Revisiting the effects of Cas9 on p53-inactivating mutations reveals sex-biased genome editing by CRISPR-Cas9

Mengbiao Guo[1,*], Yuanyan Xiong[1,*]

[1] Key Laboratory of Gene Engineering of the Ministry of Education, Institute of Healthy Aging Research, School of Life Sciences, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, China.
[*] To whom correspondence should be addressed.
guomb3@mail.sysu.edu.cn, Tel: +86-20-39943419, Fax: +86-20-39943778
xyyan@mail.sysu.edu.cn, Tel: +86-20-39943531, Fax: +86-20-39943778

Abstract

Enache *et al.* report that Cas9 alone can activate the p53 pathway and select for p53-inactivating mutations. We reanalyzed *TP53* mutations in Parental-cells (no introduction of Cas9) and Cas9-cells (Cas9-expressing derivatives) from the Enache *et al.* study and found significantly shrinking inactivating subclonal mutations of *TP53* in Cas9-cells, which means Cas9 also selects against *TP53*-inactivating mutations. We also examined the sex-biased effect of Cas9, which was implied in their results but was not noticed and discussed by Enache *et al.* We further highlighted the sex bias in large-scale CRISPR-Cas9 screening experiments in various cell lineages. We suggest the sex bias effect may need to be considered in future clinical applications using CRISPR-Cas9.

Introduction

Enache *et al.*[1] have recently presented an interesting and important study demonstrating that the protein Cas9 (CRISPR-associated protein 9, commonly used for genome editing in the CRISPR-Cas9 system) alone can activate the p53 pathway and specifically select for p53-inactivated mutants. The CRISPR-Cas9 system was known to interact with p53[2-5]. In their study, they profiled 165 pairs of human cancer cell lines without treatment (termed Parental-cells) or with Cas9 expression (termed Cas9-cells) and found non-silent *TP53* mutations emerged only in Cas9-cells but not in Parental-cells (Fig. 3c in ref.[1]). They further showed that

ten inactivating subclonal mutations of *TP53* in eight cell lines showed significant expansion

(Fig. 3d in ref.[1]), but without mentioning inactivating mutations shrinking in Cas9-cells. They

emphasized that new non-silent *TP53* mutations only emerged in Cas9-cells and *TP53*-

inactivating subclonal mutations tended to expand in Cas9-cells.

We think this message is questionable after reanalyzing *TP53* somatic mutations from their

exome sequencing experiments (see **Methods**). We observed that four inactivating mutations

from four cell lines were significantly shrinking (**Fig. 1a**, P= 0.039), including one that was

instead shown as expanding by Enache *et al* (786O-I, Fig. 3d in ref.[1]). Therefore, we think

Cas9 not only selected for some p53-inactivating mutations but also against other inactivating

mutations. Based on our observation and given the small number of cell lines with emerging

non-silent *TP53* mutations in Cas9-cells, it seems possible that some *TP53*-inactivating

mutations disappeared in Cas9-cells but were not detected. Moreover, other possibilities of

TP53 aberrations cannot be ruled out, for example, changes in DNA methylation or

transcriptional regulators binding in the *TP53* promoter[6-8]. Therefore, even for cell lines

without p53 activation after Cas9 introduction, *TP53* status may also need to be monitored after

Cas9 introduction (workflow shown in Extended Data Fig. 5 in ref.[1]).

Fig.1 Bidirectional changes of *TP53*-inactivating subclonal mutations in Cas9-cells and sex-biased KO effects of CRISPR-Cas9. (**a**) Cas9 both selects for (*P*= 0.0050) and against (*P*= 0.039) *TP53*-inactivating subclonal mutations, with the largest changes found in females. Two-sided paired t-test. (**b**) The signal of Cas9 activity difference between p53-WT and p53-MUT was mainly from male cell lines (right, *P*=3.1E-5) and barely from female cell lines (left, *P*=0.021). In females, the difference was only marginally significant. This is related to Fig. 5a in the study by Enache *et al.* Bar, median; box, 25th and 75th percentile; whiskers, 1.5 times the interquartile range of the lower and upper quartiles; points, individual cell lines. Two-sided Wilcoxon-test. (**c**) Genes from various cell lineages showing sex-biased KO effects in

CRISPR-Cas9 screening. (**d**) Volcano plots showing significantly biased KO effects in both

sexes in the central nervous system (left, p53-WT) and upper areodigestive cells (right, p53-

MUT). The ten most promising genes to show sex bias, ranked by nominal P-values, were

labeled. (**e**) Boxplots showing two gene examples of significantly sex-biased KO effects in (**d**).

SMYD2 in the central nervous system (*P*=4.9E-5, left, p53-WT) and *SRSF9* in the upper

areodigestive cells (*P*=1.4E-6, right, p53-MUT). Two-sided t-test.

Results and Discussion

Interestingly, we found that the largest effects of many results shown by Enache *et al.* were

from female cells, including the largest fold-change of p53 activation (BT159: female, Fig. 1e

in ref.[1]), more DNA damage foci (MCF7: female, Fig. 2 in ref.[1]), and the largest *TP53-*

inactivating subclonal mutations expanding or shrinking (293T, HCC1419, and OVK18:

female, **Fig. 1a**). On the other hand, both emerging non-silent *TP53* mutations in Cas9-cells

were from male cells (JHH7 and SNU1, Fig. 3c in ref.[1]). More importantly, the signal of Cas9

activity difference between p53-WT and p53-MUT cells (Fig. 5a in ref.[1]) was largely from

males (*P*=3.1E-5) and barely from females (*P*=0.021) (**Fig. 1b**).

This may not be a coincidence, and possibly reflects the sex-biased effects of Cas9 due to the

differential functions and regulations of p53 between sexes. According to two recently

published studies, p53 plays a key role in chromosome X inactivation by enhancing Xist

transcription during neural tube development in females[9], and is differentially regulated in both

healthy and cancer samples between females and males[10]. Our recent work also shows that p53

regulates the active X chromosome dosage compensation, but with different effect sizes

between sexes[11]. Importantly, some vital genomic regulators interacting with p53 are encoded

by genes on chromosome X[10].

Due to the potentially large-scale clinical usage of CRISPR-Cas9 in the future in patients with

various diseases, sex-specific effects should be studied carefully and considered beforehand.

However, we have found no report discussing sex-biased CRISPR-Cas9 knockout (KO) effects

to date. We thus briefly investigated the potential sex bias in the CRISPR screening data from

the DepMap[12] project (20Q2, see **Methods**). We obtained a list of 17 genes (seven with protein-

protein interaction (PPI) with *TP53*[13], **Fig. 1c, Supplementary Fig. S1-S4, Supplementary**

Table S1) showing significant sex-biased effects by comparing cell lines from males and

females (see **Methods**). These genes include *SMYD2* (brain cells, *P*=4.9E-5), a protein

methyltransferase of *TP53*, and *SRSF9* (upper aerodigestive cells, *P*=1.4E-6), a critical splicing

factor for mRNA (**Fig. 1d,e**). Only *MOSPD2* is located on the chromosome X. We found sex-

biased KO effects in both p53-WT and p53-MUT cells, but not for *TP53* (however, note that

its negative regulator *MDM2* in brain cells had a *P*-value of 0.0018, which may help explain

their p53 activation results in brain tumor BT159, **Fig. 1d**), possibly due to its complex

regulatory network, or due to the difference between introduction of Cas9 alone and together

with guide RNAs. We also noticed that many genes had good nominal significance, although

they did not pass the multiple-test correction due to possibly small effect sizes and the heavy

multiple-test burden (**Supplementary Fig. S1-S4**).

We think the possible sex-biased effects of Cas9 may provide a possible reason for their failure

to detect p53 activation in Cas9-expressing HCT116 (male) cells. For the cell competition

(HCT116, male) and drug response (MCF7, female) assays in the study by Enache *et al.*, it

would be interesting to know if the effects would be stronger or weaker by using cell lines from

the other sex.

Collectively, we do not question the importance of the study by Enache *et al.*, but they may

consider further improving their results related to our observations. Our analysis may also

provide advices for future CRISPR screening experiments.

Methods

<u>Reanalysis of exome sequencing data</u>

First, by following their variant filtering strategy, two subclonal inactivating mutations from

two cell lines (including 786O-I or p.P278A showing expansion in Fig. 3d in ref.1 by Enache

et al.) were shrinking in Cas9-cells. Second, we examined the allele frequency (AF)

requirement of 'AF<0.48 or AF>0.52' in Parental-cells, which should be meant to exclude the

possibility that an observed somatic mutation in a cell line may simply be the same

heterozygous SNV in all Parental-cells. We retained these somatic mutations if 'AF<0.48 or

AF>0.52' was met in either Parental-cells or Cas9-cells, with the same other requirements.

Three inactivating mutations from three cell lines were shrinking. Third, we examined the

coverages of inactivating somatic mutations of *TP53*, which showed a minimal coverage of 63

reads (since Enache *et al*. used 2% as the minimal AF threshold, 2% means one read minimal)

and that most mutations (86%) were covered by >=100 reads and about half (46%) by >=200

reads (**Supplementary Fig. S5**). It means lowering the 2% cutoff to 1% probably will also

work for most mutations. After using 1% as cutoff, we observed that four inactivating

mutations from four cell lines were shrinking (P=0.039).

<u>Analysis of sex-biased KO effects for CRISPR-Cas9 screening</u>

We obtained the gene editing effects data for CRISPR screening, gene mutations from Cancer

Cell Line Encyclopedia (CCLE), and all cell line information from the DepMap project (20Q2,

<u>https://depmap.org/portal/</u>). Cells were separated into two groups by p53 status, p53-WT and

p53-MUT (with p53 non-silent mutations as defined in the Enache *et al* study). For both groups,

cell lineages with >=10 samples (at least 3 samples for both males and females) were retained

for downstream analysis. First, we tested the sex-biased KO effects in each cell lineage for a

list of 2,007 genes interacting with *TP53*, obtained from the PPI database STRING

(<u>https://string-db.org/</u>) by requiring interaction confidence scores larger than 400. Then, we

extended the test to all genes screened by DepMap. Differential KO effects were compared by

two-sided t-test and adjusted P-values smaller than 0.2 were considered significant. All analysis

and visualizations were performed using R language (<u>http://www.r-project.org/</u>). Number of

TP53-WT cell lines available: lung (n=18), central_nervous_system (n=17), skin (n=34),

colorectal (n=12), soft_tissue (n=20), kidney (n=14), peripheral_nervous_system (n=13).

Number of *TP53*-MUT cell lines available: lung (n=88), central_nervous_system (n=43), skin

(n=20), blood (n=29), colorectal (n=24), soft_tissue (n=16), pancreas (n=30),

upper_aerodigestive (n=30), urinary_tract (n=24), bile_duct (n=22), bone (n=15), gastric

(n=20), esophagus (n=25), plasma_cell (n=14).

Data availability

All data sets are available within the article or its Supplementary Information. DepMap data

were downloaded from <u>https://depmap.org/</u>. Protein-protein interactions with *TP53* were

downloaded from STRING (<u>http://string-db.org/</u>).

Code availability

All of the code used to generate and/or analyze the data is publicly available.

Acknowledgement

We thank the DepMap and CCLE projects for making their datasets available for analysis.

Author contributions

MBG conceived the idea, performed the analysis, and drafted the manuscript. YYX provided writing input. Both authors reviewed the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Enache, O.M. *et al.* Cas9 activates the p53 pathway and selects for p53-inactivating mutations. *Nat Genet* (2020).
2. Ihry, R.J. *et al.* p53 inhibits CRISPR-Cas9 engineering in human pluripotent stem cells. *Nat Med* **24**, 939-946 (2018).
3. Haapaniemi, E., Botla, S., Persson, J., Schmierer, B. & Taipale, J. CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing induces a p53-mediated DNA damage response. *Nat Med* **24**, 927-930 (2018).
4. Wu, Y. *et al.* Highly efficient therapeutic gene editing of human hematopoietic stem cells. *Nat Med* **25**, 776-783 (2019).
5. Schiroli, G. *et al.* Precise Gene Editing Preserves Hematopoietic Stem Cell Function following Transient p53-Mediated DNA Damage Response. *Cell Stem Cell* **24**, 551-565 e8 (2019).
6. Saldana-Meyer, R. & Recillas-Targa, F. Transcriptional and epigenetic regulation of the p53 tumor suppressor gene. *Epigenetics* **6**, 1068-77 (2011).
7. Furlong, E.E., Rein, T. & Martin, F. YY1 and NF1 both activate the human p53 promoter by alternatively binding to a composite element, and YY1 and E1A cooperate to amplify p53 promoter activity. *Mol Cell Biol* **16**, 5933-45 (1996).
8. Xu-Monette, Z.Y. *et al.* Dysfunction of the TP53 tumor suppressor gene in lymphoid malignancies. *Blood* **119**, 3668-83 (2012).
9. Delbridge, A.R.D. *et al.* Loss of p53 Causes Stochastic Aberrant X-Chromosome Inactivation and Female-Specific Neural Tube Defects. *Cell Rep* **27**, 442-454 e5 (2019).
10. Haupt, S. *et al.* Identification of cancer sex-disparity in the functional integrity of p53 and its X chromosome network. *Nat Commun* **10**, 5385 (2019).
11. Guo, M., Fang, Z., Chen, B., Songyang, Z. & Xiong, Y. Identifying new regulators of evolutionarily conserved differential chromosome X dosage compensation. *bioRxiv*, 2022.07.25.501478 (2022).
12. Meyers, R.M. *et al.* Computational correction of copy number effect improves specificity of CRISPR-Cas9 essentiality screens in cancer cells. *Nat Genet* **49**, 1779-1784 (2017).

222   13.   Szklarczyk, D. *et al.* STRING v11: protein-protein association networks with increased
223   coverage, supporting functional discovery in genome-wide experimental datasets.
224   *Nucleic Acids Res* **47**, D607-D613 (2019).
225