

Germ lineage specification from a pluripotent primitive ectoderm-like substrate: a role for cell-cell contacts

A thesis submitted to the University of Adelaide for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

James Nicholas Hughes, B.Sc. (Hons)



Department of Biochemistry
School of Molecular and Biomedical Sciences
The University of Adelaide
Adelaide, South Australia

March 2008

Summary	iv
Statement	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 The promise of ES cells	1
1.2 <i>In vitro</i> differentiation: embryoid bodies (EB)	2
1.3 Lessons from the embryo and equivalence to <i>in vitro</i> systems	3
1.3.1 Primitive Ectoderm formation in the mouse	3
1.3.2 Primitive ectoderm formation <i>in vitro</i>	6
1.3.2.1 MEDII	7
1.3.2.2 EpiSCs	8
1.3.3 From primitive ectoderm to committed germ lineages in the embryo	8
1.3.4 Establishing the signalling environment for lineage specification	10
1.3.4.1 Proximal-distal Axis	10
1.3.4.2 Anterior-posterior Axis	12
1.3.5 Mesendoderm specification in the posterior primitive ectoderm	13
1.3.5.1 BMP	13
1.3.5.2 WNT	14
1.3.5.3 Nodal	15
1.3.5.4 FGF	15
1.3.5.5 E-cadherin	16
1.4 Mesendoderm induction from ES cells	17
1.5 Differentiation of mesoderm and endoderm derivatives from ES cells	20
1.6 Ectoderm formation: A role for active mesendoderm suppression <i>in vivo</i> and <i>in vitro</i>	22
1.7 ES cell differentiation can be controlled by the physical environment	23
1.8 EPL cells represent a superior starting population to ES cells for investigating lineage commitment	24
1.8.1 Ectoderm from EPL cells	25
1.8.2 Mesendoderm from EPL cells	26
1.9 Anterior/posterior model	27
1.10 Thesis Aims	29
Chapter 2: Materials and Methods	31
2.1 Nomenclature	31
2.2 Abbreviations	31
2.3 Cell culture	32
2.3.1 ES Cell Lines	32
2.3.2 Media components and additives	33
2.3.3 Media	34
2.3.4 Feeder free ES cell maintenance	34
2.3.6 Feeder dependent ES cell maintenance	34
2.3.6.1 MEF isolation and storage	35
2.3.7 MEF depletion	35
2.3.8 Differentiation of ES cells to adherent EPL cells	35
2.3.9 Differentiation of ES cells to suspension EPL cells	36
2.3.10 EPLEBs from adherent EPL cells	36
2.3.11 EPLEBM and EPLEB from suspension EPL cells	36
2.3.12 EPLIC	37
2.3.13 EBM	37
2.4 Differentiation Assays	37
2.5 Primers	37

2.6 Antibodies	41
2.7 RNA isolation	41
2.8 cDNA synthesis	41
2.9 Tissue collection from mice	41
2.10 DNA isolation	42
2.11 Northern blot analysis	42
2.11.1 Synthesis of radiolabelled DNA probes	42
2.11.2 Hybridisation of ³² P-labelled probes to Northern blots	43
2.12 qPCR analysis	43
2.13 Cellular Protein Extraction	43
2.13.1 SDS-PAGE and Western blot analysis	44
2.14 Transient transfection	44
2.15 Immunofluorescence	45
2.16 Paraffin embedding, microtome sectioning H&E staining	45
2.16.1 Hematoxylin and Eosin (H&E) staining	45
2.17 Animal Work	46
2.18 Preparation of single cells suspensions	46
2.18.1 Flow Cytometry	46
 Chapter 3: Defining EPL cell production from ES cells and comparison of mesoderm differentiation in Embryoid Bodies derived from ES and EPL cells	 47
3.1 Introduction	47
3.2 ES cells grown for 1, 2, 3 or 4 days in MEDII either adherently or in suspension all display EPL cell gene expression	48
3.3 Kinetics of EPL cell differentiation to mesoderm depends on the length of culture in MEDII	49
3.4 ES cells begin transition to EPL cells within 24 hours of MEDII exposure in suspension culture	54
3.5 Defining the EPL cell stage	56
3.6 EPLEB model primitive streak progression and share key EMT markers with the embryo	61
3.7 EPLEB differentiate to primitive blood faster than ESEB	64
3.8 Discussion	68
3.8.1 Equivalence of suspension and adherent culture for EPL cell formation	68
3.8.2 EPL cells model posterior differentiation when differentiated as EPLEB	68
3.8.3 Blood formation in EPLEBs resembles YS hematopoiesis	69
3.8.4 A transitional stage between ES and EPL cells exists after 24 hours MEDII exposure	69
3.8.5 Dynamic acquisition of EPL cell identity and equivalence to primitive ectoderm formation in the embryo	70
3.8.6 Are functional changes associated with maturing EPL cells?	70
 Chapter 4: Neither EPL nor ES cells nor their early derivatives contain detectable LTR-HSC activity	 72
4.1 Introduction	72
4.2 Establishment of radio-protection assay	74
4.3 R1-GFP ES cells undergo transgene silencing in a proportion of differentiated progeny	74
4.4 Assessment of EPL and ES derived cell populations for short-term radioprotection	76
4.5 Neither EPL nor ES cells provide short-term radio-protection	82
4.6 Discussion	82
 Chapter 5: Controlling mesoderm formation from EPL cells	 85
5.1 Introduction	85
5.2 Both Trypsinisation and MEDII withdrawal are important in mesoderm differentiation from EPL cells	87
5.3 Trypsinisation of EPL cells favours mesoderm formation at the expense of ectoderm by an unknown mechanism	87

5.3.1 Differentiation outcome in response to trypsinisation	87
5.3.2 Morphology correlates with differentiation outcomes	92
5.3.3 Trypsinisation induces gene expression changes consistent with alterations to differentiation outcome	92
5.4 Disaggregation using multiple agents is equally effective in suppressing ectoderm from EPL cells	96
5.5 MEDII favours ectoderm formation from EPL cells by an unknown mechanism	98
5.6 MEDII window of action	102
5.7 Matrigel does not favour ectoderm differentiation from EPL cells	104
5.8 Discussion	104
5.8.1 Disaggregation appears to sensitise pluripotent cells to mesoderm inducing signals	104
5.8.2 MEDII appears to substitute for AVE signalling	106
5.8.3 EPL cells retain plasticity after disaggregation	106
 Chapter 6: Staurosporine induces mesoderm from EPL cells via an EMT	 109
6.1 Introduction	109
6.2 EPL colonies display morphological EMT in response to SSP	110
6.3 25nM SSP favours mesoderm differentiation at the expense of ectoderm differentiation from EPL cells	113
6.4 Length of SSP exposure has an effect on differentiation outcome	115
6.5 EPL cells exposed to SSP for 24 hours in the presence of MEDII take on a mesodermal gene profile	117
6.6 Discussion	119
6.6.1 SSP induces morphological changes but not full mesenchymal identity in the presence of MEDII	119
6.6.2 SSP alters the differentiation outcome in favour of mesoderm	121
6.6.3 E-cadherin transcript levels drop before up-regulation of <i>Snail1</i>	121
6.6.4 Cells remain responsive to MEDII after SSP treatment	122
 Chapter 7: γ -secretase inhibition favours ectoderm differentiation from EPL cells	 123
7.1 Introduction	123
7.2 γ -secretase inhibition favours ectoderm formation at the expense of mesoderm from EPL cells	124
7.3 γ -secretase inhibition has no effect on the formation of EPL cells from ES cells	133
7.4 Active Notch1 signalling is not detectable in EBM or EPLEB	135
7.5 Stimulation of EPL cells with Notch ligand does not alter differentiation outcome	138
7.6 Ectoderm induction by γ -secretase inhibition is mediated by E-cadherin stabilisation	140
7.7 Discussion	146
7.7.1 γ -secretase is active in mesoderm specification from EPL cells	146
7.7.2 γ -secretase might operate by blocking E-cadherin proteolysis	147
7.7.3 Inhibition of γ -secretase does not inhibit EPL cell formation but appears to block differentiation prior to mesoderm specification, at a similar stage to MEDII	148
7.7.4 Notch signalling is not required for neurectoderm formation	149
 Chapter 8: Control of mesoderm formation from primitive ectoderm by disruption of the epithelial cell state	 151
8.1 Understanding and controlling early events in lineage determination will be important for delivering desired cell types from pluripotent cells	151
8.2 Integration of MEDII, cell dissociation and serum in controlling EPL cell differentiation	151
8.3 EPL cells respond to modulation of epithelial state by differentiating to alternate outcomes	152
8.4 ES and EPL cells respond differently to disaggregation	154
8.5 The effect of disaggregation is likely to involve γ -secretase independent mechanisms	154
8.6 Disruption of epithelial state can directly initiate EMT prior to <i>Snail1</i> up-regulation	156

8.7 EBM represent a good model of anterior morphogenesis	158
8.8 MEDII suppression of Mesoderm in the presence of serum relies on the maintenance of cell:cell contacts	158
8.9 Relevance to hES cells	158
8.10 Final remarks	160
References	161

Summary

During mammalian development a small number of pluripotent cells proliferate and differentiate to give rise to all the mature cell types of the organism. Among the earliest differentiation events is the process of gastrulation, in which pluripotent primitive ectoderm cells form the three germ lineages, mesoderm, ectoderm and endoderm under the control of complex signalling and environmental cues. This process can be modelled using embryonic stem cells, which have proven to respond to embryologically relevant signals during *in vitro* differentiation and promise to uncover additional insights into the process of germ lineage specification. This thesis describes the differentiation of mouse ES cells to committed cell types via a second intermediate population of pluripotent cells termed Early Primitive Ectoderm-Like (EPL) cells. The similarity of EPL cells to primitive ectoderm and the rapid acquisition of lineage specific markers and loss of pluripotent characteristics upon differentiation of EPL cells suggest they are an excellent model for the cells in the embryo that undergo germ lineage commitment.

EPL cells can be differentiated as EPLEBs, which are highly enriched in mesodermal cell types and contain essentially no ectodermal derivatives and no visceral endoderm. Here it is shown that EPLEBs can be generated from EPL cells grown either adherently or in suspension culture provided the cells are reduced to a single cell suspension before reaggregation as EPLEBs. Since EPLEBs are a rich source of mesoderm and contain less non-mesodermal cell types than traditional ESEBs, they were assayed for definitive blood formation, however none was detected.

Alternately, EPL cells can be differentiated in the presence of MEDII in aggregates termed EBMs, which are restricted to ectodermal cell fates. Here it is demonstrated that the switch from mesodermal to ectodermal differentiation observed in ELPEBs and EBMs relies on two variables; a mesoderm suppressing activity within MEDII and the pro-mesodermal activity of cell dissociation as undertaken during EPLEB formation.

Evidence has been presented that interventions that modulate the epithelial identity of EPL cells are capable of influencing subsequent differentiation such that protection of the epithelial cell state favours ectoderm while disruption favours mesoderm. Staurosporine (SSP) is a kinase inhibitor that has been shown to induce an epithelial to mesenchymal transition in chick neural tube. Here it was added to EPL cells with the result that mesodermal differentiation was enhanced at the expense of ectoderm. DAPT is a potent inhibitor of γ -secretase, which cleaves a number of protein targets including the adherens junction component E-cadherin. Addition of DAPT to differentiating EPL cells has the opposite effect to SSP, with an increase in ectodermal differentiation at the expense of mesoderm. It is proposed that DAPT is acting by preventing E-cadherin cleavage and thus stabilising the epithelial state.

Modulation of epithelial contacts between pluripotent cells represents a novel way to control lineage induction and as such the incorporation of these findings into methodologies for directed differentiation in defined culture conditions is likely to provide improved outcomes in the production of desired cell types.

Statement

This work contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

SIGNED.....

DATE.....

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Grant Booker for the opportunity to undertake a Ph.D. in the Department of Biochemistry.

My thanks also go to Peter Rathjen for accepting me as a student within his laboratory. To Joy Rathjen, who has done more than any other to ensure the success of this work, I am truly grateful for your support and insights into both the science of embryonic stem cells and the process of completing a Ph.D.. I would especially like to thank you for the many hours you spent reading this manuscript and pointing out the innumerable occasions where I had failed to adequately expound my arguments. To Mike Morris and Rebecca Keough, thanks for all your input into my project and for your part in my scientific development.

A Ph.D. would be an awfully long road if you didn't enjoy each day and it was because of all the people in the lab and the department as a whole that I can honestly say I have thoroughly enjoyed the last four years. Quite a few people have come and gone over that time but the main characters who shared a laugh with me were, my PhD classmates, Harves, Tiffany, Sarah, Phil and Ana, the lab clowns, Mike and Kenneth and my good mates, Lynda, Fernando, Brett, Svetlana, Colleen, Ljiljana, Rob, Tetyana and Nori. Thanks to John Mac, who was an enormous help with all things TC and to Jan for fixing all my dodgy orders.

As with all major undertakings in life it's only worth it if you're got the support of the people you care about and that was certainly the case with my PhD. To Mum and Dad and all my family I extend my genuine thanks for your love and encouragement. The last person I'd like to thank is the person to whom I am most indebted, my wife Beck, without whose support and encouragement I might never have finished. She put up with an absent husband for so many weekends and even managed to sound interested when I'd come home from the lab rabbiting on about some new result. It's because of Beck that I count the last four years of my life as such a success and now with our new son Oscar I look forward to the next exciting chapter of our lives together.

Amendments

Chapter 1

P16 line 6 should read ...mice to die...

P21 3rd line from bottom should readstudied are cardiomyocytes...

P24 line 15 should read ...in vivo and in vitro suggest that at the loss of pluripotence...

P25 6th line from bottom should read ...HepG2 cells...

P26 line 5 should read ...EBM⁴ (see Table 2.1)...

Chapter 2

P37 section 2.4 should include - Typically outgrowths were scored on days 4, 8 and 12 post seeding and the maximum recorded score for each cell type was plotted. Typically visible red blood cells had a maximum score on day 4, beating muscle on day 8 and neural projections on day 12.

Chapter 3

P47 paragraph 1 should include the reference;

Rathjen, J., P. D. Rathjen (2001). "Mouse ES cells: experimental exploitation of pluripotent differentiation potential." Curr Opin Gen Dev 11: 587-594.