A CHROMOSOME-SPECIFIC RECESSIVE GENETIC SCREEN FOR GENES INVOLVED IN *IN VITRO* DIFFERENTIATION IN MOUSE EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS

A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by Wei Wang

The Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute
Robinson College, University of Cambridge

August, 2005

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration, except where specially indicated in the text. None of the material presented herein has been submitted previously for the purpose of obtaining another degree.

Wei Wang

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my PhD supervisor, Dr. Allan Bradley, for the guidance, support and patience during the past four years. It is a privilege to have Allan as a mentor. I thank him for the inspiration he has given to me when I felt frustrated and also the freedom he has given to me in pursuing my interest.

I would like to thank Bradley lab members, past and present, for their kindness and generosity. Though I have not met some of them in person, they are always happy to help whenever Allan referred me to them. Special thanks to Dr. Ge Guo for her help in ES cell culture and virus work, and the instructive discussions at various stages of my project. I would express my gratitude to Dr. Pentao Liu for sharing with me some of his "magic tools" and for the instructive discussions. I thank Dr. Xiaozhong (Alec) Wang for the discussions and encouragement. I would like to thank Dr. Madhuri Warren for the histopathology analysis of the teratocarcinoma and for reading the last two chapters of my thesis. I thank Dr. Qin Si for her help in the embryo work. I am grateful to Francis Law and Alastair Beasley for the tissue culture support. I am also grateful to Evelyn Grau and Tina Hamilton for the blastocyst injection. I thank Dr. Yue Huang for his help in BAC preparation. I thank Dr. Haydn Prosser for providing some useful plasmids, Dr. Antony Rodriguez and Dr. Ilona Zvetkova for providing F1 hybrid mice.

I would like to thank Dr. Xiaolin Liu for her collaboration in identifying the mutant ES cell lines. I owe my thanks to Dr. Jos Jonkers for his help and the instructive discussions. I thank Dr. Dongrong Chen Murchie for her extensive work on *in situ* hybridization, and her husband, Dr. Alistair Murchie for reading the first chapter of my thesis. I thank Dr. Bill Skarnes for the instructive discussions. I think Dr. Lu Yu and Dr. Mercede Pardo for help with Western blotting. Thanks go to Dr. Christina Hedberg-Delouka for her kindly help in my application and also in the four years of my PhD study.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Ziyuan Wang and Huiyin Zhang, and my sister, Qin Wang for their unconditional love and support.

ABSTRACT

Mouse embryonic stem (ES) cells are pluripotent cells that retain unlimited self-renewal potential. ES cells can also differentiate into all the three germ layers and many specified cell types in vitro. The in vitro differentiation of ES cells recapitulates early embryogenesis, thus serves as a valuable in vitro model for developmental studies. Little is known about the genes which are important in the ES cell differentiation process, partly due to the difficulty of generating homozygous mutations in ES cells. In this study, we have developed a method, which explored induced mitotic recombination and regional trapping mutagenesis method to accumulate large numbers of homozygous gene-trap mutations in a genomic region of interest in mouse embryonic stem cells. A cell line was engineered to undergo mitotic recombination and to capture the subset of gene-trap mutations that were generated on chromosome 11. A large panel of genome-wide gene-traps were generated in this cell line and those that are located on chromosome 11 were specifically selected via Cre/loxP mediated inversions. The inversions were then made homozygous by induced mitotic recombination. Using this system, 66 independent homozygous gene-traps on chromosome 11 have been isolated from a library of about 10,000 gene-trap clones. These homozygous clones have been assessed for their developmental potential by an *in vitro* differentiation assay. The differentiation of each of these lines has been assessed by RT-PCR using a panel of markers that are characteristic for the three germ layers and various differentiated cell types. Clones that show abnormal expression of one or more markers are verified using microarrays, western blotting and in situ hybridization. A homozygous mutation of ATP-citrate lyase (Acly) gene was found to block the differentiation of ES cells in vitro. Under retinoic acid induction, the embryoid bodies derived from the mutated cell line were still mostly composed of undifferentiated embryonic stem cells. This was confirmed by the high expression of the epiblast makers, such as Oct3/4, Nodal and Nanog. BAC rescue experiment has been carried out to reverse the phenotype of this cell line and make a causal link between the expression level of Acly and the

phenotype. Therefore, we have shown that we can create random homozygous gene-trap mutagenesis in a candidate region of the genome and use these clones for functional genomics study.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1. Methods to generate homozygous mutations in ES cells	34-36
Figure 1-2. Three main gene trap strategies	46
Figure 1-3. Retroviral vectors and viral production	53-54
Figure 1-4. In vitro differentiation of ES cells using the "hanging drop"	60-61
method	
Figure 1-5. Thesis Project	67-68
Figure 3-1. <i>lox</i> sites used in the experiment	112
Figure 3-2. Induced mitotic recombination cassettes	113-114
Figure 3-3. Targeting 3' <i>Hprt</i> cassette to <i>D11Mit71</i> locus	116
Figure 3-4. Targeting 5' <i>Hprt</i> cassette to <i>D11Mit71</i> locus	118
Figure 3-5. Generating the <i>D11Mit71</i> ^{5' Hprt/3' Hprt} ES cell line	119
Figure 3-6. Selection marker pop-out of the <i>D11Mit71</i> ^{5' Hprt/3' Hprt} ES cell	
line	121
Figure 3-7. Test of the WW45 cell line	122
Figure 3-8. Regional trapping strategy	123
Figure 3-9. Generating end-point targeting ES cell line	125-126
Figure 3-10. The location of the end point targeting cassette	128
Figure 3-11. Determination of the location of the end point targeting	
cassette by induced mitotic recombination	129-130
Figure 3-12. Segregation pattern of recombinant chromatides after G2	
recombination	131-132
Figure 3-13. The structure of gene trapping virus	135
Figure 3-14. Functional test of the 5' trapping virus	136
Figure 3-15. Promoter test of the 3' trapping virus	139
Figure 3-16. Functional test of the 3' trapping virus	140
Figure 3-17. The trapping titer of the 5' and 3' trapping retrovirus	141
Figure 3-18. Identification of individual virus integration events	143
Figure 3-19. Identification of individual inversion events	145-146
Figure 3-20. Balanced translocation and deletion/duplication events can	
not be made homozygous	148
Figure 3-21. Induced mitotic recombination to make the inversions	

homozygous	151
Figure 3-22. Identification of the induced mitotic recombination clones	153
Figure 3-23. Confirmation of the homozygous clones	154
Figure 3-24. Revertible inversion	156
Figure 3-25. Possible results of the Cre-mediated recombination (G1)	159
Figure 3-26. Deletion	160
Figure 4-1. Inverse PCR	166
Figure 4-2. Splinkerette PCR	168-169
Figure 4-3. 5' RACE	171
Figure 4-4. Two independent gene traps at a same locus, <i>Igf2bp1</i>	178-179
Figure 4-5. Distribution of gene traps on chromosome 11	181
Figure 4-6. Transcription orientation and the proviral insertion sites of the	
trapped trapped loci	182
Figure 4-7. G1 <i>trans</i> recombination event	184-185
Figure 4-8. G2 <i>cis</i> recombination event	186-187
Figure 4-9. The gene trap insertion at 2810410L24Rik has disrupted two	
genes with opposite directions of transcription	190-191
Figure 5-1. RT-PCR results of Day 5 embryoid bodies	201-203
Figure 5-2. RT-PCR results of Day 8 embryoid bodies	204-206
Figure 5-3. Southern analysis of subclones of homozygous mutant ES cell	
lines	208-209
Figure 5-4. RT-PCR results of Day 8 embryoid bodies	211-213
Figure 5-5. WW103-8E6	214-216
Figure 5-6. WW103-4A6	217-218
Figure 5-7. WW103-8E6 and 8G9 are both chromosome 11 trisomies	220-221
Figure 5-8. WW103-14F11	222-224
Figure 5-9. WW103-13D10	227-229
Figure 5-10. RT-PCR results of WW103-18F11	232-234
Figure 5-11. Identification of WW103-18F11	235-237
Figure 5-12. Confirmation of WW103-18F11	240-241
Figure 5-13. BAC rescue	243-245
Figure 5-14. RT-PCR results of BAC rescue clones	247-248
Figure 5-15. The function of ATP-citrate lyase gene	253

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1. Primers used for oligo ligation	71
Table 2-2. Cell culture medium	80
Table 2-3. ES cell lines constructed for the project	85
Table 2-4. RT-PCR primers used for <i>in vitro</i> differentiation assay	105-106
Table 4-1. Gene trap loci	175-176

TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATIO)N	II
ACKNOWLED	OGEMENT	III
ABSTRACT		V
LIST OF FIGL	JRES	VII
	_ES	
TABLE OF CO	ONTENT	X
1 Introduction	on	1
1.1 Gene	etic screen in model organisms	1
	Genetic screens in yeast	
	Genetic screens in fruitfly	
	Genetic screens in nematode	
1.1.4	Genetic screen in mouse	8
1.1.5	Genetic screens in mammalian cells	10
1.2 Mous	se as a genetic tool	12
	ntroduction	
1.2.2	Similarity between human and mouse	13
	Tools available for mouse genetics and genomic studies	
1.3 Mous	se embryonic stem cells as a genetic tool	15
	A brief history	
1.3.2	Mouse embryonic stem cells compared with the mouse	16
	Mouse embryonic stem cells compared with other cultured	
r	mammalian cells	17
1.3.4	Genetic and epigenetic instability of mouse embryonic stem	
	cells	18
1.4 Cre//	oxP site specific recombination	20
1.4.1	A brief history	20
1.4.2 E	Basic Characteristics of Cre/loxP system	21
1.4.3	Application of Cre/loxP system in mouse genetics	22
1.4.3.1	Conditional gene knock-out	22
1.4.3.2	Selectable marker removal and recycling	23
1.4.3.3	Subtle change and hypomorphic alleles	23
1.4.3.4	Chromosome rearrangement	24
1.5 Chro	mosome engineering	24
1.5.1	A brief history	24
1.5.2 E	Engineering mouse chromosome with Cre/loxP	25
1.5.2.1		
1.5.2.2	Nested deletions	27
1.5.2.3	Regional trapping	28
	ced mitotic recombination	
1.6.1	A brief history	31
	nduced mitotic recombination in fruitfly	32
	Traditional methods to generate homozygous mutations in	
	mouse embryonic stem cells	33
1.6.3.1	Sequential gene-targeting	33
1.6.3.2	High concentration G418 selection	37

	1.6.3.	3 Elevated mitotic recombination in <i>BLM</i> -deficient cells	38
	1.6.4	Induced mitotic recombination in mouse	
	1.7 Ge	ne-trap Mutagenesis	
	1.7.1	A brief history	
	1.7.2	 	
		1 Enhancer-trap vectors	
	1.7.2.	2 Promoter-trap vectors	45
	1.7.2.	3 PolyA-trap vectors	47
	1.7.3	Application of gene-trap mutagenesis in genetic screens	48
		1 Expression screens	
	1.7.3.	2 Phenotype-driven screens	49
	1.7.3.		50
	1.7.4	Electroporation versus retroviral infection	50
	1.7.4.		
	1.7.4.	2 Retroviral infection	
	1.7.4.		
	1.8 ES	cell in vitro differentiation	
	1.8.1	Introduction	
	1.8.2		
	1.8.3	Using genetic screens to study the ES cell in vitro different	
	1.9 The	esis project	
2		l and methods	
_		ctors	
	2.1.1	Vectors for induced mitotic recombination	
	2.1.2		
	2.1.3	Trapping vectors	
		1 Promoter trapping vectors	
		2 PolyA trapping vectors	
		I culture	
	2.2.1		
	2.2.2	Chemicals used for selection of ES cells	
		Transfection of DNA into ES cells by electroporation	
	2.2.4	Picking ES cell colonies	
	2.2.5	Passaging ES cells	
	2.2.6	Freezing ES cells	
	2.2.7	Thawing ES cells	
	2.2.8	Cre-mediated recombination to pop out the selection cass	
	2.2.0		
	2.2.9	Generation of targeted ES cell lines	
	2.2.10	<u> </u>	
	2.2.10		00 88
	2.2.10		
	2.2.10		
	2.2.10		
		G	
	2.2.1		
	2.2.1		
	2.2.1		
	2.2.12	Gene trap mutagenesis using plasmid based vector	
	2.2.13	ES cell in vitro differentiation	94

	2.	.3 DNA methods	. 94
		2.3.1 Probes	. 94
		2.3.2 Southern blotting and hybridization	. 96
		2.3.2.1 Southern blotting	
		2.3.2.2 Probe preparation	. 96
		2.3.2.3 Hybridization	. 97
		2.3.3 Splinkerette PCR	. 97
		2.3.3.1 Splinkerette adaptors preparation	. 97
		2.3.3.2 Genomic DNA digestion and ligation with Splinkerette	
		adaptors	. 98
		2.3.3.3 First round PCR	
		2.3.3.4 Second round PCR	
		2.3.3.5 Sequencing the splinkerette PCR products	
	2.	.4 RNA methods	
		2.4.1 5' RACE	
		2.4.1.1 Total RNA extraction	
		2.4.1.2 First strand cDNA synthesis	
		2.4.1.3 TdT tailing	
		2.4.1.4 First round PCR	
		2.4.1.5 Second round PCR	
		2.4.1.6 Sequencing the 5' RACE product	
		2.4.2 RT-PCR	
		2.4.2.1 First strand cDNA synthesis	
		2.4.2.2 RT-PCR	
3		Library construction	
•	3	.1 Introduction	
	Ο.	3.1.1 5' trapping versus 3' trapping	
		3.1.2 Electroporation versus retroviral vector	
	વ	.2 Results	
	Ο.	3.2.1 Construction of the inducible mitotic recombination cell line	
		3.2.1.1 Modification of the inducible mitotic recombination cassette	
		3.2.1.1 Wodineation of the inducible mitotic recombination cassette	
		3.2.1.2 Targeting of the inducible mitotic recombination cassettes	
		3.2.1.3 Targeting of the end point cassette for regional trapping	
		3.2.2 Construction of the regional trapping vectors	
		3.2.2.1 5' trapping vectors	
		11 0	
		3.2.2.2 3' trapping vectors	
		3.2.4 Pilot experiment to test the regional trapping strategy	
		3.2.4.1 Pilot experiment to test the intactness of proviral insertion.	
		3.2.4.2 Pilot experiment to test the Cre-mediated inversion	144
		3.2.5 Large-scale regional trapping experiment using gene-trap	4 4 7
		retrovirus	147
		3.2.6 Regional trapping experiment using electroporation-based	440
		plasmid	
	^	3.2.7 Induced mitotic recombination	
,	3.	.3 Discussion	
4		Analysis of gene traps on chromosome 11	
	4.		
		4.1.1 Splinkerette PCR versus inverse PCR	105

	4.1.2	5' RACE	170
	4.1.3	Distribution of the trapped genes on Chromosome 11	172
	4.1.4	Orientation of transcription of the trapped genes	
	4.2 Res	sults	
	4.2.1	Gene trapping hot spots	
	4.2.2	Distribution of trapped genes on chromosome 11	
	4.2.3	Orientation of the transcription of the trapped genes	
	4.2.4	Proviral insertion sites in trapped loci	
		cussion	
5		screen on homozygous gene traps	
•		oduction	
	5.1.1	In vitro differentiation protocols	
	5.1.2	Parameters influencing <i>in vitro</i> differentiation of ES cells	
	5.1.3		
	5.1.5	Recessive genetic screens using ES cell in vitro differentiat	
	5.2 Pos	sults	
	5.2 Res 5.2.1		
		Primary screen	
	5.2.2	Secondary screen	
	5.2.3	WW103-8E6 (<i>Pecam</i>)	
	5.2.4	WW103-14F11 (2810410L24Rik)	
	5.2.5	WW103-13D10 (<i>LOC217071</i>)	
		cussion	
	5.3.1	Throughput of the screen	
	5.3.2	Alternative recombination	
	5.3.3	Acly deficiency and the impaired differentiation potential	
	5.3.3.		
	5.3.3.2	,	
	5.3.3.3	, , ,	
	5.3.3.4	•	256
	5.3.3.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
		transformation	
	5.3.3.6		
			258
	5.3.3.		
		vitro differentiation	260
	5.3.4	Summary	262
6		y, significance and future goals	
	6.1 Che	emical mutagenesis	263
	6.2 Trai	nsposon mutagenesis	265
	6.3 RNA	A interference	266
	6.4 For	ward genetics versus reverse genetics	269
		ection versus screening	
		future of genetic screens in mouse ES cells	
R			