

**CHARACTERISING THE DIFFERENTIAL
REGULATION OF HYPOXIA-INDUCIBLE
FACTOR 1 α AND 2 α**

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Cameron Peter Bracken (BSc-Mol.Biol, Hons)

School of Molecular and Biomedical Science, University of Adelaide

February, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
THESIS SUMMARY	vii
CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	x
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 HIF discovery and classification	3
1.2 Additional HIF- α proteins	8
1.3 HIF- α splice variants	9
1.4 HIF- α stabilisation and hydroxylation	12
1.5 HIF-1 α transcriptional activation	21
1.6 Alternate mechanisms of HIF- α regulation.....	25
1.7 HIF target genes	27
1.8 HIF and disease	28
1.9 Differential functions of HIF-1 α and HIF-2 α	32
1.10 Aims and approach	34
CHAPTER 2 – MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	37
2.1. ABBREVIATIONS	39
2.2. MATERIALS	41
2.2.1 GENERAL MATERIALS	41
2.2.2 CHEMICALS AND REAGENTS.....	41
2.2.3 COMMERCIAL KITS.....	42
2.2.4 ENZYMES.....	42
2.2.5 RADIOCHEMICALS	43
2.2.6 ANTIBODIES.....	43
2.2.6.1 PRIMARY ANTIBODIES	43
2.2.6.2 SECONDARY ANTIBODIES	43
2.2.7 BACTERIAL STRAINS	44
2.2.8 YEAST TWO-HYBRID STRAIN	44
2.2.9 TISSUE CULTURE CELL LINES	44
2.2.10 BUFFERS AND SOLUTIONS	45
2.2.10.1 GENERAL SOLUTIONS.....	45
2.2.10.2 BACTERIAL GROWTH MEDIA	47
2.2.11 PLASMIDS.....	47
2.2.11.1 REPORTER PLASMIDS (obtained from elsewhere):.....	47
2.2.11.2 CLONING AND EXPRESSION PLASMIDS (obtained from elsewhere)	47
2.2.11.3 CLONING AND EXPRESSION VECTORS (cloned myself).....	48
2.2.12 OLIGONUCLEOTIDES.....	51
2.2.12.1 - PRIMERS FOR CLONING AND SEQUENCING.....	51
2.2.12.2 PRIMERS FOR SITE-DIRECTED MUTAGENESIS	53
2.3 ELECTRONIC RESOURCES	53
2.4 METHODS	53
2.4.1 YEAST TWO-HYBRID	53
2.4.2 DNA MANIPULATION METHODS.....	54
2.4.2.1 AGAROSE / TBE GEL ELECTROPHORESIS	54
2.4.2.2 RESTRICTION DIGESTION OF PLASMID DNA	54

2.4.2.3 LIGATION OF INSERT DNA WITH LINEARISED VECTOR.....	54
2.4.2.4 CLONING OLIGONUCLEOTIDES	54
2.4.2.5 GEM-T CLONING	55
2.4.2.6 A-TAILING.....	55
2.2.2.7 PREPARATION OF COMPETENT BACTERIA	55
2.4.2.8 TRANSFORMATIONS	55
2.4.2.9 ALKALINE LYSIS DNA PURIFICATION (<i>Miniprep</i>).....	56
2.4.2.10 AMMONIUM ACETATE DNA PURIFICATION (<i>Midiprep</i>).....	56
2.4.2.11 GEL PURIFICATION OF PCR AMPLIFIED OR DIGESTED DNA.....	56
2.4.3 PCR PROTOCOLS.....	57
2.4.3.1 AMPLIFICATION OF DNA VIA PCR WITH PFU POLYMERASE	57
2.4.3.2 AMPLIFICATION OF DNA VIA PCR WITH TAQ POLYMERASE	57
2.4.3.3 DNA SEQUENCING.....	57
2.4.3.4 QUICKCHANGE SITE-DIRECTED MUTAGENESIS.....	57
2.4.4 PROTEIN MANIPULATION	58
2.4.4.1 BRADFORD PROTEIN CONCENTRATION ASSAY.....	58
2.4.4.2 WHOLE CELL PROTEIN EXTRACTION.....	58
2.4.4.3 DENATURING PAGE FOR PROTEIN SEPARATION.....	58
2.4.4.4 WESTERN BLOTTING.....	59
2.4.4.5 GST PULLDOWN.....	59
2.4.4.6 IMMUNOPRECIPITATION	59
2.4.4.7 2D GEL ELECTROPHORESIS	60
2.4.4.8 PULSE CHASES	60
2.4.4.9 <i>In vitro</i> TRANSCRIPTION / TRANSLATION	60
2.4.4.10 IMMUNOFLUORESCENCE.....	61
2.4.5 CELL CULTURE	61
2.4.5.1 CELL CULTURE AND REPORTER ASSAYS.....	61
2.4.5.2 DUAL-LUCIFERASE REPORTER ASSAYS	62
2.4.5.3 HYPOXIC TREATMENT OF CELLS	62
2.4.6 HYDROXYLATION (CO ₂ CAPTURE) ASSA	62
2.4.6.1 EXPRESSION AND PURIFICATION OF MBP-FIH-1	62
2.4.6.2 EXPRESSION AND PURIFICATION OF <i>Trx-6his-HIFα</i>	63
2.4.6.3 EXPRESSION AND PURIFICATION OF <i>GST-NEMO</i>	63
2.4.6.4 PERFORMING HYDROXYLATION ASSAYS.....	63
CHAPTER 3 - CHARACTERISING HIF-2α SPECIFIC PROTEIN INTERACTIONS. 65	
3.1 BACKGROUND	67
3.2 RESULTS	68
3.2.1 Identifying candidate HIF-2 α interacting proteins	68
3.2.2 Full-length TARA does not interact with HIF-2 α	69
3.2.3 NEMO and the NF- κ B pathway	76
3.2.4 NEMO specifically interacts with HIF-2 α	85
3.2.5 NEMO dose dependently increases HIF-2 α activity.....	93
3.2.6 HIF does not affect NF- κ B activation	98
3.2.7 Endogenous NEMO increases HIF-2 α activity.....	98
3.2.8 Characterising the mechanism of HIF-2 α regulation by NEMO	99
3.2.9 NEMO does not specifically alter HIF-2 α C-TAD hydroxylation.....	107
3.2.10 NEMO does not alter the subcellular localisation of HIF-2 α	112
3.2.11 NEMO does not facilitate HIF-2 α post-translational modification.....	118

3.2.12 NEMO increases HIF-2 α transactivation, not protein stability, in a C-TAD independent manner	119
3.2.13 NEMO increases HIF-2 α activity via p300 recruitment	126
3.3 DISCUSSION	133
CHAPTER 4 - REGULATED HIF-α STABILISATION AND TRANSACTIVATION	141
4.1 BACKGROUND	143
4.2 RESULTS	147
4.2.1 FIH-1 expression and stability.....	147
4.2.2 FIH-1 knockdown increases HIF- α C-TAD activity.....	147
4.2.3 Stabilisation of HIF-1 α versus HIF-2 α in mammalian cell lines	151
4.2.4 Hypoxia increases C-TAD activity without increasing protein levels.....	167
4.2.5 HIF-1 α and HIF-2 α C-TADs have the same half life	167
4.3 DISCUSSION	171
4.4 A MECHANISM OF DIFFERENTIAL HIF-1α AND HIF-2α ASPARAGINYL HYDROXYLATION	173
4.4.1 INTRODUCTION	173
4.5 RESULTS	177
4.5.1 HIF-1 α A804V and HIF-2 α V848A substitution is sufficient to swap hydroxylation efficiency <i>in vitro</i>	177
CHAPTER 5 - DISCUSSION	187
CHAPTER 6 - REFERENCES.....	195

In animals, the transcriptional responses to hypoxia primarily aim to increase oxygen delivery to cells and facilitate anaerobic glycolysis, in addition to other processes including cell matrix assembly, growth and apoptosis. The hypoxia-inducible transcription factors, HIF-1 α and HIF-2 α , are key mediators of these responses. The HIF- α s themselves are primarily regulated through the dual control mechanisms of stabilisation and transactivation, mediated by prolyl and asparaginyl hydroxylation. Despite high conservation in domain architecture and amino acid sequence, in addition to similarities in DNA binding and hydroxylation-dependent control, there are distinct biochemical and physiological differences between HIF-1 α and HIF-2 α , best demonstrated by the non-redundant nature of the HIF- α knockout mice. Very few mechanistic differences between HIF-1 α and HIF-2 α however are known, which cannot explain this non-redundancy. The aim of this PhD thesis is therefore to determine novel mechanisms regulating HIF-1 α and HIF-2 α that may underlie these differential properties.

To achieve this aim, a yeast two-hybrid screen was initially employed using a region of HIF-2 α possessing the highest sequence divergence with HIF-1 α . The NF- κ B Essential Modulator, NEMO, was identified as a HIF-2 α , but not HIF-1 α , interacting protein which was subsequently confirmed in mammalian cells by various pulldown and immunoprecipitation methods. Furthermore, NEMO specifically increased HIF-2 α activity at normoxia, both when overexpressed and at endogenous levels, via a mechanism consistent with the enhanced recruitment of the CBP / p300 coactivators.

An additional strategy to analyse differential HIF-1 α / 2 α regulation was to compare their O₂-regulated stabilisation and transactivation across a number of mammalian cell lines. Although generally, the HIF- α proteins were stabilised and transcriptionally activated over a similar O₂ range, interesting cell-specific differences were apparent, both when comparing HIF-1 α and HIF-2 α and when comparing different cell-lines to each other. For example, iron chelation does not stabilise HIF-2 α protein, although HIF-2 α transactivation, and HIF-1 α stabilisation and transactivation are strongly increased. Cell lines also display large differences in the O₂-responsiveness of HIF- α transcriptional activation.

In vitro, the HIF-2 α C-terminal transactivation domain (C-TAD) is less efficiently hydroxylated by FIH-1 than HIF-1 α . This would be expected to increase CBP / p300 recruitment which parallels the increased activity of HIF-2 α C-TAD compared with HIF-1 α in cells. Interestingly, the residue immediately C-terminal to the hydroxy-asparagine differs between HIF-1 α and HIF-2 α though is then fully conserved across species. *In vitro* hydroxylation and cell-based reporter assays were employed to identify this amino acid as an important, though not sole, contributing factor specifying the inherent differences in FIH-1 mediated C-terminal hydroxylation.

Work comprising this thesis identifies NEMO as a HIF-2 α specific interacting and regulatory factor, in addition to uncovering further insights into the cell-specific nature of HIF- α regulation. This complements an emerging body of evidence demonstrating that multiple factors appear responsible for the differential regulation of HIF-1 α and HIF-2 α that underlie their non-redundant functions.