante, Firzan Nainu*

Faculty of Pharmacy, Universitas Hasanuddin

*Email: firzannainu@unhas.ac.id

ABSTRACT **Article Info** Genotype determination of experimental animals is generally Key word: conducted using sequencing methods that require expensive cost as well as experience and special equipment. This study aimed to Draper High-resolution determine the presence of mutation in the drpr gene of Drosophila melanogaster using coupled real time PCR-High melting Genetic mutation Resolution Melting (real time PCR-HRM) as an alternative method. Two types of fly samples, w^{1118} and $drpr^{45}$ were used as Drosophila wildtype control and mutant genotype, respectively. The DNA melanogaster from twenty of each w^{1118} and mutant $drpr^{45}$ flies were isolated and amplified using real time PCR. The generated amplicons were then further processed by HRM method at the temperature **Article history:** Received: 12/01/2021 of 60-95°C. This study demonstrated that the real time PCR-HRM method could distinguish wildtype control w¹¹¹⁸ and *Revised:* 08/08/2021 mutant $drpr^{\Delta 5}$ based on the HRM data with the confidence level Accepted: 16/10/2021 was more than 90%. Therefore, this study provides an evidence that real time PCR-HRM method might be beneficial to screen the mutant genotype from its wildtype counterpart based on differences in the melting temperatures due to changes at nucleotide base level.

Introduction

The process of drug discovery begins by identifying the target protein involved in human disease then looking for chemical compounds that can alter the function of disease-causing proteins and optimizing these prospective compounds (Hughes *et al.*, 2011) prior to testing in suitable animal models and human clinical trials (Breyer *et al.*, 2015; Denayer *et al.*, 2014; McGonigle & Ruggeri, 2014). Common approach that usually used was an *in vitro* study and then continued to an *in vivo* study to obtain information about pharmacological effects, pharmacokinetic profiles and toxicity of prospective drugs using wildtype animal models such as rats,

Copyright © 2022 Author(s). All Right Reserved

mice, and rabbits (Denayer et al., 2014; McGonigle & Ruggeri, 2014). But the process using this approach is very long, complex and expensive. All of those are of concern in relation to a number of biological targets that must be considered for each new drug prior to its approval for clinical use (Denayer et al., 2014; Hughes et al., 2011; McGonigle & Ruggeri, 2014). Currently, several developing studies are trying to solve these problems and every step involved in the process of developing drugs are designed to be more efficient, including the use of alternative model organism to obtain high-throughput results in the in vivo context (Breyer et al., 2015).

One of model organisms that have been shown to be useful in the initial stage of drug discovery process is fruit fly Drosophila melanogaster. With about 65% homologous genes with humans, this insect can be used as an alternative model organism in several human diseases. (Nainu et al., 2019a; Pandey & Nichols, 2011; Ugur et al., 2016). In addition, the use of fruit fly as model organism has other advantages such as lower maintenance costs, very fast life cycle, the availability of diverse transgenic and mutant genotypes, and can be used in large quantities (Nainu et al., 2019a; Pandey & Nichols, 2011). Based on this, *Drosophila* is very suitable to be used as a model organism in the process of discovering new drugs (Cagan, 2013; Nainu et al., 2019a; Pandey & Nichols, 2011). In many studies, the use of fruit fly in the in vitro and in vivo experimental settings has been shown to produce some promising results in efforts to discover new drugs for cancer (Gladstone & Su, 2011; Willoughby et al., 2013; Yadav et al., 2016), cardiovascular diseases (Akasaka & Ocorr, 2009; Palandri et al., 2018), epilepsy (Song & Tanouye, 2008), Parkinson's disease (Maitra & Ciesla, 2019). and antimicrobials (Ahsan et al., 2019; Ekowati et al., 2017; Nainu et al., 2018; Nainu et al., 2019a; Nainu et al., 2020a). In fact, D. melanogaster has been proposed as a possible model organism to investigate potential host factor(s) responsible in the severity of coronavirus disease (COVID)-19 that are prospective as drug targets (Nainu et *al.*, 2020b).

One of the mutants currently available is $drpr^{45}$ which has a disruption in the drpr gene in Drosophila (Tung et al., 2013) making the fruit flies are unable to produce fully functional Draper protein that plays a role in the process of phagocytosis of apoptotic cells (Manaka et al., 2004) and virus-infected cells (Nainu et al., 2015). To determine the existence of mutations in experimental animals, the gold standard method that can be done is by sequencing method, which can provide genetic analysis at the nucleotide level so that it can detect all variations contained in a gene (Alberts et al., 2017; Maslov et al., 2015). But the application of this method requires specific instrument (DNA sequencer), expensive, and

time-consuming (Buckingham, 2012). Therefore, we need a reliable and economical method, especially in the context of developing countries like Indonesia, to overcome these problems.

Real time polymerase chain reaction coupled with high resolution melting (real time PCR-HRM) method is one of the solutions in the detection of transgenic or mutant genotypes of certain species (Bancerz-Kisiel et al., 2014; Ishikawa et al., 2010; Lochlainn et al., 2011) and also detection of pathogenic bacteria in certain sample (Nurhamidah et al., 2018). This method is gaining its currently momentum in biomolecular sciences. With the real time PCR method, amplification of certain DNA segments can be carried out in a proper and rapid manner. In addition, real time PCR has a good sensitivity and reproducibility profiles (Alberts et al., 2017; Buckingham, 2012). Subsequently after PCR, the detection of mutations in the amplified DNA or cDNA samples is analysed using the HRM method based on the different melting temperatures of the examined DNA/cDNA samples (Farrar & Wittwer, 2017). The real time PCR-HRM method offers a fast, cheap, and user-friendly genotyping analysis (Farrar & Wittwer, 2017). Based on the description above, this study was conducted with the aim of evaluating the real time PCR-HRM technique to determine the presence of the gene mutation of $drpr^{\Delta 5}$ line of *D. melanogaster*. Once succeed, this method can be widely used in the determination of mutant lines of D. melanogaster prior to sequencing to prevent unnecessary effort and cost which in turn presents a great economical advantage.

Materials and Methods

Fly stocks

The w^{1118} and $drpr^{45}$ lines of *Drosophila* were used in this study (*Drosophila* lines were generously provided by The Laboratory of Host Defense and Responses Kanazawa University, Japan). Male flies at the age of 4-7 days were used in the entire experiments. These flies were bred and placed in a culture vial containing standard cornmeal-agar food. Flies were maintained in standard conditions (25°C, 12 hours light and 12 hours dark cycle).

http://jurnal.radenfatah.ac.id/index.php/biota

Twenty flies of both w^{1118} and $drpr^{45} D$. melanogaster line were anesthetized with CO₂ and put into a Treff tube prior to DNA extraction. The extraction process was carried out per manufacturer's protocol using the Wizard[®] Genomic DNA Purification Kit (Promega). The obtained DNA subsequently analyzed quantitatively by qPCR-HRM method using Type-It HRM 2X Master Mix (Oiagen) and a set of drpr forward primer (5'-CGG AAT TCT CTG CCG CAG GGG TTA CAT AG-3'), and *drpr* reverse primers (5'-CCG CTG GAG CCG GCT CGA ATT TTC GCT T-3'). The process was conducted in a Rotor Gene Q thermal cycler (Qiagen, Germany) using a real time PCR protocol arranged for 40 cycles with the following settings: denaturation at 95°C for 10 seconds, annealing at 53°C for 30 seconds, and extension at 72°C for 10 seconds and followed by HRM protocol.

HRM Method Settings

In this study, gene mutation analysis in the *drpr* gene of *D. melanogaster* was conducted using HRM method towards DNA standard curve of the wild type and mutant flies. Previously, DNA of the wild type flies was isolated from w^{1118} *D. melanogaster* while its mutant sequence was isolated from the *drpr*^{$\Delta 5$} line of *D. melanogaster* which was known has have a deletion in the 5' untranslated region of the *drpr* gene (Freeman *et al.*, 2003).

HRM analysis was conducted soon after amplification by setting in the PCR cycle parameters into the Rotor-Gene Q thermal cycler software series (Qiagen, Germany) with HRM parameter profiles: temperatures from 65°C to 95°C with an increase of 0.1°C per minute. The real time PCR-HRM protocol then was started, and the machine automatically reaching stopped after temperature of 95°C as previously arranged. The data in the form of a curve displayed on the screen throughout the process.

The HRM method is used to detect differences in genotypes such as the length of the GC sequence in the nucleotide bases of each DNA samples (Farrar & Wittwer, 2017). The high content of G-C bonds will also require high temperatures to separate the bonds and will change the melting curve. HRM process was carried out with the combination of PCR method at first to amplify the sequence of targeted DNA. HRM analysis was then performed right after the completion of PCR process (Farrar & Wittwer, 2017). The examined DNA sequences were gradually denaturized by slowly increasing the temperature to acquire the DNA melting profile (Farrar & Wittwer, 2017). From the melting curve, the temperature ranges from 80°C to 90°C was selected as the melting-point location for defining the difference in the nucleotide bases sequence. HRM-location selection was attempted at the melting temperature which is most likely to have the highest GC bonds (Farrar & Wittwer, 2017). This approach has been used to identify D. suzukii (Dhami & Kumarasinghe, 2014) and to discriminate mutant variants from the wild type of *Yestinia* enterocolitica (Bancerz-Kisiel et al., 2014).

Results and Discussion

Primer Specificity Testing

Both the *drpr* forward primer and the *drpr* reverse primer used in this study were constructed to identify the *drpr* target gene in *D. melanogaster*. To confirm the specificity of both primers, these primers subjected to specificity analysis using the Basic Local Alignment Search Tool (BLAST). This database search tool revealed the similarity between the sequence of our two *drpr* primers and the *drpr* sequence stored in BLAST database. This is an important step prior to qPCR experiments to demonstrate whether the *drpr* primer set will yield unintended PCR products that may affect our further analysis.

Based on the examined sequences, it can be seen in Figure 1 that both *drpr* primers used in this study were identical and aligned to the desired *drpr* target gene in D. *melanogaster* with the similarity of sequences were 96% and 100% for *drpr* forward primer and *drpr* reverse primer, respectively. To be more specific, the alimentation of primer NM 001274347.1 (*D*. melanogaster drpr, transcript variant E, mRNA) with our drpr forward primer showed that 25 out of 26 nucleotide bases were matched. Even all of 19 nucleotide bases of our *drpr* reverse primer were totally matched with the primer NM_001274348.1 (*D. melanogaster draper* (*drpr*), transcript variant F, mRNA). These results suggested that our *drpr* primer set can

specifically bind to the *drpr* gene of *D*. *melanogaster* thus shall produce a specific amplified *drpr* amplicon with expected size.

Drosophila melanogaster strair Drosophila melanogaster strair Swithetic construct clone BS2	Ċ								
Drosophila melanogaster strain Drosophila melanogaster strain Synthetic construct clone BS2		Jeschption		Max	Total	Query	E	Iden	Accession
Drosophila melanogaster strain	n rover (forR) chromoso	ome 3L		44.1	857	96%	5e-04	96%	CP023337.1
Synthetic construct clone BS2	Drosophila melanogaster strain sitter (fors) chromosome 3L					96%	5e-04	96%	CP023331.1
Childrene construct crome boat	Svnthetic construct clone BS25335 dmr-RA (dmr) gene complete cds					89%	5e-04	96%	KX801292.1
Synthetic construct clone BO28635 drpr-RA (drpr) gene, partial cds					44.1	89%	5e-04	96%	KX800030.1
Drosophila melanogaster chromosome 3L					1059	96%	5e-04	96%	AE014296.5
Drosophila melanogaster draper (drpr), transcript variant F. mRNA					44.1	89%	5e-04	96%	NM 001274348
Drosophila melanogaster draper (drpr), transcript variant E. mRNA					44.1	89%	50-04	96%	NM 001274347
Drosonhila melanogaster draper (dror), transcript variant E, mKNA					44.1	89%	5e-04	96%	NM 001274346
Urosophila melanogaster draper (drpr), transcript variant D, mKNA					44.1	89%	5e-04	96%	NM 001259620
Drosophila melanogaster drap	44.1	44.1	80%	50-04	06%	NM 058102.3			
Drosophila melanogaster drap	er (dror), transcript van	iant P. mPNA		44.1	44.1	90%	50.04	06%	NIM 167011.3
Drosophila melanogasier urap	er (orpr), iranscript van	auce, minne		44.1	44.1	0970	00-04	30%	1411_1010111.0
Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps		Strand Plus/Plus				
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA	Expect 5e-04	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29		Strar Plus/	nd /Plus			
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA I III quences producing significant Selected.0 Alignments Download selected.0	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Мах	Strar Plus/	nd /Plus	F		0
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA II quences producing significan loct: <u>All None</u> Selected:0 Alignments © Download ~	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGC IIIIIIIIIIIII nt alignments: GenBank Graphics	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score	Strar Plus/ Total score	Ad /Plus /Plus Query cover	E value	Ident	C
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA II quences producing significat lect: <u>All None</u> Selected:0 Alignments Download ~	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG II IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2	Query cover 67%	E value 0.031	Ident 100%	Accession KX801282.1
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA III quences producing significat lect: <u>All None</u> Selected:0 Alignments © Download ~ Synthetic construct clone BS25 Synthetic construct clone BS25	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG II IIIIIIIIIIII s Distance tree of results Description ac. complete cds ne. partial cds	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2	Query 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100%	C Accession KX801292.1 KX800030.1
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA III quences producing significat cost: All None Selected:0 Alignments Download ~ Synthetic construct clone BS22 Synthetic construct clone BS22 Drosophila melanogaster drape	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG II IIIIIIIIIII s Distance free of results Description e. complete cds ne. partial cds ant F, mRNA	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query cover 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100%	Accession KX801292.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348.1
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA III quences producing significat lect: All None Selected:0 Alignments Download ~ Synthetic construct clone BS22 Synthetic construct clone BS22 Drosophila melanogaster drape Drosophila melanogaster drape	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG II IIIIIIIIIIII & Distance free of results Description we complete cds ne, partial cds ant F, mRNA ant E, mRNA	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query cover 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100%	Accession KX801202.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348.1 NM_001274347.1
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA Ult quences producing significat cost: All None Selected:0 Alignments Download ~ Synthetic construct clone BS22 Synthetic construct clone BS22 Drosophila melanogaster drape Drosophila melanogaster drape Drosophila melanogaster drape	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG TTCTTGCCGG TTCTCTGCCGG C GenBank Graphics C GenBank Graphics C C 5335 drpr-RA (drpr) ger er (drpr), transcript varia er (drpr), transcript varia er (drpr), transcript varia	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG II IIIIIIIIIII E Distance free of results Description e. complete cds ne. partial cds ant F. mRNA ant E. mRNA ant D. mRNA	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query cover 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100%	Accession KX801202.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348.1 NM_001274346.1
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA Ult quences producing significat cost: All None Selected:0 Alignments Download ~ Synthetic construct clone BS22 Synthetic construct clone BS22 Synthetic construct clone BS22 Drosophila melanogaster drape Drosophila melanogaster drape Drosophila melanogaster drape Costabilita mel	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query cover 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100%	Accession KX801202.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_001274346.1
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA Ult quences producing significat cost All None Selected:0 Alignments Download ~ Synthetic construct clone BS22 Synthetic construct clone BS22 Synthetic construct clone BS22 Drosophila melanogaster drap	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query cover 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	Accession KX801202.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_001259620.2 NM_058102.3
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA Ult quences producing significat Get: All None Selected:0 Alignments Download ~ Synthetic construct clone BS25 Synthetic construct clone BC22 Drosophila melanogaster drap	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query Cover 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	Accession KX801202.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_001259620.2 NM_058102.3 NM_167911.3
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA Ult quences producing significat Get: All None Selected:0 Alignments Download ~ Synthetic construct clone BS25 Synthetic construct clone BC22 Drosophila melanogaster drap	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query cover 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	Accession KX801292.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_001259620.2 NM_058102.3 NM_167911.3 BT044170.1
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA Query 4 AA Query 4 AA Quers producing significat Get: All None Selected 0 Alignments Download ~ Synthetic construct clone BS25 Synthetic construct clone BC21 Drosophila melanogaster drap	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query cover 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	Accession KX801202.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_001259620.2 NM_058102.3 NM_167911.3 BT042170.1 BT025854.1
Addinge 1: 2033 to 203 Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA III Sequences producing significal Select: All Name Select: All Name Soloctado III	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIII nt alignments: GenBank Graphic	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score	Strar Plus/ Total score	Query	E value	Ident	Acces
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query Cover 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	Accession KX801292.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348 NM_001274347 NM_001259620 NM_058102.3 NM_058102.3
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA U quences producing significat ect: All Nong Selected:0 Alignments Download w Synthetic construct clone BS28 Synthetic construct clone BS28 Synthetic construct clone BS28 Synthetic construct clone BS28 Drosophila melanogaster drap	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG II IIIIIIIIIII S Distance tree of results Description re. complete cds ne. partial cds ant E, mRNA ant E, mRNA ant C, mRNA ant C, mRNA ant A, mRNA	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Ad Plus Query cover 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	Accession KX801292.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348. NM_001274346. NM_001259620.3 NM_058102.3 NM_167911.3 BT044170.1
Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA Ultagences producing significan ed: All Nong Solocted:0 Alignments Download Synthetic construct clone B528 Synthetic construct clone B529 Drosophila melanogaster drap Drosophila melanogaster E103 Drosophila melanogaster E103	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Ad Plus Query cover 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	C Accession KX801292.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_0259620.2 NM_058102.3 NM_167911.3 BT044170.1 BT042854.1
Adapti F. 2003 to 203 Score 44.1 bits(22) Query 4 AA II quences producing significa act: All Nong Selected 0 Alignments Download we Synthetic construct clone B52? Synthetic construct clone B52? Drosophila melanogaster drap Drosophila melanogaster drap	Expect 5e-04 TTCTCTGCCGG IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	Identities 25/26(96%) CAGGGGTTACATAG II IIIIIIIIII S Distance tree of results Description re. complete cds net. partial cds ant E. mRNA ant E. mRNA ant E. mRNA ant E. mRNA ant E. mRNA ant E. mRNA ant E. mRNA	Gaps 0/26(0%) 29	Max score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Strar Plus/ Total score 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2 38.2	Query Query 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67% 67%	E value 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031 0.031	Ident 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100	CAccession KX801292.1 KX800030.1 NM_001274348.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_001274346.1 NM_059102.3 NM_167911.3 BT044170.1 BT025854.1 AF145617.1

Figure 1. The results of *drpr* forward primer and *drpr* reverse primer specificity testing through Primer-BLAST website (https://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Blast.cgi). Nucleotide BLAST was performed for testing both primers. The sequence of *drpr* forward primer was inserted to the query sequence and then followed by a similar analysis on the *drpr* reverse primer. The displayed results demonstrated the high specificity of *drpr* primers used in this study.

Amplification using Real Time PCR

occurred at an early cycle (data not shown) which represents the sufficient amount of this gene in *D. melanogaster* amplification of *drpr* DNA was occurred in a proper manner as samples yielded positive result of amplification and there was no positive signal given by the no template control (NTC) sample simply due to the absence of DNA template to be amplified through PCR cycles.

HRM Analysis

The result of HRM analysis showed curve differences between wild type $w^{1118}D$. *melanogaster* and its $drpr^{\Delta 5}$ mutant (Figure. 2). As can be seen in Figure 2, each increase in temperature of 0.1°C/min was constantly causing a decrease in the melting temperatures of both curves. That reduction was occurred due to the turning of the doublestranded DNA strand into single-stranded DNA due to the heating process. Therefore, the dyes bound to the double stranded were also came apart which then reducing the level of fluorescence (Farrar & Wittwer, 2017). The difference curve reduction between w^{1118} and $drpr^{\Delta 5}$ D. melanogaster was a proof that the nitrogen base arrangements amid their gene sequences are also different. For sure,

this indicates that a true mutation has occurred in $drpr^{\Delta 5}$ line of *D. melanogaster*.

To support or assumption on the HRM result, we carried out additional step to assign the examined samples based on the confidence percentage level. As shown Table 1, the confidence intervals of more than 90% were reached by all HRM results, signifying that HRM method could really distinguish between wildtype w^{1118} flies and its $drpr^{45}$ mutants. Overall, our results provide evidence that PCR-HRM analysis can be used to identify the presence of gene mutation in the animals without the need model of sequencing procedure. This would be a helpful feature in the detection of mutant animals when one need to screen mutant genotypes from their wildtype counterparts in large number of stocks (genotyping). To improve the detection of mutant genotypes, gene sequencing can be done after initial screening using PCR-HRM. This is important to locate the location of mutation and to identify what type of mutation is occurred (deletion, insertion, or others). In addition, examination on whether detection of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in the drpr gene can be assessed and visualized using our current real time PCR-HRM protocol would be useful to perform in the near future.



Figure 2. Species differentiation using HRM method by analysing the melting profile. Mutation in the *drpr* gene resulted in the decreased melting temperature of *drpr* sequence upon HRM analysis. The fluorescence curves of w^{1118} (blue line) and *drpr*⁴⁵ (red line) were normalised using Rotor-Gene Q series software.

	differe				
No	Samples	Genotypes	Confidence %		
1	w^{1118}	wildtype	90.39		
2	w^{1118}	wildtype	91.27		
3	w^{1118}	wildtype	91.89		
4	drpr	mutant	90.13		
5	drpr	mutant	96.05		
6	drpr	mutant	92.67		

Table 1. The confidence level of HRM analysis based on the genotype differences

Conclusion

This study has provided the first evidence that our real time PCR-HRM protocol can be used in the genotyping effort to discriminate the *drpr* mutant from their wildtype control genotype in a fast, specific (with confidence level more than 90%), and robust manner.

Acknowledgment

We are grateful to Prof. Yoshinobu Nakanishi (Kanazawa University, Japan) for his valuable support in the provision of *Drosophila* lines used in this study.

References

- Ahsan, M., Gonsales, A. V., Sartini, S., Wahyudin, E., & Nainu, F. (2019). In vivo anti-staphylococcal activity of roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.) calyx extract in *Drosophila* model of infection. Journal of Herbmed Pharmacology, 8(1), 41-46. doi:10.15171/jhp.2019.07
- Akasaka, T., & Ocorr, K. (2009). Drug discovery through functional screening in the *Drosophila* heart. In H. Koga (Ed.), *Reverse Chemical Genetics: Methods and Protocols* (pp. 235-249). Totowa, NJ: Humana Press. Doi:10.1007/978-1-60761-232-2 18
- Alberts, B., Johnson, A., Lewis, J., Morgan,
 D., Raff, M., Roberts, K., & Walter, P.
 (2017). *Molecular Biology of the Cell*(5th Edition ed.): W.W. Norton.
- Bancerz-Kisiel, A., Lipczyńska, K.,
 Szczerba-Turek, A., Gospodarek, E.,
 Platt-Samoraj, A., & Szweda, W. (2014). The use of the HRM method for identifying possible mutations in the *ymoA* gene region and evaluating their

influence on the enterotoxic properties of *Y. enterocolitica* strains. *BMC Veterinary Research*, *10*(1), 207. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12917-014-0207-6

- Breyer, M. D., Look, A. T., & Cifra, A. (2015). From bench to patient: model systems in drug discovery. *Disease Models & Mechanisms*, 8(10), 1171-1174. doi: 10.1242/dmm.023036
- Buckingham, L. (2012). Molecular Diagnostics: Fundamentals, Methods, and Clinical Applications: F.A. Davis Company.
- Cagan, R. (2013). Bench to bedside with fruit flies: an interview with Ross Cagan. *Disease Models & Mechanisms*, 6(3), 567-569. doi:10.1242/dmm.012443
- Denayer, T., Stöhr, T., & Van Roy, M. (2014). Animal models in translational medicine: Validation and prediction. *New Horizons in Translational Medicine*, 2(1), 5-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nhtm.2014.08. 001
- Dhami, M. K., & Kumarasinghe, L. (2014). A HRM real-time PCR assay for rapid and specific identification of the emerging pest spotted-wing drosophila (*Drosophila suzukii*). *PloS one*, 9(6). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.00 98934
- Ekowati, H., Arai, J., Putri, A. S. D., Nainu,
 F., Shiratsuchi, A., & Nakanishi, Y. (2017). Protective effects of *Phaseolus* vulgaris lectin against viral infection in *Drosophila*. *Drug Discoveries and Therapeutics*, 11(6), 329-335. doi:10.5582/ddt.2017.01071
- Farrar, J. S., & Wittwer, C. T. (2017). Chapter
 6 High-Resolution Melting Curve
 Analysis for Molecular Diagnostics. In
 G. P. Patrinos (Ed.), *Molecular Diagnostics (Third Edition)* (pp. 79-102). https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-802971-8.00006-7
- Freeman, M. R., Delrow, J., Kim, J., Johnson, E., & Doe, C. Q. (2003). Unwrapping glial biology: Gcm target genes regulating glial development,

http://jurnal.radenfatah.ac.id/index.php/biota

diversification, and function. *Neuron*, *38*(4), 567-580. doi:10.1016/s0896-6273(03)00289-7

- Gladstone, M., & Su, T. T. (2011). Chemical genetics and drug screening in *Drosophila* cancer models. *Journal of Genetics and Genomics*, 38(10), 497-504. doi: 10.1016/j.jgg.2011.09.003
- Hughes, J. P., Rees, S., Kalindjian, S. B., & Philpott, K. L. (2011). Principles of early drug discovery. *British Journal of Pharmacology*, 162(6), 1239-1249. doi:10.1111/j.1476-5381.2010.01127.x
- Ishikawa, T., Kamei, Y., Otozai, S., Kim, J., Sato, A., Kuwahara, Y., Todo, T. (2010). High-resolution melting curve analysis for rapid detection of mutations in a Medaka TILLING library. *BMC molecular biology*, *11*, 70-70. doi:10.1186/1471-2199-11-70
- Lochlainn, S. Ó., Amoah, S., Graham, N. S., Alamer, K., Rios, J. J., Kurup, S,.Broadley, M. R. (2011). High Resolution Melt (HRM) analysis is an efficient tool to genotype EMS mutants in complex crop genomes. *Plant methods*, 7(1), 43-43. doi:10.1186/1746-4811-7-43
- Maitra, U., & Ciesla, L. (2019). Using Drosophila as a platform for drug discovery from natural products in Parkinson's disease. MedChemComm, 10(6), 867-879.

doi:10.1039/C9MD00099B

- Manaka, J., Kuraishi, T., Shiratsuchi, A., Nakai, Y., Higashida, H., Henson, P., & Nakanishi, Y. (2004). Draper-mediated and phosphatidylserine-independent phagocytosis of apoptotic cells by Drosophila hemocytes/macrophages. Biological Journal of Chemistry, 48466-48476. 279(46), doi: 10.1074/jbc.M408597200
- Maslov, A. Y., Quispe-Tintaya, W., Gorbacheva, T., White, R. R., & Vijg, J. (2015). High-throughput sequencing in mutation detection: A new generation of genotoxicity tests? *Mutation research*, 776, 136-143. doi:10.1016/j.mrfmmm.2015.03.014

- McGonigle, P., & Ruggeri, B. (2014). Animal models of human disease: Challenges in enabling translation. *Biochemical Pharmacology*, 87(1), 162-171. doi:10.1016/j.bcp.2013.08.006
- Nainu, F., Asri, R. M., Arsyad, A., Manggau, M. A., & Amir, M. N. (2018). *In vivo* antibacterial activity of green algae *Ulva reticulata* against *Staphylococcus aureus* in *Drosophila* model of infection. *Pharmacognosy Journal*, *10*(5), 993-997. doi:10.5530/pj.2018.5.169
- Nainu, F., Asri, R. M., Djide, M. N., Ahsan, M., Arfiansyah, R., Sartini, S., & Alam, G. (2019). Protective effect of green algae Ulva reticulata against Pseudomonas aeruginosa in Drosophila infection model. HAYATI Journal of Biosciences, 26(4), 163-171. doi:10.4308/hjb.26.4.163
- Nainu, F., Djide, M. N., Subehan, S., Sartini, S., Roska, T. P., Salim, E., & Kuraishi, T. (2020). Protective Signatures of Roselle (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.) Calyx Fractions against *Staphylococcus aureus* in *Drosophila* Infection Model. *HAYATI Journal of Biosciences*, 27(4), 306-313. doi:10.4308/hjb.27.4.306
- Nainu, F., Nakanishi, Y., & Shiratsuchi, A. (2019). Fruit fly as a model organism in the study of human diseases and drug discovery. *Journal of Center for Medical Education Sapporo Medical University* (10), 21-32. doi:10.15114/jcme.10.21
- Nainu, F., Rahmatika, D., Emran, T. B., & Harapan, H. (2020). Potential Application of *Drosophila melanogaster* as a Model Organism in COVID-19-Related Research. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, *11*(1415). doi:10.3389/fphar.2020.588561
- Nainu, F., Tanaka, Y., Shiratsuchi, A., & Nakanishi, Y. (2015). Protection of insects against viral infection by apoptosis-dependent phagocytosis. *Journal of Immunology*, 195(12), 5696-5706. doi:10.4049/jimmunol.1500613

http://jurnal.radenfatah.ac.id/index.php/biota

- Nurhamidah, S., Djide, M. N., Arfiansyah, R., & Nainu, F. (2018). Deteksi Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium dalam produk pangan siap saji menggunakan metode PCR, Melt Curve, dan analisis HRM. *Majalah Farmasi dan Farmakologi,* 22(1), 20-26. doi:https://doi.org/10.20956/mff.v22i1. 5721
- Palandri, A., Martin, E., Russi, M., Rera, M., Tricoire, H., & Monnier, V. (2018). Identification of cardioprotective drugs medium-scale in by vivo pharmacological screening on а Drosophila cardiac model of Friedreich's ataxia. Disease Models & Mechanisms, 11(7). https://doi.org/10.1242/dmm.033811
- Pandey, U. B., & Nichols, C. D. (2011). Human disease models in *Drosophila melanogaster* and the role of the fly in therapeutic drug discovery. *Pharmacological Reviews*, 63(2), 411-436.

https://doi.org/10.1124/pr.110.003293

Song, J., & Tanouye, M. A. (2008). From bench to drug: human seizure modeling using Drosophila. Progress in Neurobiology, 84(2), 182-191. doi:10.1016/j.pneurobio.2007.10.006

- Tung, T. T., Nagaosa, K., Fujita, Y., Kita, A., Mori, H., Okada, R., Nonaka, S., & Nakanishi, Y. (2013).Phosphatidylserine recognition and induction of apoptotic cell clearance by engulfment Drosophila receptor Draper. Journal of Biochemistry, 153(5), 483-491. https://doi.org/10.1093/jb/mvt014
- Ugur, B., Chen, K., & Bellen, H. J. (2016). Drosophila tools and assays for the study of human diseases. *Disease Models & Mechanisms*, 9(3), 235-244. doi:10.1242/dmm.023762
- Willoughby, L. F., Schlosser, T., Manning, S. A., Parisot, J. P., Street, I. P., Richardson, H. E., Brumby, A. M. (2013). An in vivo large-scale chemical screening platform using *Drosophila* for anti-cancer drug discovery. *Disease Models & Mechanisms*, 6(2), 521-529. doi:10.1242/dmm.009985
- Yadav, A K., Srikrishna, S., & Gupta, S. C. (2016). Cancer drug development using *Drosophila* as an *in vivo* tool: From bedside to bench and back. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*, 37(9), 789-806. doi:10.1016/j.tips.2016.05.010