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Abstract

Frontotemporal lobar degeneration (FTLD) is the second most common form of dementia after Alzheimer’s disease. The study and the dissection of FTLD is complex due to its clinical, pathological and genetic heterogeneity.

In this review we survey the state-of-the-art genetics of familial FTLD and recapitulate our current understanding of the genetic architecture of sporadic FTLD by summarising results of genome wide association studies (GWAS) performed in FTLD to date. We then discuss the challenges of translating these heterogeneous genetic features into the understanding of the molecular underpinnings of FTLD pathogenesis.

We particularly highlight a number of susceptibility processes that appear to be conserved across familial and sporadic cases (e.g. the cellular waste disposal pathways, and immune signalling), and finally describe cutting-edge approaches based on mathematical prediction tools highlighting novel intriguing risk-pathways such as DNA damage response as an emerging theme in FTLD.
# Introduction

Frontotemporal Dementia (FTD) – with onset age that can vary from ≥ 45 to ≤ 70 years of age – is the second most common early-onset form of dementia after Alzheimer’s disease (AD) affecting about 3-15/100,000 individuals, based on North American and European epidemiological studies (Rabinovici and Miller, 2010).

FTD is clinically heterogeneous and comprises behavioural (bvFTD) (Rascovsky et al., 2011) and language (primary progressive aphasia [PPA]) impairments. The bvFTD syndrome is characterized by cognitive decline and behavioural dysfunctions, whilst the PPA syndrome is further subdivided into semantic dementia (SD or semantic variant PPA) and progressive non-fluent aphasia (PNFA or non-fluent/agrammatic variant PPA) (Gorno-Tempini et al., 2011; Neary et al., 1998). Atypical forms of FTD present an overlap with motoneuron disease (FTD-MND), mainly summarised by the FTD-ALS (amyotrophic lateral sclerosis) condition, or with parkinsonian features (FTD-17) (Rohrer and Warren, 2011).

Macro-pathological assessments have indicated that the major brain areas affected in FTD patients are the frontal and temporal lobes. On these bases, FTD is also referred to as frontotemporal lobar degeneration (FTLD) (Mackenzie and Neumann, 2016). More generally, FTLD is used as an umbrella term to define clinically as well as pathologically diagnosed cases (Rabinovici and Miller, 2010). We will use the acronym FTLD throughout the rest of this review article.

Micro-pathological studies suggest glia hyperproliferation, and aberrant protein inclusions in the cytoplasm and nucleus of neurons as the major pathological hallmarks of FTLD (Mackenzie and Neumann, 2016). Tau, the protein product of the MAPT gene, and TDP-43, the protein product of the TARDBP gene, are the most frequent protein aggregates (~45% of FTLD-tau, ≤50% FTLD-TDP) identified in FTLD brains (Halliday et al., 2012). Rarely (~10%), other proteins are found in the inclusion bodies: these comprise p62 (the protein product of the SQSTM1 gene) that define the FTLD-UPS (ubiquitin proteasome) category, and fused in sarcoma (the protein product of the FUS gene), ewing in sarcoma (the protein product of the EWS gene) and TATA-binding protein associated factor 15 (the protein product of the TAF15 gene) that are collectively referred to as FTLD-FET (Halliday et al., 2012; Jessica Deleon, 2018; Mackenzie and Neumann, 2016).

FTLD’s complex clinical and pathological landscape is mirrored by heterogeneous genetic features. Despite enormous advances in FTLD genetics over the past 20 years, clearly, the substantial lack of understanding of how genetics, phenotypic and pathological features are wired by underlying molecular mechanisms represents to date the major gap to the dissection of FTLD pathogenesis.

In this review we will survey the state of the art of FTLD genetics and discuss their biological implications (i.e. FTLD risk-pathways) as well as touch upon next steps to be taken in the field to increase our genetic and functional understanding of FTLD pathogenesis. Clearly, these two subjects will need to jointly advance in order to accelerate and support the implementation of programs to identify biomarkers and drug targets, design clinical trials and develop strategies for early diagnosis, disease prevention/monitoring and cure.
FTLD genetics

Neurodegenerative disorders are characterized by complex genetic features and, generally, a minority of familial cases are outnumbered by a large population of sporadic cases.

Mendelian genes have been classically isolated in familial studies through linkage analysis and, more recently, whole exome sequencing (WES) studies of trios, first-degree relatives or large (well-phenotyped) pedigrees (Hardy and Singleton, 2009).

Sporadic forms of disease are investigated through case/control association studies: for example genome wide association studies (GWAS) allow to assess whether allele frequencies of common genetic markers significantly differ across large cohorts of patients and population matched controls and thus isolate disease associated genetic risk factors (Manolio et al., 2009).

Familial FTLD – Mendelian genetics

Familial forms of FTLD account for up to 30-40% of all cases and are associated with mutations in a handful of genes that are usually referred to as Mendelian FTLD genes (Seelaar et al., 2011; Snowden et al., 2002; Turner et al., 2017).

The microtubule-associated protein tau (MAPT, ≥44 pathogenic mutations (Ghetti et al., 2015)) and progranulin (GRN, ≥70 pathogenic mutations (Gijselinck et al., 2008)) are classical familial FTLD genes (Table 1). Truncation mutations in the charged multivesicular body protein 2B (CHMP2B) gene have been linked to a large Danish FTLD family and a Belgian FTLD patient (Skibinski et al., 2005; van der Zee et al., 2008); this genetic form of FTLD is extremely rare and nomenclated as FTLD-3 (i.e. FTLD linked to chromosome 3) (Brown et al., 1995; van der Zee et al., 2008) (Table 1). An abnormal GGGGCC expansion in the chromosome 9 open reading frame 72 gene (C9orf72) has also been suggested as a frequent genetic cause of familial FTLD (DeJesus-Hernandez et al., 2011; van der Zee et al., 2013). The expansion has however been reported with variable prevalence across multiple neurodegenerative conditions: with higher prevalence in ALS and FTLD-ALS cases (Hardy and Rogaea, 2014; Nguyen et al., 2018) as well as, although with lower prevalence, in AD, Parkinsonian, cortico-basal (CBS) and ataxia cases (Al-Chalabi et al., 2017; Cooper-Knock et al., 2014; Ferrari et al., 2012; Ferrari R, 2013; Galimberti et al., 2014; Hensman Moss et al., 2014; Lindquist et al., 2013; Majounie et al., 2012; Simon-Sanchez et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2013; van der Zee et al., 2013) (Table 1). Interestingly, the expansion has also been reported in neurologically normal elderly individuals (Galimberti et al., 2014).

Very rare mutations in other genes such as sequestosome 1 (SQSTM1) (Le Ber et al., 2013), ubiquilin 2 (UBQLN2) (Synofzik et al., 2012), optineurin (OPTN) (Pottier et al., 2015), coiled-coil-helix-coiled-coil-helix domain containing 10 (CHCHD10) (Bannwarth et al., 2014), TANK binding kinase 1 (TBK1) (Gijselinck et al., 2015; Pottier et al., 2015), dynactin-1 (DCTN1) (Munch et al., 2005), and cyclin-F (CCNF) (Williams et al., 2016) have been associated with FTLD-ALS (Table 1); interestingly, kindreds of individuals carrying mutations in these genes comprise variable FTLD and/or ALS features within the same pedigree (Hardy and Rogaea, 2014; Van Mossevelde et al., 2018). Mutations in the valosin containing protein (VCP) have been identified in few cases carrying a combination of conditions such as inclusion body myopathy (IBM) with Paget disease of the bone (PDB) and frontotemporal dementia (IBMPFD) (Watts et al., 2004), and in FTLD-ALS cases (Koppers et al., 2012), whilst mutations in SQSTM1 have recently also been described in families whose affected members presented various phenotypes including gait abnormalities, ataxia, dysarthria, dystonia, vertical gaze palsy, and cognitive decline (Haack et al., 2016). The TIA1 cytotoxic granule associated RNA binding protein gene (TIA1), originally identified in a FTLD-ALS kindred (Mackenzie et al., 2017), was not replicated in a subsequent follow-up study (Baradaran-Heravi et al., 2018) (Table 1). Finally, it is noteworthy to consider that pathogenic genetic variability in TARDBP and FUS (whose
protein products clearly represent FTLD pathological hallmarks (Mackenzie and Neumann, 2016) has been reported to be extremely rare (TARDBP) (Benajiba et al., 2009; Borroni et al., 2010; Borroni et al., 2009; Caroppo et al., 2016; Huey et al., 2012), or, in some cases, equivocal (TARDBP and FUS) (Cannas et al., 2013; Hardy and Rogaeva, 2014; Pottier et al., 2016; Quadri et al., 2011).

In summary, one might categorise the Mendelian FTLD genes on the basis of their disease specificity: MAPT, GRN and CHMP2B have mainly or exclusively been identified in FTLD cases, thus we suggest to label them as ‘major-FTLD genes’. C9orf72, VCP, TARDBP, FUS, SQSTM1, UBQLN2, IFT74, OPTN, CHCHD10, TBK1 and TIA1 appear to encompass ALS and/or some heterogeneous array of disorders, thus we suggest to label these as ‘spectrum-FTLD genes’ (Ferrari R, 2018).

Figure 1 summarises the global Mendelian genetics landscape of FTLD.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major phenotype</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Familial cases</th>
<th>Sporadic cases</th>
<th>Clinical Presentation(s)</th>
<th>Brain Pathology</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTD</td>
<td>CHMP2B</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FTD</td>
<td>ubiquitin/p62</td>
<td>(Ferrari et al., 2011; Isaacs et al., 2011; Pottier et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRN</td>
<td>5-20%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>FTD</td>
<td>TDP43</td>
<td>(Chen-Pidsken et al., 2016; Pottier et al., 2016; Rohrer and Warren, 2011; Takada, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAPT (tau)</td>
<td>5-20%</td>
<td>0-3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>tau</td>
<td>(Pottier et al., 2016; Rohrer and Warren, 2011; Takada, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHCHD10</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, FTD, myopathy</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>(Bannwarth et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C9orf72</td>
<td>~25%</td>
<td>~5%</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>TDP43/p62/repeat-dipeptides/ubiquitin</td>
<td>(Pottier et al., 2016; van der Zee et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCNF</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, FTD</td>
<td>TDP43</td>
<td>(Williams et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DCTN1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, HMN7B, Perry syndrome, FTD</td>
<td>TDP43</td>
<td>(Munch et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPTN</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, FTD</td>
<td>TDP43/OPTN/ubiquitin</td>
<td>(Pottier et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SQSTM1 (p62)</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, FTD, IBM, Pagets disease</td>
<td>TDP43/p62</td>
<td>(Gang et al., 2016; Kovacs et al., 2016; Le Bier et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBK1</td>
<td>1-3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, FTD</td>
<td>TDP43/p62</td>
<td>(Pottier et al., 2016; Van Mossaerecke et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UBQLN2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, FTD</td>
<td>TDP43/p62/UBQLN2/FUS/OPTN</td>
<td>(Deng et al., 2011; Synatsk et al., 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VCP</td>
<td>~1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, FTD, IBM, Pagets disease</td>
<td>TDP43/p62</td>
<td>(Ferrari et al., 2011; Gang et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIF5A</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SP, ALS</td>
<td>TDP43</td>
<td>(Brenner et al., 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUS</td>
<td>~4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, FTD</td>
<td>FUS/ubiquitin/EWS/TAF15</td>
<td>(Mackenzie and Neumann, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2018; Urwin et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MATR3</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, myopathy</td>
<td>MATR3</td>
<td>(Johnson et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOD1</td>
<td>~20%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>SOD1/ubiquitin</td>
<td>(Ferrari et al., 2011; Saberi et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TARDBP (TDP43)</td>
<td>~3-4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, FTD</td>
<td>TDP43</td>
<td>(Fernari et al., 2011; Nguyen et al., 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIA1*</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ALS, myopathy, FTD</td>
<td>TDP43</td>
<td>(Jhararadari-Heravi et al., 2018; Mackenzie et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Ataxia; AD = Alzheimer’s Disease; ALS = Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis; CBS = Corticobasal Syndrome; FTLD = frontotemporal Lobar Degeneration; HMN7B = Hereditary Motor Neuropathy, type 7B; IBM = Inclusion Body Myopathy; MS = Multiple Sclerosis; PD = Parkinson’s Disease; SP = Spastic Paraplegia; * = not replicated
Figure 1. Summary of Mendelian genetics associated with FTLD and the FTLD-ALS spectrum. Genes circled in red are 'major-FTLD genes'; genes circled in violet are 'spectrum-FTLD genes', i.e. they belong to the FTLD-ALS spectrum. Genes circled in dark-violet and blue are edge/borderline between FTLD and ALS and pure ALS genes, respectively. * = not replicated.

Sporadic FTLD

Sporadic forms of FTLD account for 60-70% of all cases (Ferrari R, 2018; Turner et al., 2017).

The genetics of sporadic FTLD is poorly understood. Besides the reports of a few MAPT, GRN and C9orf72 mutations (Cruts et al., 2015; LT, 2015; Pottier et al., 2016; Rademakers et al., 2012) (Table 1), the genetic architecture of idiopathic FTLD primarily refers to genetic risk markers with small effect size likely modulated by multiple modifying factors that span from genetic to environmental (Manolio et al., 2009).

To date, the most informative studies exploring genetic risk and/or modifying factors with small effect size in FTLD have been a number of GWAs. These studies were designed to address actual sporadic cohorts (i.e. the International clinical FTLD GWAS (Ferrari et al., 2014) and the Italian clinical FTLD GWAS (Ferrari et al., 2015)) or more selective cohorts either characterised by TDP-43 pathology (i.e. FTLD-TDP GWAS (Van Deerlin et al., 2010)) or including GRN mutations carriers (i.e. FTLD GRN GWAS (Pottier et al., 2018)).

What is a GWAS?

A GWAS is designed as a large-scale case/control study to identify common genetic variants (i.e. variants with minor allele frequencies [MAF] > 1%) associating with a trait of interest. A GWAS is hypothesis free; it interrogates the genome in an unbiased manner by means of millions of evenly distributed (genotyped and imputed) single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) and assesses differences in their allelic frequencies between the two study groups (cases and controls). Such analysis allows for the identification of loci (not genes!) that increase susceptibility for a particular trait (i.e. genetic markers within genetic regions that increase risk of developing a particular trait with small to moderate effect size). A GWAS
generally consists of a discovery phase (or phase I) where one or more genetic loci associated with the trait under study are “discovered” and a replication phase (or phase II), performed in an independent cohort, that assesses the statistically significant (and suggestive [i.e. SNPs that are close to but below statistical significance]) loci of phase I for validation. Most reported associations in GWAS are intronic or intergenic affecting DNA structure and gene expression rather than protein sequence (Manolio et al., 2009). Although GWASs identify risk loci, defined by SNPs that might be the actual reason of the signal or just in linkage disequilibrium (LD) with it, the associated variants might be informative implying to causal regulation of gene expression (e.g. quantitative trait loci [eQTL]) or susceptibility functional pathways (Pearson and Manolio, 2008). The exponential growth in the number of GWAS in the past decade has led to the discovery of thousands of associations for a range of traits (over 25,000 unique SNP-trait associations from over 2,500 studies [http://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas]). More extensive information on the concept, study design, good practices and results interpretation for GWASs can be found in (Ferrari R, 2018; Hardy and Singleton, 2009; Manolio et al., 2009).

Major findings of the FTLD GWASs are discussed in the next paragraphs and summarised in Table 2.

FTLD TDP GWAS

This study was published in 2010 by van Deerlin et al (Van Deerlin et al., 2010).

It included FTLD-TDP cases diagnosed either by pathological (FTLD-TDP) or genetic (i.e. presence of pathogenic GRN mutations) assessments. As classical case-control studies it was performed on 515 FTLD-TDP cases and 2509 controls (discovery phase), and 89 independent FTLD-TDP cases and 553 controls (replication phase). Discovery phase analyses indicated 3 significant lead SNPs (rs6966915, rs1020004, and rs1990622) encompassing the transmembrane protein 106B (TMEM106B) gene (7p21.3). Replication analysis confirmed the association and same direction of effect for two lead SNPs (rs1020004 and rs1990622), yet such associations could not be replicated in additional 192 individuals with unspecified FTLD (Van Deerlin et al., 2010). Authors also characterised the effects on TMEM106B expression levels in FTLD-TDP post-mortem versus neurologically normal control brains (frontal cortex) for rs1020004 and rs1990622 indicating that risk allele carriers had 2.5-fold higher TMEM106B expression levels than controls (Van Deerlin et al., 2010). Of note, GRN mutation carriers showed highest increase of TMEM106B expression compared to non-carriers and controls (Van Deerlin et al., 2010).

Altogether, this study indicated SNPs encompassing the TMEM106B gene as risk factors for the FTLD-TDP subtype and that their risk alleles appeared to be particularly enriched in GRN mutation carriers, thus suggesting TMEM106B as a GRN modifier. Additionally, not only it is relevant to note that TMEM106B association with FTLD has been confirmed in subsequent studies (Cruchaga et al., 2011; Finch et al., 2011; Van Deerlin et al., 2010; Vass et al., 2011) but also that TMEM106B is involved in endolysosomal pathways and modulates PGRN protein levels (Lattante et al., 2014).

International clinical FTLD GWAS

This study was published in 2014 by Ferrari et al (Ferrari et al., 2014).

It included cases belonging to 4 clinical subgroups: bvFTLD, PPAs (SD and PNFA) and FTLD-MND. The discovery cohort (FTLD-GWAS phase-I) consisted of 2154 cases and 4308 controls, whilst the replication cohort (FTLD-GWAS phase-II) comprised 1372 cases and 5092 (for a total of 3526 FTLD samples and 9400 controls). Following the classical case-control strategy, analyses were performed after excluding Mendelian genes (MAPT and GRN) mutation carriers. The association analyses for the discovery phase were performed for each subtype prior meta-analysing the entire cohort: for the bvFTLD subtype (consisting of 1377 cases and 2754 controls) 2 suggestive lead SNPs – rs302652 and rs74977128 – were identified, respectively mapping to Ras-related protein Rab-38 and cathepsin C
(RAB38 and RAB38–CTSC) (11q14). Association analyses on the other subtypes – 308 SD cases (versus 616 controls), 269 PNFA cases (versus 538 controls) and 200 FTLD-MND cases (versus 400 controls) – did not indicate genetic markers reaching genome-wide significance (because of insufficient power). Conversely, the meta-analysis for all 4 subtypes indicated significant SNPs encompassing butyrophilin like 2 (BTNL2; rs1980493) and major histocompatibility complex, class II, DRs (HLA-DRA–HLA-DRB5; rs9268877 and rs9268856) at 6p21.3. Replication (for 690 bvFTLD cases versus 5094 controls), and joint analyses, indicated rs302668 as significant for the bvFTLD subtype (11q14; RAB38). Replication for the entire cohort and joint analyses confirmed strong association for 3 lead SNPs rs9268877, rs9268856, and rs1980493 at 6p21.3. From a functional perspective, although no eQTLs (expression quantitative trait loci) in brain were evident, the top SNP for RAB38–CTSC (rs302652) was associated with decreased levels of RAB38 mRNA in blood, whilst a significant cis-mQTL (methylation quantitative trait loci) for rs1980493 was evident for HLA-DRA in frontal cortex (Ferrari et al., 2014).

Altogether, this study revealed 2 two novel susceptibility loci for clinical FTLD: one suggestive involving lysosome-phagosome pathways (RAB38–CTSC locus) for the bvFTLD subtype, and one affecting immune system processes (BTNL2 and HLA-DRA–DRB5 locus) in global FTLD.

**Italian clinical FTLD GWAS**

This study was published in 2015 by Ferrari et al (Ferrari et al., 2015).

It was performed on a multi-centre Italian FTLD cohort of 530 samples (bvFTLD [n=418], SD [n=27], PNFA [n=61], and FTLD-MND ([n=24])) and 926 population matched controls. The inclusion criteria were in line with those of the clinical FTLD-GWAS (see above (Ferrari et al., 2014)). The work employed a standard cases versus controls association strategy for the discovery phase followed by replication analyses based on the implementation of 3 different tests (also called ‘SNPs-to-genes’ analyses) – GATES, supervised PCA (sPCA), and the sequential kernel machine association test (SKAT) – to score and prioritize genes (Ferrari et al., 2015). Discovery analyses identified 2 suggestive loci (i.e. close to significance, yet not genome-wide significant): one defined by 7 SNPs encompassing LOC730100 (centromeric to neurexin 1 [NRXN1]) at 2p16.3 and the other also defined by 7 suggestive SNPs encompassing centrosomal protein 131 (CEP131), C17orf89, and ENTH domain containing 2 (ENTHD2) at 17q25.3. Interestingly, the risk alleles at 17q25.3 defined a suggestive risk haplotype causing decreased expression of the cis genes RFNG O-fucosylpeptide 3-beta-N-acetylglucosaminyltransferase (RFNG), apoptosis associated tyrosine kinase (AATK) and microRNA 1250 (MIR1250) suggesting this as the biological mechanism underlying the association. During replication CEP131 and ENTHD2 were consistently identified as the most significant genes across the 3 analysis methods (GATES, sPCA or SKAT).

Altogether, this study indicated 2 novel potential loci for FTLD and that, from a functional perspective, an effect on expression of genes involved in neuronal development, differentiation and maturation processes might drive FTLD pathogenesis in the Italian population.

**FTLD GRN GWAS**

This study was published in 2018 by Pottier et al (Pottier et al., 2018).

It was performed on FTLD samples selected for the specific feature of carrying loss of function (LoF) GRN mutations (n=120 distinct mutations) (Pottier et al., 2018). The discovery phase was done using 382 patients and 1146 controls, whilst the replication phase included 210 patients (67 patients with GRN mutations and 143 confirmed FTLD-TDP type A cases). A standard case-control association study was performed to identify modifiers for GRN mutation carriers and/or FTLD-TDP in general. The discovery phase analyses did not reveal modifiers affecting age at onset (neither after conditioning on rs5848); yet a genome-wide significant lead SNP downstream to TMEM106B was evident (rs7791726; 7p21.3). Of note,
rs7791726 appears to be in almost complete LD with the previously indicated GWAS hits at this locus (rs1990622, rs3173615 and rs1990620), thus it might be argued that this result further replicates the original findings by van Deerlin et al (Van Deerlin et al., 2010). A total of 44 suggestive markers was carried forward for replication and, after meta-analysing the discovery and replication phases, two markers resulted outstanding: rs3173615 (TMEM106B) and rs36196656 (GFRA2 [GDNF family receptor alpha 2]). It was established that the effect allele for rs36196656 was a cis-eQTL to GFRA2, where homozygous carriers showed a reduced expression of GFRA2 in cerebellar tissue and it was shown that PGRN and GFRA2 co-precipitated in HEK293T cells suggesting that both might be part of the GDNF signalling pathway that promotes neuronal survival.

Altogether, this study revealed GFRA2 as a novel potential modifier in GRN mutation carriers. However, authors suggested that not only this genetic association needs to be replicated in follow-up studies, but also that GFRA2's biological implication as a PGRN modifier needs to be further assessed in ad-hoc functional studies and models.

Beside the typical GWASs, recently, epigenetic findings combined with GWAS data indicated that markers sitting in the HLA-locus (i.e. rs9357140) might contribute to the regulation of pro-inflammatory players' expression in brain cortex, impacting FTLD patients' age of onset (Zhang et al., 2018). This is interesting in that it further supports that multiple risk factors and/or modifiers (i.e. genetic markers with small effect size) might in fact significantly contribute to disease-endophenotypes or disease-specific features.

The associations reported in the different FTLD-GWASs hardly replicated across each other. The only hit that appears to be seen in at least two independent GWAS (the FTLD TDP and the FTLD GRN GWAS) is the TMEM106B locus. Both studies targeted a category of cases presenting overlapping features: on one hand, the presence of genetic variability in the GRN gene, on the other, the underlying pathology (i.e. TDP-43 pathology). Considering that the TMEM106B locus was by far not a hit in the International and the Italian clinical GWASs, one might argue TMEM106B being an exclusive modifier of GRN mutation carriers and cases featuring TDP-43 pathology. The International and the Italian clinical GWASs indicated different loci and were not cross-supportive: here the lack of replication in a bidirectional manner may underlie the fact that differences in populations might indeed play an important role in determining genetic association, even more than sample size and statistical power.

All this taken together warrants that future study designs take into account a number of points: from a statistical perspective it is and will be fundamental to increase samples sizes to improve the power of associations. From a study design perspective, it will be fundamental to study the different FTLD subtypes (based on both clinical and pathological diagnoses) to better define their genetic architecture. This will be extremely valuable to genetically classify groups of patients both for later ad-hoc inclusion in clinical trials and for the development, in the long-run, of syndrome-specific prevention and treatment options.
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenotype</th>
<th>Chr</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Alleles</th>
<th>Risk Allele</th>
<th>p-value Discovery</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>p-value Replication</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>p-value Joint</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTLD TDP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12283787</td>
<td>rs1990622</td>
<td>C/T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.08×10^-11</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.0002*</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>(Van Deerlin et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12255778</td>
<td>rs1020004</td>
<td>A/G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.00×10^-11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12265988</td>
<td>rs6966915</td>
<td>A/C/T</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.63×10^-11</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12265988</td>
<td>rs6966915</td>
<td>A/C/T</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.63×10^-11</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| International clinical bvFTD | 11 | 87894831 | rs302652 | T/A | T | 2.02×10^-6 | 1.37 | NA | NA | 2.44×10^-6 | 1.23 | (Ferrari et al., 2014) |
|                               | 11 | 87876911 | rs302668 | T/C | T | NA | NA | 0.041 | 1.14 | 5.1×10^-6 | 1.24 | |
|                               | 11 | 87936874 | rs74977128 | T/C | C | 3.06×10^-9 | 1.81 | NA | NA | NA | NA | |
| Meta International clinical FTLD | 6 | 32363215 | rs1980493 | T/C | T | 4.94×10^-6 | 1.39 | 0.02 | 1.17 | 1.57×10^-6 | 1.30 | |
|                                | 6 | 32431147 | rs9268877 | A/C | A | 1.65×10^-10 | 1.33 | 0.104 | 1.08 | 1.05×10^-6 | 1.20 | |
|                                | 6 | 32429719 | rs9268856 | A/C | C | 1.30×10^-6 | 1.33 | 0.014 | 1.14 | 5.1×10^-6 | 1.24 | |
| GRN GWAS                     | 7  | 12283787 | rs1990622 | C/T | T | 1.61×10^-10 | 1.88 | 4.09×10^-7 | 1.81 | 3.54×10^-8 | 1.85 | (Potter et al., 2018) |
|                               | 8  | 21621247 | rs36196656 | A/C/G/T | A | 9.44×10^-6 | 1.51 | 4.4×10^-4 | 1.46 | 1.58×10^-4 | 1.49 | |

### B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenotype</th>
<th>Chr</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Alleles</th>
<th>Risk Allele</th>
<th>p-value Discovery</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>FDR</th>
<th>Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian clinical FTD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52600067</td>
<td>rs17042852</td>
<td>C/T</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.01×10^-2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52635727</td>
<td>rs15267678</td>
<td>G/A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2.19×10^-7</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52571393</td>
<td>rs17042770</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.22×10^-7</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52509876</td>
<td>rs12621157</td>
<td>T/G</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>3.73×10^-7</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52546301</td>
<td>rs12622570</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.99×10^-7</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52532874</td>
<td>rs12619513</td>
<td>A/G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.39×10^-7</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52521716</td>
<td>rs12614311</td>
<td>T/C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8.33×10^-7</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|Italian clinical FTD | 17 | 79173462 | rs906175 | T/C | T | 1.22×10^-7 | 1.58 | GATES | CEP131 | 0.001469 | |
|                    | 17 | 79192430 | rs2725391 | T/C | T | 2.50×10^-7 | 1.52 | ENTHD2 | 0.004264 | |
|                    | 17 | 79195814 | rs969413 | A/T | A | 4.26×10^-7 | 1.52 | C17orf89 | 0.004264 | |
|                    | 17 | 79177974 | rs2659030 | A/G | A | 4.42×10^-7 | 1.56 | sPCA | CEP131 | 0.000650 | |
|                    | 17 | 79213562 | rs2255166 | C/T | C | 6.19×10^-7 | 1.55 | ENTHD2 | 0.001007 | |
|                    | 17 | 79192446 | rs9319617 | C/T | T | 6.62×10^-7 | 1.51 | SKAT | CEP131 | 0.000014 | |
|                    | 17 | 79202329 | rs1048775 | G/C | C | 8.04×10^-7 | 1.51 | ENTHD2 | 0.000651 | |

### Table 2. A. Summary of association results for FTLD TDP, the International clinical FTLD GWAS and the FTLD GRN GWAS. *Replication tested in 89 FTLD-TDP cases; ^surrogate/proxy SNPs for the bvFTD subtype; ©denotes heterogeneity p-value < 0.01 in the meta-analysis of the discovery and replication phases combined. B. Summary of association results for FTLD Italian clinical GWAS.
Ongoing and future efforts to tackle sporadic FTLD

In comparison to other neurodegenerative disorders such as AD and PD, FTLD is a rather rare condition with an insidious clinical presentation that embraces a spectrum of syndromes. As indicated in the previous paragraph, gathering large and phenotypically well-characterized cohorts of the various syndromes contributing to FTLD is a critical element to allow powered genetic studies of sporadic FTLD, and issues of this kind can only be overcome by large International collaborations involving multiple research centres, worldwide.

The International Frontotemporal Dementia Genomics Consortium (IFGC; https://ifgcsite.wordpress.com/) is among the largest consortia for the study of sporadic FTLD. The IFGC conducted the clinical FTLD-GWAS (see above (Ferrari et al., 2014)), and is expanding its dataset through the current FTLD-GWAS phase-III project. Through these efforts, the IFGC has been and is generating genetic data – through a mix of whole-genome array, exome-chip and NGS techniques – for about 6,000 independent sporadic FTLD cases that encompass the various and major subtypes such as bvFTLD, SD, PNFA and FTLD-MND.

The IFGC comprises research groups form Europe, North America and Australia who share an interest in the genetics and understanding of sporadic FTLD. The IFGC’s vision entails the use of genetics to expand on genes and genetic markers that cause or increase risk of developing FTLD and bioinformatics to interpret genetic data and predict risk-pathways, in silico.

Clearly, this altogether represents a unique resource for the wider scientific community with an interest in FTLD and neurodegeneration as it helps increasing statistical power for genetic analyses and a range of cross-disciplinary studies and projects. Particularly, this resource allows well powered studies aiming at dissecting syndrome-specific genetic fingerprints, disease risk prediction through polygenic risk-scores, genotype-phenotype correlation, defining parameters for the identification of cohorts qualifying for tailored clinical trials, as well as fostering largescale meta- and/or pleiotropy-analyses with other closely related neurodegenerative conditions.
Molecular mechanisms of FTLD pathogenesis

The translation from genetic knowledge to functional understanding of impacted biological processes and molecular mechanisms at the basis of disease is currently among the major and most debated topics in biomedical research in the context of complex disorders (Karczewski and Snyder, 2018), including FTLD.

Genetics of FTLD clearly has and is contributing to drive research efforts aimed at better understanding its molecular mechanisms and underpinnings. Mendelian FTLD candidate genes are particularly informative to functional biologists to design experiments around their protein products and further their characterisation in *in-vitro* and *in-vivo* models. Although it might be argued that Mendelian genes ‘just’ account for a minority of cases (all together ~30-40% of all FTLD), an intriguing hypothesis is that, if familial genes indicate functions and processes whose alteration is necessary and sufficient to trigger FTLD pathogenesis, they might be baits for defining the global pathogenic mechanisms leading to FTLD and thus being informative also for the vast majority, i.e. the sporadic (~60-70% of all FTLD), of cases. In the latter scenario, in fact, not only their genetic features are still understudied but also a specific link to genes is less clear than in Mendelian cases because of the nature of GWASs.

The study of protein products of Mendelian (and sporadic [or ‘GWAS’]) candidate genes and their functional characterisation is thus, in the first instance, informative on the potential impacted processes. Nevertheless, this approach tends to take into consideration ‘one gene at a time’ and might be reductionist in the long run. Additionally, proteins encoded by the candidate genes are involved in multiple sub-cellular processes/pathways, thus it is critical to highlight those that are truly involved in disease pathogenesis.

Innovative methods to aid in this respect rely on data integration and bioinformatics analyses. These are emerging alternatives to the classical studies in that they allow to evaluate altogether the genetic players contributing to the phenotype, to simulate different pathogenic scenarios and to isolate the most likely risk-pathways to be validated and tested in the functional setting. For instance, network analyses based on gene co-expression and protein-protein interactions (PPIs) are becoming suitable methods to serve these purposes. Weighted gene co-expression network analysis (WGCNA) is a bioinformatics pipeline developed in 2008 by Langefelder (Langfelder and Horvath, 2008) that allows the generation of a network whose nodes are genes connected on the basis of their co-expression profile. This type of analysis relies on the assumption that genes that are tempo-spatially expressed together are likely to be involved in similar functions within the cells expanding on the functional environment of candidate genes. Protein-protein interaction networks are composed by proteins connected on the basis of proof of physical interaction (as per peer reviewed functional literature). The hypothesis, behind this second type of networks (WPPINA), is that proteins that interact with each other likely share the same function within a conserved pathway due to biochemical reasons (Ferrari et al., 2017). Network analyses have been recently supported by high-throughput approaches that have the advantage of being unbiased and can take into consideration multiple genes at a time. Comparative mass spectrometry has been used to compare FTD, ALS and controls to define common and specific molecular players and cellular pathways possibly involved in disease onset and progression (Umoh et al., 2018).

The study of the physiology of Mendelian genes has to date indicated a number of susceptibility processes that appear to be conserved across familial and sporadic cases suggesting these processes being commonly impacted biological processes underpinning FTLD pathogenesis. This appears to be the case for cellular waste disposal pathways, and immune signalling. Additionally, there seem to be a number of novel intriguing processes
emerging form the more holistic (network based) approaches, including DNA damage response (Figure 2).

**Cellular waste disposal pathways** (CHMP2B, C9orf72, GRN, VCP, UBQLN2, OPTN, SQSTM1, TBK1, CCNF, TMEM106, RAB38)

The cellular waste disposal pathways involve an intertwined sub-cellular continuum of processes that comprise: i) the endolysosomal pathway that delivers endocytic cargoes engulfed from the extracellular environments to the lysosomes for degradation; ii) the macro-autophagy and chaperone mediated autophagy (CMA) pathways that target damaged organelles and misfolded proteins for lysosomal degradation; iii) the mitophagy pathway for mitochondrial removal via autophagy, and; iv) the unfolded protein response (UPR) and the ubiquitin-proteasome systems (UPS) pathways that are responsible for degradation of ubiquitinated proteins. Different alterations of the waste disposal process have been associated with various neurodegenerative disorders including PD, AD, prion disease and Huntington’s disease (HD) (Menzies et al., 2017). There is still no unequivocal agreement on the detailed mechanisms however it is accepted that an alteration of the waste disposal capacity can lead to an accrual of toxic molecules within the sub-cellular environment that, through time, accounts for progressive neuronal damage and accumulation of misfolded and aggregated proteins. Drugs to potentiate the cell waste disposal machinery have therefore been proposed at least as coadjuvant therapies in neurodegenerative conditions (Sarkar et al., 2008).

Among the ‘major-FTLD genes’, GRN encodes for a long glycoprotein product (PGRN) that is secreted in the extracellular space. Extracellular PGRN can be up taken and subsequently cleaved into 7 units of granulins (GRNs) within the endolysosomal pathway (Holler et al., 2017). The functions of PGRN as well as GRNs are still not completely clear, and it has been linked to grow factor like activities as well as modulation of the inflammatory response (Tang et al., 2011; Van Damme et al., 2008). However, it is interesting to note that homozygous mutations in GRN are causative of neuronal ceroid lipofuscinosis (NCL) a lysosomal storage disorder while heterozygous mutations in GRN are associated with FTD (Almeida et al., 2016). These mutations appear to be loss of function (Cruts and Van Broeckhoven, 2008), and PGRN deficiency has been linked to defective autophagy (Chang et al., 2017) and alteration of lysosomal homeostasis (Evers et al., 2017).

CHMP2B encodes a component of the endosomal sorting complex required for transport III (ESCRT-III) involved in the endosomal trafficking, concentration of ubiquitinated cargoes and proteins/enzymes involved in the endocytic pathway as well as moulding lipid bilayers (Bodon et al., 2011; Morita et al., 2010). Among the ‘spectrum-FTLD genes’, SQSTM1, that encodes the p62 protein, is responsible for recognising poly-ubiquitinated cargoes and for delivering them to the autophagy machinery for degradation (Katsuragi et al., 2015); also, it has been suggested that a dysfunctional p62 might impact mitochondria depolarization and lead to a reduced autophagosome formation (Haack et al., 2016). VCP is well known for its relevant roles within the ubiquitin-mediated proteostasis (Meyer and Weihl, 2014). UBQLN2 codes for a protein involved in the control of proteostasis by delivering substrates tagged for degradation to the proteasome (Hjerpe et al., 2016). OPTN has been reported to recognise protein aggregates in a ubiquitin-independent fashion and in association with the kinase TBK1 before directing them to the autophagy/lysosomal pathway for degradation (Korac et al., 2013). CCNF holds a function in the E3 ubiquitin-protein ligase complex to mediate proteasomal targeting of ubiquitinated CP110 during G2 phase (Nguyen et al., 2018).

Peculiar is the case of C9orf72: although its physiological role is still not known, many studies have been carried out to evaluate the effect of the pathogenic hexanucleotide expansion indicating that C9orf72 expansions might reduce mRNA expression or generate toxic nuclear foci (Pottier et al., 2016) with a possible alteration of the nuclear transport. Nevertheless, more recently, C9orf72 has been linked to autophagy and proteostasis (Pottier et al., 2016).
GWAS candidate genes also appear to play major roles within the endolysosomal trafficking and the waste disposal processes: such is the case of TMEM106B that is associated with maintenance of endolysosomal trafficking (Busch et al., 2016; Jun et al., 2015), whilst RAB38 is responsible for vesicle trafficking, fusion and autophagosome maturation (Wasmeier et al., 2006).

Altogether this suggests that a number of ‘major’, many of the ‘spectrum’ and some of the ‘GWAS’ genes point towards different yet convergent components of the more broad waste disposal pathway indicating that both dominant mutations (high penetrance) as well as common markers with small effect size (low penetrance) support a common process involved in disease pathogenesis. Clearly, more studies will need to be performed to further characterise how genetic variability in the candidate genes affects these pathways and contributes to disease mechanisms in order to be able to recognise potential biomarkers and/or druggable targets within the waste disposal matrix.

CHCHD10 does not seem to fit in the waste disposal picture: CHCHD10 codes for a mitochondrial protein that might play a role in maintaining mitochondrial physiological activity, yet further ad-hoc investigations will be needed to verify whether CHCHD10 might exert a relevant role in mitochondria quality control and mitophagy.

**Immune system signalling** (GRN, TBK1, BTNL2, HLA-DRA)

Immune-related processes are extremely complex and heterogeneous. A few ‘major’, ‘spectrum’ and ‘GWAS’ genes appear to support signalling pathways involved in immune responses.

PGRN has been shown to be upregulated in activated microglial cells (Baker et al., 2006) and, among multiple processes, to be involved in wound healing and inflammation (van Swieten and Heutink, 2008). Interestingly, PGRN appears to act as an anti-inflammatory agent, whilst GRNs, the products of PGRN cleavage, have been shown to promote pro-inflammatory activities (He and Bateman, 2003). All the more, it was also suggested that PGRN is involved in inflammatory processes acting as antagonist of the tumour necrosis factor α (TNFα) in binding the TNF receptor (Tang et al., 2011) or by regulating innate immunity gene expression and complement production thus, in turn, controlling synaptic pruning by microglia (Lui et al., 2016). Interestingly, TBK1, although implicated in the proteostasis processes (see ‘Cellular waste disposal pathways’ section) is, primarily known for mechanisms that relate to the innate immune response (Xiao et al., 2017), suggesting a potentially ubiquitous role in FTLD pathogenesis that warrants additional focused studies. The clinical FTLD GWAS also clearly supported the involvement of the immune system signalling and inflammatory response: BTNL2 encodes a membrane protein that is ubiquitously expressed across different tissues, including the brain, and is involved in repressing T-cells proliferation (Valentonyte et al., 2005), whilst HLA-DRA encodes a monomorphic class II HLA-DR transmembrane receptor that is expressed on the surface of microglia. Interestingly, increased expression of HLA-DR molecules on microglia may reflect pathological activity, as previously indicated in AD and PD (McGeer et al., 1988), suggesting that aberrant HLA-DRA levels might in fact impact modulation and regulation of immune responses in the brain. The relevance of elements of the immune system mapping to the HLA-locus was further supported by a recent study assessing genetic pleiotropy across auto-immune disorders and FTLD (Broce et al., 2018).

Clearly these avenues need to be further explored, yet it is relevant to note that rare and common genetic variability might imply that constitutive functional alteration of innate and adaptive immune responses may contribute to disease pathogenesis.

**Gene expression regulation pathways**

Despite the extremely rare genetic variability of TARDBP and FUS in FTLD, yet considering TDP-43 and FUS being pathological hallmarks of FTLD, a brief note about their contribution to disease pathogenesis is warranted: TDP-43 and FUS are functionally involved in
processes that control gene expression and RNA metabolism (more details can be found in (Ratti and Buratti, 2016)). Particularly, it is widely accepted that defective and mislocalized RNA binding protein granules (mRBPs, i.e. stress granules that have been directly associated with the activity of TDP-43 and FUS) cause neuronal dysfunctions, abnormal stress response and ultimately neurodegeneration (Bowden and Dormann, 2016).

**Other (minor) processes/pathways: protein aggregation (MAPT) and neuronal development & homeostasis (GRN, RFNG, AATK, GFRA2)**

Interesting is the case of MAPT that encodes the microtubules associated protein tau. Our current knowledge about tau’s functions and physiology points to binding and stabilisation of microtubules (MT). The consequences exerted by mutations in MAPT have been associated with both alterations in splicing events leading to an imbalanced ratio of tau isoforms and with impairment in binding (and stabilising) microtubules (due to mutations affecting the MT-binding domain) all this leading to increased free cytosolic population of tau that favours its aggregative properties (Ferrari et al., 2011). Tau is target of multiple post-translational modifications such as phosphorylation and acetylation (Min et al., 2010) and balance in tau phosphorylation has shown to be essential for supporting tau physiological functions: hyperphosphorylation does occur in the disorder setting and increases tau’s aggregative capacity (Bodea et al., 2016). It follows that, based on the above, besides the occurrence of abnormal protein aggregation, it is not fully clear what pathways and cascades become disrupted in MAPT driven Mendelian cases.

Another process that might be impacted on the basis of genetic variability affecting both ‘major’ and ‘GWAS’ genes is neuronal development and homeostasis. Among the (many) functions associated with PGRN and GRNs, in fact, PGRN by activating several kinase-dependant signalling cascades, stimulates the induction of vascular endothelial growth factor (Tangkeangsirisin and Serrero, 2004), promotes endothelial cell migration during wound healing (He et al., 2003) and appears to play a role in brain development (Mackenzie and Rademakers, 2007) and neurite outgrowth (Van Damme et al., 2008). Similarly, PRGN has been shown to bind to EphA2 (a tyrosine kinase receptor) with consequent activation of mitogen-activated protein kinases (MAPKs) and AKT thus promoting vessel growth with capillary morphogenesis (Neill et al., 2016). Furthermore, recent GWAS (Ferrari et al., 2015; Pottier et al., 2018) indicated a number of loci including genes that, if confirmed as the real biological reason for association (provided that RFNG and AATK results from suggestive loci, i.e. close to but below genome-wide significance), support to some good extent additional processes related to neuronal development and protection (RFNG, AATK and GFRA2).

**Emerging pathways: DNA damage response (MAPT, VCP, CCNF)**

Gene co-expression and protein interaction networks are state of the art bioinformatics tools supporting fast in silico characterisation of shared functions across groups of candidate genes/proteins. In this respect, results from extended bioinformatics work focusing on gene co-expression analyses (WGCNA) of ‘major’, spectrum’ and ‘GWAS’ genes confirmed susceptibility pathways belonging to the waste disposal processes such as autophagy, ubiquitin proteasome system and immune response pathways (Ferrari et al., 2016). Other work adopting PPI network analyses (WPPINA) further supported the waste disposal process driven by endoplasmic reticulum (ER) stress particularly referring to the ubiquitin/proteasome and unfolded protein response (Ferrari et al., 2017).

Most interestingly, these bioinformatics works jointly supported DNA damage response (DDR) as a novel potential mechanism underpinning FTLD (Ferrari et al., 2016; Ferrari et al., 2017). In the WGCNA work it was evident that MAPT was a hub in modules indicating DNA protection among the most significant biological processes in frontal and temporal cortices (Ferrari et al., 2016). The WPPINA work replicated quite in detail the DDR results described above (Ferrari et al., 2017).
This bioinformatics work globally raised the importance of DDR in FTLD. Recently, a number of studies showed indeed that alterations in the DDR are among the functional consequences of mutations in MAPT, suggesting that alterations of the cellular cycle, chromatin damage and aberration of the normal DNA repairing process may be functionally linked to brain cells death and neurodegeneration observed in FTLD (Rossi et al., 2013; Rossi et al., 2008). More functional characterisation of this process in FTLD models is currently under way.

Interestingly, CCNF plays a role in the E3 ubiquitin-protein ligase complex and mediates proteasomal targeting of ubiquitinated CP110 during G2 phase, thereby not only acting in the cell waste disposal (see above) but also in the control of the cell cycle check points that control genome stability through ubiquitin-mediated proteolysis (Nguyen et al., 2018). As well, VCP has been shown to be part of a complex of proteins recruited to the DNA double-strand breaks (Acs et al., 2011; Meerang et al., 2011).

The DNA damage response (DDR) is the general functional term indicating the process through which a cell keeps control of alterations/mutation in the genetic code through mechanisms of damage recognition, repair, tolerance, in addition to cell-cycle checkpoint pathways and signalling events (Giglia-Mari et al., 2011). Alterations of the DDR have been associated with different severe disorders such as Xeroderma Pigmentosum, a syndrome characterized by photosensitivity, increased risk of cancer (particularly skin cancer) often presenting with neurological symptoms (Garcia-Moreno et al., 2018). Additionally, it is indeed remarkable that congenital and age-related neurodegeneration has been associated with accumulation of DNA lesions (Madabhushi et al., 2014).
Figure 2

Figure 2. Summary of all putative impacted molecular processes contributing to FTLD pathogenesis on the basis of the current global genetic characterisation of FTLD including ‘major’, ‘spectrum’ and ‘GWAS’ FTLD genes.


**Final remarks**

Genetics and cell biology work over the past two decades have tremendously contributed shedding light on genetic causes and molecular mechanisms involved in FTLD. However, there is much more to be learned on these matters as our current understanding of FTLD pathogenesis is clearly in its infant stages and not sufficient to achieve effective preventive and therapeutic measures.

From a genetics perspective, we are at a moment in time where the available and emerging technologies (e.g. genome-wide, exome-chip arrays and NGS techniques) are becoming more cost-effective enabling a better characterisation of common and rare genetic variability contributing to disease. Much of this work will need to be aimed at fine-mapping classical GWAS loci, exploring more in depth the (likely) oligo-genic nature of disease and identifying novel causative genes. This will clearly impact the way and pace at which we will fill the gap of missing heritability in FTLD a key step in deciphering and defining the genetic risk-architecture of FTLD. Of course, these approaches will be best applied to large and well-defined patients’ cohorts, the gathering of which is made possible by international disease-focused working groups and/or Consortia. Applying these techniques to large cohorts representative of the different FTLD subtypes (i.e. clinical bvFTLD, SD and PNFA cases as well as pathologically defined cohorts [e.g. FTLD-Tau or FTLD-TDP]) will aid improving genotype-phenotype correlation defining syndrome- and/or subtype-specific genetic fingerprinting (important, for example to identify cohorts qualifying for tailored clinical trials).

The gap from genes to mRNA and proteomics shall be reduced through better study designs where multi-omics approaches are applied to the same sample source and disease-relevant tissue(s) in order to avoid inter-sample variability issues and correlate data by grounds of sample and tissue-specificity (Manzoni et al., 2016). From a functional perspective, we need a more time-effective way to coherently translate genetic into functional knowledge. These goals will be achieved by the use of more holistic approaches to interpret the genetic knowledge and guide functional studies investigating risk-pathways. For example, in silico methods involving assessments of genetic variability’s effect on gene-expression regulation (e.g. eQTLs, mQTL[methylation quantitative trait loci], ASE [allele-specific expression], TWAS [transcriptome-wide association study]) (Gusev et al., 2016; Manzoni et al., 2016) as well as molecular interactions and functional annotation analyses of gene co-expression and protein-protein interaction (PPI) networks will allow to better put into perspective the biological processes and pathways that are impacted by genetic variability (Furlong, 2013). In turn, this will provide solid ground for the development of testable hypotheses and aid functional biologists designing more precise experimental models, including cell-specificity studies (Skene et al., 2018), for validating risk-pathways.

Normalising all such strategies will require some time, yet this is the paradigm-shift to improve basic and translational research, and pave the way for advancements in preventive, monitoring and therapeutic measures.

**Acknowledgments**

This work is supported by a MRC Programme grant to J.H. MR/N026004/1. R.F. is supported by funding from Alzheimer’s Society (grant number 284).

**Conflict of Interest**

Authors declare no conflict of interests
References


d


d


d


d


d


d


d


d


