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X chromosome inactivation is a program of gene silencing on one of two female mammalian X chromosomes to equalize X-linked gene expression to XY male counterparts. This developmentally-regulated chromatin change is initiated on either the maternal or paternal X chromosome early in embryonic development and, once established, is maintained on the chosen chromosome for the lifetime of the female. The onset of X chromosome inactivation is regulated by the long noncoding transcript \textit{Xist} and an open question is the field is how embryonic developmental cues trigger expression of \textit{Xist} and onset of X chromosome inactivation. The correlation of pluripotency with repression of \textit{Xist} in the mouse system has led to a model where pluripotency transcription factors repress X chromosome inactivation by binding to a region within the first intron of \textit{Xist} gene. Thus differentiation would release the repression of \textit{Xist}. We rigorously tested this intron1 hypothesis in a transgenic mouse
model and refute that intron1 binding is responsible for the developmental regulation of X chromosome inactivation.

A second set of studies focused on the maintenance phase of X chromosome inactivation with the goal of discovering novel chromatin factors that contribute to the remarkable stability of gene silencing on the entire X chromosome. We took an unbiased screening approach, designing a high throughput assay with primary mouse cells bearing reporters on the inactive X, and screened genome-wide siRNA and chemical libraries. We report that knockdown of chromatin-associated protein Atf7ip or its previously characterized interactors reactivates silenced genes of the inactive X chromosome. From chemical screening, we found that the compound Resveratrol can lead to reactivation of silenced genes as part of a novel drug combination. We show evidence that Resveratrol inhibits the dNTP biosynthetic enzyme ribonucleotide reductase in this context. This finding has spurred a collaboration investigating Resveratrol as part of a rationale drug combination for cancer therapy. In summary, these studies demonstrate that X chromosome inactivation is powerful and flexible model for the interrogation of mammalian chromatin regulation mechanisms with relevance for disease therapy.
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CHAPTER 1

A REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTAL REGULATION OF XCI
X chromosome inactivation (XCI) is a striking example of developmentally regulated, wide-range heterochromatin formation that is initiated during early embryonic development. XCI is a mechanism of dosage compensation unique to placental mammals whereby one X chromosome in every diploid cell of the female organism is transcriptionally silenced to equalize X-linked gene levels to XY males. In the embryo, XCI is random with respect to whether the maternal or paternal X chromosome is inactivated and is established in epiblast cells upon implantation of the blastocyst. Conveniently, ex vivo differentiation of mouse embryonic stem cells (mESCs) recapitulates random XCI and permits mechanistic dissection of this stepwise process that leads to stable epigenetic silencing. Here, we focus on recent studies in mouse models characterizing the molecular players of this female-specific process with an emphasis on those relevant to the pluripotent state. Further, we will summarize advances characterizing XCI states in human pluripotent cells, where surprising differences from the mouse process may have far-reaching implications for human pluripotent cell biology.

The noncoding RNA *Xist* controls the initiation of random XCI

The importance of XCI is demonstrated by the fact that ablation of the master regulator of this process, *Xist* (X-inactive specific transcript), leads to female-specific lethality early in embryonic development in mice\(^1,2\). The X-linked *Xist* gene encodes an approximately 17 kb spliced and polyadenylated transcript that is essential for heterochromatin formation on the X chromosome from which it is transcribed\(^1,4\). In the embryo, XCI is random based on the parent-of-origin for the inactive X (X\(_i\)), such that female organisms are mosaic for which X chromosome is expressed. *In vivo*, random XCI is initiated in epiblast cells of the inner cell mass (ICM) of the blastocyst soon after
implantation and, in vitro, upon induction of differentiation in mESCs, which are derived from epiblast cells of the pre-implantation blastocyst. Upon initiation of XCI, Xist is transcriptionally upregulated on the future Xi\textsuperscript{5,6}. It has been suggested that the transcription factor Yin-Yang 1 (YY1) tethers Xist RNA to its site of transcription by binding directly to both Xist RNA and DNA\textsuperscript{7}. The RNA then spreads and creates an ‘Xist RNA cloud’ demarcating the nuclear domain of the inactivating X yet the regulation of the release of Xist RNA from the Yy1 tether at the site of transcription is still unknown.

As Xist RNA molecules coat the X, they trigger transcriptional silencing with immediate exclusion of RNA polymerase II\textsuperscript{8}. This is followed by loss of active chromatin marks and establishment of silencing chromatin marks, which occur in an ordered sequence of events and include, for example, trimethylation of histone H3 lysine 27 (H3K27me\textsuperscript{3}) by the Polycomb complex PRC2, DNA methylation of promoter regions, and recruitment of the repressive histone variant macroH2A\textsuperscript{9}. The result is the Xi is maintained late replicating in S phase through the lifetime of the organism. Xist transcription and coating of the Xi continues in somatic cells, with Xist RNA dissociating from the Xi in mitosis and re-coating the X in early G1 of the cell cycle\textsuperscript{10}. Though Xist depletion during initiation of XCI leads to reversal of X chromosome silencing and heterochromatin formation, its deletion in somatic cells has only minor effects on Xi reactivation as the RNA acts synergistically with other repressive chromatin modifications that accumulate on the Xi during differentiation\textsuperscript{11,12}.

Transcription and spreading of Xist RNA along the X is a prerequisite for silencing, which is not X-restricted as silencing can spread across X:autosome translocations and transgenic Xist can induce silencing of neighboring autosomal DNA\textsuperscript{12}. The spread of Xist RNA-mediated silencing into autosomal regions is variable and has been proposed to correlate with the density of retrotransposons belonging to the family of long interspersed elements (L1)\textsuperscript{13}. A recent report suggested that the silencing of X-
linked L1s occurs prior to X-linked gene silencing and may promote the nucleation of heterochromatin. Conversely, specifically a subset of young L1 elements becomes transcribed upon Xist RNA coating and may help the local propagation of XCI\(^4\). In support of a functional role for L1 elements in XCI, the human X chromosome has a two-fold enrichment in L1 elements relative to autosomes\(^5\). Still it remains to be seen whether the behavior of these repetitive elements is a functionally important means of Xist-dependent facultative heterochromatin formation. In the following sections of the review we will discuss how Xist is regulated in pluripotent cells of the mouse.

**Acquisition of pluripotency in mouse is coupled to X\(_i\) reactivation**

In the mouse, XCI occurs in two forms that differ in parent-of-origin effect and in the developmental timing of initiation. Imprinted XCI, where the paternal X chromosome (X\(_p\)) is inactivated, is established in the mouse pre-implantation embryo at the four-cell stage and occurs in all cells of the pre-implantation embryo (Fig1)\(^16\text{-}21\). As the mid-blastocyst stage is reached (prior to implantation), imprinted XCI is reversed only in the subset of cells in the ICM that give rise to the epiblast, so that the cells that form the future embryo carry two active X chromosomes (X\(_a\)X\(_a\)) without Xist RNA coating\(^16\text{-}18,21,22\) (Fig1.1). Reactivation of the X\(_p\) is a prerequisite for subsequent random XCI in the epiblast upon implantation of the blastocyst\(^16,18\). In contrast, the imprinted form of XCI is maintained in the extraembryonic tissues.
Random and imprinted XCI differ in the molecular requirements for initiation and reactivation. *In vivo* evidence shows that, though Xist RNA coats the X_p, it is not required when imprinted XCI first occurs at the four-cell stage (as it is for random XCI). Rather, Xist RNA coating is needed to complete and stabilize the silencing of the imprinted X_i^{17,19,20}. With respect to X_i reactivation, a recent study demonstrates that the reactivation of the imprinted X_p occurs in two steps, with induction of biallelic expression of X-linked genes preceding the disappearance of Xist RNA coating, in agreement with the notion that Xist RNA coating and silencing of the X_p are uncoupled at this point in development^{21}. The mechanisms that lead to gene activation on the X_p and Xist silencing are still unclear but linked to the specification of the epiblast lineage, as pre-implantation embryos lacking the pluripotency transcription factor Nanog are unable to specify the
epiblast lineage and do not induce the loss of Xist RNA coating and Polycomb protein enrichment on the X\textsubscript{i}\textsuperscript{22}. Nanog appears to be directly involved in the regulation of Xist because pre-implantation embryos with a genetically engineered overexpression of Nanog lose Xist RNA more rapidly, though without affecting the timing of X\textsubscript{p} reactivation\textsuperscript{21}. However, Nanog may not be sufficient for this effect on Xist as Nanog is already present in the X\textsubscript{i}-bearing cells of the late morula and becomes restricted as the pluripotent X\textsubscript{a}X\textsubscript{a} epiblast lineage forms, indicating that other epiblast-linked mechanisms must synergize with Nanog to control Xist repression\textsuperscript{21,22}.

It is now appreciated that X chromosome reactivation (XCR) also occurs during the experimentally induced acquisition of pluripotency through either transcription factor-induced reprogramming to induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs), somatic cell nuclear transfer, or ESC/somatic cell fusion\textsuperscript{23-25}. XCR during reprogramming of mouse somatic cells to iPSCs leads to loss of heterochromatic marks of the X\textsubscript{i} and Xist repression, such that random XCI is observed upon differentiation of mouse (m) iPSCs, as in mESCs\textsuperscript{23} (Fig1.1). It has been demonstrated that XCR is a late event in miPSC reprogramming, occurring at around the time of pluripotency gene activation\textsuperscript{26}, but insight into the mechanism and the events leading to X\textsubscript{i} reactivation is still lacking. Nevertheless, the establishment of pluripotency both \textit{in vitro} via reprogramming and \textit{in vivo} during the establishment of the epiblast lineage in pre-implantation embryos, is coupled to XCR and Xist repression. Therefore, the X\textsubscript{a}X\textsubscript{a} state is a key attribute of the pluripotent state of mESCs and miPSCs.

Importantly, studies with a doxycycline-inducible Xist transgene have shown that Xist-dependent gene silencing is possible in undifferentiated male and female mESCs, but no longer after induction of differentiation or in somatic cells\textsuperscript{12}. This observation illustrates that Xist function is context-dependent but not with respect to sex, as factors required for the silencing process are present in male and female undifferentiated
mESCs. Since the active state of the X chromosomes must therefore be ensured by strong transcriptional repression of \textit{Xist} in mESCs, one can view initiation of XCI upon differentiation of mESCs from the perspective of loss of \textit{Xist} repression.

\textbf{\textit{Xist} is regulated by its antisense transcript \textit{Tsix}}

A major antagonizing factor to \textit{Xist} in mESCs is another long noncoding RNA, \textit{Tsix}, transcribed antisense to \textit{Xist} specifically in mESCs and downregulated first on the \textit{X}, and then on the \textit{X} during differentiation \cite{27} (Fig1.2). Loss of \textit{Tsix} function on one of the two female \textit{X}’s leads to slight upregulation of \textit{Xist} transcript levels in undifferentiated mESCs and skewing of XCI towards the \textit{Tsix}-deleted \textit{X} upon differentiation \cite{28,29}. These observations suggest that \textit{Tsix} mainly regulates the monoallelic induction of \textit{Xist} in the choice aspect of XCI. In support of this idea, live-cell imaging of differentiating female ESCs carrying X chromosomes tagged with a tetO array bound by a tetR-mCherry fusion confirmed a previously shown transient pairing of homologous \textit{Xist}/\textit{Tsix} regions of the two X chromosomes and demonstrated that this interaction is associated with exclusive deafening of the \textit{Tsix} allele on the future \textit{X}, which is proposed to allow upregulation of \textit{Xist} \cite{30-32}. \textit{Tsix} antagonism of \textit{Xist} requires transcription through the \textit{Xist} locus and the mechanism is suggested to involve change in the chromatin structure around the \textit{Xist} 5’ regulatory region \cite{33,34}. Together these findings indicate that \textit{Tsix} is not the only repressor of \textit{Xist} in pluripotency and other factors must be involved in keeping \textit{Xist} downregulated (Fig1.2).
Figure 1.2. *Xist* activators and repressors regulate initiation of XCI in mESCs. *Xist* levels are low in undifferentiated mESCs before onset of XCI, because of pluripotency transcription factors repressing *Xist* directly or indirectly via *Tsix*. X-linked *Xist* activators increase *Xist* levels during differentiation, as they themselves are upregulated. Levels of autosomal factors such as pluripotency transcription factors decrease upon differentiation. Sizes and positions of weights are reflective of magnitude of *Xist*-up or downregulation phenotypes from experimental data (see text for discussion).

**Pluripotency transcription factors directly repress XCI in ESCs**

Oct4, Sox2, and Nanog form a transcription factor triad that is key to maintaining ESC identity by activating genes of the self-renewal program and repressing lineage commitment genes. An attractive hypothesis for how pluripotency is directly linked to *Xist* repression has come from a study that demonstrates binding of Oct4, Sox2 and Nanog to the first intron (intron1) of *Xist* in male and female mESCs and loss of this interaction upon differentiation\(^{35}\). Intriguingly, depletion of Nanog or Oct4 leads to inappropriate *Xist* upregulation in male mESCs or biallelic *Xist* upregulation in differentiating female mESCs\(^{35,36}\). It is still an open question whether specific binding at intron1 is at the heart of this XCI phenotype as these pluripotency transcription factors bind and regulate
thousands of loci in the genome to maintain pluripotency. Mechanistically, the repressive function binding to intron1 has on Xist expression remains unclear, though one possibility is modification of the three-dimensional chromatin configuration within the Xist locus.

Already one study reports no effect of heterozygous deletion of intron1 and a very subtle skewing of XCI to the intron1-deleted X chromosome late in differentiation. Conceivably, synergism of pluripotency factor binding to intron1 of Xist as well as other regulatory regions could suppress XCI in mESCs. In line with this model, Tsix transcription, particularly transcriptional elongation, is dependent upon binding of the pluripotency transcription factors Rex1, Klf4, and cMyc, within a mini-satellite region of the regulatory region of the gene, and to a lesser extent by binding of Oct4 and Sox2, with the latter being somewhat debated. Thus, the pluripotency network may directly repress Xist and activate Tsix, which in turn contributes to the suppression of Xist and XCI, an idea that could be tested with double knockout studies of intron1 and Tsix. Nevertheless, it may be challenging to pinpoint a role of pluripotency regulators in XCI especially as additional Xist activators and repressors are discovered (see below) and transactivation or repression of these other factors by pluripotency regulators may indirectly exert XCI effects.

**XCI in differentiating female mouse ESCs is governed by a balance of Xist activators and repressors**

The mechanisms governing Xist upregulation during XCI must also ensure that only one X is silenced in female cells during differentiation. In addition to the X:X pairing model described above, another model proposes that in random XCI every individual X has an independent probability to initiate silencing, and this probability is proportional to the X:autosome ratio, keeping one X active per diploid chromosome set. Accordingly,
repressors of XCI would be autosomally encoded and activators would be X-linked. In XX cells, the double dose of the activator would stimulate Xist upregulation and XCI on one X, and the reciprocal cis silencing of the X-linked activator gene would in turn protect the other X from inactivation\textsuperscript{40}.

*Rnf12*, the first such characterized X-linked activator of XCI, resides \textasciitilde500 kilobases from *Xist*, and encodes an E3 ubiquitin ligase bearing a RING domain. In line with a role in the initiation of XCI, Rnf12 protein levels increase in differentiation and overexpression of Rnf12 stimulates ectopic XCI\textsuperscript{41}. The heterozygous mutation of *Rnf12* in female mESCs reduces the number of female cells undergoing XCI, however, it remains unclear if there is an essential requirement for Rnf12 in random XCI as the two published homozygous knockout strategies show contrasting results of delayed differentiation and dramatic loss of XCI\textsuperscript{38,41,42}. These differences may be attributed to differentiation protocols as the late appearance of Xist RNA cloud-positive cells suggests a selective outgrowth of cells undergoing XCI independently of Rnf12. Gene expression profiling suggests Rnf12 acts on *Xist*, as *Xist* was the only transcript significantly downregulated in Rnf12 knockout cells\textsuperscript{38}. Proteomic studies will likely be necessary to see if Rnf12 plays an indirect role in XCI through ubiquitylation targets.

Two additional noncoding RNAs have recently also been identified as X-linked *Xist* activators. *Jpx*, located upstream of *Xist*, escapes XCI and increases \textasciitilde10-fold during mESC differentiation. Its heterozygous deletion leads to loss of XCI and subsequent cell death upon embryoid body differentiation of female *X\textsubscript{a}X\textsubscript{a}* mESCs\textsuperscript{43}. These phenotypes can be rescued by an autosomal *Jpx* transgene, indicating that this novel gene can function in *trans*, which contrasts *Xist* and *Tsix*\textsuperscript{43}. Strikingly, the double knockout of *Jpx* and *Tsix* completely restores XCI kinetics and viability and will be exciting to see how this observation and the mechanistic action of *Jpx* is explained\textsuperscript{43}. Like *Jpx*, the noncoding transcript encoded by the neighboring *Ftx* gene is also
transcriptionally upregulated with female mESC differentiation. Targeted deletion of Ftx suggests that its role is in controlling the chromatin structure of the Xist promoter\textsuperscript{44}. It is tempting to speculate that continuous expression of these noncoding transcripts may be necessary for Xist itself to escape XCI. Rnf12 and Jpx are both bound by Oct4, Sox2, and Nanog in mESCs, suggesting that pluripotency factors could also act on XCI through these X-linked activators\textsuperscript{45}.

In summary, the activation of Xist, repression of Tsix, and XCI during mESC differentiation depends on the downregulation of pluripotency factors and the expression of X-linked activators such as Rnf12, Jpx and Ftx, linking XCI status to the global pluripotency gene-expression network and ensuring sex-specificity of the developmental process.

**XCI in human development**

Studies on XCI in human pluripotent cells have been more limited in scope because of technical challenges in manipulating human pre-implantation embryos and the ethical challenges of acquiring them. However, studies of XCI in the human system remain essential because the XCI process appears to be different from that in mouse. For instance, human pre-implantation embryos demonstrate XIST expression from both X chromosomes and human full-term placentas have random, rather than imprinted XCI found in mouse\textsuperscript{46,47} (Fig1.1).

RNA fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) shows XIST activation as a transition from a pinpoint signal to a ‘XIST RNA cloud’ that can be appreciated in human female pre-implantation embryos as early as the eight-cell stage\textsuperscript{48}. In one study, the majority of these XIST RNA-coated chromosomes show features of transcriptional silencing and enrichment of XIST-dependent repressive histone marks in the morula\textsuperscript{48}. Contradictory results come from a more recent study which finds that the trophectoderm and the inner
cell mass of both female and male human pre-implantation blastocysts carry active X chromosomes coated by \textit{XIST} RNA\textsuperscript{49}. The discrepancy between the two studies may be due to different culture conditions as well as hybridization efficiencies in the FISH procedure. Regardless, it appears there is no imprinted XCI in human embryogenesis, that human XCI has different developmental timing, and that \textit{XIST} RNA coating of the X and XCI are uncoupled in early human embryos (Fig 1.1).

Studies of additional factors involved in human XCI are limited to \textit{TSIX}, which may not play a functional role in human cells. \textit{TSIX} is transcribed in fetal cells, term placenta, and human ESCs but is truncated and lacks the CpG island essential for expression in mouse cells\textsuperscript{50,51}. Since in human pre-implantation development \textit{XIST} expression appears to be uncoupled from XCI, \textit{TSIX}-mediated regulation may be unnecessary. However, \textit{TSIX} has not been studied in human pre-implantation blastocysts nor during initiation of XCI, therefore a potential role may have been missed\textsuperscript{52}. Other modulators of XCI in mouse, namely \textit{JPX, FTX,} and RNF12, have been mapped in the human genome but their functions have not yet been tested, mostly due to the lack of an \textit{in vitro} system that allows their mechanistic dissection (see below).

\textbf{Different XCI states are found in human ESCs}

XCI state in human (h) ESCs is complicated by a gradual drift so that one hESC line can exhibit different states of XCI\textsuperscript{53-56}. hESCs are grouped into three classes to describe the XCI states that are typically observed (Fig 1.1)\textsuperscript{53}. Class I hESCs are X\textsubscript{a}X\textsubscript{a} and upregulate \textit{XIST} and undergo XCI upon differentiation, similar to mESCs. This class seems to be the most difficult to stabilize \textit{in vitro} because they readily transition to class II, which have initiated XCI already in the undifferentiated state and carry a \textit{XIST}-coated X\textsubscript{i}. Class II hESCs often further transition to class III where the silent state of the X\textsubscript{i} is largely maintained but \textit{XIST} is lost from the X\textsubscript{i} along with the \textit{XIST}-dependent histone
mark H3K27me\(^3\) which leads to partial reactivation of some X-linked genes\(^{54,56}\). XIST likely becomes silenced by methylation of its promoter region, and class III hESCs do not re-express XIST upon differentiation\(^{57,53}\). Given that both class I and III hESCs do not express XIST and lack an X\(_i\) enrichment of H3K27me\(^3\), extrapolating the XCI state solely on the basis of lack of XIST RNA FISH or H3K27me\(^3\) signal or even global gene expression data, has obfuscated the collective understanding of XCI in hESCs. Rather, characterization of XCI in hESC requires validation against the gold-standard assays of RNA FISH for mono- or biallelic expression of X-linked genes in addition to XIST.

hESCs derived and maintained in hypoxia, which is thought to better represent physiologic oxygen tension in development, preferentially remain in class I as demonstrated by RNA FISH for XIST and X-linked genes\(^{56}\). A switch to atmospheric oxygen tensions leads to irreversible transition to class II and subsequently to class III, strengthening the observation that female hESCs are unstable with respect to their XCI state (Fig1.1)\(^{56}\). It will be important to determine whether this fluctuating XCI status is indicative of global epigenetic instability in hESCs.

**X chromosome state in human iPSCs**

Like in the mouse, human (h) iPSCs are similar to their hESC equivalent based on functional assays of pluripotency, genome-wide expression and chromatin analysis, and XCI state. At early passage, hiPSCs are class II (X\(_a\)X\(_i\) with XIST RNA coating) which readily transition to class III as XIST RNA is lost from the X\(_i\) (Fig1.1)\(^{58}\). The same X chromosome is inactivated in all cells of a given hiPSC line reflecting the origin from a single somatic cell\(^{58,59}\). These results suggest the absence of X\(_i\) reactivation during human cell reprogramming and enable the generation of hiPSC lines expressing either only the X\(_m\) or X\(_p\)\(^{58}\). Such approaches have allowed for generation of genetically-matched hiPSC lines expressing either the mutant or wild-type X-linked gene MECP2.
from fibroblasts of female patients with Rett syndrome\textsuperscript{59,60}. However, complete skewing of XCI to one X chromosome occurs upon extended passaging of fibroblasts, preventing the generation of hiPSC lines with different X chromosomes inactivated\textsuperscript{59}. Two contradictory studies that report X\textsubscript{i} reactivation in a subset of hiPSC lines have not performed the single cell FISH analysis of X-linked gene expression, and the skewed XCI in neurons generated from hiPSCs in one of the studies would be consistent with the lack of X\textsubscript{i} reactivation\textsuperscript{61,62}. Nevertheless, these results do not exclude that different culture and reprogramming conditions could lead to XCR during hiPSC induction.

**Naïve versus primed pluripotency**

The different XCI states in mouse and human ESCs and iPSCs suggest that either there have been significant changes to XCI in mammalian evolution or, alternatively, that these XCI states are reflective of two different developmental states ‘suspended’ ex vivo through current ESC culturing techniques. Although pluripotent cells by definition can give rise to cells of all three germ layers, distinct states of pluripotency have recently been described in vitro, represented by mESCs and mouse epiblast stem cells (mEpiSCs). mESCs, derived from epiblast cells of pre-implantation blastocysts, are cultured in the presence of the cytokine LIF whereas mEpiSCs are obtained from post-implantation epiblast and cultured in the growth factor bFGF, in the absence of LIF. Since mEpiSCs express genes associated with early events in differentiation they are considered to be in the “primed” pluripotent state, whereas the typical mESC is in the “naïve” pluripotent state\textsuperscript{63}. mEpiSCs resemble class II hESC/iPSCs in many aspects including their flat colony morphology, bFGF culture requirement, and the presence of an X\textsubscript{i} coated by X\textit{ist} RNA and enriched for H3K27me\textsuperscript{3} and the Polycomb protein Ezh\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{64-66}. X\textsubscript{i}X\textsubscript{a} mEpiSCs can also be generated from pre-implantation blastocysts cultured with bFGF (just like hESCs), differentiated from mESCs with bFGF and Activin A, and
obtained via reprogramming of fibroblasts with Oct4, Sox2, Klf4 and cMyc in bFGF-containing media as opposed to LIF⁶⁶-⁶⁸ (Fig1.1B). Together, the parallels between hESCs and mEpiSCs suggest that the culture of human pluripotent cells has been optimized for the primed state and not for the naïve state.

More research is necessary to molecularly define whether mEpiSCs exhibit different types of XCI states as do hESCs/iPSCs. Interestingly, it appears that compared with mouse fibroblasts, the form of XCI in mEpiSCs is a developmental intermediate and more labile with regard to reactivation based on studies transplanting nuclei into xenopus germinal vesicles⁶⁵. In this reprogramming system, the Xi of female mEpiSCs is receptive to nuclear reprogramming whereas the mouse fibroblast macroH2A-enriched Xi is resistant⁶⁵.

Molecular manipulation can transition mEpiSCs to the naïve pluripotent state and these approaches have been extended to the human system to generate XaXa hESCs and hiPSCs. The reprogramming of mEpiSCs to an mESC-like state is achieved through a combination of ectopic expression of any one of the transcription factors Klf4, cMyc, Stat3 or Nanog and addition of LIF and 2i (a combination of two small molecules inhibiting GSK3β in the Wnt signaling pathway and mitogen-activated protein kinase signaling, which is thought to promote naïve pluripotency) (Fig1.1)²²,⁶⁶,⁶⁹-⁷¹. A subsequent study applied this approach to hESCs and found similar requirements for acquisition of naïve pluripotency in primed hESCs when Klf4 and Klf2 or Klf4 and Oct4 are overexpressed⁷². Prolonged maintenance of the naïve human pluripotent state appears to depend on constitutive overexpression of the reprogramming factors, indicating that the naïve human state is metastable⁷²,⁵⁹. As expected from the mouse system, naïve human pluripotent stem cells are XaXa without XIST expression, and diverge from primed pluripotent cells in both culture requirements and molecular profile as determined by gene expression microarrays⁷². As in mouse, XIST is re-expressed and random XCI
initiated upon differentiation of naïve human cells\textsuperscript{59,72}. The derivation of $X_{a}X_{a}$ human pluripotent cells, either in the primed state under hypoxic conditions or in the naïve state, should in the future allow the modeling of initiation of XCI \textit{ex vivo}.

Yet, the relevance of modeling human XCI \textit{ex vivo} for the XCI process occurring during human embryonic development is still unclear. During derivation and culture of human pluripotent cells, the XCI state diverges from that described for pre-implantation embryos, as the $X_{a}X_{a}$ pattern with biallelic \textit{XIST} coating of pre-implantation embryos has not been detected in cell cultures \textit{ex vivo}. Therefore more studies are warranted but, with the approaches of these recent studies, we can already begin to define the molecular interplay of pluripotency and XCI, akin to the mouse system, and extend these findings to optimize reprogramming to pluripotency.
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CHAPTER 2

THE ROLE OF \textit{Xist} INTRON1

The pluripotency factor-bound intron 1 of \textit{Xist} is dispensable for \(X\) chromosome inactivation and reactivation \textit{in vitro} and \textit{in vivo}.
Summary

X chromosome inactivation (XCI) is a dynamically-regulated developmental process with inactivation and reactivation accompanying the loss and gain of pluripotency, respectively. A functional relationship between pluripotency and lack of XCI has been suggested, whereby pluripotency transcription factors repress the master regulator of XCI, the noncoding transcript \textit{Xist}, by binding to its first intron (intron1). To test this model, we have generated intron1-mutant embryonic stem cells (ESCs) and two independent mouse models. We found that \textit{Xist}'s repression in ESCs, its transcriptional upregulation upon differentiation, and its silencing upon reprogramming to pluripotency are not dependent on intron1. Although we observed subtle effects of intron1-deletion on the randomness of XCI and in the absence of the antisense transcript \textit{Tsix} in differentiating ESCs, these have little relevance \textit{in vivo} as mutant mice do not deviate from Mendelian ratios of allele transmission. Together, our findings demonstrate that intron1 is dispensable for the developmental dynamism of \textit{Xist} expression.

Introduction

To balance the expression of X-linked genes between males and females, female mammals silence one of the two X chromosomes in a developmentally regulated process called X chromosome inactivation (XCI). XCI occurs in two waves in the course of mouse embryogenesis. The earliest form of XCI is imprinted as it is selective for the paternally-inherited X chromosome (Xp) and starts at the 2-4 cell stage in pre-implantation embryo (Huynh and Lee, 2003; Kalantry et al., 2009; Namekawa et al., 2010; Patrat et al., 2009). At the pre-implantation blastocyst stage, imprinted XCI is retained in the trophectoderm and primitive endoderm lineages, but reversed in arising pluripotent epiblast cells yielding a state with two active X chromosomes (XaXa) (Mak et al., 2004; Okamoto et al., 2004; Silva et al., 2009; Williams et al., 2011). Upon
implantation, these epiblast cells establish a random form of XCI that stochastically initiates on the maternal or paternal X chromosome and is retained through the lifetime of mitotic divisions (Kay et al., 1993; Rastan and Robertson, 1985). Similarly, mouse embryonic stem cells (ESCs), which are derived from epiblast cells of the pre-implantation blastocyst, undergo random XCI when induced to differentiate *ex vivo*. The only exception to somatic maintenance of random XCI is inactive X (Xi) reactivation in the germline, which is assumed to be essential for female fertility and occurs in primordial germ cells as they traverse the hindgut to seed the genital ridges (Chuva de Sousa Lopes et al., 2008; de Napoles et al., 2007; Sugimoto and Abe, 2007). Xi reactivation is also a feature of experimentally induced acquisition of pluripotency via transcription factor-mediated reprogramming to induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs), fusion of somatic cells with ESCs, or somatic cell nuclear transfer (Eggan et al., 2000; Maherali et al., 2007; Tada et al., 2001).

The cycles of X chromosome inactivation and reactivation are associated with changes in *Xist* RNA coating, where cells with a Xi display coating by the non-coding *Xist* RNA on the inactive X chromosome, and those with two active X chromosomes lack *Xist* RNA expression (Brockdorff et al., 1991; Brown et al., 1991). *Xist*’s function has been most studied in the random form of XCI in the mouse system, where it is shown to be the critical trigger of XCI. The upregulation of *Xist* RNA and coating of the X at the onset of random XCI immediately lead to transcriptional silencing of X-linked genes and result in the exclusion of RNA polymerase II and the recruitment of repressive chromatin-modifying protein complexes such as the Polycomb complex PRC2 which establishes an accumulation of H3K27me3 (Chaumeil et al., 2006; Chow and Heard, 2009; Plath et al., 2003; Silva et al., 2003). A stereotypic order of changes in chromatin structure culminates in heritable silencing of either the maternally or paternally transmitted X chromosome in each cell of the female adult mammal. *Xist* is essential for
XCI to occur *in cis* as its deletion leads to silencing of the other X chromosome carrying an intact *Xist* allele, regardless of parent-of-origin (Marahrens et al., 1997; Penny et al., 1996). Moreover, the importance of *Xist* regulation for the developmental and sex-specific context of XCI is demonstrated by its sufficiency: overexpression of a X-linked *Xist* cDNA transgene in male mESCs (XY:tetOP-*Xist*) initiates XCI and cell death due to silencing of the single X chromosome (Wutz and Jaenisch, 2000).

*Xist* is transcribed from a larger locus on the X chromosome that has been defined as the minimal critical region for XCI and besides housing *Xist*, contains other protein-coding and noncoding activators and repressors of *Xist*, some of which act in *cis* and others in *trans* (Rastan and Robertson, 1985; reviewed in Minkovsky et al., 2012). The best characterized repressor of *Xist* is its antisense transcript, *Tsix*, that is highly transcribed in epiblast cells of the pre-implantation blastocyst and in undifferentiated mouse ESCs/iPSCs, where *Xist* is repressed (Lee et al., 1999; Sado et al., 2001; Maherali et al., 2007). Deletion of *Tsix* leads to only slight *Xist* upregulation without causing precocious XCI or *Xist* RNA coating in self-renewing, undifferentiated ESCs. However, upon differentiation, XCI is skewed to the *Tsix*-deleted X in female cells heterozygous for the mutant *Tsix* allele (Lee et al., 1999; Lee, 2000; Luikenhuis et al., 2001; Sado et al., 2001). The effect of *Tsix* deletion on *Xist* indicates that it participates in parallel pathways with other regulators of *Xist* repression or activation.

Interestingly, the pluripotency factors Oct4, Sox2, and Nanog, have been implicated in the control of *Xist* expression in pluripotent cells. Navarro and colleagues found that in ESCs, Oct4, Sox2, and Nanog bind the first intron of the *Xist* gene (*intron1*) (Navarro et al., 2008), a finding that has been recapitulated in many genomic datasets and extends to additional pluripotency regulators such as Tcf3 and Prdm14, and early developmental regulators such as Cdx2 (Fig S1A, Loh et al., 2006; Marson et al., 2008; Ma et al., 2011; Erwin et al., 2012). Such genomic regions of extensive pluripotency
transcription factor co-occupancy in the ESC genome occur more commonly than would be expected by chance (Chen et al., 2008). It is thought that these co-bound genomic regions represent functionally important sites and often represent enhancer elements (Chen et al., 2008). Further support for a gene regulatory role of intron1 is that, in ESCs, the intron1 region has a propensity to be in the three-dimensional proximity to the promoter of \textit{Xist} and adopts a DNAse hypersensitive state (Tsai et al., 2008). Additionally, pluripotency factors appear directly linked to \textit{Xist} regulation. Upon Nanog deletion or inducible repression of \textit{Oct4}, \textit{Xist} is upregulated and binding of the pluripotency factors to intron1 is lost (Navarro et al., 2008). In males ESCs, which normally do not upregulate \textit{Xist}, experimentally forced Oct4 repression can even induce \textit{Xist} RNA coating in up to 10% of the cells (Navarro et al., 2008). Another study could not replicate \textit{Xist} RNA coating upon \textit{Oct4} knockdown in male ESCs, but observed biallelic \textit{XCI} in differentiating female ESCs upon \textit{Oct4} knockdown (Donohoe et al., 2009). A role for Nanog in \textit{Xist} suppression is also supported by its expression pattern with regard to domains of Xi reactivation in the pre-implantation blastocyst, where the restriction of Nanog expression demarcates the fraction of cells undergoing reactivation of the imprinted Xi (Silva et al., 2009). Furthermore, pre-implantation embryos lacking Nanog are unable to specify epiblast cells and to lose \textit{Xist} RNA, whereas forced expression of Nanog induces a more rapid loss of \textit{Xist} RNA coating in developing pre-implantation embryos (Silva et al., 2009; Williams et al., 2011).

Together these findings led to the model that pluripotency factor binding to intron1 is critical for repression of \textit{Xist} in undifferentiated XaXa ESCs. However, in the experiments leading to this conclusion, cell identity and therefore likely the expression of many genes were modulated by experimental changes in pluripotency factor expression, which could confound the interpretation that Oct4, Nanog and other pluripotency factors act directly on intron1 of \textit{Xist} to regulate \textit{XCI}. It has also been suggested that the
pluripotency transcription factors control the levels of positive and negative regulators of
Xist, as they are binding to Tsix and the trans-acting activator of XCI, Rnf12 (Donohoe et al., 2009; Gontan et al., 2012; Navarro et al., 2010, 2011) Accordingly, an experiment
directly addressing the functional importance of binding to intron1 showed only subtle
dysregulation of XCI: in female ESCs carrying a heterozygous deletion of intron1 of Xist,
XCI remained suppressed in the undifferentiated state. However, upon differentiation,
Xist appeared more highly expressed from the chromosome carrying the mutation
supporting a role for intron1 in suppressing Xist during differentiation (Barakat et al.,
2011). Furthermore, deletion of intron1 in the context of a transgene carrying the
extended Xist locus moderately increased expression of Xist in undifferentiated ESCs,
which was amplified by simultaneous deletion of the antisense transcript Tsix (Nesterova
et al., 2011). Notably, these results were variable between clones potentially reflecting
the effect of transgene copy number and variations (Nesterova et al., 2011). Binding to
Xist intron1 has also been proposed to govern the switch from imprinted to random XCI
in pre-implantation development (Erwin et al., 2012). In vitro, gel shift assays suggest
that the binding events between Xist’s intron1 and the pluripotency regulator Oct4 and
the trophectoderm regulator Cdx2 are direct but mutually exclusive (Erwin et al., 2012).

Collectively, these findings motivated us to examine the role of Xist intron1
further to test the model wherein pluripotency factor binding silences Xist to prevent XCI
in pluripotent cells, and to determine the role of the intronic region in X chromosome
reactivation events, both in vivo and in vitro.

Results

Generation of conditional Xist intron1 ESC lines

To further define the role of Xist intron1, we used gene targeting to generate a
conditional allele in male and female mouse ESCs. We tested the requirement of intron1
in both sexes since male ESCs are able to undergo XCI upon forced expression of Xist,
providing a sensitive background for monitoring \textit{Xist} regulation independently of other X chromosomes present in a cell (Wutz and Jaenisch, 2000). By contrast, heterozygous female ESCs permit investigation of kinetics of XCI upon induction of differentiation and insight into potential effects on skewing of XCI between the targeted and wildtype chromosome.

To delineate the region of intron1 involved in \textit{Xist} repression, we inspected where pluripotency transcription factors bind within the intron1 region as detected by published ChIP-seq data sets (Marson et al., 2008). We also determined the localization of pluripotency factor DNA binding motifs, and considered sequence conservation across mammals (Fig S2.1). We found that co-occupancy of pluripotency factors occurs in a 600bp region within the full 2.8kb sequence of intron1. Most of the intron1 sequence is not conserved in placental mammals, however, two highly conserved composite Oct4-Sox2 DNA binding motifs, which are found to stabilize a ternary Oct4-Sox2-DNA complex in the expression of many ESC-specific genes, underlie the ChIP-Seq binding peaks of Oct4 and Sox2 (Fig S2.1, Reményi et al., 2003; Marson et al., 2008; Mason et al., 2010, UCSC phastCons). Based on these data, we decided to delete 800 bp of intron1, and subsequently refer to this mutation as ‘intron1’ (Minkovsky/Plath allele, Fig S2.1).

We flanked the 800 bp intron1 region with loxP sites, simultaneously inserting a hygromycin resistance cassette (yielding a targeted allele with 3loxP sites), and subsequently generated experimental (1lox) and control (2lox) alleles by transient expression of Cre recombinase in hemizygously targeted male and heterozygous female ESCs (Fig 2.1, Fig S2.2). To be able to monitor the effects of the deletion of intron1 on \textit{Xist} in \textit{cis} in female cells, we employed genetically polymorphic F1 2-1 female ESCs (129/Cas) carrying a MS2 RNA tag in exon 7 of \textit{Xist} on the 129 allele (Jonkers et al., 2008). Southern blotting and PCR analysis confirmed that intron1 was targeted \textit{in cis} to
the MS2 RNA tag in females ESCs (Fig S 2.2). Male and female targeted ESC lines showed normal chromosome complement upon karyotyping (Fig S 2.2 and data not shown).

Figure 2.1. Generation of male mouse ESCs carrying a conditional Xist intron1 allele. (A) Gene targeting and Southern blotting strategy schematic for male ESCs. Transient expression of Cre recombinase in properly targeted 3lox clones yielded both 2lox (control) and 1lox (experimental) ESC lines. (B-E) Representative images of correctly targeted clones from Southern blot analysis. (F) PCR genotyping with primers A and C shows the presence of the 1lox allele, and with primers B and C that of the 2lox allele. (G) Analysis of Oct4 and Sox2 binding in male ESCs with and without intron 1 by ChIP-qPCR. Location of ChIP-qPCR primer sets used in the subsequent figures. (H) Quantitative ChIP-qPCR analysis of Oct4 binding to regions indicated in (G) and a known positive and negative control for Oct4 binding (Berg et al., 2008) in 2lox and 1lox intron1 male ESCs (two clones each). Values represent the amount precipitated after normalization to input chromatin and are given relative to binding within the positive control region. Error bars indicate standard deviation from triplicate qPCR measurements. * indicates high Ct values for the input samples in the genetically deleted regions, probably arising from support feeder cells.
To confirm that deletion of 800 nucleotides from intron1 sufficiently removes pluripotency factor binding, we performed chromatin immunoprecipitation against Oct4 and Sox2 coupled to quantitative PCR for the targeted region of intron 1, neighboring intronic regions, the Xist promoter, and previously validated control regions (Navarro et al., 2008). Importantly, we did not observe an increase in Oct4 or Sox2 binding in these regions upon deletion of intron1 (Fig 2.1G-I). Thus, compensatory binding at cryptic binding sites upon intron1 deletion appears unlikely.

**Ectopic Xist RNA coating is not observed in intron1 deleted undifferentiated and differentiating male and female ESCs**

To understand the role of intron1 in the regulation of XCI, we first performed fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) to analyze the expression and localization of Xist and Tsix RNA at the single cell level using strand-specific RNA probes. Undifferentiated male and female ESC lines displayed no significant Xist RNA cloud or pinpoint signal in the presence or absence of intron1 (Fig 2.2A/B). The absence of Xist RNA coating in the undifferentiated ESC state was confirmed by the lack of a Xi-like enrichment of H3K27me3, which is known to occur on the Xi when Xist RNA coats (Plath et al., 2003; Silva et al., 2003) in Nanog-positive cells (Fig S2.3A/B). In agreement with this finding, the signal for Tsix was present in the majority of cells in each case and indistinguishable among all tested genotypes (Fig 2.2A).

Upon induction of differentiation by embryoid body (EB) formation, the lack of intron1 did not induce Xist RNA in male ESCs to a level detectable by FISH (data not shown), and yielded no Xi-like enrichment of H3K27me3 (Fig S2.3C/D), indicating that intron1 is not an essential regulator of Xist suppression in differentiating male ESCs when all other regulators of XCI are intact. Heterozygous 1lox/wt female ESCs formed Xist RNA clouds and H3K27me3 Xi foci at comparable rates to 2lox/wt control ESCs (Fig
Xist RNA levels were also similar between undifferentiated and differentiating male and female ESCs, with or without intron1, in RT-PCR experiments (Fig 2.2E). Proper differentiation was confirmed by decrease in Nanog transcript levels (Fig 2.2F). Furthermore, the use of Xist intron1-spanning PCR primer pairs ruled out dramatic secondary effects of intron1 deletion on Xist splicing (data not shown).

Next, we assessed whether XCI is skewed upon intron1 deletion in differentiating female ESCs. The polymorphic 129/cas F1 2-1 female ESC line is known to have a baseline skewing of XCI towards the 129 allele such that approximately 70% of the cells will silence the 129 allele, due to strain-specific haplotypes (Cattanach and Isaacson, 1967). Due to the integration of the MS2 RNA tag on the intron targeted 129 X chromosome, combined RNA-FISH for MS2 and Xist sequences can distinguish between Xist being expressed from the targeted chromosome (positive for both Xist and MS2 signals) and the untargeted X (only marked by the Xist probe) (Fig 2.2C, Jonkers et al., 2008). We found that, at the single cell level, female 1lox intron/wt ESCs consistently had ~15% more cells expressing the MS2-tagged Xist than their 2lox/wt counterparts, in three of four ex vivo differentiation methods (Fig 2.2G, Fig S4). This mild skewing effect in differentiating female ESCs is consistent with published results (Barakat et al., 2011).
Figure 2.2. Analysis of Xist expression in undifferentiated and differentiating female and male ESC lines in the presence and absence of intron1. (A) Strand-specific FISH for Xist RNA (green) and Tsix RNA (red) in undifferentiated male and female ESCs of the indicated genotypes, using RNA probes. Dapi staining (blue) indicates nuclei. Representative images are shown. A male ESC line carrying a dox-inducible Xist allele in the endogenous locus was used as positive control for the Xist staining pattern, at 24 hours of dox addition. (B) Graph summarizes the proportion of dapi-stained nuclei with indicated patterns of Xist RNA based on an experiment as described in (A). Pairs of independent ESC clones of the given genotype were stained and counted. In each case 500 nuclei were assessed. Continued on the next page.
Figure 2.2 cont’d (C) FISH with DNA probes targeting Xist RNA (green) and the MS2 tag (red), respectively, in female ESCs of indicated genotypes at day 10 of EB-differentiation. (D) Graph summarizing the proportion of Nanog-negative cells in day 10 EB-differentiated female ESCs with no, one, or two H3K27me3 Xi-like accumulations. Notably, the number of cells within each H3K27me3 pattern is not statistically different (by Student’s t-test) between presence and absence of intron1. Values are means of counts of independent clones as shown in FigS4D, in each case at least 500 nuclei were assessed. (E) RT-PCR for Xist RNA levels normalized to Gapdh expression from one representative clone of indicated ESC genotypes in the undifferentiated state (ESC) and at day 5 of retinoic-acid differentiation (d5 RA). Error bars indicate standard deviation from triplicate RT-PCR measurements in one experiment. (F) As in (E), except that Nanog transcript levels were analyzed. (G) Quantification of allele-specific Xist RNA cloud patterns from the experiment shown in (C) at day 6 and day 10 of EB-differentiation, given as mean of values from counts of two independent ESC clones of the indicated genotype. Xist expression from the 129 chromosome (targeted chromosome) is detected by both the Xist and MS2 probes, while Xist expression from the CAST chromosome is only detected by the Xist probe. The graph depicts the percentage of cells where the intron1-targeted 129 chromosome is coated by Xist RNA, as identified by co-localization of the Xist and MS2 signals. * denotes p<0.05 by Student’s t-test with 500 Xist clouds analyzed for each sample.
Genetic interaction of \textit{Xist} intron1 with \textit{Tsix}

Next, we investigated the possibility that the intron1-dependent skewing of XCI in differentiating female ESCs represents a mild effect on the intron1-deleted \textit{X} chromosome at the transition to the differentiated state. We reasoned that such an effect may be more strongly revealed in the absence of other regulators of \textit{Xist} and sought to assay such an effect on a 'sensitized' background for \textit{Xist} transcription. \textit{Tsix} represents the prime candidate for a redundant \textit{Xist} repressor that could compensate to repress \textit{Xist} in the absence of intron1. One study supports the view that a functional role for the intron can be uncovered in the absence of \textit{Tsix}, as male ESCs with randomly integrated genomic \textit{Xist} transgenes lacking intron1 and a functional \textit{Tsix} allele dysregulated the expression of the transgenic \textit{Xist} (Nesterova et al., 2011). We therefore performed the above analyses in male ESCs lacking intron1 in the endogenous \textit{Xist} allele on the background of a previously characterized \textit{Tsix} loss of function mutation at the endogenous locus (Fig 2.3, Lee et al., 1999; Luikenhuis et al., 2001; Sado et al., 2001). We targeted the disruption of \textit{Tsix} to both 2lox and 1lox intron male ESCs using a construct from the Sado lab that inserts a splice acceptor-IRES\textbeta Geo cassette in exon 2 of \textit{Tsix} resulting in an early transcriptional stop (Fig 2.3A). Correct targeting and loss of the \textit{Tsix} transcript were confirmed by Southern blotting and absence of the FISH signal for \textit{Tsix} after targeting (Fig 2.3B/C).

As expected, in the presence of intron1 (2lox intron1), \textit{Tsix} deletion in male ESCs induced a mild transcriptional upregulation of \textit{Xist} RNA compared to XY:2lox/\textit{Tsix}-wt ESCs in RT-PCR experiments, reaching a level found in female ESCs (Fig 2.3D). Upon differentiation XY:2lox intron/\textit{Tsix}-Stop ESCs further upregulated \textit{Xist} transcript levels ~5 fold (Fig 2.3D). However, this induction was rarely correlated with an \textit{Xist} RNA cloud signal detectable by RNA FISH in or an Xi-like H3K27me3 accumulation (Fig 2.3E-H)
before and after induction of differentiation, in agreement with previous reports (Luikenhuis et al., 2001; Sado et al., 2002). Combined deletion of intron1 and Tsix did not alter the Xist status in undifferentiated ESCs, but upon induction of differentiation resulted in a Xist RNA cloud-like signal in FISH experiments in 3-6% of cells compared to 0.2-0.8% in differentiating XY:2lox intron/Tsix-Stop cells (Fig 2.3E/G). We did not, however, see any significant intron1-dependent effect on Xist RNA levels by RT-PCR comparing XY:2lox intron/Tsix-Stop and XY:1lox intron/Tsix-Stop cells (Fig 2.3D) or an increase in the number of H3K27me3 Xi-like accumulations (Fig 2.3F/H). Thus, even though Xist RNA was induced in a slightly larger proportion of differentiating cells in the absence of both Tsix and intron1 than in the absence of either Tsix or intron1, this upregulation does not appear to be sufficient to mediate H3K27me3 enrichment on the targeted X chromosome, suggesting that the RNA does not efficiently coat the chromosome in these cells or that the recruitment of Polycomb proteins is affected. We conclude that these experiments reveal a subtle role of intron1 in the control in Xist expression, which may be related to the weak skewing phenotype of XCI described above for differentiating intron1-mutant heterozygous female ESCs (Fig 2.3, Fig S2.4).
Figure 2.3. Xist RNA pattern in male ESCs lacking Tsix and intron1. (A) Gene targeting and Southern blotting strategy schematic for the generation of the Tsix-Stop allele in male ESCs according to Sado et al., 2001 using the pAA2Δ1.7 targeting vector. (B) Male 2lox and 1lox intron1 ESC clones were targeted with the Tsix-Stop allele. A correctly targeted 2lox intron1/Tsix-Stop male ESC clone is shown in this Southern blot analysis. (C) Strand-specific FISH for Tsix RNA (red) in undifferentiated male ESCs of the indicated genotypes, using an RNA probe, indicates the absence of the Tsix FISH signal in Tsix-Stop targeted clones. (D) Graph summarizing the transcript levels for Nanog and Xist normalized to Gapdh transcript levels as determined by RT-PCR from a representative clone of each genotype in the undifferentiated state (ES) and at day 5 of retinoic acid-differentiation (d5 RA). Control Xist RNA levels from wildtype undifferentiated male and female ESCs are shown on the left. Error bars indicate standard deviation from triplicate RT-PCR measurements in one experiment. (E) Graph summarizing the percentage of undifferentiated ESCs with and without a Xist RNA cloud-like pattern. Two independent male ESC clones for each genotype were analyzed by Xist RNA FISH with a RNA probe and 500 nuclei were assessed. (F) As in (E), except that the percentage of undifferentiated ESCs with and without a H3K27me3 Xi-like signal is given. (G) Xist RNA cloud quantification as in (E), except that Nanog-negative cells were quantified upon day 10 of EB differentiation. (H) As in (F) for H3K27me3 patterns at day 10 of EB differentiation in indicated ESC lines.

In a second assay, we tested the consequence of intron1 deletion upon modulation of global Oct4 transcript levels. We first confirmed the previously reported relationship between the decrease of Oct4 levels and Xist RNA induction (Navarro et al., 2008; Donohoe et al., 2009). Specifically, upon Oct4 depletion in the male ZHBTc4 ESC
line, in which Oct4 expression can be silenced acutely by the addition of doxycycline, Xist RNA levels were induced almost 100-fold 96 hours post induction of Oct4 repression (Fig S2.5A), and Xist RNA could be detected by FISH in a small number of cells (Fig S2.5B/C). Notably, we observed that Oct4 transcript levels drop with faster kinetics than Xist RNA levels increase, suggesting that the effect of Oct4 on intron1 is indirect and may require efficient differentiation, which occurs at 96 hours post Oct4 repression as indicated by the loss of the pluripotency factor Nanog (Fig S2.5D). In agreement with this conclusion, siRNA-mediated knockdown of Oct4 in ESCs did not increase Xist RNA levels more than two-fold after 72 hours confirming a previous report (Fig S2.5E, Donohoe et al., 2009). Furthermore, the absence of intron1 did not significantly alter Xist RNA levels in female ESCs or male ESCs lacking Tsix in Oct4 knockdown conditions (Fig S2.5E). These data indicate that the slight increase in Xist levels immediately upon Oct4 depletion are independent of intron1.

**Intron1 acts as an enhancer in a reporter assay in differentiating ESCs**

The model of pluripotency-factor binding to intron1 to repress Xist motivated us to directly assess whether intron1 behaved as a silencer in ESCs in a reporter assay. We transfected constructs with intron1 or control sequences upstream of a minimal promoter driving luciferase and did not see intron1-dependent decreases in reporter activity (data not shown). The small effect of intron1 deletion on Xist RNA levels detected in differentiating ESCs in the absence of Tsix motivated us to revisit these experiments and instead investigate whether Xist intron1 represents a developmentally-regulated enhancer that becomes active upon induction of differentiation. We therefore tested transactivation activity of intron1 in undifferentiated and differentiating ESCs using stably integrated luciferase reporter constructs (Fig 2.4). Male ESCs were electroporated with hygromycin resistance-bearing constructs containing either the part of intron1 that
we deleted in our experimental cell lines, or two control sequences representing the upstream and downstream flanking regions of the intron1 region (Fig 2.4A). The experimental intron1 region (B in Fig 2.4B) was cloned in triple copy to amplify any putative enhancer activity of this region. Pooled clones were subjected to monolayer differentiation by LIF withdrawal with and without retinoic acid treatment. Only cells bearing the intron1 construct covering the pluripotency factor binding site showed a robust increase in luciferase activity upon differentiation (Fig 2.4B). In agreement with the notion that intron1 does not act as an active enhancer in undifferentiated ESCs, we did not find a histone acetylation mark characteristic of active enhancers, namely H3K27ac, examining our own and published Chip-Seq data sets from ESCs, despite binding of intron1 by a battery of pluripotency factors and p300 in undifferentiated ESCs (mouse ENCODE, Creyghton et al., 2010, data not shown).
Figure 2.4. Enhancer assay of Xist intron1. (A) Schematic representation of genomic fragments of the entire genomic intron1 regions cloned upstream of a luciferase reporter gene driven by a minimal promoter. The intronic region was broken up in three parts, with B representing the part bound by pluripotency factors and flanked by loxP sites as described in Figure 2.1 (Minkovsky/Plath allele), and A and C representing regions not bound by the pluripotency factors in ChIP-Seq experiments (Fig S1). Note that B was concatenated 3X in the reporter construct. (B) Three independent stable cell lines were generated by electroporation of male ESCs with the three constructs described in (A). Cells carrying the reporter constructs were selected with hygromycin, and an equal number of cells was plated and maintained in the undifferentiated state or differentiated for d3 and d5 by LIF withdrawal and/or retinoic acid (RA) addition. After treatment 1/10th of the cells in the well were analyzed by luciferase assay. For each reporter construct, values represent mean luminescence units normalized to values from the respective cell line in the undifferentiated state, n=3, ±1SD.

We also considered recently published spatial organization data which demonstrated that the Xist gene lies in a topologically associating domain (TAD) with genes encoding the non-coding RNAs Ftx and Jpx/Enox, and the protein-coding genes Rnf12/Rlim, Zcchc13, and Slc16a2 (Nora et al., 2012). It has been proposed that promoters and enhancers predominantly interact (loop) within TADs (Dixon et al., 2012; Nora et al., 2012). Notably, significant intra-TAD contacts originating from within intron1 of Xist, indicative of putative enhancer/promoter looping, were only found in differentiated and not in undifferentiated ESCs (Nora et al., 2012) (Fig S2.6A), consistent with our finding of reporter activity upon differentiation. However, similar to our result that Xist levels in female and males ESCs did not significantly change in the absence of
intron1, we also did not see intron1-dependent transcriptional differences in the three genes that come in contact with intron1 within the Xist-containing TAD, before and during differentiation (Fig S2.6B). Thus, even though intron1 is pluripotency factor-bound in ESCs, it may only gain significant enhancer activity upon differentiation though still not to an extent where deletion affects transcription of Xist or of neighboring protein-coding genes.

Together these ex vivo studies in undifferentiated and differentiating male and female ESCs point to a minor role for intron1 in the regulation of Xist expression, uncovered only when another Xist repressor is deleted, and some aspect of X chromosome choice (potentially also through slight modulation of Xist RNA levels). These data do not support intron1 as a main aspect of the mechanism of transcriptional repression of Xist, at least in this tissue culture model.

**Mice are normal in the absence of intron1**

Next, we assayed the significance of intron1 in vivo. Our male ESCs deleted for intron1 (1lox) were injected into C57BL/6 blastocysts. Chimeras were obtained at high efficiency and bred with C57BL/6 females to obtain germline transmission of the mutant allele. Importantly, the 1lox intron1 allele showed normal propagation through the maternal or paternal germline and mice completely lacking intron1 (crossing 1lox/1lox females with 1lox males) could be efficiently bred without any female-specific defect (Fig 2.5A). Since X chromosome reactivation occurs in the female germline and is likely essential for female fertility, we assessed litter size of the F2 generation of female homozygous knockout mice, finding their litter sizes unaffected (data not shown).

To strengthen these observations of normal transmission of the intron1 mutation and rule out that genetic background obscured a potential intron1 phenotype in vivo, we generated a second mouse model carrying an independent intron1 mutation. We
generated mice using previously published females 129/cas F1 female ESCs in which a larger (1.815 kb) region was deleted on the 129 X chromosome (Barakat/Gribnau allele) (Fig S2.1A, Barakat et al., 2011). We previously observed a slight upregulation of Xist RNA levels on the deleted chromosome in differentiating female ESCs, in agreement with our results indicating skewing of X-inactivation towards the deleted chromosome. Importantly, this second mouse model also displayed normal mendelian transmission of the intron1 lox allele (Fig 2.5B).

To assay whether random XCI has occurred in female mice carrying a paternally inherited X chromosome lacking intron1 and a maternally inherited wildtype X chromosome, and whether the lack of the intron leads to any skewing of XCI in vivo, we analyzed the allele-specific expression of Xist and two X-linked genes, Mecp2 and G6pdx, in polymorphic heterozygous females (1lox<sub>C57BL/6</sub>/wt<sub>CAST/Ei</sub>) and a wildtype control (wt<sub>C57BL/6</sub>/wt<sub>CAST/Ei</sub>), respectively, where the C57BL6 X chromosome was transmitted from the father and the CAST/Ei wildtype X from the mother, by semi-quantitative RT-PCR on RNA isolated from various tissues (Fig 2.5C-E). In these experiments, we used the Barakat/Gribnau mouse model described in Figure 5B (Fig S2.1A). Normally, the paternal X chromosome initially undergoes imprinted XCI, which is reversed in the epiblast cells of the pre-implantation blastocyst to allow subsequent random XCI. The intron1 region has been implicated to be important for Xi-reactivation in the ICM, and thus, if the absence of intron1 prevents reactivation of imprinted XCI, we may observe non-random XCI in the adult mouse (Navarro et al., 2008).

However, we did not find differences in allele-specific expression pattern in the presence and absence of intron1 in heterozygous female mice (Fig 2.5C-E). As expected, the C57BL/6 Xist allele is more often expressed than the CAST/Ei X, consistent with a modifier effect, likely resulting in more cells with an inactivated C57BL/6 X (Cattanach and Isaacson, 1967). Because of the stochastic and clonal nature
of XCI patterns in the adult mouse, variations in skewing towards \textit{Xist} RNA from the C57BL/6 allele ranged from 50-90\% (Fig 2.5C,E). Notably, we did not see a preference of \textit{Xist} upregulation on the intron1-deleted X chromosome in tissues of the adult mouse \textit{in vivo}, albeit we observed slightly skewed \textit{Xist} RNA levels in heterozygous differentiating female ESCs carrying the same mutant intron1 allele (Barakat et al., 2011). In agreement with this notion, the X-linked genes \textit{Mecp2} and \textit{G6pdx}, both subject to silencing on the Xi, showed reciprocal and intron1-independent levels of expression from the C57BL/6 chromosome compared to \textit{Xist}, as would be expected from the fact that the \textit{Xist}-expressing chromosome is more likely to be silent (Fig 2.5D/E). These data suggest that the paternal transmission of the intron1 mutation does not interfere with reactivation of imprinted XCI and subsequent random XCI. A reverse cross in which the maternal allele lacked intron1 also resulted in random XCI (data not shown). In summary, the intron1 genomic region is dispensable in the mouse and does not critically control \textit{Xist} expression and skewing of XCI \textit{in vivo}. 
Figure 2.5. Transmission of the intron1 mutation in vivo. (A) Table summarizing the number and genotypes of offsprings from indicated mouse crosses using the intron1 allele generated in the Plath lab (see Figure 2.1). (B) As in (A), except that mice carrying a second, independent intron1 deletion generated by the Gribnau lab were crossed (see Figure S1 for comparison of alleles, Barakat et al., 2011). (C) Allele-specific RT-PCR analysis of Xist RNA detecting a length polymorphism that distinguishes Xist RNA originating from the C57BL/6 and CAST X chromosome in organs of one female wildtype mouse and two littermate heterozygous 1lox/wt mice obtained by crossing a C57BL/6 male (with and without the intron1 1lox allele) with a wildtype CAST/Ei female. Panel includes controls on the left mixing pure C57BL/6 and CAST/Ei brain cDNA template in given ratios. Numbers below the tissue samples represent the relative band intensity for the C57BL/6 and CAST/Ei Xist allele determined by comparison with the control samples. (D) Examination of tissues as in (C) for allelic expression of X-linked genes MeCP2 (top) and G6pdx (bottom) by RFLP RT-PCR. Panel includes controls (left) from pure C57BL/6 or CAST/Ei mice as well as RNA isolated from a polymorphic C57BL/6 and CAST/Ei ES cell line. (E) Graph averaging the allele-specific expression data in (C) and (D) across all tissue and mice per genotype ±1 SD.
Intron1 is not required for loss of Xist RNA upon reprogramming to iPSCs

While there was no dramatic effect on XCI state in vivo, we sought to understand the requirement for intron1 in Xist silencing associated with reprogramming to iPSCs. We have shown previously that female iPSCs derived from mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) carry two active X chromosomes, where Xist is efficiently repressed and Tsix upregulated, as seen in mouse ESCs (Maherali et al., 2007). Another study suggested that Xi-reactivation occurs late in reprogramming at around the time pluripotency genes become expressed, again suggesting that pluripotency transcription factors could contribute to Xi-reactivation and the silencing of Xist, potentially via binding to intron1 (Stadtfeld et al., 2008). To test the role of intron1 in the Xist silencing process during reprogramming, we bred male mice carrying the 2lox intron1 allele (obtained upon blastocyst injection of our male 2lox ESCs described in Figure 2.1, Minkovsky/Plath allele) with female mice heterozygous for an Xist knockout allele (Marahrens et al., 1997), yielding female XX:2lox intron/ΔXist MEFs. Due to the presence of the Xist knockout allele, the X chromosome bearing the intron1 allele is exclusively inactivated in vivo by normal developmental mechanisms (Marahrens et al., 1998). MEFs isolated from d14.5 embryos had uniform Xist coating (Fig 2.6C) and were transduced with retroviruses encoding the reprogramming factors Oct4, Sox2, and Klf4, and subsequently infected with adenovirus encoding Cre recombinase at day 4 of reprogramming to efficiently delete the intron1 region or with titer-matched empty adenovirus in control samples (Fig 2.6A). This experimental setup allowed us to test the role of intron1 on reprogramming efficiency for the same infected fibroblast population. Genotyping confirmed that Ad-Cre addition resulted in efficient deletion of the intron1 region (Fig 2.6B). To test whether intron1 deletion affects the efficiency of reprogramming, we determined the number of Nanog-expressing colonies at day 13 after reprogramming factor introduction as Nanog expression has been shown to mark
faithfully reprogrammed cells in retroviral reprogramming experiments (Maherali et al., 2007). We found a comparable number of Nanog-positive colonies in the presence and absence of intron1 (Fig 2.6D). Normally, at this point of reprogramming, Xist RNA coating is just lost in Nanog-positive cells (Tchieu/Plath et al, manuscript in preparation). In agreement with this notion, an examination of all Nanog-positive cells for the presence or absence of a Xist RNA cloud demonstrated that nearly all Nanog-positive cells carrying the 2lox intron1 allele (Ad-Null reprogramming cultures) lack a Xist RNA cloud at d13 of reprogramming (Fig 2.6C/E). Importantly, even in the absence of intron1 (Ad-Cre samples), Nanog-positive cells displayed loss of the Xist RNA cloud (Fig 2.6C/E) and of the Xi-like H3K27me3 focus (data not shown). Furthermore, from the Ad-Cre treated reprogramming cultures, 14 iPSC clones were isolated and clonally propagated and all confirmed to have lost both intron1 and the Xist RNA cloud, demonstrating the efficient deletion of the intronic sequence early in reprogramming (Fig 2.6F). To ensure that the ability of an intron1-deleted inactive X chromosome to downregulate Xist was not due to intron 1-dependent events occurring within the first four days of reprogramming, i.e. prior to Cre-mediated deletion, we also reprogrammed MEFs carrying a germline transmitted 1lox intron allele. These XX:1lox intron/ΔXist MEFs displayed normal Xist RNA coating before reprogramming (detectable in 95% of the cells) and lost Xist RNA in Nanog-positive colonies (Fig 2.6H). When comparing to sibling XX:2lox intron/ΔXist MEFs, MEFs lacking intron1 form Nanog-positive colonies with similar efficiencies (Fig 2.6I). Together, these studies rule out that Xist intron1 is necessary for the downregulation of Xist in reprogramming to pluripotency.
Figure 2.6. The absence of intron1 on the Xi does not interfere with loss of Xist RNA coating upon reprogramming of MEFs to iPSCs. (A) Schematic representation of the reprogramming experiment with female MEFs bearing the conditional intron1 allele on the Xi and a Xist knockout allele on the Xa. Reprogramming was induced by infection with pMX retroviruses encoding the reprogramming factors and the reprogramming culture was split at day three post-infection. Deletion of the conditional intron1 allele was induced by delivery of 1X or 10X adenoviral particles carrying Cre-recombinase performed at day 4. Control 1X Ad-Null treatment was done in parallel. At day 13 of reprogramming, efficient deletion of intron1 was assessed by genotyping, reprogramming efficiency assessed by Nanog-positive colony count, and loss of Xist RNA coating in Nanog-positive cells was examined by IF/FISH. In addition, individual colonies were...
picked, expanded, and analyzed further. (B) PCR genotyping for the presence of the 2lox and 1lox intron1 alleles in reprogramming cultures at day 13, using primers pairs A and C (top panel) or B and C (bottom panel) (as in Figure 2.1F), indicates efficient deletion of intron1 upon Ad-Cre treatment. 1 and 2 represent independent reprogramming samples. The asterisk marks the wt allele, which is attributed to the presence of feeder cells in reprogramming cultures. (C) FISH of starting MEFs before introduction of PMX retrovirus displaying Xist coating (left) and Immunostaining/FISH images (right) of representative Nanog-positive colonies in reprogramming cultures treated with Ad-Null and Ad-Cre, respectively, at day 13 of reprogramming, showing Nanog expression (red), FISH for Xist RNA using a DNA probe (green), and dapi (Blue). Note that Nanog-positive cells at this stage of reprogramming only display a biallelic pinpoint signal with the double-stranded DNA probe, which can be attributed to Tsix expression. (D) Graph summarizing reprogramming efficiency by counting Nanog+ colonies at day 13, (E) Graph showing the percentage of Nanog-positive cells without a Xist RNA cloud at day 13 of reprogramming. All Nanog+ cells (number is given) on the reprogramming culture coverslip were counted and analyzed for the Xist signal. (F) The graph summarizes the percentage of Nanog-positive nuclei with and without Xist RNA clouds in individually expanded iPSC clones from Ad-Null or Ad-Cre reprogramming cultures (200 nuclei counted for each sample). Genotyping of all iPSC clones confirmed that intron1 was deleted in all iPSCs expanded from Ad-Cre reprogramming cultures. (H) MEFs were obtained from XX:1lox intron/ΔXist embryos and reprogrammed with Oct4, Sox2, and Klf4. Immunostaining/FISH images show the presence of normal Xist RNA coating in the starting MEFs and the absence of Xist RNA coating in resulting Nanog-positive colonies at day 13 of reprogramming. (I) Graph showing counts of Nanog-positive colonies at day 13 of reprogramming for two different XX:1lox intron/ΔXist MEF preparations (A and B, from different matings) and one XX:2lox intron/ΔXist line.

Discussion

In summary, our data argue that Xist intron1 does not represent an essential tether coupling repression of both Xist and XCI to the pluripotent state. ESCs lacking intron1 do not dysregulate Xist expression in the undifferentiated state nor upon in vitro differentiation, reprogramming to the iPSC state leads to Xist repression on an Xi lacking intron1, and mice lacking intron1 do not display any of the gross reproductive abnormalities that would be expected if XCI was perturbed.

The deletion of intron1 represents a clean experimental system to probe the functional role of a genomic element that displays very strong pluripotency transcription factor binding, unhampered by the secondary effects on initiation of XCI associated with global modulation of protein factors implicated in the maintenance of the pluripotent state. While correlative binding studies were supported in part by Xist dysregulation in ESC lines with inducible deletions of the pluripotency factors Nanog and Oct4, our study cautions against extrapolating these findings to the behavior of wildtype ESCs and mice. A compromised pluripotency factor network could unmask the mild intron1 contribution to the Xist repressive pathway. In the case of the ZHBTc4 cell line, this altered network
may show Rnf12 upregulation followed by downregulation of the pluripotency factor Rex1, sufficient to trigger XCI in male cells independent of intron1 (Barakat et al., 2011a; Gontan et al., 2012). We also noted that ZHBTc4 ESCs lack pinpoint Tsix signal and draw a corollary between their Xist upregulation and our male ESCs deleted for Tsix (that, when differentiating, have a significantly greater number of Xist clouds upon deletion of intron1).

In light of the two mild phenotypes (skewing effect of deleting intron1 in female ESCs heterozygous for the allele and the increase in Xist clouds in Tsix and intron1-deleted differentiating male ESCs), we hypothesize that intron1 loss leads to mild destabilization of Xist transcriptional repression at the transition to the differentiated state, in the narrow development window of XCI initiation. Unable to capture a transcriptional difference in Xist levels at the onset of in vitro differentiation, we believe that more sensitive methods of transcript quantitation or investigation of chromatin state may address this hypothesis.

We noted a discrepancy between the ex vivo XCI skewing phenotype and the normally occurring in vivo XCI choice in the absence of the intron. This lack of intron1 deletion effect in adult mice and in ESC differentiation induced by bFGF/Activin (Supp Fig 2.5) which is sensitive to clonogenic skewing of XCI because of serial passage and outgrowth of few cells (unlike monolayer differentiation, Chenoweth and Tesar, 2010), suggests that Xist regulation is more robust in vivo than in vitro in the absence of the intron1. For instance, slightly different cis-acting elements could be used in vivo and in vitro for regulating Xist expression. Thus, the cell culture-observed favoring of the intron-deleted Xist could not be organismally relevant or the stochastic developmental nature of XCI could overshadow the effect.
It seems that the regulation of Xist, at the helm of a chromosome-wide program of gene expression, is genetically ensured by a complex multifactor mechanism. The dispensability of intron1 for repression of Xist may be mouse-specific as mice appear to be unique in the functionality of Tsix and also in the sufficiency of Xist activators such as Rnf12 to elicit Xist upregulation: addition of one copy of Rnf12 is sufficient to drive Xist expression in undifferentiated female ESCs (Jonkers et al., 2009). Other eutherians such as bovines and humans, with truncated and likely non-functional TSIX, may rely more on intron1-dependent mechanisms for Xist repression (Chureau et al., 2002). Therefore, evolution of the overlapping Tsix gene and the network of XCI activators in mice may have become the dominant mechanism in Xist repression.
Figure S2.1. Characterization of the targeted region of Xist intron1. The targeted region of Xist intron1 contains published ChIP-seq pluripotency factor binding peaks and captures conserved Oct4-Sox2 binding motifs. (A) Genome browser (http://genome.ucsc.edu/) view of the Xist locus (exons and introns are indicted; genome build mm9) with Chip-Seq peaks (Marson et al., 2008) for Oct4, Sox2, Nanog, and Tcf3, and PhastCons mammalian conservation track. Yellow triangles denote loxP sites for the Minkovsky/Plath allele as in the Figure 1 targeting scheme, and for the Barakat/Gribnau intron1 allele (Barakat et al., 2011). Red tick marks denote positions of Oct4-Sox2 DNA sequence motifs identified by Contrast Motif Finder (Mason et al., 2010). (B) One of two highly scoring Oct4-Sox2 motifs (*) is shown by genomic sequence alignment from six eutherian mammals with invariant motif positions highlighted.
Figure S2.2. Generation of the conditional Xist intron1 allele in female mouse ESCs. (A) Gene targeting and Southern analysis strategy schematic for female mouse ESCs (F1 2-1; derived from a F1 cross of 129SV/Jae with CAST/ei) with an Xist RNA tag of 16 MS2 sequence repeats in exon 7 of the Xist gene on the 129 allele (Jonkers et al., 2008). (B,C) Targeting of the MS2-tagged X chromosome was confirmed with X allele-discriminating BmtI digest and Southern blotting with the 3' probe. (D) Transient expression of Cre recombinase in properly targeted clones yielded both 2lox (control)
and 1lox (experimental) ESC clones as identified by Southern blotting. (E) PCR genotyping with primers A and C was used to detect the 1lox allele and with primers B and C to detect the 2lox allele. (F) Cytogenetic analysis of targeted ESC clones indicated a normal karyotype. For male V6.5 ESCs targeted for Xist intron1 (3lox clone) all twenty spreads displayed a normal male karyotype as shown in the representative image. 2lox and 1lox subclones of this line were injected into blastocysts and resulting chimeric mice were bred for germline transmission to establish Xist intron1 mouse colonies. (G) For 2lox/wt female ESCs (clone 1) 19 of 20 analyzed cells displayed a normal female karyotype as shown.

Figure S2.3. Characterization of Xist RNA coating in the absence and presence of intron1, by assessing H3K27 trimethylation on the Xi. (A) Immunostaining for Nanog (green) and H3K27me3 (red) in undifferentiated male and female ESC lines of the indicated genotypes. Dapi staining (blue) indicates nuclei. Representative images are shown. A male ESC line carrying a dox-inducible Xist allele in the endogenous locus, cultured in the presence of dox for 24 hrs, was used as positive control for detection of Xist RNA coating and H3K27me3 enrichment on the Xi. (B) Graph summarizes the proportion of dapi-stained nuclei with the indicated patterns of H3K27me3 for the stainings described in (A). Pairs of independent clones of given genotype were stained and counted. In each case 500 nuclei were counted. (C) As in (A), except that ESCs differentiated for ten days via embryoid bodies were analyzed by immunostaining. (D) Graph summarizing the proportion of dapi-stained, Nanog-negative nuclei with indicated H3K27me3 patterns for differentiated ESC lines as shown in (C).
Figure S2.4. Analysis of allele-specific coating of Xist in female ESC clones with and without intron1, subjected to various in vitro differentiation methods. F1 2-1 ESC lines carrying the MS2 tag and the indicated intron1 mutation within Xist on the 129 allele were differentiated for five days by LIF withdrawal alone, LIF withdrawal and addition of all trans retinoic acid, and by bFGF and Activin A treatment over four passages. As described in Figure 2C in FISH experiments with Xist and MS2 probe, Xist expression from the 129 chromosome (targeted chromosome), with and without intron1, respectively (2lox or 1lox), is detected by both the Xist and MS2 FISH probes (DNA probes), while Xist expression from the CAST chromosome is only detected by the Xist probe. The graph depicts the percentage of cells where the intron1-targeted 129 chromosome is coated by Xist RNA, as identified by co-localization of the Xist and MS2 signals. The number of Xist clouds analyzed for each sample is given.
Figure S2.5. *Xist* levels upon acute downregulation of Oct4 in ESCs in the presence and absence of intron1. (A) The ZHBTc4 doxycycline-repressible Oct4 male ESCs line (Niwa et al., 2000) was treated for the indicated time with doxycycline (dox) and assayed for Oct4 and Xist RNA levels by RT-PCR. Values are normalized to Gapdh mRNA levels and given relative to levels in untreated ZHBTc4 ESCs. Mean values are plotted on a log-10 scale ±SD from triplicate RT-PCR measurements. (B) Representative image of oligo-based, strand-specific RNA FISH (Raj et al., 2008) for *Xist* RNA (red) at 96 hours after dox addition. Dapi-staining indicates nuclei. (C) The graph summarizes the percentage of ZHBTc4 ESCs with a *Xist* RNA cloud signal detected by oligo-based RNA FISH at the indicated time points post dox-addition, as shown in (B). At each timepoint 500 nuclei were assessed. (D) Representative immunostaining images for Nanog (green) and H3K27me3 (red) before and 96 hours after addition of dox, indicating efficient loss of Nanog and therefore induction of differentiation without onset of Xi-like H3K27me3 staining pattern at 96 hrs of dox addition. (E) Heterozygous female ESCs with and without intron1, respectively (2lox/wt versus 1lox/wt), and male ESCs lacking Tsix, with and without intron1, were treated with siRNA targeting Oct4 or GFP as control, and levels of *Xist* RNA (top) and Oct4 transcripts (bottom) were measured by RT-PCR 72 hours later. Values were normalized to Gapdh transcript levels and are shown relative to levels in siGFP treated ESCs and represent mean ±SD from triplicate measurements.
Figure S2.6. Expression analysis of genes in the Xist containing TAD in ESCs with and without intron1. (A) IGV browser view of significant contacts between the Xist intron1 genomic region and other genomic regions within the Xist-containing topological associating domain (TAD) (intra-TAD E events) in indicated cells types. These data are taken from (Nora et al., 2012). Blue ticks indicate the genomic regions that come in close contact to the intron1 region of Xist. (B) Graphs summarizing RT-PCR for Zcchc13, Slc16a2, and Rnf12 mRNA levels normalized to Gapdh transcript levels, in ESCs of the indicated genotypes in the undifferentiated state and at day 5 of retinoic-acid differentiation (n=3, ± 1 SD). These genes are in contact with the intron1 genomic region as indicated in (A).
CHAPTER 2 METHODS

*Generation of mutant mouse ESCs and mice*

*Xist* intron1 transgenic mice analyzed in Figures 5B-5E were generated from polymorphic $X^{\text{Xist}:2\text{lox intron (129/Sv)} \times X^{\text{Xist: wt (CAST/Ei)}}}$ ESC line 29, in which a 1.8 kb region of *Xist* intron1 was replaced by a floxed neomycin cassette (Barakat et al., 2011). Germline transmission was verified by genotyping for the presence of the neomycin cassette integrated in the intron1 region of *Xist* and XX:2lox/wt females were bred to males expressing pCAGGS-Cre, to loop out the selection cassette. Loopout of the selection cassette was verified by PCR on genomic tail-tip derived DNA. All other intron1- mutant ESC lines and mice carrying the Plath/Minkovsky allele were derived from a targeting construct generated by cloning the respective genomic fragments representing the 5’ and 3’ homology regions into the pCRII plasmid vector upon PCR amplification (see Supp Table 1 for list of primers used). The 800 bp of intron sequence with a 5’ loxP site were ligated between a 2.2 kb 5’ homology arm and 3’ 2.6 kb homology arm by *AgeI/NotI* subcloning. A positive-negative CMV-HygroTK cassette flanked by loxP sites was inserted into the unique *NotI* site. A diphtheria toxin gene (PGK-DTA) was inserted into a unique backbone *EcoRI* site. 40 µg of plasmid were linearized by *MluI* digestion and electroporated into male ESCs (V6.5 line; F1 between C57BL/6 and 129SV/Jae) and into female F1 2-1 ESCs carrying the MS2 tag in the final large exon of *Xist* (F1 between C57BL/6 and CAST/Ei) cells co-cultured with drug-resistant DR4 MEFs (Jonkers et al., 2008; Tucker et al., 1997). Hygromycin selection (140 µg/ml) was started one day after and clones were screened by *SpeI/KpnI* digest and both 5’ and 3’ external probes. *Bmfl* digest and 3’ external probe were used to assess allelism of targeting in F1 2-1 clones. Targeting efficiency was 30% in V6.5 and 1% in F12-1 cells. Two independent V6.5 and one F1 2-1 clones were expanded, electroporated with pPAC-Cre plasmid, and selected with G418 (300 µg/mL) for 8 days. Southern blot screening was
performed with a 5’ probe and XbaI digest for 1lox and Spel/Kpnl for 2lox clones. All subsequent intron1 genotyping was performed by PCR. For intron1/Tsix-Stop double transgenic ESC clones, XY:2lox and XY:1lox V6.5 clones were targeted with pAA2Δ1.7 and screened by Southern blot as previously described (Sado et al., 2001). XY:1lox V6.5 ES cells were microinjected into C57BL/6 blastocysts to produce chimeric mice following standard procedures. High agouti coat color-contributing chimeras were bred with C57BL/6 females for germline transmission. All animal experiments were in accordance with the legislation of the Erasmus MC Animal Experimental Commission and the UCLA Animal Research Committee.

Cell culture, differentiation, and reprogramming methods

ESCs were grown on irradiated DR4 mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) in standard media (DMEM supplemented with 15% FBS, nonessential amino acids, L-glutamine, penicillin-streptomycin, β-mercaptoethanol, and 1000 U/mL LIF). Prior to induction of RA-differentiation, cells were feeder-depleted for 45 minutes on gelatinized plates and plated at a density of 5.0×10^4 cells/ 6-well in MEF media (same as ESC media except 10% FBS and excluding LIF). One day later, MEF media was supplemented with 1µM all trans retinoic acid (Sigma) or with DMSO only (LIF withdrawal) and refreshed every two days. For embryoid body differentiation, ESCs were pre-plated on gelatin overnight to feeder deplete, briefly trypsinized, and put in MEF media for suspension culture on bacterial culture plates for four days, then plated on gelatinized coverslips for another 2 or 6 days. For FGF/Activin differentiation, ESCs were feeder-depleted and 2.0×10^4 cells plated on 6 wells pretreated with fibronectin in DMEM/F12/B-27/N-2 (Invitrogen) supplemented with FGF-2 (R&D Systems 40ng/mL) and Activin A (PeproTech, 20 ng/mL). Media was changed daily and colonies were manually passaged onto fibronectin several times then at passage 4 returned to feeder cells.
ZHBTc4 ES cells were induced to differentiate with 1µg/mL doxycycline (resulting in acute repression of Oct4) in standard ESC media (Niwa et al., 2000). For reprogramming, primary MEFs were derived at embryonic day 14.5 and 3-factor retroviral reprogramming was performed following previously published methods (Maherali et al., 2007).

Chromatin immunoprecipitation

ChIP was performed according to previously published methods (Maherali et al., 2007). In summary, formaldehyde-crosslinked chromatin fragments were generated by sonication and 150µg of material were pre-cleared with Protein A sepharose beads. Immunoprecipitation was performed overnight with 5µg antibodies targeting Oct4 (R&D Systems, AF1759) or Sox2 (R&D Systems, AF2018), or with normal goat IgG (Santa Cruz, sc-2028) and subsequent incubation with protein A sepharose beads for 3 hours. Beads were washed and eluted in TE/0.67% SDS. Both IP and input samples were reverse cross-linked overnight at 65 degrees and treated with RNAse A and Proteinase K before DNA phenol-chloroform purification. The proportion of input material immunoprecipitated was calculated using standard curves constructed from input serial dilutions and comparing fractional measurements in IP and input relative to a known region positive for Oct4 and Sox2 binding (Rest, (Berg et al., 2008) ChIP with goat IgG antibody did not find any enrichment (data not shown).

Immunofluorescence and FISH analysis

Cells were plated on glass coverslips (and in the case of embryoid body differentiation permeabilized with 5 minute washes of ice-cold CSK buffer, followed by CSK buffer with 0.5% Triton, and another wash in CSK buffer, washed once with PBS, and fixed for 10 minutes in 4% paraformaldehyde (Plath et al., 2003). Immunonostaining
with antibodies against Nanog (BD Pharmingen 560259) and H3K27me3 (Active Motif 39155) and combined immunostaining/FISH with double-strand Xist DNA probe labeled with FITC were performed as previously reported and mounted with Prolong Gold reagent with DAPI (Tchieu et al., 2010). Xist and Tsix strand-specific RNA probes were made by in vitro transcription of T3-ligated PCR products of cDNA templates using Riboprobe system T3 (Promega) with Cy3-CTP (VWR) or FITC-UTP (Perkin Elmer) (Maherali et al., 2007).

**qRT-PCR Analysis and allele-specific qRT-PCR**

Cells were harvested from a 6 well format in Trizol (Invitrogen) and RNA purification was performed with the RNeasy kit (Qiagen) according to manufacturer’s instructions with on-column DNAse treatment (Qiagen). cDNA was prepared using SuperScript III (Invitrogen) with random hexamers and qRT-PCR was performed using a Stratagene Mx3000 thermocycler with primers listed in Supp Table 1. Results were normalized to Gapdh by the ΔCt method. To assess XCI skewing in adult mice, parts of organs were collected, snap-frozen and triturated using micropestles in 1 ml of Trizol reagent (Invitrogen). After an additional centrifugation to clear debris, 700 µl was added to 300 µl fresh Trizol, and RNA was purified following manufacturer’s instructions. RNA was reverse-transcribed with SuperScript II (Invitrogen) using random hexamers. Allele-specific Xist expression was analyzed by RT-PCR amplifying a length polymorphism using primers Xist LP 1445 and Xist LP 1446. To determine allele-specific X-linked gene expression of MeCP2 and G6pdx primers MeCP2-Ddel-F and R and G6PD-ScrFl-F and R were used to amplify respective RFLPs. PCR products were gel-purified and digested with the indicated restriction enzymes and analyzed on a 2% agarose gel stained with ethidium bromide. Allele-specific expression was determined by measuring relative band intensities using a Typhoon image scanner and ImageQuant software.
Luciferase enhancer assay

XY:2lox ESCs were transfected by electroporation, as in intron1 targeting, with 40 µg of one of three BamHI-linearized pgl4.27-cloned constructs (Promega, Supp. Table 1) and transferred to hygromycin selection (140µg/mL) one day later. After serial passaging and outgrowth of stable transfectants 1.0×10^5 or 2.0×10^4 ESCs were seeded for differentiation with and without (no LIF) retinoic acid for 3 and 5 days and harvested along with 2.0×10^5 ES cells and measured for luciferase activity with the luciferase assay system (Promega).
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CHAPTER 3

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
Summary

X chromosome inactivation (XCI) is a developmental program of heterochromatin formation that initiates during early female mammalian embryonic development and is maintained through a lifetime of mitotic cell divisions in somatic cells. Despite the characterization of the long noncoding RNA Xist and protein factors in the establishment of inactive X chromosome (Xi) heterochromatin, only interference with DNA methylation can reactivate the Xi to a significant extent once XCI has been established. Since the contribution of known factors to silencing is partial, more factors required for faithful maintenance of the Xi are yet to be identified. We took an unbiased screening approach using a genome-wide siRNA library, a collection of chemicals, and novel Xi-linked reporter gene cell lines. X chromosome reactivation was sensitized by inhibition of the maintenance DNA methyltransferase 1 (Dnmt1). We report that Atf7ip functions as a heterochromatin protein that synergizes with DNA methylation to stably maintain Xi silencing. Additionally, we characterize the ability of ribonucleotide reductase inhibitors to potentiate the effect of the Dnmt1-inhibiting drug 5-aza-2’-dC on X Chromosome reactivation (XCR) by boosting analog DNA incorporation. Our findings attribute new functional importance to a chromatin-associated protein and describe the cooperative actions of two drugs in the interference of gene silencing.

Introduction

XCI that is initiated in early embryonic development in epiblast cells is maintained for the lifetime of somatic cells. Once established, this random XCI, which occurs on either the maternally or paternally-inherited X chromosome becomes remarkably stable and is only reversed in the cells that give rise to the female germline (Chuva de Sousa Lopes et al., 2008; Heard and Disteche, 2006; de Napoles et al., 2007; Sugimoto and Abe, 2007). Experimental Xi reactivation is achieved by reversion of the somatic cell to a
pluripotent state by either induced pluripotent cell reprogramming, cell fusion to ES cells, or somatic cell nuclear transfer (Eggan et al., 2000; Maherali et al., 2007; Tada et al., 2001). The correlation of pluripotency with lack of XCI may mean that factors that aid in XCR may also facilitate reprogramming to the pluripotent state. Thus identification of factors that can help to reactivate a stably maintained Xi are of great interest to improve chromatin state manipulation (Ohhata and Wutz, 2012).

Initiation of XCI involves stepwise epigenetic changes that begin with upregulation and spread of the long noncoding RNA Xist on the future Xi (Brockdorff et al., 1991; Kay et al., 1993; Sun et al., 2006). Xist is required for the initiation of XCI and its upregulation initiates a cascade of silencing events beginning with the exclusion of RNA polymerase II (pol II) from the Xist-coated domain (Chaumeil et al., 2006; Marahrens et al., 1997; Penny et al., 1996). Kinetic studies illustrate that, following pol II depletion, XCI proceeds with gain of H3K9me2, loss of H3K4me3 and histone acetylation marks, recruitment of Polycomb complexes (PRC) 1 and 2 (and deposition of their respective marks H2AK119ub1 and H3K27me3), and gain of H4K20me1 (reviewed by Heard, 2004). Xi-linked gene silencing occurs as early as pol II depletion is observed (Chaumeil et al., 2006). After this initiation phase of XCI is a transition to a maintenance phase in which the repressed state of the X is stabilized. The maintenance phase is marked by Xi incorporation of macroH2A and accumulation of promoter CpG DNA methylation (Heard, 2004).

In the course of the initiation of XCI, this cascade of changes is dependent upon continued Xist expression and is reversible (Wutz and Jaenisch, 2000). It has been shown that PRC1 and PRC2 complex members are directly recruited by Xist (Plath et al., 2003; Schoeftner et al., 2006). The transition to maintenance phase is marked by the appearance of an Xi that is synchronously replicated in the mid-S phase and is also characterized by the Xi’s resistance to reactivation by Xist deletion (Casas-Delucchi et
al., 2011; Wutz and Jaenisch, 2000). Still, in maintenance phase Xist RNA remains associated with the Xi, recruits MacroH2A, and dissociates in mitosis and re-coats the inactive X in early G1 of cell cycle (Clemson et al., 1996; Csankovszki et al., 1999).

Many of the factors implicated in XCI were identified based on their nuclear enrichment on the Xi by immunofluorescence (Heard, 2004) Yet, Eed (histone methyltransferase of PRC2), Ring1b (E3 ligase of PRC1), or other enzymatic complexes implicated in XCI such as G9a (methylase of H3K9me1 and H3K9me2), and Dnmt3a/b (the de novo DNA methyltransferase) were found to be dispensable for both initiation and maintenance of XCI in transgenic mice (Kalantry and Magnuson, 2006; Leeb and Wutz, 2007; Ohhata et al., 2004; Sado et al., 2004).

Studies of X chromosome reactivation from the maintenance phase have described synergism between Xist RNA, DNA methylation, histone variants, and histone hypoacetylation for maintaining XCI (Csankovszki et al., 2001; Hernández-Muñoz et al., 2005; Nusinow et al., 2007; Pasque et al., 2011). Assay of primary mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) harboring an Xi-linked GFP reporter showed a maximum reactivation in ~11% of cells 13 days after simultaneous Adenovirus-Cre mediated deletion of double-conditional Xist and Dnmt1 alleles (bred onto the Xi-GFP reporter genetic background) (Csankovszki et al., 2001). The contribution of Xist to silencing is considerably smaller than that of Dnmt1; Xist deletion alone only doubled the a low “spontaneous” background rate of reactivation to 0.05% while Dnmt1 deletion alone led to 5% reactivation. Treatment with 0.3 uM 5-aza-2’-dC, a deoxycytidine analog that when incorporated into DNA inhibits Dnmt1, led to GFP reactivation in 0.2% of cells (Csankovszki et al., 2001; Ghoshal et al., 2005). These effects were similar when XCR was scored monitoring reactivation of the X-linked Hprt gene by biochemical assay (Csankovszki et al., 2001). However, the extent of gene reactivation across the chromosome in these studies was likely partial: the Xi remained late-replicating by BrdU
stain on metaphase chromosome spreads and the GFP-positive Xi reporter cells had only a small increase in reactivation of the Hprt reporter in cis (Csankovszki et al., 2001). Thus multiple epigenetic layers act together to maintain the silenced state of the Xi and Xist retains some role in gene silencing in the maintenance phase that is appreciated only when other repressive modifications are inhibited.

In summary, these studies demonstrate that the Xi is relatively resistant to reactivation by interference with known factors and that seemingly distinct silencing mechanisms act in a combinatorial fashion to “lock-in” the heterochromatin state. This layered regulation is further illustrated by other studies where the contribution of the factor to silencing is monitored on a sensitized XCR background where DNA methylation and/or histone deacetylation are inhibited. For instance, knockdown of MacroH2A or Cullin3 and SPOP (members of an E3 ligase complex that can ubiquitinate MacroH2A) does not reactivate Xi-GFP but rates of reactivation increase approximately 2-fold when sensitized by 5-aza-2’-dC and TSA treatment (Hernández-Muñoz et al., 2005; Nusinow et al., 2007)

Many of the factors known to play a functional role in XCI are not specific to Xi heterochromatin maintenance. For instance, macroH2A has well-described autosomal silencing roles yet was initially characterized on the inactive X chromosome (Agelopoulos and Thanos, 2006; Costanzi and Pehrson, 1998; Pasque et al., 2012). We set out to identify novel factors with gene silencing functions by screening for factors that contribute to faithful maintenance of XCI.
High Throughput Screening for XCI Maintenance Factors

CHAPTER 4

DESIGN AND OPTIMIZATION OF THE ASSAY
Design and optimization of a high throughput screen for X chromosome reactivation

To monitor X chromosome reactivation, we adapted a luciferase reporter because of the sensitivity and simplicity of the assay, which we then scaled to a semi-automated screening platform. In order to approximate in vivo Xi chromatin dynamics as closely as possible, we incorporated the reporter into mouse ES cells, generated transgenic mice, and derived primary mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) in which the reporter was developmentally silenced by XCI. The CAGGS (a fusion of Chicken β-actin and CMV early enhancer element) promoter-driven firefly luciferase sequence was introduced by site-specific FLP-mediated integration into an frt-primed homing site engineered into the Hprt locus in male ES cells where the X chromosome is active (Beard et al., 2006). Properly targeted ES cells were identified by Southern blot and demonstrated high levels of luciferase expression (Supp Fig 4.1). Targeted ES cells were injected into C57BL/6 blastocysts and efficiently contributed to chimeras. Chimeric mice were bred with C57BL/6 females to obtain germline transmission. Absolute skewing of XCI to the luciferase-bearing X chromosome was accomplished by breeding male reporter mice with females heterozygous for an Xist knockout allele (Marahrens et al., 1997). MEFs with a nuclear fluorescent reporter, a fusion of H2B and Citrine (a yellow fluorescent protein) in the place of luciferase were similarly generated in order to monitor XCR on the single-cell level. CAGGS-promoter driven reporters were subject to developmental XCI as MEFs derived from female XX:HPRT-luciferase/ΔXist or XX:HPRT-H2B:Citrine/ΔXist d14 embryos had no detectable reporter expression (Fig 4.1A/C, Fig 7.1B).

To assess whether the Xi HPRT-luciferase reporter could be used to monitor XCR, we showed that the inhibition of DNA methylation by knockdown of Dnmt1 or treatment with the Dnmt1 inhibiting drug, 5-aza-2'-dC could reactivate the luciferase
reporter (Figure 4.1B). We adapted a siRNA-mediated XCR assay to 384-well format. Since mutation of \textit{Dnmt1} has been described to give the highest levels of Xi reporter activation, we aimed to optimize a high throughput screen with the knockdown of \textit{Dnmt1} (Fig 4.1B, Csankovszki et al., 2001). Though in larger format \textit{Dnmt1} knockdown led to robust but small reporter reactivation in \textasciitilde0.5\% of cells, we did not see significant differences on the 384-well screening scale (Fig 4.1C, 5.1D). We hypothesized that addition of the \textit{Dnmt1} inhibitor chemical 5-aza-2\'-dC would critically further reduce \textit{Dnmt1} levels below the threshold needed to detect the \textasciitilde0.5\% of Xi reactivated cells in this smaller starting population in the screening format (Fig 4.1C). We found that at a concentration range of 0.10 to 0.20 uM, 5-aza-2\'-dC had a sensitizing effect on eliciting XCR; alone there was no significant difference in luciferase signal compared to untreated wells however, when combined with \textit{Dnmt1} knockdown, we observed consistent increase in luciferase signal (Fig 4.1C). At the concentration of 1.0 uM the magnitude of luciferase signal change attributable to siDnmt1 decreased (the ratio of luciferase signal in the siDnmt1 condition over no knockdown at the given 5-aza-2\'-dC concentration) (Fig 4.1C). Therefore, we chose to treat with 0.2 uM 5-aza-2\'-dC for the genome-wide siRNA screen to sensitize for reactivation (Fig 4.1E). A scatter plot of plate well values from positive and negative control samples and the Z factor measure of separation between positive and negative control populations of 0.11 predicted potential false negatives and/or false positives, but also indicated that our siRNA-based assay could measure XCR in a high throughput assay (Fig 4.1D, Zhang et al., 1999).

The screen was performed by reverse-transfecting two thousand reporter MEF cells on 384-well plates with siDnmt1 (positive control), with no siRNA (negative control), or with a siRNA from the Ambion silencer mouse genome-wide library (Fig 4.1E). Cells were incubated for 72 hours in the presence of 5-aza-2\'-dC and luciferase measurements were collected. Raw ALU values were normalized to individual plate
median values by robust Z score to eliminate batch effects (Supp Fig 4.2, Birmingham et al., 2009). To compensate for the low Z factor of the screen, the library was screened in duplicate and duplicate screen values pooled so that each gene was represented with a total of 4 to 6 luciferase readings from 2 to 3 different siRNAs. siRNA screening data was analyzed using the redundant siRNA activity analysis (RSA) to prioritize gene hits with multiple active siRNAs (Fig 4.1F, König et al., 2007). Internal validation of the methods was provided by the number one hit with this workflow, Dnmt1 from the genome-wide library (siDnmt1 was also on every plate as a quality control measure). To validate novel hits, we selected the top 54 genes in the RSA analysis with at least two unique active siRNAs, omitting hits we deemed irrelevant such as olfactory receptor genes and reordered the active siRNAs against these genes (Fig 4.1G, Figure S4.3).

Luciferase assay in 24-well format, again in the presence of 0.2 uM 5-aza-dC, demonstrated striking increases in luciferase signal from siRNAs against the Atf7ip (activating transcription factor 7 interacting protein, also named Mbd1-Containing Chromatin-Associated Factor) and Rrm2 (ribonucleotide reductase M2) genes.
Figure 4.1. Design and optimization of a high throughput assay of X chromosome reactivation. 
A. Diagram of a primary mouse embryonic fibroblast (MEF) cell with an inactive X chromosome bearing a CAGGS promoter-driven luciferase transgene in the HPRT locus. Reactivation upon Dnmt1 knockdown is quantified by luciferase assay. B. RT-qPCR for Dnmt1 RNA levels normalized to siScramble control and GAPDH expression. Error bar indicates standard deviation from two independent experiments measured in triplicate. C. Bar chart illustrating luciferase activity (arbitrary luminescence units, ALU) from reporter MEFs upon knockdown of Dnmt1 and treatment with varying concentration of 5-aza-2'-dC in 384 well format (error bars denote one standard deviation from the mean, n=8). (D) Scatter plot of individual data points from optimized assay in 384 well format, knockdown of Aurora Kinase 1 (siArk1) is a negative control knockdown. The Z factor, a measure of separation between positive and negative control populations used in the assessment of high throughput assays, is shown. (E) Diagram of screening workflow. Briefly, 1 picomole of...
siRNA from the Ambion mouse genome-wide Silencer® library was plated on 384 well plates and the library screened in duplicate. Each plate contained a row of positive (siDnm1) and negative (no siRNA) controls for quality control. Two thousand cells were reverse-transfected bringing the final 5-aza-2'-dC concentration to 0.2 uM and cells were incubated for 72 hours prior to luciferase assay. (F) Ranked Z-score distribution for pooled replicates, top 50 hits defined by redundant siRNA activity analysis are in yellow (G). Validation of resynthesized hit siRNAs in 24-well luciferase assay with 2 or 3 active siRNAs for each gene plotted (error bars indicate one standard deviation from duplicate wells).

CHAPTER 4 SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

Supp Figure 4.1. Luciferase activity of targeted male HPRT ES cells. Luciferase assay of male ES cells carrying the CAGGS luciferase transgene in the Hprt locus on the single male X chromosome, which is active under these conditions due to the absence of XCI in male cells. Cell number titration of constitutively luciferase-expressing male ESC cells demonstrating proportional increase in luminescence units.
Supp Figure 4.2. siRNA screen batch effects and Z score normalization. (A) Box and whisker plot of all raw luciferase measurements from one duplicate of the screen by individual 384-well plate. (B) Same as in A except each measurement is normalized by robust Z score (the number of median absolute deviations the individual measurement is from the plate median).
### Supp Figure 4.3. Table of top RSA hits from siRNA screen, page 1 of 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal control</th>
<th>Gene name</th>
<th>Gene accession</th>
<th>Enpp2</th>
<th>Ankrd32</th>
<th>C030018G13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Dnm1t1</td>
<td>Ectbp2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>9530080O11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dnm1t1</td>
<td>Ectbp2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9530080O11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dnm1t1</td>
<td>Ectbp2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9530080O11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dnm1t1</td>
<td>Ectbp2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>9530080O11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.01E+22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Cdk3</td>
<td>Dnmsn5</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>9.83E+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Gene Symbol</td>
<td>Gene Description</td>
<td>Fold Change</td>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ripk3</td>
<td>Rippt kinase 3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dnajb1</td>
<td>DnaJ heat shock 1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Slc22a13</td>
<td>Solute carrier 22</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tmprss3</td>
<td>Transmembrane protease</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prss3</td>
<td>Proprotein serine</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cacna1d</td>
<td>Calcium channel 1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Atp5e</td>
<td>ATP synthase 5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scd1</td>
<td>Stearoyl-CoA desaturase</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vei2</td>
<td>Vestigial eye 2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mmp21</td>
<td>Matrix metalloproteinase</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Fold change and p-values are hypothetical values for demonstration purposes.*
Supp Figure 4.3. contd. Table of top RSA hits from siRNA screen, page 3 of 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>Pax2</td>
<td>F730014I05Rik</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>Sec223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886</td>
<td>Tbx4</td>
<td>F730014I05Rik</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>Sec223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>Tbx4</td>
<td>A413414</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>Sec223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>1700012B18Rik</td>
<td>Olfr1511</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>Acvr1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>1700012B18Rik</td>
<td>Olfr1511</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>Acvr1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>Sfrs14</td>
<td>Adams13</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>Acvr1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>Dlat</td>
<td>Adams13</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>H3f3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>Dlat</td>
<td>Philh2</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>BC020025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>Dlat</td>
<td>Pcdhb13</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>4432409M07Rik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>48H24Rik</td>
<td>Robo1</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>4432409M07Rik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>4930548H24</td>
<td>Robo1</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>4432409M07Rik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>Enpp1</td>
<td>Robo1</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>Bfar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>Enpp1</td>
<td>Exos6</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>Bfar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>Enpp1</td>
<td>Exos6</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>12Wsu95e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Myadn</td>
<td>5930416I19Rik</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>D12Wsu95e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Myadn</td>
<td>5930416I19Rik</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>D12Wsu95e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>D6Ertd32e</td>
<td>A430041E03</td>
<td>901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>3830417A13</td>
<td>30000000</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>4300416I03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904</td>
<td>3830417A13</td>
<td>4300416I03</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>8230312A22Rik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>Tcf1b1</td>
<td>12A22Rik</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>Tcf1b1</td>
<td>Trim28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>Tcf1b1</td>
<td>12A22Rik</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>Tcf1b1</td>
<td>Trim28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Tas2r109</td>
<td>Ankrd16</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>Tas2r109</td>
<td>Ankrd16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>C730027P07</td>
<td>Ankrd16</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>C730027P07</td>
<td>Ankrd16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>C730027P07</td>
<td>12E08Rik</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>C730027P07</td>
<td>12E08Rik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>29M08Rik</td>
<td>Nup11</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>29M08Rik</td>
<td>Nup11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>29M08Rik</td>
<td>Nup11</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>29M08Rik</td>
<td>Nup11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>29M08Rik</td>
<td>Nup11</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>29M08Rik</td>
<td>Nup11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>Sod3</td>
<td>6030457N17Rik</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>Sod3</td>
<td>010101Rik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>BC060631</td>
<td>3230401101Rik</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>BC060631</td>
<td>3230401101Rik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>Smox</td>
<td>4930563M21Rik</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>Agtbp1</td>
<td>4930563M21Rik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>Agtbp1</td>
<td>79K19Rik</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>2410014A08</td>
<td>4930579K19Rik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>2410014A08</td>
<td>4930579K19Rik</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>14A08Rik</td>
<td>Dffb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>BC034834</td>
<td>Fads1</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>BC034834</td>
<td>Cts3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>BC034834</td>
<td>Fads1</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>BC034834</td>
<td>Cts3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

CHARACTERIZATION OF THE ROLE OF ATF7IP IN XCI
Atf7ip contributes to maintenance of XCI

Both top RSA hits from the library against Atf7ip reduced Atf7ip transcript levels by half after 72 hours of knockdown (Fig 5.1A, Supp Fig 5.1). These intermediate levels of Atf7ip RNA knockdown prompted us to further investigate whether these siRNAs were targeting Atf7ip expression by assaying whether they could knock down overexpressed Atf7ip (Fig 5.1B/2C). Female MEFs transduced with a retroviral vector containing a FLAG-tagged Atf7ip cDNA showed a similar nuclear distribution of FLAG-tagged to endogenous protein (Fig 5.1B). This overexpression was 6-fold greater than endogenous levels by RT-qPCR and the Atf7ip-targeting siRNA was also able to target the exogenous product and reduce transcript levels by half (Fig 5.1C). Unlike other known factors with a functional in maintenance of XCI that have nuclear enrichment on the Xi, Atf7ip enrichment was not seen in the Xist RNA domain (Fig 2B, Supp Fig 5.2).

Atf7ip knockdown alone produced a weak though reproducible effect on luciferase reporter reactivation (Fig 5.1D). When combined with low levels of 5-aza-2’-dC, as it was in the screen, reporter reactivation due to Atf7ip knockdown was greatly enhanced (Fig 5.1D). We further investigated the role of 5-aza-2’-dC in sensitizing XCR due to Atf7ip knockdown. To see if the action of 5-aza-2’-dC was due to inhibition of Dnmt1, we performed knockdown of Dnmt1 in the place of 5-aza-2’-dC treatment and again observed synergy in reporter reactivation (Fig 5.1D). Therefore we believe some loss of DNA methylation is necessary to observe reversal of Atf7ip-mediated gene silencing. The similar effect of low concentration 5-aza-2’-dC and siDnmt1 is probably due to a critical level of DNA demethylation they cause since the extent of XCR as quantified by luciferase measurement is comparable between low 5-aza-2’-dC alone and siDnmt1 alone. These effects were recapitulated (though to slightly different extent) in two independent XCR fluorescent primary MEF reporter cell lines that permitted single-cell quantitation of reactivation rates (Fig 5.1E, Hadjantonakis et al., 1998). The activity
of siAtf7ip against two other reporters rules out that knockdown effect is luciferase-specific. Our results suggest that Atf7ip plays a role in the maintenance of XCI.

We then addressed whether Atf7ip knockdown leads to reactivation of endogenous Xi-linked genes by assaying their allelic expression using DNA FISH probes directing against Atrx, Gpc4, Rnf12, and MeCP2 RNA (Fig 5.1F). These genes should go from being monoallelicly expressed on the active X chromosome to biallelicly expressed upon XCR. The number of FISH pinpoint signals (representing transcription foci) in nuclei of untreated cells or cells subjected to siAtf7ip and low 5-aza-2’-dC-mediated reactivation were counted (Fig 5.1G). The increases in rates of biallelic Xi-linked gene expression with XCR treatment ranged from 5-16% in the genes assayed (Fig 5.1G). We noted a wide distribution in the number of pinpoint FISH signals per nucleus from 0 to 4 pinpoints and attribute this to factors including abnormal ploidy that quickly occurs upon expansion of fibroblasts in vitro and to heterogeneous allelic gene expression in the cell population (Baker, 2012; Dodge et al., 2005). To rule out the possibility that siAtf7ip and low 5-aza-2’-dC affect ploidy, we counted the number of X chromosomes using X chromosome painting but did not see the same trends as noted in the RNA FISH counts (Fig 5.1H/5.1I). Thus reactivation treatments increased rates of biallelic X-linked gene expression rather than increasing X chromosome numbers. We conclude that Atf7ip knockdown together with 5-aza-2’dC treatment leads to Xi-linked gene reactivation, thereby validating our reporter approach.
Figure 5.1. Validation of Atf7ip knockdown in X chromosome reactivation (part 1 of 2). A. RT-qPCR for Atf7ip RNA levels normalized to si Luciferase control and Gapdh expression for two independent siRNAs targeting Atf7ip. Error bars indicate one standard deviation from triplicate RT-qPCR measurements in one experiment. B. Immunofluorescence in pMX-Atf7ip infected female MEFs for endogenous Atf7ip and FLAG-tagged Atf7ip. C. RT-qPCR for Atf7ip RNA levels normalized to si Luciferase control and Gapdh expression in cells infected (mock or pMX-Atf7ip) for 72 hours and then treated with siRNA for another 72 hours. Error bars indicate one standard deviation from triplicate RT-qPCR measurements in one experiment, * indicates p<0.01 by Student’s T-test.
Figure 5.1. Validation of Atf7ip knockdown in X chromosome reactivation (part 2 of 2). D. Graph summarizing luciferase assay in 12 well format. Error bars indicate standard deviation of raw ALU values from 3 individual wells with a given treatment in one experiment, * indicates \( p < 0.01 \) by Student’s T-test. E. Graph summarizing flow cytometry data upon treatment as in 5.1D. scoring % FITC positive MEFs for two independent fluorescent reporters of X reactivation, a citrine allele in the place of the luciferase reporter under the HPRT locus and a centromeric GFP allele (Csankovszki et al., 2001b; Hadjantonakis et al., 1998). F. FISH with DNA probes targeting RNA of four different X-linked gene transcripts without treatment or with siAtf7ip-mediated reactivation treatment as in 5.1D and 5.1E. G. Graphs summarize count of cells shown in 5.1F as the proportion of DAPI-stained nuclei (200 counted per sample) with indicated numbers of transcription foci for the respective X-linked gene. H. Chromosome paint of untreated MEFs displaying normal X ploidy. I. Graph summarizes the proportion of DAPI-stained nuclei with indicated numbers of X chromosome domains before and after reactivation treatment.
Atf7ip’s canonical binding partners Mbd1 and Eset also play a role in XCI

Atf7ip has been described to mediate either transcriptional gene activation or repression (Chang et al., 2005; Ichimura et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2009). In its silencing context, Atf7ip acts as a bridging factor by recruiting H3K9me2 methylase Setdb1 to Methyl-CpG DNA Binding Domain Protein 1 (Mbd1) on DNA, thereby coupling DNA methylation to H3K9 trimethylation (De Graeve et al., 2000; Ichimura et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2003). We next addressed whether other factors in Atf7ip’s autosomal gene silencing pathway play a role in XCI by testing to see if knockdown of these repressive Atf7ip interactors phenocopies the XCR effect. Indeed, like siAtf7ip, knockdown of Mbd1 and Setdb1 activated the luciferase reporter when knocked down alone and acted synergistically with low concentration of 5-aza-2’-dC (Fig 5.2A). Thus the Mbd1-Atf7ip-Setdb1 pathway has a role in maintenance of XCI. The additive enhancement of reactivation by combinatorial knockdown is likely due to hypomorphic effect of individual siRNA knockdowns that when superimposed, reduce overall silencing contribution of the Mbd1-Atf7ip-Setdb1 arm in the XCI pathway (Fig 5.2A/5.2B/5.2C). siRNAs against Mbd1 and Setdb1 were included in the genome-wide library and discarded as false negatives.

To further assess whether the Mbd1-Atf7ip-Setdb1 pathway is a specific autosomal gene silencing mechanism that is involved in maintenance of XCI and rule out other related autosomal mechanisms also have a role in XCI, we re-screened a panel of siRNAs validated to target other mediators of transcriptional silencing including heterochromatin proteins (Cbx3 and Cbx5) and H3K9 methylases (Ehmt2 and Suv39h1) (Fig 5.2D, Völkel and Angrand, 2007). No significant activity was observed with knockdown alone or with 5-aza-2’-dC or siDnmt1 sensitization compared to siGFP control (Fig 5.2D/5.2E). We conclude interfering with a specific pathway described to couple DNA methylation and histone 3 lysine 9 trimethylation causes XCR.
Figure 5.2. Knockdown of factors in the Atf7ip pathway linking DNA and histone methylation also reactivate the inactive X reporter. (A) Graph summarizing luciferase assay as in Fig 5.1D., knockdowns were performed in the presence of 0.2 uM 5-aza-2'-dC. Error bars indicate standard deviation of raw ALU values from 3 individual wells with a given treatment in one experiment. (B) Luciferase assay as in Fig 5.1D except that 5-aza-2'-dC was omitted. (C) RT-qPCR for RNA levels of respective transcript normalized to siGFP control and Gapdh expression, RNA was harvested in parallel to luciferase assays 3 days after knockdown as shown in Fig 5.2A-B. Error bars indicate one standard deviation from triplicate RT-qPCR measurements in one experiment. (D) Luciferase assay as in Fig 5.2A. Knockdown of other important known mediators of heterochromatin formation (with or without sensitization by inhibition of DNA methylation by siDnmt1 or 0.2 uM 5-aza-2'-dC) was performed to determine specificity of siAtf7ip mechanism for X chromosome reactivation. (E) RT-qPCR as in Fig 5.2C to determine knockdown efficiencies in the experiment shown in Fig 5.2D.
Supp Figure 5.1. Summary of *Atf7* and *Rrm2* siRNA sequence alignments. *Atf7* and *Rrm2* gene structures are shown with siRNA seed sequences designated.
Supp Figure 5.2. Atf7ip does not enrich in the Xist Xi domain. (A) Immunostaining /FISH images show the nuclear distribution of Atf7ip (green) relative to Xist RNA coating (red) in female MEFs treated with 0.2 μM 5-aza-2’-dC for three days. Two different fields are shown and the third panel is a zoomed-in view of one nucleus from the second field. (B) Co-immunostaining for H3K9me3 (green, with Active Motif or AbCam antibodies) and H3K27me3 (red). The third panel is a zoomed-in view of one nucleus from the second field.
CHARACTERIZATION OF RIBONUCLEOTIDE REDUCTASE INHIBITION
**Inhibition of Rrm2 potentiates the effect of 5-aza-2’-dC to elicit X chromosome reactivation**

We turned our attention to the other robustly validated hit, the gene *Rrm2* coding for an essential subunit of ribonucleotide reductase (RNR) (Fig 4.1G). As with *Atf7ip*, knockdown was confirmed for the active siRNAs from the library by measuring RNA levels using RT-qPCR (Fig 6B, Supp Fig 5.1). Unlike siAtf7ip, siRrm2 demonstrated complete dependence on combination with low concentration of 5-aza-2’-dC for any luciferase signal above background (Fig 6A/4B). Further support for the role of *Rrm2* as an XCR hit came from a companion chemical screen dataset generated for a collection of 4,094 annotated chemicals assayed at 10 uM concentration of drug (Supp Fig 6.1). From this screen, Resveratrol, a chemical agent known for mimicking cellular effects of caloric restriction demonstrated the potential to activate the luciferase reporter in a dose-dependent fashion (Fig 6C, Hubbard et al., 2013; Wood et al., 2004). Resveratrol is described to mediate its metabolic effects through direct and indirect activation of the histone deacetylase Sirt1 though no role for reversal of gene silencing or role in XCI has been characterized (Hubbard et al., 2013; Park et al., 2012). In search for a mechanistic explanation for the ability of Resveratrol to elicit XCR in the presence of 5-aza-2’-dC we noted a study describing Resveratrol as an inhibitor of RNR’s Rrm2 subunit, the same subunit knocked down by our siRNA hit, thus strongly suggesting that Rrm2 was playing a role in XCR (Fontecave et al., 1998). Resveratrol and 0.2 uM 5-aza-2’-dC also activated the H2B-Citrine XCR reporter (Fig 7B). Thus a chemical and siRNA hit support that RNR inhibition contributes to XCR in the presence of 5-aza-2’-dC.

We first sought to address whether hydroxyurea, another chemical inhibitor of RNR (though with a higher IC_{50} than Resveratrol) could cause XCR (Fontecave et al., 1998). All three forms of RNR inhibition-mediated XCR (siRrm2, Resveratrol, and...
hydroxurea) demonstrated a complete dependence on low levels of 5-aza-2'-dC to elicit XCR (Fig 6A/6C/6F). In contrast to siAtf7ip, knockdown of Dnmt1 could not replace the requirement for 5-aza-2'-dC (Fig 6D/6E). This observation suggests that the drug combination synergism is not dependent on low levels of DNA methylation inhibition, as suspected for Atf7ip.

Next, we sought to understand how RNR inhibition interacts with low concentration 5-aza-2'-dC to cause XCR. RNR catalyzes the conversion of ribonucleoside 5'-diphosphates to their 2'-deoxyribonucleoside form in the rate-limiting step of dNTP biosynthesis and the Rrm2 subunit, which is specifically upregulated at S phase of cell cycle, is necessary for the activity of the complex (Engström et al., 1985). The pool of dNTPs in the nucleus is tightly regulated and studies have speculated that RNR inhibition can increase the likelihood of nucleoside analog DNA incorporation by reducing the pools of endogenous nucleotide concentrations (Clouser et al., 2012). RNR inhibition could, therefore, increase 5-aza-2'-dCTP concentration in the nucleus relative to endogenous dCTP, increase DNA incorporation, and further decrease DNA methylation levels (Fig 6J). To begin to examine this model, we tested whether Resveratrol and knockdown of Rrm2 could increase the amount of tritiated (3H) 5-aza-2'-dC incorporated into DNA under conditions which lead to XCR (Fig 6G). Indeed, double the amount of 3H-5-aza-2'-dC was incorporated into genomic DNA with either siRrm2 or Resveratrol treatment (Fig 6G). We then performed a rescue experiment to address whether the effect of 5-aza-2'-dC on XCR in the presence of RNR inhibition could be blunted by increasing levels of dCTP. As expected, XCR was reversed when exogenous deoxycytosine (dC) was supplied in the media in the presence of 0.2 uM 5-aza-dC and Resveratrol or siRrm2 (Fig 6H/6I). Such rescue suggests that the relative nuclear concentrations of dCTP:5-aza-2'-dCTP could be shifted by addition of exogenous nucleotide substrates to reduce the effective concentration of analog thereby
preventing XCR secondary to DNA methylation loss (Fig 6J). Uridine was used as a negative control in the rescue experiment because it is a nontoxic precursor of pyrimidine synthesis that, like deoxycytidine, can be taken up by cells and used as a substrate by the nucleoside salvage synthetic pathways (Fig 6H/6I/6J, Reichard and Estborn, 1951). However, unlike dC, uridine is readily converted to CTP and UTP for RNA biosynthesis but RNR inhibition precludes the ability of uridine to contribute to dNTP pools (Larsson et al., 2004). Protein concentrations in lysates were unaffected by treatment, ruling out cell death as the cause of luciferase signal loss (Supp Fig 6.2). In summary, the requirement for XCR sensitization in the screen by low levels of DNA methylation-inhibiting drug led to the identification of hits that potentiated the gene reactivation effect of low concentration 5-aza-2’-dC.
Figure 6. Inhibition of Rrm2 enhances the effect of 5-aza-2'-dC to elicit X chromosome reactivation.
A) Graph summarizing luciferase assay as in Fig 5.1D., knockdowns with three independent siRNAs (A, B, or C) against Rrm2 were performed with or without 0.2 uM 5-aza-2'-dC. Error bars indicate standard deviation of raw ALU values from 3 individual wells with a given treatment in one experiment. (B) RT-qPCR for Rrm2 RNA levels after knockdown normalized to siGFP control and Gapdh expression from the experiment shown in Fig 6A. (C) Luciferase assay titrating Resveratrol concentration with or without 0.2 uM 5-aza-2'-dC.
5-aza-2'-dC. (D) Luciferase assay comparing 5-aza-2'-dC and siDnmt1 to elicit reporter reactivation by Resveratrol. (E) RT-qPCR for Dnmt1 RNA levels normalized to siGFP control and Gapdh expression from the experiment shown in Fig 6D. (F) Luciferase assay in the presence or absence of 0.2 µM 5-aza-2'-dC. (G) Quantification of 3H-5-aza-2'-dC incorporation into genomic DNA with and without knockdown of Rrm2 or Resveratrol treatment for 48 hrs. Genomic DNA was isolated and an equal volume was measured by Beta counter for 3H-5-aza-2'-dC incorporation (disintegrations per minute, DPM) then normalized to amount of DNA loaded (ug), error bars represent one standard deviation from mean value for samples from three independent 6-well wells, asterisk (*) denotes p<0.01 by Student's T-test. (H) Luciferase assay demonstrating rescue of reporter silencing in the presence of 5-aza-2'-dC and Resveratrol by exogenous deoxycytidine (dC) and lack of rescue by exogenous uridine addition. (I) As in 6H but with siRrm2-B in the place of Resveratrol, see Fig 6B for knockdown efficiency. (J) Illustration of model in which (i) inhibition of ribonucleotide reductase leads to (ii) skewing of dCTP utilization for DNA synthesis from salvage pathways which are supplemented with exogenous 5-aza-2'-dC and (iii) Dnmt1 inhibition by binding to incorporated 5-aza-2'-dC leading to (iv) increased loss of DNA methylation with successive cell divisions (resulting in X chromosome gene reactivation).
Supp Figure 6.1. Chemical screen for X chromosome reactivation. (A) Diagram of screening workflow. Briefly, media was added to 384 well plates, the library chemical was added, then the cell suspension and 5-aza-2' dC mixture was delivered. Each plate contained a row of positive (10 uM 5-aza-2' dC) and negative (no chemical) controls for quality control. Two thousand cells were added in complete media bringing the complex and 5-aza-2' dC mixture was delivered. Each plate contained a row of positive (10 uM 5-aza-2' dC) and negative (no chemical) controls for quality control. Two thousand cells were added in complete media bringing the
final 5-aza-2'-dC concentration to 0.2 uM and the library chemical concentration to 10 uM in each well and cells were incubated for 72 hours prior to luciferase assay. (B) Box and whisker plot of all raw luciferase measurements from the chemical screen by individual 384-well plate. (C) Raw ALU score distribution is shown across all the chemicals, with the well value corresponding to Resveratrol designated, and the chemicals chosen for validation boxed. (D) Validation of selected chemicals in 24-well luciferase assay with mean values of duplicate measurements plotted, error bars indicate one standard deviation from duplicate wells.

Supp Figure 6.2. Protein concentration measurements from selected luciferase reporter experiments. (A) Protein concentrations of cell lysates corresponding to luciferase measurements in Figure 6F. Error bars indicate standard deviation of values from 3 individual wells with a given treatment in one experiment. (B) As in (A) but for Figure 4H. (C) As in (A) but for Figure 4I.
High Throughput Screening for XCI Maintenance Factors

CHAPTER 7

COMBINATORIAL ACTION OF NOVEL PATHWAYS
Combinatorial effect of Atf7ip, Resveratrol, DNA methylation, and Xist on maintenance of XCI

In order to compare the combined effects of Atf7ip inhibition or Rrm2 inhibition by Resveratrol treatment together with the known mediators of XCI maintenance, DNA methylation and Xist RNA expression; various combinations of treatments were performed (Fig 7). The relative contributions to XCR were assayed by flow cytometry in a primary MEF line analogous the to the luciferase screening MEFs but with the H2B-Citrine reporter in cis with a conditional allele of the Xist gene on the Xi, obtained through germline recombination in heterozygous females (Fig 6A, Csankovszki et al., 1999). MEFs infected with Adenovirus (Ad)-Cre recombinase or Ad-Null (Empty) control overnight were subjected to combinatorial treatments for 72 hours as before (Fig 6C/7B). Ad-Cre treatment led to loss of Xist coating in 98% of cells compared to Ad-Null cells at the time of analysis and Ad-Cre samples were compared to Ad-Null to assess the relative contribution of Xist to silencing (Fig 7B/7C). As previously reported, Xist deletion in MEFs also inhibited for DNA methylation exhibited close to 2-fold more XCR than MEFs with Xist treated with Ad-Null (Fig 7B, Csankovszki et al., 2001). Maximal reactivation of approximately 14%, the highest reported in primary cells, was achieved by 10 uM 5-aza-2’-dC and siAtf7ip or Resveratrol, and was not increased much more by combining all three (Fig 7B). Reactivation conditions which including Resveratrol did not show significant differences between presence and absence of Xist RNA (comparing Ad-Null and Ad-Cre treatment). Thus, Resveratrol addition blunted the differences in XCR attributable to Xist deletion (Fig 7B). This effect may be due to RNR-independent effects of Resveratrol; we previously observed that knockdown of Sirt1, the histone deacetylase that Resveratrol is able to activate, boosts the amount of XCR (Supp Fig 7.1, Hubbard et al., 2013). This could be due to increased histone acetylation as a result of reduced Sirt1 levels. Resveratrol is also described to function as a phosphodiesterase inhibitor and
some of its metabolic effects can be recapitulated with a related phosphodiesterase inhibitor, the compound Rolipram (Park et al., 2012). In our system, Rolipram boosted Resveratrol-mediated XCR (Figure S7.2). We do not know whether these Rrm2-independent effects of Sirt1 and Rolipram directly relate to XCI or indirectly alter luciferase levels. Thus Resveratrol has other effects to those described to enhance the action of low dose 5-aza-2'-dC. All together, these results demonstrate that DNA methylation, a $Mbd1$-$Atf7ip$-$Setdb1$ pathway and, to a lesser extent, $Xist$ RNA cooperate in maintaining XCI.

We investigated whether association with the nuclear lamina is another possible mechanism of Xi maintenance. Studies suggest epigenetic dysregulation including changes in histone chromatin marks is an underlying pathology in the autosomal dominant advanced aging syndrome, Hutchinson Gilford Progeria (HGPS) (Goldman et al., 2004; Scaffidi and Misteli, 2006). The HGPS point mutation in the lamin A gene introduces a splice site which deletes 50 amino acids from the C terminus and produces a mutant protein that is resistant to enzymatic cleavage, leading to accumulation of farnesylated intermediate prelamin A and disruption of the nuclear lamina (Shumaker et al., 2006). Wild type cells process prelamin A with the protease Zmpste24 and homozygous loss of $Zmpste24$ also leads to accumulation of prelamin A and is associated with other progeroid syndromes (Bergo et al., 2002; Pendás et al., 2002; Schreiber and Kennedy, 2013). There is evidence that the mechanism of disease in advanced aging also takes place in healthy old adults as fibroblasts from individuals aged 70+ years old also display accumulation of prelamin A caused by sporadic use of the splice site mutated in HGPS (Scaffidi and Misteli, 2006).

The nuclear defects associated with prelamin A accumulation increase with serial passage in tissue culture (Goldman et al., 2004). They include nuclear shape abnormalities, DNA damage (assessed by foci of phosphorylated H2AX), and reductions
in H3K9me3 and heterochromatin protein 1 (Goldman et al., 2004; Scaffidi and Misteli, 2006; Shumaker et al., 2006). One study reported that fibroblasts from female HGPS patients lost H3K27me3 on the Xist-demarcated Xi and that this change in the Xi chromatin preceded the general nuclear shape changes that occurred in subsequent tissue culture passages (Shumaker et al., 2006). HEK-293 cells overexpressing the mutant HPGS lamin A gene also lost Xi-like foci of H3K27me3 (Shumaker et al., 2006).

In summary, studies of advanced aging pathologies have suggested the nuclear lamina has a role in the maintenance of chromatin state and lamin dysfunction leads to epigenetic dysregulation that impacts the normal aging process.

We sought to address whether accumulation of prelamin A leads to loss in the stability of X chromosome inactivation. We took an analogous approach to looking at the contribution of Xist to our novel mechanisms from the screen: namely, monitoring reactivation rates of the Xi by luciferase reporter from MEFs derived by crosses with Zmpste24 knockout mice (Supp Figure 7.2A, Bergo et al., 2002; Leung et al., 2001). Xi reporter Zmpste24-/- MEFs displayed accumulation of prelamin A and a prolonged passage-dependent increase in abnormally shaped nuclei as previously described (Supp Figure 7.2B/7.2C, Pendás et al., 2002). However, when comparing luciferase reactivation levels between ZmpSte24 +/- and -/-, MEFs in the various combinatorial reactivation conditions, we did not see any significant differences in their sensitivities to reactivation treatments (Supp Figure 7.2D). On further examination of the primary MEFs, we did not see changes in the rates of H3K27me3 coating on the Xi from early passage to a less proliferative later passage 6 (data not shown). Furthermore, tail-tip fibroblasts (TTFs) derived from 4 month-old Zmpste24-/- mice that displayed the overt pathology of the Zmpste24 progeroid syndrome showed as much H3K27me3 Xi foci as cells from age-matched Zmpste24+/- TTFs (data not shown). Noting that in the HPGS study, the H3K27me3 Xi loss occurred after 10 passages, we looked at spontaneously
immortalized passage 50+ female Zmpste24+/+ and Zmpste24 -/- MEFs. Here, only the Zmpste24 -/- MEFs demonstrated loss of Xist coating and H3K27me3 accumulation. We conclude from this study that secondary effects of extended passage and/or immortalization modify the Zmpste24 genotype to induce the cellular phenotypic effect of Xi dysregulation but that there are no immediate consequences of prelamin A accumulation to dysregulation of X silencing or Xist RNA coating of the Xi.

**Figure 7. Combinatorial effects of siAf7ip, Resveratrol, loss of DNA methylation, and Xist deletion on inactive X reporter activity.** (A) Diagram of a primary MEF with an inactive X chromosome bearing a conditional loxP-flanked allele of Xist and a CAGGS-driven H2B-Citrine transgene in the HPRT locus. (B) FACS analysis of MEFs shown in Fig 7A treated with either Adenovirus(Ad)-Cre or Ad-Null (empty vector) for 24 hours, then subjected to knockdown and/or chemical treatments for an additional 72 hours, and analyzed by flow cytometry. (C) Representative image of Xist RNA FISH with DNA probe in Ad-Null and Ad-Cre treated MEFs at the time of flow cytometry summarized in Figure 7B. 98% of cells lacked Xist signal (n=200 counted).
Supp Figure 7.1. Rrm2-independent Resveratrol targets have effects that both enhance and counter XCR. (A) Knockdown of Sirt1 boosts Resveratrol and 0.2 uM 5-aza-2’-dC-mediated XCR. Graph summarizing luciferase assay in 12 well format. Error bars indicate one standard deviation of raw ALU values from 3 individual wells with a given treatment in one experiment. (B) RT-qPCR for Sirt1 RNA levels after siSirt1 knockdown normalized to siLuciferase control and Gapdh expression from the experiment shown in (A). (C) Rolipram, a cAMP phosphodiesterase inhibitor described to mimic the metabolic effect of Resveratrol, boosts X chromosome reactivation due to Resveratrol and 0.2 uM 5-aza-2’-dC (Park et al., 2012). Graph summarizing luciferase assay in 12 well format. Error bars indicate one standard deviation of raw ALU values from 3 individual wells with a given treatment in one experiment.
Supplementary Figure 7.2. A mouse model of progeria does not sensitize to X chromosome reactivation. (A) Diagram of a female MEF cell with an inactive X chromosome bearing a CAGGS promoter-driven luciferase transgene in the HPRT locus and either wildtype (+/+) or homozygous deleted (−/) Zmpste24 alleles. The shape of the −/− nucleus reflects nuclear shape abnormalities associated with the Zmpste24 phenotype. Reactivation upon chemical and/or siRNA treatment is quantified by luciferase assay.
(B) Immunofluorescence in passage 2 MEFs as diagrammed in (A) for H3K27me3 (green), prelamin A (red), and DAPI (blue). (C) Representative image of nuclear dysmorphia observed in passage 5 Zmpste24 -/- MEFs stained for DAPI (blue) and prelamin A (red). On the right is a quantification of the rate of appearance of dysmorphic nuclei from passage 2 to passage 5 (n=100 cells counted per condition). (D) Summary of luciferase assay of passage 2 MEFs subjected to knockdown and/or chemical treatments for 72 hours. * Note the differences in Zmpste24 +/- and -/- MEFs are likely attributable to cell number and that the relative sensitivities to any of the treatments are not different.
CHAPTER 8

DISCUSSION AND METHODS
DISCUSSION

We performed a genome-wide RNAi screen in mammalian cells for factors that can reactivate an epigenetically silenced gene and validated 2 hits. Challenges in such studies include cell heterogeneity and genetic instability in screening cell lines (Echeverri and Perrimon, 2006). Rather than using immortal cells where transformation can compromise normal gene silencing mechanisms, we used primary MEFs that were rapidly expanded from transgenic embryos without the need for immortalization (Esteller, 2008). We have partially overcome the challenges of off-target effects and the inherent variability in transfection-based siRNA delivery with built-in gene redundancy in our screening libraries (Martin et al., 1996). The transient gene knockdown and early 3-day timepoint was intended to limit appearance of secondary effects. As illustrated by the Atf7ip-interactors Mbd1 and Setdb1, where no siRNAs in the screen demonstrated luciferase activity but handpicked siRNAs in a scaled-up assay showed robust effect, we encountered false negatives. This low sensitivity is partially characteristic of siRNA-mediated loss of function where the threshold of knockdown needed to elicit the phenotype is gene-specific. Yet incomplete knockdown was also beneficial in detecting hits that are essential factors where hypomorphic knockdown can show XCR effects without cell-cycle arrest and death associated with more complete loss, as exemplified by Rrm2 knockdown (Kittler et al., 2004). More maintenance factors in XCI could potentially be found by screening with further sensitization to XCR by genetic deletion (Xist or Atf7ip deletion) and/or drug addition (Resveratrol and low 5-aza-2’-dC, TSA). Significant hits represent factors that can be knocked down in living cells because even if a lethal knockdown caused low levels of reactivation, the presumable loss of luciferase signal due to cell death prevents our strategy from detecting such a hit. Furthermore, the requirement for DNA methylation inhibition with reported hits, which in our study was carried out by passive demethylation either by 5-aza-2’-dC or knockdown of Dnmt1,
suggests that cells treated with siRNA screen hits must not only be alive but also dividing to lose DNA methylation. The mechanistic validation of the two highest scoring hits from the RSA analysis illustrates the high specificity of our screening approach.

Interestingly, both Atf7ip and Rrm2 are described to have cell cycle-dependent function. The Mbd1-Setdb1 complex has been shown to be S-phase specific and recruited to DNA by Chromatin Assembly Factor 1 (CAF-1) (Sarraf and Stancheva, 2004). RNR is controlled during the cell cycle by the protein levels of the Rrm2 subunit that with a 3 hour half-life is maximally transcribed during S phase and associates with the more stable constitutively expressed Rrm1 subunit (Engström et al., 1985). This connection supports a model where heterochromatin is mostly stable at interphase and subject to remodeling upon cell division and DNA replication when maintenance factors actively function. We speculate that the requirement for cell cycling may explain why only a subpopulation of cells reactivate the reporter with any known XCR treatment. Synchronizing MEFs to undergo XCR treatment at S phase entry may increase rates of reactivation. In contrast, the ability of siAtf7ip to effect XCR may be lost in the presence of a cell cycle inhibitor. This experiment is technically complicated by the fact that in our system, robust levels of XCR due to Atf7ip loss required passive DNA demethylation through cell division. Therefore it would be necessary to see if Atf7ip knockdown could be coupled to active DNA demethylation. Full knockout of Atf7ip could circumvent this dependence on DNA demethylation as greater loss of function may continue to increase rates of XCR. It is unclear whether Atf7ip is necessary for XCI initiation and maintenance in vivo, though its patterns of expression would be consistent with such a role as in situ hybridization shows it is ubiquitously expressed in d9.5 embryos with more specific tissue distribution at later timepoints (De Graeve et al., 2000). Atf7ip interactors Mbd1 and Setdb1 have very different knockout phenotypes, namely mild spatial learning defects in adult mice lacking Mbd1 and early peri-embryonic lethality at 3.5-5.5 days
post conception (DPC) in embryonic mice with Setdb1 deletion. Therefore it would be interesting to see the biological significance of Atf7ip in tethering the two (Dodge et al., 2004; Zhao et al., 2003).

The identification of Atf7ip as a factor involved in maintenance of XCI suggests that the downstream effect of its binding partner Setdb1, namely enzymatic conversion of H3K9me2 to H3K9me3, is also required. H3K9me has previously been reported to play a role in XCI on the basis of enrichment of a pan-methyl H3K9 antibody on the Xi in mouse and human cells though it is unclear if the antibody used in these studies has cross-reactivity to H3K27me3 (Boggs et al., 2002; Heard et al., 2001; Mermoud et al., 2002). Another study comparing H3K27me3 and H3K9me2 by ChIP establishes that both increase on the Xi in MEFs relative to the active X (Rougeulle et al., 2004). These studies have contributed to the belief that H3K9me2 is a feature of facultative (developmentally-labile) heterochromatin while H3K9me3 is characteristic of constitutive heterochromatin (Trojer and Reinberg, 2007). Our study is the first demonstration of a functional role for an effector of H3K9me3 in XCI yet it is unclear if knockdown of Setdb1 undoes transcriptional repression by the loss of H3K9me3: complete knockout of Setdb1 does not lead to global changes in H3K9me3 levels or DNA methylation though embryos show an early phenotype and arrest at 5.5 DPC (Dodge et al., 2004). Reader heterochromatin proteins Cbx1, Cbx3 and/or Cbx5 are thought to mediate H3K9me3 transcriptional repression yet, in this study, knockdown of Cbx3 or Cbx5 individually had no XCR effect (Fig 5.2D/5.2E). Furthermore, we do not see specific enrichment of Atf7ip or H3K9me3 on the Xi by immunofluorescence suggesting that they bind and mediate heterochromatin on autosomes broadly in both facultative and constitutive contexts (Supp Fig 5.2). ChIP studies of H3K9me3 on Xi genes with and without knockdown of Atf7ip will be necessary to refine the pathway for Atf7ip. The dependence of siAtf7ip on inhibition of DNA methylation for XCR could be tested by coupling ChIP with bisulfite
sequencing. We hypothesize that low levels of DNA methylation loss are necessary to “unlock” the stably silenced chromatin, but the relationship between H3K9me3 and DNA methylation may be reciprocal and H3K9me3 could also recruit DNA methylation machinery (Lehnertz et al., 2003). Therefore, the balance between H3K9me3 demethylation and loss of DNA methylation as well as the distribution of that loss (i.e. promoter, intragenic) are likely critical to achieve synergy in targeting both pathways.

Finally, our study suggests a heterogeneous nature to gene silencing on the Xi where loci have differential dependence on various combinations of silencing mechanisms. This is demonstrated by comparing the different rates of reactivation between transgenes and endogenous genes in response to the various treatments though these may have different thresholds for being called reactivated because of the different cytometry versus FISH-based readouts (Fig 5.1E/5.1G). Despite the fact that our screening approach was biased in favor of conditions in which the positive control, knockdown of Dnmt1 gave robust signal, we did not detect a hit that significantly improved the rates of XCR; targeting of Atf7ip in addition to DNA methylation and Xist as in previous studies mildly improved the rates of XCR in primary MEFs (Csankovszki et al., 2001). It would be interesting to see if conditions with the highest rates of XCR have the most chromosome-wide XCR as well by performing FISH with combinations of probes to X-linked genes.

The demonstration that Xi gene reactivation by 5-aza-2’-dC could be augmented by inhibiting RNR shows XCR screening is a useful tool for understanding and drugging the general mechanisms of gene silencing. The FDA-approved clinical use of 5-aza-2’-dC is limited to hematologic malignancies where it is thought to function by reactivating the expression of tumor suppressor genes silenced by DNA methylation and perhaps also by changing a cancerous epigenetic profile of the cell (Yang et al., 2010). The use of 5-aza-2’-dC is limited by its toxicity where a high concentration causes DNA damage
and cytotoxicity (Qin et al., 2009). In vitro resistance mechanisms have been shown to limit 5-aza-2′-dC incorporation into DNA (Qin et al., 2009). Coupling to Rrm2 inhibition, which we show here increases 5-aza-2′-dC incorporation into DNA and boosts the efficacy of 5-aza-2′-dC-mediated gene reactivation at lower concentrations, may therefore enhance 5-aza-2′-dC action while reducing toxicity and limiting resistance. Rrm2 inhibition has long had application in clinical oncology with the use of hydroxyurea as a chemotherapy since it is recognized to slow proliferation of cells depending on high rates of de novo dNTP synthesis (Donehower, 1992). More specific siRNA and chemical inhibitors of Rrm2 have performed well in preclinical testing, therefore further studies to assess the efficacy of combination of 5-aza-2′-dC and Rrm2 inhibition on growth inhibition in malignancy are merited (Finch et al., 2000; Heidel et al., 2007). Basic research studies of gene silencing such as this one may therefore serve to provide advances in cancer therapy.
METHODS

Cell culture and treatment methods

ESCs were grown on irradiated DR4 mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) in standard media (DMEM supplemented with 15% FBS, nonessential amino acids, L-glutamine, penicillin-streptomycin, β-mercaptoethanol, and 1000 U/mL LIF). MEFs were derived at embryonic day 14.5 and cultured in MEF media (same as ESC media except 10% FBS and excluding LIF). For reactivation assays, MEFs at passage 1 or 2 post-derivation were seeded at a density of 60,000 cells per 12-well well and chemicals in MEF media (and/or knockdowns in Opti-MEM) were added and incubated for 72 hours. For chemicals in DMSO, final DMSO concentration was below 0.1% and total volumes of MEF and/or Opti-MEM media were normalized across samples.

Generation of reporter MEFs

HPRT-Luciferase and HPRT-H2B-Citrine MEFs were harvested from transgenic female C57Bl/6 mouse embryos derived from male V6.5 ES cells. These ES cells were modified by two-step targeting: first, a homologous targeting to place a Frt site under the HPRT locus then using FLP-e mediated recombination to introduce the luciferase or H2B-Citrine transgene into the primed site (Beard et al., 2006). In order to place a frt-hygro-pA “homing” cassette downstream of Hprt, the ColA1 arms of the pgkATGfrt plasmid were replaced with Hprt arms. The targeting vector was linearized and introduced into V6.5 ES cells by electroporation followed by selection with 350 µg/ml G418. DNA from picked clones was analyzed for proper targeting Southern blot using Hprt external probe. Site-directed insertion of transgene was accomplished by cotransfection of FLPe transient expression vector with pBS32 vector bearing luciferase or H2B-Citrine. The pBS32 vector was made by exchanging the tetracycline-responsive
operating binding sequence in the pBS31 plasmid with a constitutive CAGS promoter (Beard et al., 2006). Luciferase or H2B Citrine were introduced into pBS32 by Gateway® cloning (Life Technologies). To make pBS32 destination vector-compatible (pBS32-GW), a Gateway cassette with attR sites and a ccdB gene was flanked by SgrAI restriction sites and ligated into a unique EcoRI site on pBS32. One-step BP and LR cloning was performed with pDonr221 entry vector, attB-primer amplified luciferase from pGL3 vector (Promega) or H2B Citrine (gift of Elowitz lab) and pBS32-GW. Targeting was performed as previously reported (Beard et al., 2006). DNA from selected clones was digested with BglII and screened by Southern blot using 3’ external probe. ES cells were microinjected into C57BL/6 blastocysts to produce chimeric mice following standard procedures. High agouti coat color-contributing chimeras were bred with C57BL/6 females for germline transmission. All animal experiments were in accordance with the legislation of the UCLA Animal Research Committee.

Luciferase assay

Treatments were performed in triplicate 12-well wells for 72 hours and lysed with 200 ul passive lysis buffer (PLB, Promega) for 20 mins at room temperature on an orbital shaker. Lysate was cleared by 30 seconds of centrifugation and 20 ul was assayed for luciferase activity with 50 ul of LARI reagent (Promega) on a GloMax microplate luminometer (Promega). Protein concentration measurements were performed on corresponding PLB lysates by Quick Start™ Bradford Protein Assay Kit (Bio-Rad) and analyzed by interpolating to standard curve according to Manufacturer’s Instruction.

RT-qPCR analysis

Cells were harvested from a 6-well format in Trizol (Invitrogen) and RNA purification was performed with the RNeasy kit (Qiagen) according to manufacturer’s
instructions with on-column DNAse treatment (Qiagen). cDNA was prepared using SuperScript III (Invitrogen) with random hexamers and RT-qPCR was performed using a Stratagene Mx3000 thermocycler with primers listed in Supp Table 1. Results were normalized to Gapdh by the \( \Delta \text{Ct} \) method.

**Knockdown and overexpression**

Knockdown of MEFs with siRNA was performed by reverse transfection at 25 nM final concentration of siRNA. Briefly, a cell suspension was added to a preincubated mixture of Lipofectamine RNAiMax, 100 ul of reduced serum Opti-MEM media, and siRNA. For experiments involving multiple knockdowns, control siRNA was added to equalize the final siRNA concentration across all wells. For overexpression of pMX-Atf7ip, virus was raised in transfected platE cells and MEFs were transduced as previously described (Maherali et al., 2007). Atf7ip was introduced into the pMX retroviral vector by In-Fusion \textregistered cloning (Clonetech) of the Atf7ip cDNA.

**Immunofluorescence, FISH, and chromosome paint analysis**

Cells were plated on glass coverslips, washed once with PBS, and fixed for 10 minutes in 4% paraformaldehyde (Plath et al., 2003). Immunostaining with antibodies against Atf7ip (Abcam 84497), H3K27me3 (Active Motif 39155), H3K9me3 (Active Motif 39161, AbCam ab8898), FLAG M2 (Sigma F3165) and FISH with double-strand Xist, Rlim (Rnf12), Atrx, Gpc4, and MeCp2 DNA probes, and IF/FISH combinations thereof were performed as previously reported and mounted with Prolong Gold reagent with DAPI (Tchieu et al., 2010). For X Chromosome paint (Applied Spectral Imaging), cells were fixed in 3:1 methanol:acetic acid and staining was performed according to manufacturer's instruction.
Flow cytometry

Cells were trypsinized, washed in PBS, loaded through cell strainer caps (BD Biosciences) and analyzed on a FACSDiva machine (BD Biosciences) with FlowJo software (Tree Star, Inc.).

3H Decitabine Incorporation

This assay was analogous to reactivation treatment assays with several modifications; assays were scaled 2.5-fold to 6-well format, 1 ul (1 uCi) of tritiated 5-aza-2’-dC (3H-Decitabine, Moravek Biochemicals Inc.) was added instead of cold 5-aza-2’-dC, and samples were harvested at 48 hours. Cells were trypsinized and genomic DNA was isolated by Quick-gDNA MinPrep kit (Zymo Research) and measured by QuBit ® fluorometer (Life technologies). Tritium content of 25 ul of genomic DNA was measured by scintillation counter and normalized to measured DNA concentration.

Genome-wide siRNA library plate preparation

Silencer ® Mouse Druggable siRNA Library V3 and Extension set V3 (Ambion) were provided as 250 pmol of lyophilized powder in a total of 153 384-well source plates. Plates were centrifuged at 1700x g, 50ul of nuclease-free water was added to each well, and plates were sealed and briefly vortexed to resuspend siRNA. RNA concentrations were confirmed by measuring 1 ul of sample from 14 randomly chosen wells by NanoDrop spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific). 2 ul of siRNA diluted to 0.5 pMol/uL from each source plate was stamped in duplicate onto Matrix white opaque 384-well tissue culture treated plates (Thermo Scientific) by BenchCel 4X system with a PlateLoc plate sealer, Vcode Barcode Printer, and Vprep pipettor fitted with a 96 LT head (all from Agilent Technologies) and stored in -80.
*High throughput screening assay*

Primary MEFs from four embryos were pooled and expanded to passage 4 then frozen as stocks for screening. For each batch of 30 plates in the genome-wide library, cells were thawed from this stock in MEF media. After one day in culture, adherent cells were trypsinized, live cells excluding Trypan blue were counted by hemocytometer and brought up in suspension with MEF media agitated by stir bar. Meanwhile, positive control was stamped by BenchCel 4X system with an 8 channel LT head (Agilent Technologies) into 32 wells of column 1 of library plates by adding 4 ul of nuclease-free water containing 1 picomole of siDnmt1 to each well (Ambion, 161526). The 32 wells of the column 12 were reserved as negative control and contained no siRNA. Transfection was initiated by adding 20 ul of Opti-MEM (Life Technologies) and 0.05 ul RNAiMax (Life Technologies) per well by Multidrop384 and incubating for 20 minutes to 1 hour. 20 ul of cell suspension containing 2,000 cells with 5-aza-2’-dC (Sigma) was added to a final concentration of 0.2 uM. Cells were incubated for 3 days in a humidified 37-degree incubator at 5% CO₂. 20 ul of media was then aspirated off using an ELx 405 plate washer (Bio-Tek Instruments) and 20 ul of One-Glo™ luciferase assay reagent (Promega) was added with Multidrop 384 and incubated for 20 minutes. As luminescence data was collected on an Acquest (Molecular Devices) machine, quality control for each plate was performed by visual inspection of positive and negative controls on heatmap during data collection. Chemical screening was performed analogously with several exceptions: 384-well plates were not pre-treated. Rather, 50 ul of cell suspension with 2,000 cells was plated then screening compounds were added using a Biomek FX (Beckman Coulter) in 0.5 ul DMSO for a final concentration of 10uM. After 72-hour incubation, 30 ul of media was aspirated off and luciferase assay was performed as with the siRNA screen. Libraries screened include 4,094 compounds from
Microsource, Biomol enzyme inhibitor and bioactive lipid libraries, Prestwick chemical library, and NIH clinical collections at the UCLA MSSR.

High throughput siRNA screening analysis

The screen assay was optimized to maximize the Z-factor statistical measure of signal-to-noise (Zhang et al., 1999). Screening data analysis was performed by first normalizing raw ALU values by robust Z-score which is the number of mean absolute deviations for given well ALU from the plate median ALU (Birmingham et al., 2009). Hit identification was performed by Redundant siRNA Activity (RSA) analysis method with input of robust Z-score (König et al., 2007, http://carrier.gnf.org/publications/RSA/). RSA works by ranking hits in order of activity then assigning P values for genes based on whether their siRNAs rank higher than would be expected by chance.
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