Epigenetic regulation by RARα maintains ligand-independent transcriptional activity

Kristian B. Laursen¹, Pui-Mun Wong² and Lorraine J. Gudas^{1,*}

¹Pharmacology Department of Weill Cornell Medical College of Cornell University and ²Department of Cell Biology, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, NY 10065, USA

Received May 11, 2011; Revised July 15, 2011; Accepted July 20, 2011

ABSTRACT

Retinoic acid receptors (RARs) α , β and γ are regulators embryonic kev of development. Hematopoietic differentiation is regulated by RARa, and several types of leukemia show aberrant RARa activity. Through microarray expression analysis, we identified transcripts differentially expressed between F9 wild-type (Wt) and RARa knockout cells cultured in the absence or presence of the RAR-specific ligand all trans retinoic acid (RA). We validated the decreased Mest, Tex13, Gab1, Bcl11a, Tcfap2a and HMGcs1 transcript levels, and increased Slc38a4, Stmn2, RpL39l, Ref2L, Mobp and Rlf1 transcript levels in the RARa knockout cells. The decreased Mest and Tex13 transcript levels were associated with increased promoter CpG-island methylation and increased repressive histone modifications (H3K9me3) in RARa knockout cells. Increased SIc38a4 and Stmn2 transcript levels were associated with decreased promoter CpG-island methylation and increased permissive histone modifications (H3K9/K14ac. H3K4me3) in RARa knockout cells. We demonstrated specific association of RARa and RXRa with the Mest promoter. Importantly, stable expression of a dominant negative, oncogenic PML-RARa fusion protein in F9 Wt cells recapitulated the decreased Mest transcript levels observed in RARa knockout cells. We propose that RARa plays an important role in cellular memory and imprinting by regulating the CpG methylation status of specific promoter regions.

INTRODUCTION

Retinoic acid (RA) receptors α , β and γ are nuclear receptors that function as ligand-activated regulators of embryonic development. Retinoic acid receptor α (RAR α) is the major RA receptor involved in hematopoietic differentiation (1). In vitro, RAR α was shown to regulate the transcriptional activities of RA target genes by dimerizing with retinoid X receptors (RXRs) and binding to retinoic acid response elements (RAREs) (2,3), but little is known about transcriptional regulation by endogenous RAR α .

Translocation events targeting the RARa gene is a recurring theme in acute promyelocytic leukemia (APL) (4–6), thus pointing to oncogenic functions of the resulting RARα fusion proteins. The most common translocation generates a PML-RAR fusion protein which is sufficient to induce APL in mouse models (7). The expression of leukemic RARa fusion proteins attenuates the transcriptional induction by RA (2,4) and induces DNA hypermethylation of specific genes (8). Importantly, aberrant promoter methylation is a key feature in APL patients (9,10). The deregulated promoter methylation in cells from APL patients and the binding of RARa to genomic regions devoid of RA inducible genes (11,12) strongly argue for a role of RAR α in regulating cellular memory and imprinting through CpG methylation of promoter regions.

The nuclear receptor co-regulatory protein TIF1 α (Trim24) modulates the function of RAR α in a ligand-dependent manner, and loss of TIF1 α increases the incidence of hepatocellular carcinomas in animal models (13), indicating that unmodulated RAR α activity in certain contexts can drive tumorigenesis. Studies from MMTV-wnt1 animal models demonstrated that agonist activated RAR α inhibited mammary tumor formation and growth, but that the loss of RAR α delayed mammary tumorigenesis (14), thus supporting roles of RAR α as both a tumor suppressor and protooncogene. Current models of nuclear receptor action suggest that the different functions of RAR α are dictated by cofactor recruitment, resulting in epigenetic changes, e.g. histone modifications (15).

Histone modifications are important hallmarks of epigenetic activity. Acetylation of histone 3 lysines 9 and 14 (H3K9/K14ac) and trimethylation of histone 3 lysine 4 (H3K4me3) are frequently increased in the promoter

© The Author(s) 2011. Published by Oxford University Press.

^{*}To whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel: +1 212 746 6250; Fax: +1 212 746 8858; Email: ljgudas@med.cornell.edu

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/ by-nc/3.0), which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

proximal regions of actively transcribed genes relative to silenced genes (16,17). In contrast, trimethylation of histone 3 lysine 9 (H3K9me3) is associated with imprinting and transcriptional repression (16,18). H3K9me3 also marks genes differentially expressed in human cancers (19). The inverse relationship between H3K4me3 and H3K9me3 is emphasized by the observation that HP1, a key factor in the formation of heterochromatin, binds with high affinity to histone H3 methylated at lysine 9 but not at lysine 4 (18). Consequently, the transcriptional status is reflected by various epigenetic marks.

The heritable silencing and imprinted regulation of mammalian transcription relies in part on the symmetric methylation of CpG dinucleotides (20). In humans, imprinting defects have been associated with Beckwith-Wiedemann, Prader-Willi and Angelman syndromes (21,22). The processes of hypermethylation and *de novo* DNA methylation have been extensively studied in development as well as in cancer, but less is known about the role of DNA demethylation (23). This may be because enzymes catalyzing the active removal of cytosine methylation have not been established (24). As a consequence, it is not clear how specific promoters are targeted for methylation or demethylation.

The F9 embryonal carcinoma stem cell system is a model well-established for RA signaling (25). Importantly, F9 cells are genomically stable and closely resemble embryonic stem cells in morphology, growth behavior and marker expression (25,26). We show here that in F9 cells the knockout of RARa is associated with reduced Mest transcript levels and gene-specific epigenetic changes in the Mest promoter region, an effect that is partially rescued by restoring $RAR\alpha_2$ expression. Furthermore, a similar decrease in Mest transcript level can be seen by overexpression of the dominant negative PML-RARa oncoprotein. Our findings demonstrate that the loss of a single transcription factor can induce extensive, gene-specific changes in DNA methylation and thus alter the epigenetic signature of the cell. Our findings yield new insights into the mechanisms of APL and hereditary disorders resulting from defective genetic imprinting. We conclude that in F9 stem cells RARa sustains the transcription of Mest and Tex13 and prevents the transcription of Slc38a4 and Stmn2 by maintaining promoter specific epigenetic signatures independent of the RA ligand.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cell culture and RA treatment of F9 teratocarcinoma cells

F9 Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells were propagated as described (27,28). A batch of F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells with low passage number was revived from liquid nitrogen cryo-storage and the genotype of the RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cell line was confirmed by western blot (Figure 1F). For microarray analyses 2.0 × 10⁶ cells were plated 16 h prior to drug treatment. All-*trans* RA (Cat. #R2625, Sigma, MD, USA) and cycloheximide (chx) (Cat. #C7698, Sigma, MD, USA) were dissolved in 100% ethanol (EtOH). The cells were

pretreated with $1 \mu g/ml$ chx for 30 min before 7.5 h treatment with RA ($1 \mu M$) or vehicle (EtOH, 0.1%). For gene expression analyses F9 cells were cultured in RA ($1 \mu M$) or vehicle (0.1%, EtOH) 24 or 8 h prior to RNA harvest.

Purification of RNA, microarray analysis and statistical analysis

Total RNA was extracted and on-column DNase treatment was carried out using a RNAeasy mini kit (Cat. #74104, Qiagen, MD, USA) according to the manufacturers' specifications. Preparation of cRNA, gel electrophoresis quality control, chip hybridization and scanning were carried out by the Microarray Core Facility at Weill Cornell Medical College (WCMC). The microarray analyses were performed following the Affymetrix Genechip expression analysis technical manual. The fragmented cRNA was hybridized to the microarray chips (MG-430.2, Cat. #900496, Affymetrix, CA, USA), which include over 45000 transcripts representing 34000 substantiated mouse genes. The hybridization assays were performed using biological triplicates (e.g. independently propagated cells). The data were analyzed using Genespring v7.0 software (Agilent Technologies, CA, USA). Briefly, the data sets were summarized using the GC-RMA algorithm, followed by a three-step normalization process consisting of: (i) data transformation, converting values <0.01-0.01. (ii) chip normalization to the 50th percentile of total intensity and (iii) per gene normalization to median intensity. Genes were filtered by expression level to exclude genes with a raw signal below 100. In order to identify RA-induced genes that were differentially expressed between Wt and $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cell line, treatment (RA+chx) versus control (EtOH+chx) comparisons were performed for each cell line. To determine which genes were differentially expressed at statistically significant levels between EtOH- and RA-treated cells, a one-way ANOVA (P < 0.05 cutoff) was performed on each of the two groups (Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells). To identify genes which were differentially expressed between Wt and $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cell lines independent of RA treatment, Wt versus $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cell line comparisons were performed for each of the two conditions (RA+chx and vehicle+chx), and a one-way ANOVA (P < 0.05 cutoff) was performed on each of the two groups (EtOH and RA-treated cells). The data have been deposited in the GEO database (accession #GSE31280). For reverse transcriptase (RT) reactions total RNA was extracted using Trizol reagent (Cat. #15596, Invitrogen, CA, USA). The RNA was quantitated by optical density at 260 nm.

Generation of cDNA, semi-quantitative and real-time PCR reaction

Total RNA ($1.5 \mu g$) isolated from F9 cells was reverse transcribed (Cat. #95048, Quanta Biosciences, MD, USA), then diluted 1:10 with H₂O. Subsequent PCR reactions were set up using $3-5 \mu l$ as template. Semi-quantitative PCRs were performed with Taq polymerase (0.5 U, Cat. #CB4050, Denville Scientific, NJ, USA) in a BioRad iCycler: (95° C, 120 s)_{×1}, (94° C, 15 s; $55-65^{\circ}$ C, 30 s; 72° C, 30 s)_{×28-35}, (72° C, $4 \min$)_{×1}.



Figure 1. Gene expression analyses of wild-type and RAR α knockout cells. Relative transcript levels were identified by microarray analysis and the genes differentially expressed (2-fold or more difference in transcript levels between wild-type and RARa knockout cells) were plotted as fold difference in presence of RA against the fold difference in vehicle-treated cells (A right panel, transcript levels in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells >2-fold transcript levels in Wt cells; C left panel, transcript levels in RARa^{-/-} cells <0.5-fold transcript levels in Wt cells). Selected genes with increased transcript levels in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Slc38a4 and Stmn2) and with decreased transcript levels in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Mest and Tex13) were validated by real-time PCR (A left panel and C right panel, respectively) to be differentially expressed between Wt and RAR α^{-1} cells in a ligand-independent manner (measured in arbitrary units correlated with 36B4 expression, note the logarithmic scale). The duration of the RA treatment is indicated by the bar color (0 h; gray, 8 h; light gray, and 24 h; dark gray). Additional genes were validated by semi-quantitative PCR to be differentially expressed between cells in a ligand-independent manner. Genes with increased transcript levels (B) and genes decreased transcript levels (D). Different Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/}$ time points of RA treatment are indicated by the bar color (0 h; gray, and 24 h; dark gray). The specific bands (white arrowheads) and the relative transcript levels (bars above gels) are indicated. Assessment of household gene (36B4 and HPRT1) transcript levels confirmed similar amounts of cDNA in all samples (data not shown). (E) Transcript levels of RA inducible genes (Cyp26a1, Hoxa5, Hoxb5 and Hoxb2) assessed by real-time PCR at 0, 8 and 24 h of RA treatment of Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (correlated with 36B4 transcript levels). Each graph is a compilation of three independent biological replicates. (F) Western blot validation of the RAR α knockout cell line. A band of the expected size is detected by an RAR α specific antibody in Wt, but not in the RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cell line (left). In lysates from transfected COS cells RAR α , but not RAR β or RAR γ , is detected by the Ab (Santa Cruz, sc-551). The data represent three independent assays (microarray and real-time PCR), harvesting new RNA for each experiment, or a representative assay out of at least three independent assays (semi-quantitative PCR and western blot).

Annealing temperature and number of repeats were determined empirically for each primer pair such that the PCR was in the linear range. Amplification in the linear range was demonstrated by including a 3-fold serial dilution of cDNA from RA-treated Wt cells in each reaction (1:1, 1:3, 1:9). An RT reaction without RT enzyme served as negative controls for gDNA template. The PCR products were subjected to electrophoresis on TAE gels with 1.5% (w/v) agarose and 0.3 mg/ml ethidium bromide. The bands were visualized and quantified using a FluorChem 8800 system (Alpha Innotech, CA). Real-time

PCR was performed using SYBR Green Supermix (Cat. #84091, Quanta Biosciences, MD, USA) in a 15 μ l reaction containing reaction-mix (×1), 0.25 μ M of each primer and 3 μ l of cDNA template. The reactions were run on a Bio-Rad MyiQTM Single Color Real-time PCR Detection System (BioRad, CA, USA). Amplification in the linear range was demonstrated by a serial dilution of cDNA from RA-treated Wt cells included in each reaction (1:1, 1:5, 1:10, 1:50, 1:100, 1:500). Reactions with H₂O and template without RT enzyme, respectively, served as negative controls for primer–dimer and for amplification

Purification of gDNA and Bisulfite methylation assay

gDNA was isolated from untreated F9 Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells and purified (29.30). Promoter-specific methylation was assessed by bisulfite sequencing (31). The regions assayed were Mest: -337; +116, Slc38a4: -123; +374, Stmn2: -103; +224, Tex13: -248; +29 and Cyp26a1: -67; +152 relative to the transcriptional start site of each gene, see Supplementary Appendix S1A for details (Supplementary Data). In brief, cytosine to uracil conversion was performed on 1.0 µg of gDNA according to the manufacturer (Cat. #D5001, Zymo Research, CA, USA). PCR reactions were performed on the converted DNA with promoter-specific primers (Supplementary Data) designed using the online Methprimer software (32). PCR reactions were set up using 3-5 µl cytosine to uracil converted gDNA as template with Taq polymerase (Cat. #10342, Invitrogen, CA, USA) in 15 µl reactions containing PCR buffer [final concentration of 20 mM Tris-HCl (pH 8.4), 50 mM KCl, 1.5 mM MgCl₂], 0.2 mM concentration of each deoxynucleoside triphosphate, 0.2 µM concentration of each primer, and 3-5 µl of cDNA template. Sequential PCR reactions were performed using converted gDNA (3–5 μ l), and then 1 μ l of the initial PCR, as templates in a BioRad iCycler using following protocol: $(95^{\circ}C, 120 s)_{\times 1}, (94^{\circ}C, 15 s; 55^{\circ}C, 30 s; 72^{\circ}C, 30 s)_{\times 35-40},$ $(72^{\circ}C, 4 \min)_{\times 1}$. In the second PCR reaction, semi-nested primer pairs were utilized for increased fidelity in the amplification of Mest and Stmn2 promoter region. The PCR products were purified using PCR purification kit (Cat. # 28106, Oiagen, MD, USA), and the eluted DNA was recovered by ligation into the pGEM-T easy vector (Cat. #A1360, Promega, WI, USA). The ligated products were transformed into competent DH5a bacteria, and plated on LB agar plates containing ampicillin for overnight incubation at 37°C. DNA was isolated from resistant colonies and confirmed by NotI restriction digest (Cat. #R0189, New England Biolabs, MA, USA) to contain inserts of the expected sizes. From each F9 cell line (Wt and $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$) a total of 10n independent clones containing each of the desired PCR products were sequenced using T7(+) and SP6(+) primers (Supplementary Data).

Western blots

The SDS–PAGE and western blot analysis were performed as described (30,33) using RAR α primary Ab (Cat. #sc-551, Santa Cruz, CA, USA) in a 1:1000 dilution and HPR-conjugated anti-rabbit secondary Ab (Cat. #sc-2030, Santa Cruz, CA, USA) in a 1:10000 dilution. Each Ab was diluted in PBS with 5% Blotto (Biorad, CA, USA) and 0.1% Tween-20. The membranes were developed with Supersignal Substrate (Cat. #34080, Pierce, IL, USA) for 5 min and exposed to Biomax film (Eastman Kodak, NY, USA).

Chromatin immunoprecipitation assays

A one-step ChIP protocol which utilizes formaldehyde cross-linking was employed for histone ChIP assays. For transcription factor ChIP assays (RARa and RXRa), we used a two-step ChIP protocol. IPs of sonicated chromatin from 5.0×10^6 F9 cells were performed with 2 µg of Ab per IP (30,31). The regions amplified were Mest: -337; -197, Slc38a4: -123; +171, Stmn2: -103; +22, Tex13: -132; +32 and Cyp26a1: -97: -10 relative to the transcriptional start site of each gene (Supplementary Data). Each ChIP assay was performed using biological triplicates (e.g. independently propagated cells). Abs: H3K9me3 (ab8898, Abcam, MA, USA), H3K4me3 (07-473, Upstate, MA, USA), H3K9/K14ac (06-599, Upstate, MA, USA), RARa (sc-551, Santa Cruz, CA, USA), RXRa (sc-553, Santa Cruz, CA, USA), Rabbit-IgG (sc-2027, Santa Cruz, CA, USA).

Generation of stable clones

The pSG5 mRAR α_2 and pSG5 mPML-RAR α expression vectors were stably introduced into F9 Wt and $RAR\alpha^{-1}$ cells, respectively (Supplementary Data). In brief, the expression vector and a selection vector, pPGK Hygromycin (34), were co-transfected into F9 cells using lipofectamine2000 (Cat. #11668, Invitrogen, CA, USA) as described (35). Colonies were picked and screened (28). PCR screening was performed using the $mRAR\alpha E6(+)/mRAR\alpha E7(-)$ primer pair. Successful gDNA purification was evident by a 414-bp PCR product, whereas integration of the transgene was evident by an additional PCR product of 239 bp. Transgene expression in positive clones was verified by the presence of a 162-bp PCR product using the r β -globin5'C/r β -globin3'B primer pair, which spans the β-globin intron of the pSG5 vector (primer sequences (Supplementary Data)).

Accession of data sets

Gene expression profiles were deposited at GEO with the accession code GSE31280 (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih. gov/geo/querry/acc.cgi?acc=GSE31280).

Statistical analysis

Biological triplicates were analyzed using one-way ANOVA in the expression and ChIP analyses. The data was analyzed by a two step approach; the first step assessed the effect of RA (vehicle versus RA-treated cells). The second step assessed the effect of RAR α (Wt versus RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells). If the difference between vehicle and RA-treated cells (first step) was not significant the data was collectively assessed when assessing the effect of the genotype (second step). The standard deviation was determined for each of the data sets (plotted as error bars in the graphs), and ANOVA values of P < 0.05 between compared samples were assigned statistical significance.

RESULTS

Transcriptome profiling of F9 Wt and RAR α knockout cells reveals a ligand-independent role of RAR α

We aimed to identify novel genes whose expression depends on RAR α . Therefore, we performed a comparative microarray analysis of F9 Wt and F9 RAR α knockout (RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$) cells cultured in the presence or absence of RA. Through pair-wise comparison between the Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cell lines in either the presence or absence of RA (see supplementary material for details (Supplementary Data)), we identified several genes that were differentially expressed (Figure 1A and C display genes increased and decreased, respectively, in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ relative to Wt cells). Excluding multiple hits of the same genes, we found 63 transcripts with elevated levels in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells and 14 transcripts with reduced levels in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells relative to levels in Wt cells.

We reviewed the functions of the differentially expressed genes to elucidate the pathways in which RARa may be implicated. Slc38a4 (solute carrier family 38, member 4; Ata3) is a paternally expressed gene regulated by imprinting (36). Slc38a4 encodes an arginine transporter found in placental tissue and in adult liver and muscle (37). Stmn2 (Statmin 2; Scg10) is differentially expressed during neoplastic conversion of human prostate epithelial cells and may be an early marker of cancer initiation (38). Ref2L (similar to RNA and export factor-binding protein 1-II) may, by similarity to Thoc4, function as a co-factor for PML (39). RpL39l (ribosomal protein L39-like) is involved in spermatogenesis and the human homolog is overexpressed in various types of cancer, including ovarian cancer (40).Mobp (myelin-associated oligodendrocytic basic protein) stabilizes the myelin sheath (41). Rlf (rearranged L-myc fusion sequence) is the intrachromosomal recipient of the L-myc rearrangement. Expression of the resulting fusion protein inhibits embryonic stem cell differentiation and embryoid body formation (42).

Mest (mesoderm specific transcript: Peg1) is a paternally expressed gene regulated by imprinting; the Mest promoter is unmethylated in sperm, but highly methylated in oocytes (43,44). Decreased Mest expression has been associated with glioblastoma (45), whereas invasive breast and lung cancer show increased Mest expression (46). Tex13 (testis expressed gene 13B) is located on the X chromosome and may play a role in spermatogenesis (47). Gab1 (growth factor receptor-bound protein 2 associated protein 1) is a key factor in endothelial development (48). Tcfap2a (transcription factor AP-2, alpha) is induced during RA-mediated differentiation of primary astrocytes (49). Abnormal expression of the human homolog was reported in breast cancer, acute lymphoblastic leukemia, and head and neck squamous cell carcinomas (50-52). HMGcs1 (3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-CoA synthase 1) is involved in cholesterol biosynthesis (53).

The genes that are differentially expressed between Wt and $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cells are predominantly expressed in the placenta, in the brain and in the testis (Supplementary Data). These are tissues where imprinting plays a major role in transcriptional regulation (54,55) thus suggesting

that $RAR\alpha$ could be involved in regulating genetic imprinting.

We verified transcript levels of a subset of the differentially expressed genes identified in our microarray analysis. The Slc38a4 and Stmn2 transcript levels were assessed by real-time PCR upon 0, 8 and 24 h of RA treatment (Figure 1A, left panel). Relative to F9 Wt cells the $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cells exhibited increased levels of Slc38a4 and Stmn2 at all three time points. The observed increases in transcript levels of Ref2L, Rlf, RpL391 and Mobp in $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cells relative to Wt cells were validated by semi-quantitative PCR (Figure 1B). The decreased Mest and Tex13 transcript levels in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells relative to F9 Wt cells were validated by real-time PCR after 0, 8 and 24 h of RA treatment (Figure 1C). The observed decreases in Bcl11a, Gab1, HMGcs1 and Tcfap2a transcript levels in $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cells relative to Wt cells were validated by semi-quantitative PCR (Figure 1B). Consistent with the microarray data, the transcript levels were affected by the knockout of RAR α , but were relatively insensitive to RA.

The transcript levels of 11 out of 12 differentially expressed genes were not changed by addition of RA. This was somewhat unexpected as RAR α is an RA activated nuclear receptor. In contrast, the microarray analyses identified several known RA-inducible target genes (Cyp26a1, Hoxa5, Cdx1, Tmtc1, Csn3, Aurkc, MP11, Pdgfr β , RAR β 2, Hoxb5 and Hoxb2 (Supplementary Data)) as showing >3-fold increases in transcript levels upon addition of RA to F9 Wt cells for 8 h.

We validated four of the RA responsive genes (Cyp26a1, Hoxa5, Hoxb5 and Hoxb2) by real-time PCR, and demonstrated a similar induction of these genes in F9 Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells upon addition of RA to F9 Wt cells for 8h and for 24h (Figure 1E). This demonstrates a functional transcriptional response to the RA treatment, possibly mediated by RARB and/or RAR γ . Thus, in the F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells the addition of RA induces transcription of several known RA responsive genes. Specifically, the transcript levels of Cyp26a1, Hoxa5, Hoxb5 and Hoxb2 were increased by 10-fold or more while transcript levels of Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 were increased by <2-fold upon 24h of RA treatment of F9 Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Figure 1A and C). Overall, these results indicate that in F9 Wt cells, but not in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells, the levels of several transcripts, including Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2, are maintained in an RA-independent manner.

The epigenetic signatures of Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4, and Stmn2 promoters are altered in RARα knockout cells

The largest differences in transcript levels between the Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells were observed for Slc38a4 and Mest (>10-fold difference in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ versus Wt cells). These genes are both paternally expressed (36,43), which suggests that transcription of Slc38a4 and Mest, and possibly also of Stmn2 and Tex13 are regulated by differential CpG promoter methylation in Wt versus RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells. We identified CpG-rich promoter regions and assessed the promoter-specific methylation status of

Slc38a4, Mest, Stmn2 and Tex13 (the regions amplified are specified in Figure 2C (Supplementary Data)). Because the Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 transcript levels are not affected by RA treatment (Figure 1A and C), we assessed the methylation status of each of these genes in untreated F9 Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells.

The methylation analysis revealed increased CpG methylation of the Mest and Tex13 promoter regions in F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells, from ~60% for either gene in Wt cells to 80% in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Figure 2A). Notably, two CpGs of the Mest promoter region (-32 and -149) persistently show low levels of methylation, even in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells. The increased promoter methylation correlates with the decreased Mest and Tex13 transcript levels in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Figure 1C). The increased promoter methylation in the RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells supports the idea of a cellular memory,

through increased DNA methylation, by which *de novo* methylation is maintained through subsequent cell divisions. Conversely, methylation of the Slc38a4 and Stmn2 promoters is decreased in F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells from ~90% for both genes in Wt to 40% in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Figure 2A). In summary, the knockout of F9 RAR α results in increased Mest and Tex13 promoter methylation and decreased Slc38a4 and Stmn2 promoter methylation, each of which is correlated with altered transcript levels in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ relative to F9 Wt cells (Figures 1A, C and 2A). In contrast, the Cyp26a1 promoter region was unmethylated even when transcriptionally silent, i.e. in the absence of RA [data not shown and (31)]

We wanted to elucidate the underlying mechanisms of RA-independent transcriptional regulation by $RAR\alpha$ by measuring key histone marks that characterize the



Figure 2. The Epigenetic Signatures of Mest, Tex13, Stmn2 and Slc38a4 promoter regions. (A) Mest and Tex13 promoters displayed increased methylation in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ relative to Wt cells. In contrast, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 displayed decreased methylation in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ relative to Wt cells. Each horizontal line represents the methylation status of an independent allele. The numbers below the figures indicate the CpG position relative to the transcriptional start site (+1). (B-D) Promoter specific ChIP were quantified by real-time PCR on chromatin IPed from Wt and from RARa knockout cells treated with vehicle or RA (vehicle-0h; gray and RA-24h; dark gray bars). (B) Histone modification in F9 Wt and RARa cells. H3K9/14ac modifications (upper panel). In RAR α^{-1} cells H3K9/K14ac levels at the Mest and Tex13 promoters is decreased, while levels at the Stmn2 and Slc38a4 promoters is increased relative to Wt. (C) H3K9me3 modifications (middle panel). In RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells the H3K9me3 level at the Mest promoter is increased, while the level at the Slc38a4 promoter is decreased. H3K9me3 levels at the Tex13 and Stmn2 promoters are not cells. A low signal (15- to 30-fold above the IgG) for H3K9me3 is seen at the Cyp26a1 promoter. (D) H3K4me3 significantly changed in RAR^a modifications (lower panel). In RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells H3K4me3 levels at the Mest and Tex13 promoters are decreased, whereas the levels at the Stmn2 and Slc38a4 promoters are increased relative to Wt. The signal from the IgG IP was set to 1 for each PCR. The data represent three independent IPs for each Ab, harvesting new chromatin for each IP. Statistical significance is demonstrated by P-values below 0.05 for the indicated comparisons. (C) Mest proximal promoter region. The promoter (excluding the sequences in italics) was evaluated for CpG methylation (bold). Underlined sequences indicate putative elements: RARE (DR1), NFkB-binding site, TATA box (TATA), transcriptional start site (TSS) and the exact region targeted by ChIP primers (labels to the right).

epigenetic signatures of the Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 promoter regions. Specifically, we assessed the H3K9/K14ac, H3K9me3 and H3K4me3 marks on the Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 promoters in the Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cell lines by chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP). In addition, the histone marks on the RA inducible Cyp26a1 promoter (Figure 1E) were assessed as a control (Mest, Tex13, Stmn2, Slc28a4 and Cyp26a1 ChIP target regions (Supplementary Data)).

The H3K9/K14ac levels at the Mest and Tex13 promoters decreased, while levels at the Stmn2 and Slc38a4 promoters increased in RAR $\alpha^{-/}$ relative to Wt (Figure 2B, upper panel). Increased H3K9/K14ac levels at the Cyp26a1 promoter in RA-treated cells corroborate transcriptional activation by RA in Wt and in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Figures 1D and 2B). We also found that the H3K9me3 levels at the Mest promoter increased, while levels at the Slc38a4 promoter decreased in RAR α^{-1} relative to Wt cells (Figure 2B, middle panel). H3K9me3 levels displayed no changes at the Tex13 and Stmn2 promoters in F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ relative to Wt cells (Figure 2B, middle panel). The H3K4me3 levels at the Mest and Tex13 promoters decreased in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ relative to Wt cells (Figure 2B, lower panel), while levels at the Stmn2 and Slc38a4 promoters increased relative to Wt cells (Figure 2B, lower panel). Increased H3K4me3 levels at the Cyp26a1 promoter in RA-treated cells further corroborate transcriptional activation by RA (Figure 2B, lower panel). Consequently, the changes in DNA methylation in the Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 promoter regions upon knockout of RAR α correlate with changes in histone marks associated with the respective promoters. Importantly, these specific changes in epigenetic signatures also correlate with specific changes in Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 transcript levels in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells relative to Wt cells.

RAR α and RXR α associate with the Mest, but not the Tex13, Slc38a4, and Stmn2 promoters

We next wanted to determine if Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 are direct targets of RAR α , we performed ChIP using an RAR α antibody and measured the enrichment of Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 promoters in chromatin immunoprecipitated from Wt relative to that from RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells. In order to assess RAR α heterodimerization with RXR α we performed parallel ChIP assays using an RXR α antibody (Supplementary Data).

We identified RAR α at the Mest promoter (>2-fold in both untreated and RA-treated Wt cells relative to RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells, P < 0.05), but not at the Tex13, Stmn2 and Slc38a4 promoter regions (each <2-fold enrichment, P > 0.05). This suggests that only the Mest promoter is a direct target of RAR α (Figure 3A). In contrast, RAR α levels at the Cyp26a1 promoter increased upon RA treatment in Wt cells (>2-fold, P < 0.05), but not in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (P > 0.05). However, the transcription of Cyp26a1 is not dependent on RAR α since similar Cyp26a1 transcript levels are observed in Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells after RA addition (Figure 1E), which is consistent also with transcription of Cyp26a1 relying primarily RAR γ (29). We conclude that RAR α is associated with the Mest promoter, but not with Tex13, Stmn2, and Slc38a4 promoters. In support of our findings a genome-wide mapping of RAR α -binding sites in MCF-7 breast cancer cells demonstrated binding of RAR α proximal to the Mest promoter, but not to the Tex13, Stmn2 and Slc38a4 promoters (12).

We identified RXR α at the Mest promoter only in Wt cells (>2-fold relative to RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells, P < 0.05), but not at the Tex13, Stmn2 and Slc38a4 promoters (each <2-fold enrichment, P > 0.05). This suggests that only the Mest promoter is a direct target of RXRa (Figure 3B). In contrast, we detected an RA dependent increase in RXR α at the Cyp26a1 promoter in Wt and in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (evident by a >2-fold higher signal in Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells after RA, P = 0.01 and 0.03, respectively). The minor RA dependent increase in RXR α levels at the Cvp26a1 promoter even in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ (~2-fold) suggests that RAR β and/or RAR γ are partners of RXR α at the Cyp26a1 promoter, thus corroborating the role of RAR γ in the regulation of Cyp26a1 (30). The assays demonstrate that RXR α is associated with the Mest promoter only in Wt cells, e.g. only in the presence of RAR α . The reported heterodimerization of RARa and RXRa (56) corroborates the requirement of RXR α on RAR α for association with the Mest promoter. We conclude that direct binding of RAR α /RXR α heterodimers is required to maintain RA-independent transcription of the Mest gene (Figure 5B).

Ectopic expression of RAR α_2 in F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells partially restores Mest transcript levels

To confirm that the altered transcriptional activity observed in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells relative to Wt cells is indeed caused by the loss of RAR α we re-introduced RAR α_2 , which in F9 cells is the predominantly expressed isoform originating from the RAR α gene. We derived two independent cell lines from the F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cell line (RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$:RAR α_2 , clone #1 and clone #2), which stably express murine RAR α_2 in the RAR α null background (Supplementary Data)). We then assessed Mest, Stmn2, Tex13 and Slc38a4 transcript levels in each of the two RAR α_2 restoration cell lines.

We observed increased Mest transcript levels in both $RAR\alpha_2$ restoration cell lines relative to the parent F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cell line (Figure 4A, upper left, P < 0.01). The RAR α_2 transcript levels in each of the RAR α_2 restoration cell lines were below the RARa transcript levels seen in Wt (67% and 50%, respectively), but still significantly higher than in the RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Figure 4A, upper right, P < 0.01). The overall Mest promoter methylation was not reversed by restoring RAR α_2 expression (Figure 4A, lower right), but in contrast to both Wt and RAR α knockout cells, specific CpG sites (-155, -124 and -32)displayed extremely low levels of methylation. Stmn2 transcript levels were reduced in both $RAR\alpha_2$ restoration cell lines relative to the parent F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cell line (Figure 4A, upper middle). The Tex13 and Slc38a4 transcript levels were inconsistent between the two RAR α_2 restoration cell lines (Figure 4A, lower).



Figure 3. RAR α and RXR α binding to target promoters. Promoter specific ChIP were quantified by real-time PCR on chromatin IPed from Wt and from RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells treated with vehicle or RA (vehicle–0h; gray and RA–24h; dark gray bars). The chromatin was IPed using (A) an RAR α Ab, (B) an RXR α Ab or (C) IgG negative control. The western blot in Figure 1f demonstrates antibody specificity toward RAR α . The average signal from IgG IP was set to 1 (marked by the light gray background in A, B and C). The data represent four independent IPs for each Ab, harvesting new chromatin for each IP. Statistical significance is demonstrated by P < 0.05 for the indicated comparisons.

These data indicate that the altered Mest and Stmn2 transcript levels in the RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cell lines are related to the lack of RAR α . Furthermore, our observation that Mest and Stmn2 transcript levels are only partially restored upon RAR α_2 restoration in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Figure 4A, upper left), suggests that this RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ phenotype is not fully reversible.

Expression of the PML-RAR α oncogene alters transcript levels of Mest, a direct RAR α target gene

APL is frequently caused by a t(15;17) (q22;q12–21) translocation which introduces the expression of an oncogenic PML–RAR α fusion protein (2,57). Several reports suggest that oncogenic RAR α fusion proteins cause APL in part by functioning as a dominant negative RAR (4,58,59). We hypothesized that the oncogenic PML–RAR α fusion protein would function as a dominant negative regulatory protein, effectively preventing RAR α (and possibly RAR β and RAR γ) from functioning in F9 Wt cells. If our hypothesis is correct, genes such as Mest, whose expression is maintained by RAR α , would be silenced upon expression of the PML–RAR α oncoprotein in F9 Wt cells. In addition, if the phenotype from overexpression of the dominant negative PML–RAR α in F9 Wt cells mimics the phenotype of RAR α knockout cells, this would be validation of the role of RAR α in RA-independent transcriptional regulation.

In order to test this hypothesis, we generated an F9 cell line, PML–RAR α^+ (Wt), which stably expresses a murine PML–RAR α fusion protein in the wild-type background (the 562 amino-terminal residues of PML fused to 400 carboxy-terminal residues of RAR α (Supplementary Data)). We then assessed Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 transcript levels in the PML–RAR α^+ (Wt) cells. Since oncogenic RAR α fusion proteins attenuate the RA responsiveness of HL-60 and U937 cells (4,59), the transcriptional induction of Cyp26a1 by RA treatment of the F9 PML–RAR α^+ (Wt) cells was assessed in parallel.

We observed reduced levels of Mest transcript and increased levels of promoter methylation in the F9 PML–RAR α^+ (Wt) relative to F9 Wt cells (Figure 4B). In contrast, Tex13 expression was elevated by ~20% in PML–RAR α^+ (Wt) compared to Wt cells (Figure 4B). Only minor changes in Slc38a4 and Stmn2 transcript levels were observed in PML–RAR α^+ (Wt) relative to Wt cells (Figure 4B). Consequently, expression of the PML– RAR α fusion protein in F9 Wt cells recapitulated the RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ phenotype with respect to Mest, but not with respect to Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 transcript levels.



Figure 4. Ectopic RAR α expression affects Mest transcript levels in F9 cells. (A) Full-length RAR α_2 was stably expressed in F9 RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (upper right). Transcript levels assessed by real-time PCR demonstrate partial restoration of Mest transcript levels (upper left), but no reversal of the overall promoter methylation (lower left). Stmn2 transcript levels were not affected (middle panel). Tex13 and Slc38a4 transcript levels were inconsistent between the two independent RAR α_2 restoration lines (lower middle and right panel). The *P*-values show a comparison of RAR α_2 restoration cell lines to the RAR α knockout cell line. The data represent three independent assays, harvesting new RNA for each experiment. (B) The PML–RAR α oncogene was stably expressed in F9 Wt cells. Transcript levels assessed by real-time PCR (upper left panel) suggest a dominant negative function of the PML–RAR α protein for Mest associated with increased levels of promoter methylation (lower left panel), while Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2 transcript levels were not affected (Wt, 24h RA was set to 1). RA induced transcription of Cyp26a1 was impaired in PML–RAR α expressing cells (upper right panel). The duration of the RA treatment is indicated by the bar color (0 h; gray, 8 h; light gray, and 24 h; dark gray bars). The *P*-values show a comparison of the PML–RAR α cell line to the F9 Wt cells. The data represent three independent assays, harvesting new RNA for each experiment.

In addition, with Cyp26a1 mRNA levels reduced to 25% in the PML–RAR α^+ (Wt) cells relative to Wt cells after 24h of RA (Figure 4B), the RA responsiveness of the Cyp26a1 gene was greatly attenuated upon overexpression of PML–RAR α . In summary, whereas the knockout of RAR α was associated with decreased Mest and Tex13 transcript levels and increased Slc38a4 and Stmn2 transcript levels, only Mest transcript levels were decreased upon overexpression of a PML–RAR α fusion protein in F9 Wt cells. Consequently, stably expressing the PML–RAR α protein in F9 Wt cell recapitulate the RAR α

knockout phenotype with respect to the Mest transcript levels and promoter methylation.

DISCUSSION

Transcriptional silencing through DNA methylation has been extensively studied, yet the reverse process of transcriptional activation through DNA demethylation has started to receive attention only in recent years. We have demonstrated that knockout of RAR α is accompanied by increased methylation of the Mest and Tex13 promoter



Figure 5. Model for RAR α dependent epigenetic regulation. (A) Ligand-independent binding of $RAR\alpha/RXR\alpha$ heterodimers to the Mest promoter region is required to maintain transcriptionally permissive histone modifications (H3K4me3 and H3K9/K14ac) and relatively low methylation levels of promoter CpG islands (upper panel). Knockout of RARa results in higher levels of Mest promoter methylation, loss of permissive histone modifications, and gain of repressive histone modifications (lower panel). (B) Actively transcribed genes display relative low levels of promoter methylation and high levels of H3K9/K14ac and H3K4me3 (Mest and Tex13 in Wt, Stmn2 and Slc38a4 in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$), whereas silenced genes display high levels of promoter methylation and, if paternally expressed, high H3K9me3 levels (Slc38a4 in Wt, Mest in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$). Transcriptional start sites (TSS) and relative transcriptional activities are indicated by the arrows and arrow sizes, respectively. The relative levels of CpG promoter methylation are denoted by black lollipops (the CpG-rich regions assessed each span the TSS but for clarity are drawn upstream of the TSS).

regions and decreased methylation of the Slc38a4 and Stmn2 promoter regions, an effect that, with respect to Mest and Stmn2 transcript levels, is partially reverted upon restoration of RAR α_2 expression in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells. Furthermore, with respect to Mest the RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ phenotype is recapitulated by overexpression of PML–RAR α in F9 Wt cells.

In RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells both Mest and Tex13 overall promoter methylation was increased from 60% to 80%. However, whereas Mest transcript levels and H3K9/K14ac levels were severely reduced (to 13% and 15%, -/+ RA, respectively), the Tex13 transcript levels and H3K9/K14ac levels were only moderately reduced (to 49% and 48%, -/+ RA, respectively). Consequently, promoter methylation only partially reflects the transcriptional activity. The H3K9me3 repressive histone mark displays a much stronger association with the Mest promoter region than with the Tex13 promoter region,

which may account for the more pronounced repression of Mest relative to Tex13 in RAR $a^{-/-}$ cells. Overall, the altered levels of promoter methylation correlate with specific changes in histone modifications (H3K9me3, H3K9/K14ac and H3K4me3). The RA-independent association of RARa and RXRa with the Mest promoter region contrasts with the RA dependent enrichment of RXRa at the Cyp26a1 promoter region and points to a direct role of RARa/RXRa heterodimers in preventing DNA methylation of the Mest promoter region of Wt cells. Our data also suggest that the lower level of DNA methylation of the Tex13 promoter region and the highly methylated states of the Slc38a4 and Stmn2 promoter regions are indirectly maintained by RARa in F9 Wt cells (Figure 5B). However, we cannot exclude the possibility that distant RAR_{\alpha}-binding sites regulate Tex13, Stmn2 and Slc38a4 expression, as these would elude detection in the promoter specific ChIP assay.

A novel ligand-independent function of RARa

Retinoid receptors and other nuclear hormone receptors has been reported to regulate transcription mainly by their ability to activate and repress transcriptional activities reversibly in the presence and absence of ligands, respectively (30,31,60-62). We identified several transcripts, including Mest, Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2, which are differentially expressed between F9 Wt and RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells in a RA-independent manner, e.g. the exogenous addition of RA had no effect on the transcriptional activities measured by transcript levels (Figure 1), promoter methylation and histone modifications (Figure 2). We cannot rule out that these differences are caused by endogenously produced ligands, but a number of findings argue for an unliganded function of RARa. First, several known RA responsive genes, including Hoxb5, Hoxa5, Cyp26a1 and Hoxb2, were potently induced in F9 Wt and in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells upon RA addition (Figure 1E), thus demonstrating a positive transcriptional effect of RA in the RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells. Second, RARa has been shown by us and others to mediate RA-dependent transcription of reporter plasmids (63,64), and thus to have the capability to mediate ligand-dependent transcriptional activation. Third, using a non-biased, genome-wide approach, RARa-binding sites have been identified proximal to both RA responsive and RA non-responsive genes (11,12), and it was suggested that RA responsiveness may be dictated by the specific configuration of the RARE. In this respect, it is particularly intriguing that the Mest promoter contains a degenerate RARE immediately downstream of the ChIP target region (Figure 2C). Our findings demonstrate that in F9 cells the levels of RAR α and RXR α at the Mest promoter region were not affected by the presence of RA, since the IP signals displayed no statistically significant change upon RA treatment of Wt cells $[p_{(RAR\alpha)} = 0.28$ and $p_{(RXR\alpha)} = 0.72$, respectively, Figure 3]. This suggests that $RAR\alpha/RXR\alpha$ heterodimers can maintain transcription of Mest independently of RA. In contrast, the levels of RARa and RXRa at the Cyp26a1 promoter region increased upon RA treatment of Wt cells $[p_{(RAR\alpha)} = 0.04$ and

 $p_{(RXR\alpha)} = 0.01$, respectively, Figure 3]. These results suggest that RA treatment results in increased levels of RAR α (and RXR α) at RA responsive elements (as observed for the promoter proximal RARE of Cyp26a1), whereas RAR α targets whose transcriptional activities are independent of ligand binding (e.g. Mest) do not display changes in the levels of RARa (and RXRa) upon RA treatment (Figure 5A). Intriguingly, the model of RARs and RXRs constitutively associated with RAREs even in the absence of ligand was recently challenged by a study which demonstrated a highly dynamic and RA-dependent association of RARs and RXRs with endogenous RAREs (65). It is worth noting that the Mest promoter contains a degenerate putative RARE (DR1), whereas the Cyp26a1 promoter contains two proximal RAREs (DR5), thus potentially explaining why RA induces transcription of Cyp26a1 but not of Mest. Alternatively, cis-bound transcription factors may modulate the function of RARa. In this respect, the relatively low levels of methylation of the two CpGs in the Mest promoter, even in the RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells, may indicate the presence of constitutively bound transcription factors. A putative NFkB-binding site (GGRNNYYCC) located next to CpG(-149) and a potential TATA-box positioned proximal to CpG (-32) may indicate coordinated action of several transcription factors. Upon restoration of RAR α_2 expression it is interesting that CpG (-32) becomes unmethylated. In contrast, the CpG (-149) is highly methylated, but the two neighboring sites to CpG (-149) exhibit low levels of DNA methylation. In summary, the Mest transcript levels are partially rescued by restored RAR α_2 expression. However, the promoter methylation is reversed only for specific sites. This suggests that these sites may be key in regulating the transcriptional activity of Mest.

Expression of PML-RARa in F9 Wt cells mimics the aberrant Mest transcription in RARa knockout cells

The Mest and Cyp26a1 transcript levels were differentially affected by the expression of PML-RARa in F9 Wt cells (Figure 4B). The transcriptional induction of Cyp26a1 by RA was attenuated in PML-RAR α^+ (Wt) but not in $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cells. In contrast, Mest expression was reduced in both PML-RAR α^+ (Wt) and in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells relative to Wt cells (Figure 4B). Whereas transcription of Cyp26a1 is regulated by ligand binding to RAR β and/or RAR γ (29), the transcription of Mest shows a strong correlation with promoter methylation and presence of $RAR\alpha/RXR\alpha$ dimers in the proximal promoter region. Consequently, the expression of PML-RAR α and the knockout of RAR α have similar effects on Mest expression, but different effects on Cyp26a1 expression. The ligand-independent association of RARa only with the Mest promoter (Figure 3) may explain why the introduction of PML-RARa mimicked the loss of RARa only for the Mest gene, and not for Tex13, Slc38a4 and Stmn2. We suggest that PML–RARα expression attenuates transcription from RA-inducible promoters (e.g. Cyp26a1) as previously reported, but functionally mimics the lack of RAR α at RAR α target promoters, which are not RA responsive (e.g. Mest).

Association with RAR α maintains high transcriptional activity and low levels of promoter methylation

When comparing the set of genes with aberrant transcript levels in RARa knockout cells with the genomic RARa targets identified in a genome-wide study evaluating DNA binding of RARa in MCF-7 cells (12), an intriguing pattern emerges. The RARa-binding sites identified by Hua et al. mapped exclusively to promoter regions of genes whose transcript levels were decreased in the F9 RARα knockout cells (Mest, Tcfap2a, Cux1, HMGcs1 and Gab1, Figure 1A and B (Supplementary Data)). None of the more than 7000 RAR_α-binding sites identified (12) mapped to genes with transcript levels elevated in the F9 RARa knockout cells (relative to F9 Wt cells), which indicates that target genes directly regulated by RARa display decreased expression in the absence of RARa. We observed direct association of RARa with the Mest promoter in Wt cells, and increased promoter methylation of Mest in RARa knockout cells, which suggests that RARa through direct association can hinder CpG methylation of specific promoters. Mixed-lineage leukemia (MLL) which is a H3K4 methyltransferase of the Trithorax family maintains transcription by preventing of CpG methylation in the Hoxa9 promoter regions of murine embryonic fibroblasts (66). The decreased H3K4me3 association with the Mest promoter region in $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cells (Figure 2B, lower panel) argues that the H3K4 methyltransferase activity of MLL plays an important role in the epigenetic regulation of Mest and possibly other genes whose expression is reduced in RAR $\alpha^{-/-}$ cells. Intriguingly, RAR α has been reported to interact directly with MLL5, a key MLL in hematopoiesis (67,68). This provides a biologically relevant, potential mechanism for the methylation inhibitory function of RARa.

The function of RARa may be modulated by TIF1β

The notion that Mest transcriptional activity is maintained by RAR α /RXR α heterodimers poses the intriguing question of why Mest is not induced by RA treatment. It has been suggested that binding of RAR/RXR heterodimers is required, but not sufficient for RA responsiveness (11). Indeed, this model is consistent with the observed RARa binding to genomic elements devoid of RA responsive genes (12). Alternatively, the lack of RA responsiveness could result from the activities of co-repressors (e.g. Sin3a, N-CoR2 or TIF1B) which modulate the activity of RARa. In manipulated F9 cells, heterozygotic for TIF1^β, the expression of Mest was RA inducible (69), suggesting that the activity of RAR α can be modulated by TIF1^β. Another candidate is the PRAME co-repressor, which can bind to RARs in the presence of RA and prevent ligand-induced transcriptional activation (70), potentially by inhibiting RAR α . However, ectopically expressed PRAME and RARa both caused resistance to growth arrest and apoptosis induced by HDAC inhibitors (71), which indicate similar, not

opposing functions of ectopically expressed PRAME and RAR α .

Alternatively, RARE configuration was suggested to determine RA responsiveness (11), but may be further modulated by promoter specific epigenetic signatures. Indeed, the increased levels of RAR α at the RA inducible Cyp26a1 promoter versus the unchanged levels of RAR α at the RA non-responsive Mest promoter (Figure 3) indicate that the promoter epigenetic signature play a role in determining the RAR association and thus RA responsiveness. This is supported by histone modifications and transcript levels, which demonstrate that the Mest gene is transcriptionally active in the absence of RA (Figure 1C), whereas Cyp26a1 is silent in the absence of RA (Figure 1E).

The biological relevance of RARa regulated imprinting

The majority of genes whose transcript levels differ between the Wt and $RAR\alpha^{-/-}$ cell lines are expressed in the placenta, the testis and the brain (Supplementary Data). These tissues are all sites where imprinting plays a major role in transcriptional regulation (54,55), and importantly, RAR α is expressed in these specific tissues (72–74). We predict that RAR α plays a key role in regulating genetic imprinting in animals, but this has yet to be investigated.

It was recently demonstrated that in the growth plate, a cartilage structure located between the epiphysis and metaphysis of long bones, differentiation from stem-like to hypertrophic chondrocytes is associated with decreased Mest expression and increased Slc38a4 expression (75). This inverse correlation corroborates our findings and provides a physiological framework for the molecular mechanisms identified here. Based on the key role of RAR α in hematopoiesis (1) and the interaction of RAR α with MLL5 (67), we speculate that similar changes in Mest and Slc38a4 expression occur during the differentiation of hematopoietic stem cells and that these changes in transcriptional activities are associated with the same epigenenetic changes in DNA and histones as here reported. The ligand-independent mechanism of RARa identified here sheds new light on the mechanisms of RA receptor action, and suggests that in addition to ligand-induced transcriptional regulation, ligand-independent regulation should be considered when investigating the epigenetic actions of RA receptors.

ACCESSION NUMBER

GSE31280.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplementary Data are available at NAR Online

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Dr Pierre Chambon for providing RAR α 1, RAR β 2 and RAR γ 1 expression vectors, and

Dr Nigel Mongan for keen and insightful scientific discussions.

FUNDING

Funding for open access charge: National Institutes of Health (R01CA043796 to L.J.G.); Weill Cornell Medical College funds.

Conflict of interest statement. None declared.

REFERENCES

- Collins, S.J. (2002) The role of retinoids and retinoic acid receptors in normal hematopoiesis. *Leukemia*, 16, 1896–1905.
- de The,H., Lavau,C., Marchio,A., Chomienne,C., Degos,L. and Dejean,A. (1991) The PML-RAR alpha fusion mRNA generated by the t(15;17) translocation in acute promyelocytic leukemia encodes a functionally altered RAR. *Cell*, **66**, 675–684.
- Leroy, P., Krust, A., Zelent, A., Mendelsohn, C., Garnier, J.M., Kastner, P., Dierich, A. and Chambon, P. (1991) Multiple isoforms of the mouse retinoic acid receptor alpha are generated by alternative splicing and differential induction by retinoic acid. *EMBO J.*, **10**, 59–69.
- 4. Chen,Z., Guidez,F., Rousselot,P., Agadir,A., Chen,S.J., Wang,Z.Y., Degos,L., Zelent,A., Waxman,S. and Chomienne,C. (1994) PLZF-RAR alpha fusion proteins generated from the variant t(11;17)(q23;q21) translocation in acute promyelocytic leukemia inhibit ligand-dependent transactivation of wild-type retinoic acid receptors. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **91**, 1178–1182.
- 5. Qiu,J., Huang,Y., Chen,G., Chen,Z., Tweardy,D.J. and Dong,S. (2007) Aberrant chromatin remodeling by retinoic acid receptor alpha fusion proteins assessed at the single-cell level. *Mol. Biol. Cell.*, **18**, 3941–3951.
- 6. He,L.Z., Merghoub,T. and Pandolfi,P.P. (1999) In vivo analysis of the molecular pathogenesis of acute promyelocytic leukemia in the mouse and its therapeutic implications. *Oncogene*, **18**, 5278–5292.
- Brown,D., Kogan,S., Lagasse,E., Weissman,I., Alcalay,M., Pelicci,P.G., Atwater,S. and Bishop,J.M. (1997) A PMLRARalpha transgene initiates murine acute promyelocytic leukemia. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **94**, 2551–2556.
- 8. Di Croce, L., Raker, V.A., Corsaro, M., Fazi, F., Fanelli, M., Faretta, M., Fuks, F., Lo Coco, F., Kouzarides, T., Nervi, C. *et al.* (2002) Methyltransferase recruitment and DNA hypermethylation of target promoters by an oncogenic transcription factor. *Science*, **295**, 1079–1082.
- Figueroa, M.E., Lugthart, S., Li, Y., Erpelinck-Verschueren, C., Deng, X., Christos, P.J., Schifano, E., Booth, J., van Putten, W., Skrabanek, L. *et al.* (2010) DNA methylation signatures identify biologically distinct subtypes in acute myeloid leukemia. *Cancer Cell*, **17**, 13–27.
- Martens, J.H., Brinkman, A.B., Simmer, F., Francoijs, K.J., Nebbioso, A., Ferrara, F., Altucci, L. and Stunnenberg, H.G. (2010) PML-RARalpha/RXR alters the epigenetic landscape in acute promyelocytic leukemia. *Cancer Cell*, 17, 173–185.
- Delacroix, L., Moutier, E., Altobelli, G., Legras, S., Poch, O., Choukrallah, M.A., Bertin, I., Jost, B. and Davidson, I. (2010) Cell-specific interaction of retinoic acid receptors with target genes in mouse embryonic fibroblasts and embryonic stem cells. *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, 30, 231–244.
- Hua,S., Kittler,R. and White,K.P. (2009) Genomic antagonism between retinoic acid and estrogen signaling in breast cancer. *Cell*, 137, 1259–1271.
- Khetchoumian,K., Teletin,M., Tisserand,J., Mark,M., Herquel,B., Ignat,M., Zucman-Rossi,J., Cammas,F., Lerouge,T., Thibault,C. *et al.* (2007) Loss of Trim24 (Tiflalpha) gene function confers oncogenic activity to retinoic acid receptor alpha. *Nat. Genet.*, 39, 1500–1506.
- 14. Cohn, E., Ossowski, L., Bertran, S., Marzan, C. and Farias, E.F. (2010) RARalpha1 control of mammary gland ductal

morphogenesis and wnt1-tumorigenesis. *Breast Cancer Res.*, 12, R79.

- Gudas, L.J. and Wagner, J.A. (2010) Retinoids regulate stem cell differentiation. J. Cell Physiol, 226, 322–330.
- Barski,A., Cuddapah,S., Cui,K., Roh,T.Y., Schones,D.E., Wang,Z., Wei,G., Chepelev,I. and Zhao,K. (2007) High-resolution profiling of histone methylations in the human genome. *Cell*, **129**, 823–837.
- Koch,C.M., Andrews,R.M., Flicek,P., Dillon,S.C., Karaoz,U., Clelland,G.K., Wilcox,S., Beare,D.M., Fowler,J.C., Couttet,P. *et al.* (2007) The landscape of histone modifications across 1% of the human genome in five human cell lines. *Genome Res.*, **17**, 691–707.
- Bannister, A.J., Zegerman, P., Partridge, J.F., Miska, E.A., Thomas, J.O., Allshire, R.C. and Kouzarides, T. (2001) Selective recognition of methylated lysine 9 on histone H3 by the HP1 chromo domain. *Nature*, **410**, 120–124.
- Wiencke, J.K., Zheng, S., Morrison, Z. and Yeh, R.F. (2008) Differentially expressed genes are marked by histone 3 lysine 9 trimethylation in human cancer cells. *Oncogene*, 27, 2412–2421.
- Ooi,S.K., O'Donnell,A.H. and Bestor,T.H. (2009) Mammalian cytosine methylation at a glance. J. Cell. Sci., 122, 2787–2791.
- Biliya,S. and Bulla,L.A. Jr (2010) Genomic imprinting: the influence of differential methylation in the two sexes. *Exp. Biol. Med.*, 235, 139–147.
- 22. Butler, M.G. (2009) Genomic imprinting disorders in humans: a mini-review. J. Assist. Reprod. Genet., 26, 477–486.
- 23. Ehrlich, M. (2009) DNA hypomethylation in cancer cells. *Epigenomics*, **1**, 239–259.
- Klug,M., Heinz,S., Gebhard,C., Schwarzfischer,L., Krause,S.W., Andreesen,R. and Rehli,M. (2010) Active DNA demethylation in human postmitotic cells correlates with activating histone modifications, but not transcription levels. *Genome Biol.*, 11, R63.
- Gudas, L.J. (1992) Retinoids, retinoid-responsive genes, cell differentiation, and cancer. *Cell Growth Differ.*, 3, 655–662.
- Soprano, D.R., Teets, B.W. and Soprano, K.J. (2007) Role of retinoic acid in the differentiation of embryonal carcinoma and embryonic stem cells. *Vitam. Horm.*, **75**, 69–95.
- Strickland, S. and Mahdavi, V. (1978) The induction of differentiation in teratocarcinoma stem cells by retinoic acid. *Cell*, 15, 393–403.
- Boylan, J.F., Lufkin, T., Achkar, C.C., Taneja, R., Chambon, P. and Gudas, L.J. (1995) Targeted disruption of retinoic acid receptor alpha (RAR alpha) and RAR gamma results in receptor-specific alterations in retinoic acid-mediated differentiation and retinoic acid metabolism. *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, **15**, 843–851.
- Gillespie, R.F. and Gudas, L.J. (2007) Retinoic acid receptor isotype specificity in F9 teratocarcinoma stem cells results from the differential recruitment of coregulators to retinoic response elements. J. Biol. Chem., 282, 33421–33434.
- Gillespie, R.F. and Gudas, L.J. (2007) Retinoid regulated association of transcriptional co-regulators and the polycomb group protein SUZ12 with the retinoic acid response elements of Hoxa1, RARbeta(2), and Cyp26A1 in F9 embryonal carcinoma cells. J. Mol. Biol., 372, 298–316.
- Kashyap,V. and Gudas,L.J. (2010) Epigenetic regulatory mechanisms distinguish retinoic acid mediated transcriptional responses in stem cells and fibroblasts. J. Biol. Chem., 285, 14534–14548.
- Li,L.C. and Dahiya,R. (2002) MethPrimer: designing primers for methylation PCRs. *Bioinformatics*, 18, 1427–1431.
- Laursen, K.B., Mielke, E., Iannaccone, P. and Fuchtbauer, E.M. (2007) Mechanism of transcriptional activation by the proto-oncogene Twist1. J. Biol. Chem., 282, 34623–34633.
- 34. Mortensen, R.M., Zubiaur, M., Neer, E.J. and Seidman, J.G. (1991) Embryonic stem cells lacking a functional inhibitory G-protein subunit (alpha i2) produced by gene targeting of both alleles. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, 88, 7036–7040.
- Nowling, T., Desler, M., Kuszynski, C. and Rizzino, A. (2002) Transfection of embryonal carcinoma cells at high efficiency using liposome-mediated transfection. *Mol. Reprod. Dev.*, 63, 309–317.
- 36. Smith, R.J., Dean, W., Konfortova, G. and Kelsey, G. (2003) Identification of novel imprinted genes in a genome-wide screen for maternal methylation. *Genome Res.*, **13**, 558–569.

- 37. Sundberg,B.E., Waag,E., Jacobsson,J.A., Stephansson,O., Rumaks,J., Svirskis,S., Alsio,J., Roman,E., Ebendal,T., Klusa,V. *et al.* (2008) The evolutionary history and tissue mapping of amino acid transporters belonging to solute carrier families SLC32, SLC36, and SLC38. *J. Mol. Neurosci.*, **35**, 179–193.
- Prasad,S.C., Thraves,P.J., Soldatenkov,V.A., Varghese,S. and Dritschilo,A. (1999) Differential expression of stathmin during neoplastic conversion of human prostate epithelial cells is reversed by hypomethylating agent, 5-azacytidine. *Int. J. Oncol.*, 14, 529–534.
- Bruhn,L., Munnerlyn,A. and Grosschedl,R. (1997) ALY, a context-dependent coactivator of LEF-1 and AML-1, is required for TCRalpha enhancer function. *Genes Dev.*, 11, 640–653.
- Nadano, D., Notsu, T., Matsuda, T. and Sato, T. (2002) A human gene encoding a protein homologous to ribosomal protein L39 is normally expressed in the testis and derepressed in multiple cancer cells. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 1577, 430–436.
- Yamamoto, Y., Mizuno, R., Nishimura, T., Ogawa, Y., Yoshikawa, H., Fujimura, H., Adachi, E., Kishimoto, T., Yanagihara, T. and Sakoda, S. (1994) Cloning and expression of myelin-associated oligodendrocytic basic protein. A novel basic protein constituting the central nervous system myelin. *J. Biol. Chem.*, 269, 31725–31730.
- MacLean-Hunter,S., Makela,T.P., Grzeschiczek,A., Alitalo,K. and Moroy,T. (1994) Expression of a rlf/L-myc minigene inhibits differentiation of embryonic stem cells and embroid body formation. *Oncogene*, 9, 3509–3517.
- Kobayashi,S., Kohda,T., Miyoshi,N., Kuroiwa,Y., Aisaka,K., Tsutsumi,O., Kaneko-Ishino,T. and Ishino,F. (1997) Human PEG1/MEST, an imprinted gene on chromosome 7. *Hum. Mol. Genet.*, 6, 781–786.
- Lucifero, D., Mertineit, C., Clarke, H.J., Bestor, T.H. and Trasler, J.M. (2002) Methylation dynamics of imprinted genes in mouse germ cells. *Genomics*, **79**, 530–538.
- 45. Martinez, R., Martin-Subero, J.I., Rohde, V., Kirsch, M., Alaminos, M., Fernandez, A.F., Ropero, S., Schackert, G. and Esteller, M. (2009) A microarray-based DNA methylation study of glioblastoma multiforme. *Epigenetics*, 4, 255–264.
- 46. Pedersen, I.S., Dervan, P., McGoldrick, A., Harrison, M., Ponchel, F., Speirs, V., Isaacs, J.D., Gorey, T. and McCann, A. (2002) Promoter switch: a novel mechanism causing biallelic PEG1/MEST expression in invasive breast cancer. *Hum. Mol. Genet.*, **11**, 1449–1453.
- Wang,P.J., McCarrey,J.R., Yang,F. and Page,D.C. (2001) An abundance of X-linked genes expressed in spermatogonia. *Nat. Genet.*, 27, 422–426.
- Katoh,M. (2006) Cross-talk of WNT and FGF signaling pathways at GSK3beta to regulate beta-catenin and SNAIL signaling cascades. *Cancer Biol. Ther.*, 5, 1059–1064.
- Philipp, J., Mitchell, P.J., Malipiero, U. and Fontana, A. (1994) Cell type-specific regulation of expression of transcription factor AP-2 in neuroectodermal cells. *Dev. Biol.*, 165, 602–614.
- Pellikainen, J.M. and Kosma, V.M. (2007) Activator protein-2 in carcinogenesis with a special reference to breast cancer–a mini review. *Int. J. Cancer*, **120**, 2061–2067.
- Dunwell,T., Hesson,L., Rauch,T.A., Wang,L., Clark,R.E., Dallol,A., Gentle,D., Catchpoole,D., Maher,E.R., Pfeifer,G.P. *et al.* (2010) A genome-wide screen identifies frequently methylated genes in haematological and epithelial cancers. *Mol. Cancer*, 9, 44.
- Bennett,K.L., Romigh,T. and Eng,C. (2009) AP-2alpha induces epigenetic silencing of tumor suppressive genes and microsatellite instability in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *PLoS One*, 4, e6931.
- 53. Dolt,K.S., Karar,J., Mishra,M.K., Salim,J., Kumar,R., Grover,S.K. and Qadar Pasha,M.A. (2007) Transcriptional downregulation of sterol metabolism genes in murine liver exposed to acute hypobaric hypoxia. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.*, 354, 148–153.
- Trasler, J.M. (2009) Epigenetics in spermatogenesis. Mol. Cell. Endocrinol., 306, 33–36.
- Nelissen, E.C., van Montfoort, A.P., Dumoulin, J.C. and Evers, J.L. (2010) Epigenetics and the placenta. *Hum. Reprod. Update*, 17, 397–417.

- Nagpal,S., Friant,S., Nakshatri,H. and Chambon,P. (1993) RARs and RXRs: evidence for two autonomous transactivation functions (AF-1 and AF-2) and heterodimerization in vivo. *EMBO J.*, **12**, 2349–2360.
- 57. Goddard,A.D., Borrow,J., Freemont,P.S. and Solomon,E. (1991) Characterization of a zinc finger gene disrupted by the t(15;17) in acute promyelocytic leukemia. *Science*, **254**, 1371–1374.
- Lin, R.J. and Evans, R.M. (2000) Acquisition of oncogenic potential by RAR chimeras in acute promyelocytic leukemia through formation of homodimers. *Mol. Cell.*, 5, 821–830.
- Pandolfi,P.P., Grignani,F., Alcalay,M., Mencarelli,A., Biondi,A., LoCoco,F. and Pelicci,P.G. (1991) Structure and origin of the acute promyelocytic leukemia myl/RAR alpha cDNA and characterization of its retinoid-binding and transactivation properties. *Oncogene*, 6, 1285–1292.
- Xu,L., Glass,C.K. and Rosenfeld,M.G. (1999) Coactivator and corepressor complexes in nuclear receptor function. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.*, 9, 140–147.
- 61. Chambon, P. (1996) A decade of molecular biology of retinoic acid receptors. *FASEB J.*, **10**, 940–954.
- 62. Kashyap, V., Gudas, L.J., Brenet, F., Funk, P., Viale, A. and Scandura, J.M. (2011) Epigenomic reorganization of the clustered Hox genes in embryonic stem cells induced by retinoic acid. *J. Biol. Chem.*, 286, 3250–3260.
- Vasios,G.W., Gold,J.D., Petkovich,M., Chambon,P. and Gudas,L.J. (1989) A retinoic acid-responsive element is present in the 5' flanking region of the laminin B1 gene. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, 86, 9099–9103.
- 64. Kruyt, F.A., van den Brink, C.E., Defize, L.H., Donath, M.J., Kastner, P., Kruijer, W., Chambon, P. and van der Saag, P.T. (1991) Transcriptional regulation of retinoic acid receptor beta in retinoic acid-sensitive and -resistant P19 embryocarcinoma cells. *Mech. Dev.*, 33, 171–178.
- Mahony,S., Mazzoni,E.O., McCuine,S., Young,R.A., Wichterle,H. and Gifford,D.K. (2011) Ligand-dependent dynamics of retinoic acid receptor binding during early neurogenesis. *Genome Biol.*, 12, R2.
- 66. Erfurth, F.E., Popovic, R., Grembecka, J., Cierpicki, T., Theisler, C., Xia, Z.B., Stuart, T., Diaz, M.O., Bushweller, J.H. and

Zeleznik-Le,N.J. (2008) MLL protects CpG clusters from methylation within the Hoxa9 gene, maintaining transcript expression. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **105**, 7517–7522.

- Fujiki, R., Chikanishi, T., Hashiba, W., Ito, H., Takada, I., Roeder, R.G., Kitagawa, H. and Kato, S. (2009) GlcNAcylation of a histone methyltransferase in retinoic-acid-induced granulopoiesis. *Nature*, 459, 455–459.
- Liu, H., Westergard, T.D. and Hsieh, J.J. (2009) MLL5 governs hematopoiesis: a step closer. *Blood*, 113, 1395–1396.
- 69. Riclet, R., Chendeb, M., Vonesch, J.L., Koczan, D., Thiesen, H.J., Losson, R. and Cammas, F. (2009) Disruption of the interaction between transcriptional intermediary factor 1{beta} and heterochromatin protein 1 leads to a switch from DNA hyper- to hypomethylation and H3K9 to H3K27 trimethylation on the MEST promoter correlating with gene reactivation. *Mol. Biol. Cell.*, **20**, 296–305.
- Epping, M.T., Wang, L., Edel, M.J., Carlee, L., Hernandez, M. and Bernards, R. (2005) The human tumor antigen PRAME is a dominant repressor of retinoic acid receptor signaling. *Cell*, **122**, 835–847.
- Epping, M.T., Wang, L., Plumb, J.A., Lieb, M., Gronemeyer, H., Brown, R. and Bernards, R. (2007) A functional genetic screen identifies retinoic acid signaling as a target of histone deacetylase inhibitors. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **104**, 17777–17782.
- Vernet, N., Dennefeld, C., Rochette-Egly, C., Oulad-Abdelghani, M., Chambon, P., Ghyselinck, N.B. and Mark, M. (2006) Retinoic acid metabolism and signaling pathways in the adult and developing mouse testis. *Endocrinology*, **147**, 96–110.
- Mollard, R., Viville, S., Ward, S.J., Decimo, D., Chambon, P. and Dolle, P. (2000) Tissue-specific expression of retinoic acid receptor isoform transcripts in the mouse embryo. *Mech. Dev.*, 94, 223–232.
- 74. Sapin, V., Ward, S.J., Bronner, S., Chambon, P. and Dolle, P. (1997) Differential expression of transcripts encoding retinoid binding proteins and retinoic acid receptors during placentation of the mouse. *Dev. Dyn.*, **208**, 199–210.
- Andrade, A.C., Lui, J.C. and Nilsson, O. (2010) Temporal and spatial expression of a growth-regulated network of imprinted genes in growth plate. *Pediatr. Nephrol.*, 25, 617–623.