The condensin II/TOP-2 axis silences transcription during germline specification in *C. elegans*

Short title: Genome silencing during germline development

Mezmur D. Belew[1], Emilie Chien[1], Matthew Wong[1], and W. Matthew Michael[1][*]

[1]Department of Biological Sciences, Molecular and Computational Biology Section, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, 90089

[*]denotes corresponding author (mattm@usc.edu)

Abstract

In *C. elegans*, the germline is specified via a preformation mechanism that relies on the PIE-1 protein's ability to globally silence mRNA transcription in germline precursor cells, also known as the P-lineage. Recent work from our group has identified additional genome silencing events in *C. elegans*, during oogenesis and in starved L1 larvae, and these require the condensin II complex, topoisomerase II (TOP-2), and components of the H3K9me/heterochromatin pathway. Interestingly, silencing in oocytes also requires PIE-1, but this is not the case in starved L1s. Here, we ask if additional genome silencing components besides PIE-1 are required to repress gene expression in the P-lineage of early embryos, and we find that condensin II and TOP-2 are required and the H3K9me/heterochromatin pathway is not. We show that depletion of condensin II/TOP-2 activates the normally suppressed RNA polymerase II to inappropriately transcribe somatic genes in the P-lineage. We also present evidence that while both PIE-1 and condensin II/TOP-2 are required for genome silencing in the P-lineage, PIE-1 can silence transcription independently of condensin II/TOP-2 when misexpressed in somatic cells. Thus, in

oocytes all three genome silencing systems (TOP-2/condensin II, H3K9me, and PIE-1) are

operational while in both early embryos and starved L1s two of the three that are active (TOP-

2/condensin II and PIE-1 for early embryos, TOP-2/condensin II and H3K9me for starved L1s).

Our data show that multiple, redundantly acting genome silencing mechanisms act in a mix and

match manner to repress transcription at different developmental stages in the *C. elegans*

germline.

Introduction

Just like individual genes, the transcriptional output of entire genomes can be regulated in a signal-mediated manner. In fact, genome repression and activation are recurring events during germline development and gametogenesis in the roundworm *C. elegans*. In meiotic prophase, for example, oocytes globally repress transcription as they prepare to divide (1,2). The known transcriptional repressors, TOP-2, condensin II, the H3K9me heterochromatin pathway, and PIE-1 are all involved in the silencing of oocytes during meiotic maturation (2,3). After fertilization, transcription remains repressed, but repression is now mediated by the OMA-1/2 proteins that bind to and inactivate the essential transcription factor TAF-4 (4). The OMA system blocks transcription through the first two mitotic divisions and then these proteins are rapidly degraded. Loss of OMA-1 and 2 activates transcription in three of the four cells in the 4-cell embryo, with the holdout being the germline precursor P_2. P_2 remains transcriptionally repressed via the action of PIE-1, and this is the case for the remainder of P-lineage development (5-7).

Upon division of the P_4 cell, to form the Z2/Z3 primordial germ cells (PGCs), PIE-1 is rapidly degraded, and the germline robustly activates transcription for the first time (5,8). Z2/Z3 are transcriptionally active for the remainder of embryogenesis, however if the embryo hatches into a nutrient-free environment then the PGC genome is rapidly silenced, and this requires the combined efforts of TOP-2/condensin II and the H3K9me heterochromatin pathway, working in concert such that TOP-2/condensin II promotes H3K9me deposition, which is then acted upon

by H3K9me reader proteins like CEC-4 and HPL-2 to hyper-compact chromatin and silence

transcription (3). We named this system the Global Chromatin Compaction pathway to highlight

the linear arrangement of its components. Interestingly, in oocytes, despite the involvement of

both TOP-2/condensin II and the H3K9me heterochromatin pathway in genome silencing, there

is no requirement for TOP-2/condensin II in H3K9me deposition, and thus it appears that the

two chromatin compaction systems can work either together as a single pathway (Z2/Z3) or

separately as two redundant pathways (oocytes).

The findings discussed above highlight the plasticity in how the worm germline silences

transcription globally. Oocytes use TOP-2/condensin II, the H3K9me heterochromatin pathway,

and PIE-1, and loss of any one of these systems prompts unscheduled transcription. After

fertilization, PIE-1 becomes dispensable, even though it is still present, and OMA-1/2 take over

briefly to block transcription in P_0 and P_1. The requirement for PIE-1 returns with the birth of P_2,

and this lasts until PIE-1 is destroyed upon division of P_4. Later, in starved L1s, TOP-2/condensin

II and the H3K9me heterochromatin pathway are required once again, and this time they act in

a concerted manner. Thus, multiple systems are active in oocytes and Z2/Z3, however in the P-

lineage, to date, we only know of single systems – OMA-1/2 for P_0/P_1 and PIE-1 for P_2-P_4. In this

work we asked if TOP-2/condensin II and/or the H3K9me heterochromatin pathway are

required in the P-lineage for genome silencing and found that the H3K9me heterochromatin

pathway is totally dispensable while TOP-2/condensin II is required for P_2-P_4 but not for P_0-P_1.

We also find that TOP-2/condensin II require the germline progenitor state to silence the

genome, and that PIE-1 does not. These findings increase our understanding of how whole-

genome silencing occurs and highlight the importance of developmental fate in regulating the

ability of TOP-2/condensin II to perform this task.

Materials and Methods

C. elegans strains

N2 (wild-type), WMM1 ([pie-1::gfp::pgl-1 + unc-119(+)]; [(pAA64)pie-1p::mCherry::his-58 + unc-119(+)] IV), WMM2 (ltls37 [(pAA64) pie-1p::mCherry::his-58 +unc-119(+)] IV; unc-4(e120) top-2(it7ts) II), MT17463 (set-25(n5021) III), WM330 (pie-1(ne4301[pie-1::GFP]) III) and 1284 (rrrSi199[Pvet-4::NLS:gfp:gfp::vet-4 3'UTR; unc-119(+)] II; rrrSi198[Pvet-4::NLS:gfp:gfp::vet-4 3'UTR; unc-119(+)] IV) strains were used in this study. Worms were maintained on 60-mm plates containing nematode growth media (NGM) seeded with the *E. coli* strain OP50 or HT115. Worms were grown at 20°C and propagated through egg preparation (bleaching) every 72 hours.

Bacterial strains

OP50 bacteria served as the primary food source. It was grown in LB media containing 100 μg/ml streptomycin by shaking at 37°C overnight. 500 μl of the culture was seeded on Petri dishes containing NGM + streptomycin. HT115 bacteria grown in LB media containing 100 μg/ml carbenicillin and 12.5 μg/ml tetracycline and seeded on NGM + carbenicillin + tetracycline plates were also used as a source of food. Our RNAi strains were obtained from the Ahringer library and verified by Sanger sequencing. Bacteria containing dsRNA were streaked on LB-agar plates containing 100 μg/ml carbenicillin and 12.5 μg/ml tetracycline and incubated at 37°C overnight. Single colonies were then picked and grown in 25 ml LB cultures with 100

98   μg/ml carbenicillin and 12.5 μg/ml tetracycline. 500 μl of this culture was seeded on 60-mm

99   Petri dishes containing 5mM IPTG.

Egg preparation

Bleach solution containing 3.675 ml H_2O, 1.2 NaOCl, and 0.125 ml 10N NaOH was

prepared. Adult worms were washed from plates with 5 ml of M9 minimal medium (22mM

KH_2PO_4, 22mM Na_2HPO_4, 85mM NaCl, and 2mM $MgSO_4$). Worms were centrifuged at 1.9 KRPM

for 1 minute and the excess medium was removed, then the bleach solution was added. Eggs

were extracted by vortexing for 30 seconds and shaking for 1 minute. This was done a total of 3

times and worms were vortexed one last time. Then the eggs were spun down at 1900 rpm for

1 minute and excess bleach solution was removed and the eggs were washed 3 times with M9

minimal medium.

RNAi treatment

RNAi containing NGM plates were prepared as described in the "Bacterial strains"

section. For double RNAi treatments, RNAi cultures were mixed at a 1:1 ratio by volume. HT115

cells transformed with an empty pL4440 vector was used as a negative control. RNAi conditions

used in this study and tests for their efficacy is described below:

top-2 RNAi

L1 worms were plated on HT115 food plates for the first 24 hours and were then moved to

plates seeded with *top-2* RNAi for the remaining 48 hours. Embryonic lethality was observed at

>90%.

capg-2 RNAi

Worms were grown on HT115 food plates for the first 24 hours and were moved to plates

containing *capg-2* RNAi for the remaining 48 hours. An embryonic lethality of 80%-100% was

seen with this RNAi treatment.

top-2/capg-2 double RNAi

Worms were grown on HT115 food plates for the first 24 hours and were transferred to *top-*

2/capg-2 double RNAi plates for the next 48 hours. Embryonic lethality ranged from 90%-100%

for this RNAi treatment.

set-25 RNAi

Worms were grown on plates containing *set-25* RNAi for the entirety of their life cycle. Some of

the adult worms were bleached and an L1 chromatin compaction assay was performed on the

resulting larvae to test RNAi efficacy. Please see ref. 3 for details on the L1 compaction assay.

pie-1 RNAi

Worms were grown on plates containing *pie-1* RNAi for the entirety of their life cycle. An

embryonic lethality of 100% was observed for this RNAi.

mex-5/6 RNAi

Worms were grown on HT115 food plates for the first 48 hours of their life and were then

switched to mex-5/6 RNAi plates for the remaining 24 hours. An embryonic lethality of 100%

was observed for this RNAi treatment.

Antibodies and dilutions

RNAPIIpSer2: Rabbit antibody from Abcam (ab5095, Cambridge, Massachusetts) was

used at a dilution of 1:100. GFP: mouse Mab #3580, from EMD Millipore, was used at 1:500.

H3K9me3: Rabbit antibody from Abcam (ab176916, Cambridge, Massachusetts) was used at a

dilution of 1:1000. P-granules: mouse Mab K76, from the Developmental Studies Hybridoma

Bank, was used neat. Secondary antibodies: Alexa Fluor conjugated secondary antibodies from

Invitrogen (Thermofisher Scientific, Waltham, Massachusetts) were used at a dilution of 1:200.

Immunofluorescence staining

Adult worms were first washed off plates with 10 ml of M9 minimal medium and

washed 3 more times. Then, they were centrifuged at 1.9 KRPM and the excess medium was

removed. 20 µl of media containing about 50 worms were spotted on a coverslip and 3 µl of

anesthetic (20mM Sodium Azide and 0.8M Tetramisole hydrochloride) was added to immobilize

them. Worms were dissected using 25Gx5/8 needles (Sigma Aldrich, St. Louis, Missouri). To

release early embryos, worms were cut once midway through their length. The coverslip was

then mounted onto poly-L-lysine covered slides and let rest for 5 minutes. Slides were put on

dry ice for 30 minutes. Samples were then freeze-cracked by flicking the coverslips off for

permeabilization.

For RNAPIIpSer2 staining experiments, once samples are permeabilized, slides were put

in cold 100% methanol for 2 minutes and then fixing solution (0.08M HEPES pH 6.9, 1.6mM

MgSO$_4$, 0.8mM EGTA, 3.7% formaldehyde, 1X phosphate-buffered saline) for another 30

minutes. After fixing, slides were washed three times with TBS-T (TBS with 0.1% Tween-20) and

were blocked for 30 minutes with TNB (containing 100mM Tris-HCl, 200mM NaCl, and 1% BSA).

Primary antibodies were then applied at the dilutions described above in TNB and slides were

incubated at 4°C overnight.

For H3K9me3 and GFP staining experiments, permeabilized samples were put in cold

100% methanol for 10 seconds and then fixing solution (0.08M HEPES pH 6.9, 1.6mM MgSO$_4$,

0.8mM EGTA, 3.7% formaldehyde, 1X phosphate-buffered saline) for 10 minutes. After fixing,

slides were washed three times with TBS-T (TBS with 0.1% Tween-20) and were blocked for 2

hours with TNB (containing 100mM Tris-HCl, 200 mM NaCl, and 1% BSA) supplemented with

10% goat serum. Primary antibodies were then applied at the dilutions described above in TNB

and slides were incubated at 4°C overnight. On the next day, the slides were washed 3 times

with TBS and slides were incubated with secondary antibodies and Hoechst 33342 dye for 2

hours at room temperature. Slides were washed 3 times with TBS, mounting medium (50 %

glycerol in PBS), and coverslips were applied and sealed with Cytoseal XYL (Thermofisher).

HCR (In Situ Hybridization Chain Reaction)

A kit containing a DNA probe set, DNA hybridized chain reaction (HCR) amplifier hairpins, and hybridization, wash, and amplification buffers were purchased from Molecular Instruments (molecularinstruments.com). Genes that were examined were *vet-6* and *F58E6.6*. DNA was visualized with Hoechst 33342 dye. Embryos were prepared by bleaching and were immediately spotted on poly-L-lysine coated slides. Coverslips were applied and slides were freeze-cracked to permeabilize samples. Immediately after freeze-cracking, 500 µl of 100% ice-cold methanol was applied over the samples. Slides were dried off by tilting slides, 1 ml of 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) was added and samples were incubated in a humidity chamber for 10 minutes. Samples were then washed 3 times with 100 µl of PBS-T. A 1:1 solution of probe hybridization buffer (PHB) and PBS-T was added to the samples, and they were incubated for 5 minutes at room temperature. Samples were then prehybridized with PHB for 30 minutes at 37°C and DNA probes (at a final concentration of 2 picomoles per 500 µl of PHB) were added to the samples and were incubated overnight at 37°C. The next day, samples were washed 4 times with probe wash buffer (PWB) at 37°C with 15 minutes of incubation for each wash. They were then washed three more times with 5xSSCT at room temperature. Samples were pre-amplified with Amplification buffer for 30 minutes at room temperature. Probe amplifier hairpins were snap cooled by heating to 95°C for 90 seconds and putting in a dark drawer for 30 mins then were added to the sample. Worms were incubated with the hairpins overnight in a dark drawer. On the third day, samples were washed with 5xSSCT and incubated with Hoechst-

199 33342 (1:5000 dilution) for 15 minutes. Finally, samples were mounted on poly-L-lysine coated

200 slides and imaged.

Immunofluorescent imaging

203 All slides were imaged using an Olympus Fluoview FV1000 confocal microscope using

204 Fluoview Viewer software. A magnification of 600x (60x objective and 10x eyepiece

205 magnifications) was used. Laser intensity was controlled for experiments to achieve consistency

206 among samples.

Results

Loss of TOP-2 and condensin II function results in active RNA polymerase II (RNAPII) in the P-lineage of early embryos.

The goal of this study was to determine if the genome silencing systems TOP-2/condensin II and/or the H3K9me heterochromatin pathway are required for transcriptional repression in the P-lineage of early embryos. To do so, we stained the samples with an antibody that detects a phospho-serine 2 epitope on the RNAPII carboxyl-terminal domain (CTD). The presence of this RNAPIIpSer2 signal in nuclei is a marker for actively elongating RNAPII (9), and we and others have used this approach extensively to identify transcriptionally active nuclei within a variety of *C. elegans* tissues (1-4, 7, 10-11). The antibody that we are using, a rabbit polyclonal that recognizes RNAPIIpSer2, has previously been validated by us for use in *C. elegans* embryos (3). It is at the 4-cell stage that the somatic precursor cells ABa, ABp, and EMS activate zygotic transcription (12). The remaining cell, P_2, remains transcriptionally repressed due to the presence of PIE-1. We stained 4-cell embryos for RNAPIIpSer2 and in the control samples the expected pattern emerged – signal could be seen in ABa, ABp, and EMS, but not P_2 (Figure 1). We next depleted either TOP-2 or the CAPG-2 subunit of condensin II. Interestingly, in samples exposed to either *top-2* or *capg-2* RNAi, we could now detect RNAPIIpSer2 in P_2, and the same was true of samples exposed to *pie-1* RNAi (Figure 1). We next examined the remainder of the P-lineage (P_3 and P_4) and in both cases we could detect active transcription after depletion of either TOP-2, CAPG-2, or PIE-1 (Figure 1). Interestingly, when 1- or 2-cell embryos were examined after depletion of TOP-2, no RNAPIIpSer2 signal was observed in P_0 or

P_1 (Fig S1). Based on these data, we conclude that TOP-2 is dispensable for transcriptional

repression in P_0 and P_1, but for P_2, P_3, and P_4 it, along with condensin II, is required to silence

gene expression.

Figure 1: Loss of TOP-2 or CAPG-2 allows for active RNAPII in the P-lineage of early embryos.

Early embryos from N2 worms treated with control, *top-2*, *capg-2* or *pie-1* RNAi were fixed and

stained for P-granules (green), RNAPIIpSer2 (red) and DNA (blue). Shown on top are the entire

embryos and the P-cell is magnified below. Quantification of the data is shown at right.

A genome activation reporter gets misexpressed in the P-lineage when TOP-2

and condensin II are depleted.

RNAPIIpSer2 staining reveals that TOP-2/condensin II are required to suppress active

RNAPII in P cells. We next sought an independent readout for spurious transcription in these

cells and settled on a previously described reporter for "embryonic genome activation" (EGA),

which is GFP under control of the *vet-4* reporter (13-14). The *vet-4* transcript is first detected in

either 4- or 8-cell embryos and is expressed exclusively in somatic cells (6). Using the EGA-GFP

strain, we asked if the depletion of TOP-2 and CAPG-2 resulted in the misexpression of the GFP

reporter in P-lineage cells. In our hands, for control samples, no EGA-GFP signal was detected in

4- or 8-cell embryos at all, and this may reflect the time required to translate the *vet-4*

transcript. By the 28-51 cell stage, when P_4 is present, we could clearly detect GFP in numerous

somatic cells, but not P_4 (19 of 20 samples were negative for GFP; Figure 2). By contrast, when

TOP-2 and CAPG-2 where co-depleted, GFP signals emerged in P_4 in a substantial percentage of

the samples (14 of 20 were positive for GFP, Figure 2). These data provide additional evidence

for the derepression of transcription in the P-lineage when TOP-2 and condensin II are

depleted.

Figure 2: EGA-GFP gets misexpressed in P_4 when TOP-2 and CAPG-2 are depleted.

Early embryos from the 1284 strain were treated with either control or *top-2/capg-2* RNAi.

Samples were fixed and stained for P-granules (white), EGA-GFP (green) and DNA (blue). 20

samples were analyzed over 2 independently performed replicates. EGA-GFP signal was

aberrantly present in P_4 of embryos treated with *top-2/capg-2* RNAi. Quantification of the data

is shown below. Scale bar represents a length of 2 μm.

Aberrant expression of EMS-specific genes is observed in the P-lineage when

TOP-2 and condensin II are depleted.

Data presented thus far demonstrate aberrant RNAPII activity in P_2, P_3, and P_4 after

depletion of TOP-2 or CAPG-2 (Figure 1), as well as unscheduled gene expression (Figure 2). To

obtain additional evidence for the misregulation of gene expression in these cells, we

performed the *in-situ* hybridization chain reaction (HCR), also known as RNA-FISH (15), to

detect and localize mRNAs in early embryos. For this, we focused on 4-cell embryos, and we

started by looking at the expression pattern of the somatic gene *vet-6*, which has previously

been shown to be expressed exclusively in EMS at the 4-cell stage (6). In wild-type

embryos, *vet-6* expression was indeed localized to the EMS blastomere, with 100% of samples

showing *vet-6* transcript signals in EMS (Figure 3A). On the other hand, only 7.5% of wild-type

embryos had *vet-6* signal in P_2. Upon treatment with *top-2* RNAi, however, most of the samples

(57.5%) had *vet-6* transcripts in P_2 (Figure 3A). We next examined the expression pattern of an

additional transcript, F58E6.6. Similar to *vet-6*, F58E6.6 transcripts are seen predominantly in

EMS in wild-type embryos, with only 10-20% of the wild-type samples showing transcript

signals in ABa, ABp, or P_2 (Figure 3B, quantification of the total sample set is shown to the right

and quantification on a per embryo basis is shown in Figure S2A). After TOP-2 or CAPG-2

depletion, however, 50% and 82%, respectively, of the embryos expressed F58E6.6 in P_2 (Figure

3B and S2A). As a positive control, we depleted PIE-1 and found that both *vet-6* and F58E6.6

transcripts were expressed in P_2 in 85% and 100% of our samples (Figures 3A and S2B). In

Figures 3B and S2A we included dashed circles to highlight the nuclear boundaries, the

unmarked images are shown in Figure S2C. Based on these data, we conclude that depletion of

TOP-2 and condensin II results in the misexpression of EMS genes in the P-lineage of early

embryos.

Figure 3: EMS specific genes are aberrantly expressed in the P_2 cell of 4-cell embryos after loss

of TOP-2 or CAPG-2.

(A) 4-cell embryos from N2 animals treated with control, *top-2* or *pie-1* RNAi were fixed and

HCR was performed to probe for *vet-6* mRNA (white). DNA was stained using Hoechst-

33342 (blue). Representative images are shown and percentage of samples with *vet-6*

transcripts in P_2 are shown below (n=40).

(B) 4-cell embryos from N2 animals treated with control, *top-2* or *capg-2* RNAi were fixed

and HCR was performed to probe for F58E6.6 transcripts (white). DNA was visualized

using Hoechst-33342 dye (blue). P_2 nuclei are outlined with red dashed line while

somatic nuclei are outlined by white dashed line. Representative images are shown and

quantification of F58E6.6 signal in each blastomere is shown on the right. Scale bar

represents a length of 2 μm.

The H3K9 methyltransferase SET-25 is dispensable for genome silencing in the P-lineage.

Data thus far have focused on the role of TOP-2/condensin II in transcriptional control

within the P-lineage. In starved L1s, TOP-2 and condensin II collaborate with the H3K9me

pathway to repress transcription, and in oocytes both pathways are required for genome

silencing, but they appear to function independently of one another (2,3). It was, therefore, of

interest to determine if H3K9me pathway components are required for P-lineage silencing. One

characteristic of the involvement of the H3K9me pathway in silencing is the massive

accumulation of H3K9me3 marks on chromatin, as this is observed in Z2/Z3 of starved L1s, and

in proximal oocytes (2,3). To determine if H3K9me marks also accumulate in transcriptionally

silenced cells of the P-lineage, we stained early embryos for H3K9me3. Figure 4A shows

representative images for both early and late zygotes. Importantly, we have previously shown

that the chromatin of pre-fertilization oocytes is heavily decorated with H3K9me3 marks, such

that the immunofluorescence signal for H3K9me3 overlaps entirely with the DNA-based DAPI

signal (2). This is not the case for nuclei in one-cell embryos, where H3K9me3 signal is present,

but is limited to small patches scattered along the chromatin. By contrast, H3K9me3 signals are

much stronger in polar bodies, where they overlap with much of the DAPI signal (Figure 4A).

These data suggest that, upon fertilization, H3K9me3 marks are rapidly erased on much of the

chromatin inside the female pronucleus, but not on the chromatin in polar bodies. We went on

to examine 4- and 8-cell embryos, comparing P_2 and P_3 to their sister cells EMS and C. All four

cell types showed a similar pattern of H3K9me3 foci scattered throughout the chromatin, and

quantification of these signals showed that P cells did not accumulate H3K9me3 marks to a

greater extent than their transcriptionally active sisters (Figure 4B). Consistent with a lack of

massive accumulation of H3K9me3 marks in the P-lineage we also observed that *set-25* mutant

embryos could readily silence transcription in the P-lineage, as assessed by RNAPIIpSer2

staining (Figure 4C), and the same is true in 1- and 2-cell embryos after *set-25* RNAi (Figure S1).

Thus, unlike in oocytes or starved L1s, where SET-25 plays a crucial role in genome silencing

(2,3), it is dispensable for silencing in the P-lineage.

Figure 4: The H3K9me heterochromatin pathway is not required for transcriptional repression

in the P-lineage.

(A) The indicated zygotes from N2 worms were fixed and stained for H3K9me3 (red) and

DNA (blue). Shown below the entire embryos are magnified views of the pronuclei and

polar bodies (PB). Note that the H3K9me3 signal overlaps with the Hoechst signal more

extensively on the polar bodies than within the pronuclei. Scale bar represents a length

of 2 μm.

(B) Same as (A) except four- and eight-cell embryos were examined. Quantification of

H3K9me3 foci for P_2 and P_3 (germ) or EMS and C (soma) is shown below. Scale bar

represents a length of 2 μm.

(C) Four-cell embryos, either wild type (N2) or *set-25* mutants (strain MT17463), were fixed

and stained for RNAPIIpSer2 (red) and P-granules (blue). 20 samples were analyzed over

2 independent experiments. Both wild-type and set-25 mutants had no H3K9me3 signal

in P_2. Scale bar represents a length of 2 μm.

PIE-1 does not require TOP-2 in a compulsory manner to repress RNAPII.

Previous data, together with work presented here, show that both the TOP-2/condensin

II axis and the PIE-1 protein are required for genome silencing in oocytes and in P_2, P_3, and P_4 of

early embryos. Whether TOP-2 and PIE-1 work together, or separately, to silence transcription

is not known, and this is a difficult question to answer given that standard genetic epistasis

tests are unavailable in this system due to an inability to generate *top-2* null embryos devoid of

maternally supplied protein. To get an indication, however, we reasoned that it was possible to

misexpress PIE-1 in early embryos, where it blocks transcription in all cells that contain it (6,16),

and then ask if TOP-2 was needed for ectopic PIE-1 to silence transcription. Previous work has

shown that depletion of the translational regulators MEX-5 and MEX-6 allow PIE-1 expression in

all cells of the 4-cell embryo (17). The loss of PIE-1 asymmetry in *mex-5/6* RNAi embryos is

accompanied by loss of somatic asymmetries as well, e.g. the SKN-1 protein that is normally

expressed only in the somatic EMS cell is also found in all four cells after *mex-5/6* RNAi (17).

Thus, it appears that depletion of MEX-5/6 results in blastomeres assuming a merged somatic

and germline precursor state. We first confirmed that TOP-2 is normally expressed in all cells at

the 4-cell stage, using a strain where TOP-2 contains a FLAG tag at the endogenous locus. FLAG-

TOP-2 retains TOP-2 function (18) and is indeed present in all 4 cells (Figure 5A). We next

confirmed the effect of *mex-5/6* RNAi on PIE-1 localization using a PIE-1 with a GFP tag at the

endogenous locus (19,20). As shown in Figure S3, in control samples GFP-PIE-1 is expressed

solely in P_2, whereas loss of MEX-5/6 causes a redistribution to all four blastomeres, as

expected. Furthermore, when samples were stained for RNAPIIpSer2, control embryos

displayed signals in the three somatic cells, as expected, while the *mex-5*/6 RNAi samples did

not show active RNAPII in any cells, consistent with the misexpression of GFP-PIE-1. To examine

a role for TOP-2 in promoting transcriptional repression by ectopic PIE-1, we used a

temperature-sensitive allele of *top-2* (18) in combination with *mex-5/6* RNAi and examined

RNAIIpSer2 in 4-cell embryos at both the permissive temperature (15°C) and the non-

permissive temperature (24°C). For the control, we observed that inactivation of TOP-2 caused

the appearance of RNAIIpSer2 in P_2, as expected, whereas samples raised at the permissive

temperature were devoid of RNAIIpSer2 in P_2 (Figure 5B). Interestingly, after *mex-5/6* RNAi, PIE-

1 blocked transcription in all four blastomeres regardless of the activity state of TOP-2 (Figure

5B), and this show that PIE-1 does not depend on TOP-2 for genome silencing, at least in a

compulsory manner. These data also show that that the ability of TOP-2 to repress transcription

globally is tightly linked to the germline progenitor state, and when that state is perturbed (by

loss of MEX-5/6) then TOP-2 can no longer repress transcription. Ideas about why this is so are

presented in the Discussion, below.

Figure 5: PIE-1 does not require TOP-2 to repress transcription in *C. elegans* early embryos.

A. Wild type 4-cell embryos were fixed and stained for FLAG-TOP-2 (red) and DNA (blue).

TOP-2 is distributed across all 4 cells of the embryos. Scale bar represents a length of 2

μm.

B. 4-cell embryos from WMM2 (*top-2* TS) animals treated with either control or *mex-5/6*

RNAi were optionally shifted to the nonpermissive temperature of 24°C for 24 hours or

left at the permissive 15°C. Then samples were fixed and stained for P-granules (white),

RNAPIIpSer2 (red) and DNA (blue). 20 samples were analyzed over 2 independent

replicates. Attenuation of TOP-2 via temperature shift does not reverse the

transcriptional silencing by PIE-1 in *mex-5/6* RNAi embryos. Quantification of the data is

presented below. Scale bar represents a length of 2 μm.

Discussion

In this study we focused on the early embryonic P-lineage with the goal of determining if the TOP-2/condensin II and/or H3K9me/heterochromatin genome silencing pathways are required for transcriptional repression in these cells. Previous work has revealed that two different genome silencers, OMA-1/2 and PIE-1, are active in the P-lineage, with OMA-1/2 responsible for P_0 and P_1 (as well as AB) and PIE-1 taking over for P_2-P_4 (Figure 6A). Our work has added to this profile with the demonstration that TOP-2/condensin II are needed for efficient silencing in P_2-P_4, but not P_0 or P_1, and that the H3K9me/heterochromatin pathway is not required at all in the P-lineage. We base these conclusions on the following data. For TOP-2/condensin II we show that depletion of either TOP-2, the condensin II subunit CAPG-2, or co-depletion of both results in the appearance of RNAPIIpSer2 signals in P_2, P_3, and P_4 (Figure 1), activation of the *vet-4* promoter in P_4 (Figure 2), and inappropriate transcription of the somatic *vet-6* and F58E6.6 genes in P_2 (Figure 3). We note that the impact of TOP-2 and/or CAPG-2 depletion on transcription in the P-lineage was not as profound as depletion of PIE-1 (Figures 1-3), and this is likely due to the fact that we use rather mild RNAi conditions for TOP-2/CAPG-2, relative to PIE-1, as stronger conditions for TOP-2/CAPG-2 result in torn, cut, and malformed nuclei, as has been reported previously (21-23). Although we tested just one condensin II subunit in this work, our previous work had shown that depletion of KLE-2, in addition to CAPG-2, disrupts silencing in starved Z2/Z3 (3), and thus it seems likely that the *capg-2* phenotypes reported here represent a loss of condensin II function and not a condensin II independent function of CAPG-2.

For the H3K9me/heterochromatin pathway we focused on the SET-25

methyltransferase, which we have previously shown to be required for genome silencing in

both oocytes and in starved Z2/Z3 (2,3). We found no role for SET-25 in P-lineage silencing

(Figures 4 and S1). Furthermore, unlike oocytes and starved Z2/Z3, we did not observe a hyper-

accumulation of H3K9me3 marks in P-lineage nuclei, adding further support to the conclusion

that the H3K9me/heterochromatin pathway is dispensable for genome silencing in early

embryos.

Figure 6 summarizes current knowledge of how genome silencing occurs in the

nematode germline. In oocytes, which are named based on their position relative to the

spermatheca in gonadal tube (-1 is closest, -2 one position more distal, etc), our previous work

showed that three of the four known genome silencing pathways are required (TOP-

2/condensin II, H3K9me/heterochromatin pathway, and PIE-1; Belew et al, 2023). Interestingly,

once the oocyte is fertilized, then all three pathways become dispensable – despite their

physical presence in the zygote – and only OMA-1/2 can repress transcription (ref. 4 and this

work). In addition, we found that the H3K9me3 marks that prominently decorate oocyte

chromatin (2), are rapidly erased from the maternal pronucleus in the zygote but not from

polar bodies (Figure 4). Thus, it is clear that while transcriptional repression continues during

and after the egg-to-zygote transition the mechanisms are fundamentally different. Another

handoff occurs when P_1 divides to form P_2 and OMA-1/2 are abruptly degraded. At this

juncture, both PIE-1 and TOP-2/condensin II are once again required for silencing (Figures 1-3).

Thus, a fascinating question becomes how PIE-1 and TOP-2/condensin II are regulated such that

they can repress transcription in P_2-P_4 but not in P_0-P_1 despite being present in these cells. A

related and equally fascinating question is how TOP-2/condensin II is regulated such that the

system silences gene expression in P_2-P_4 but not in early embryonic somatic cells, again despite

being present in these cells. The final genome silencing event that we know of occurs in the

Z2/Z3 PGCs during L1 starvation. PIE-1 is not present in these cells, and silencing occurs via a

concerted effort between the TOP-2/condensin II and H3K9me/heterochromatin pathways (3).

All told, these findings make it clear that while genome silencing is a predominant feature of

germline development, in the worm it occurs in a "mix and match" manner where different

silencing systems are employed dependent on the developmental context.

Figure 6: Summary of genome silencing during germline development.

(A) Cartoon summarizes current knowledge of factors required for genome silencing at

different developmental stages in the germline.

(B) Summary of experimental data presented in Figure 5.

Other important questions raised by this work include how do these different silencing

pathways work, mechanistically, and do the different systems interact or do they work

independently of one another? Regarding mechanism, how PIE-1 inhibits transcription is still

poorly understood but has been linked to the phosphorylation of RNAPII on serines 2 and 5

within its CTD (24). The RNAPII CTD contains numerous copies of the heptapeptide repeat

sequence $Y_1S_2P_3T_4S_5P_6S_7$, with humans containing 52 copies and nematodes 42 copies (25).

During the transcription cycle, RNAPII arrives at the promoter in an unphosphorylated state and

is then phosphorylated on serine 5 to allow promoter clearance. Phosphorylation on serine 2

follows, and this has been linked to an active, elongating state for RNAPII (26). PIE-1 blocks both

serine 5 and serine 2 phosphorylation, and genetic experiments using separation-of-function

mutants have shown that the ability to block serine 5 phosphorylation is critical to suppressing

transcription in the P-lineage, whereas the ability to block serine 2 phosphorylation is

dispensable (27). More recent work has shown that the phosphorylation of serine 2 on RNAPII

CTD is dispensable for embryonic development (28). This softens the link between active

transcription and RNAPII serine 2 phosphorylation and supports the idea that PIE-1 represses

transcription by acting on serine 5 phosphorylation. How is PIE-1 connected to TOP-

2/condensin II? In oocytes, there may be an indirect connection as we have previously observed

that depletion of TOP-2/condensin II delays nucleolar dissolution and PIE-1 is primarily localized

to the nucleolus prior to dissolution (2). Thus, it may be that PIE-1 is held in an inactive state via

nucleolar residency and TOP-2/condensin II are needed to release PIE-1. In the P-lineage PIE-1

is not a nucleolar protein, and thus if TOP-2/condensin II controls PIE-1 it must be via a different

mechanism. To address this, in this work, we used *mex-5/6* RNAi to distribute PIE-1 evenly in all

blastomeres of a 4-cell embryo and observed, as expected, that transcription was repressed in

all four cells. We then asked if PIE-1 required TOP-2 for this silencing and found that it did not

(Figures 5 and 6B). This result makes two important points. One, PIE-1 is not obligated to TOP-2

to repress transcription, it can do so independently. This does not mean that the situation is the

same in a proper P-cell, as the composition of a 4-cell *mex-5/6* RNAi embryo is very different

from a wild-type embryo. Second, the data show that TOP-2 (and presumably condensin II as

well) requires the germline progenitor identity to block transcription, as when that identity is

abolished by *mex-5/6* RNAi then TOP-2 can no longer silence the genome. How might this work

at a molecular level? It may simply be that a co-factor required by TOP-2 for repression is

asymmetrically localized to P-cells, and after *mex-5/6* RNAi this factor becomes diluted across

all four blastomeres and can no longer perform its function. It is fair to say that the work

presented here opens the door to many important and exciting lines of future research.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by an NIH R01 award (R01GM127477) to W.M.M.

References

1. Walker AK, Boag PR, Blackwell TK. Transcription reactivation steps stimulated by oocyte maturation in C. elegans. Dev Biol. 2007 Apr 1;304(1):382-93.

2. Belew MD, Chien E, Michael WM. Characterization of factors that underlie transcriptional silencing in C. elegans oocytes. PLoS Genet. 2023 Jul 21;19(7):e1010831.

3. Belew MD, Chien E, Wong M, Michael WM. A global chromatin compaction pathway that represses germline gene expression during starvation. J Cell Biol. 2021 Sep 6;220(9):e202009197.

4. Guven-Ozkan T, Nishi Y, Robertson SM, Lin R. Global transcriptional repression in C. elegans germline precursors by regulated sequestration of TAF-4. Cell. 2008 Oct 3;135(1):149-60.

5. Mello CC, Schubert C, Draper B, Zhang W, Lobel R, Priess JR. The PIE-1 protein and germline specification in C. elegans embryos. Nature. 1996 Aug 22;382(6593):710-2.

6. Seydoux G, Mello CC, Pettitt J, Wood WB, Priess JR, Fire A. Repression of gene expression in the embryonic germ lineage of C. elegans. Nature. 1996 Aug 22;382(6593):713-6.

7. Seydoux G, Dunn MA. Transcriptionally repressed germ cells lack a subpopulation of phosphorylated RNA polymerase II in early embryos of Caenorhabditis elegans and Drosophila melanogaster. Development. 1997 Jun;124(11):2191-201.

8. Schaner CE, Deshpande G, Schedl PD, Kelly WG. A conserved chromatin architecture marks and maintains the restricted germ cell lineage in worms and flies. Dev Cell. 2003 Nov;5(5):747-57.

9. Palancade B, Bensaude O. Investigating RNA polymerase II carboxyl-terminal domain (CTD) phosphorylation. Eur J Biochem. 2003 Oct;270(19):3859-70.

10. Shakes DC, Wu JC, Sadler PL, Laprade K, Moore LL, Noritake A, et al. Spermatogenesis-specific features of the meiotic program in Caenorhabditis elegans. PLoS Genet. 2009 Aug;5(8):e1000611.

11. Bowman EA, Bowman CR, Ahn JH, Kelly WG. Phosphorylation of RNA polymerase II is independent of P-TEFb in the C. elegans germline. Development. 2013 Sep;140(17):3703-13.

12. Seydoux G, Fire A. Soma-germline asymmetry in the distributions of embryonic RNAs in Caenorhabditis elegans. Development. 1994 Oct;120(10):2823-34.

13. Tocchini C, Keusch JJ, Miller SB, Finger S, Gut H, Stadler MB, et al. The TRIM-NHL protein LIN-41 controls the onset of developmental plasticity in Caenorhabditis elegans. PLoS Genet. 2014 Aug;10(8):e1004533.

14. Fassnacht C, Tocchini C, Kumari P, Gaidatzis D, Stadler MB, Ciosk R. The CSR-1 endogenous RNAi pathway ensures accurate transcriptional reprogramming during the oocyte-to-embryo transition in Caenorhabditis elegans. PLoS Genet. 2018 Mar;14(3):e1007252.

15. Choi HM, Calvert CR, Husain N, Huss D, Barsi JC, Deverman BE, et al. Mapping a multiplexed zoo of mRNA expression. Development. 2016 Oct 1;143(19):3632-7.

16. Batchelder C, Dunn MA, Choy B, Suh Y, Cassie C, Shim EY, et al. Transcriptional repression by the
Caenorhabditis elegans germ-line protein PIE-1. Genes Dev. 1999 Jan 15;13(2):202-12.

17. Schubert CM, Lin R, de Vries CJ, Plasterk RH, Priess JR. MEX-5 and MEX-6 function to establish
soma/germline asymmetry in early C. elegans embryos. Mol Cell. 2000 Apr;5(4):671-82.

18. Jaramillo-Lambert A, Fabritius AS, Hansen TJ, Smith HE, Golden A. The Identification of a Novel
Mutant Allele of topoisomerase II in Caenorhabditis elegans Reveals a Unique Role in Chromosome
Segregation During Spermatogenesis. Genetics. 2016 Dec;204(4):1407-22.

19. Kim H, Ishidate T, Ghanta KS, Seth M, Conte D, Shirayama M, et al. A co-CRISPR strategy for efficient
genome editing in Caenorhabditis elegans. Genetics. 2014 Aug;197(4):1069-80.

20. Gauvin TJ, Han B, Sun MJ, Griffin EE. PIE-1 Translation in the Germline Lineage Contributes to PIE-1
Asymmetry in the Early Caenorhabditis elegans Embryo. G3 (Bethesda). 2018 Dec 10;8(12):3791-801.

21. Chan RC, Severson AF, Meyer BJ. Condensin restructures chromosomes in preparation for meiotic
divisions. J Cell Biol. 2004 Nov 22;167(4):613-25.

22. Stanvitch G, Moore LL. cin-4, a gene with homology to topoisomerase II, is required for centromere
resolution by cohesin removal from sister kinetochores during mitosis. Genetics. 2008 Jan;178(1):83-97.

23. Bembenek JN, Verbrugghe KJ, Khanikar J, Csankovszki G, Chan RC. Condensin and the spindle
midzone prevent cytokinesis failure induced by chromatin bridges in C. elegans embryos. Curr Biol. 2013
Jun 3;23(11):937-46.

24. Wang JT, Seydoux G. Germ cell specification. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2013;757:17-39.

25. Phatnani HP, Greenleaf AL. Phosphorylation and functions of the RNA polymerase II CTD. Genes Dev.
2006 Nov 1;20(21):2922-36.

26. Zaborowska J, Egloff S, Murphy S. The pol II CTD: new twists in the tail. Nat Struct Mol Biol. 2016 Sep
6;23(9):771-7.

27. Ghosh D, Seydoux G. Inhibition of transcription by the Caenorhabditis elegans germline protein PIE-
1: genetic evidence for distinct mechanisms targeting initiation and elongation. Genetics. 2008
Jan;178(1):235-43.

28. Cassart C, Yague-Sanz C, Bauer F, Ponsard P, Stubbe FX, Migeot V, et al. RNA polymerase II CTD S2P is
dispensable for embryogenesis but mediates exit from developmental diapause in C. elegans. Sci Adv.
2020 Dec;6(50):eabc1450.

Supporting information captions

Figure S1: RNAPII-mediated transcription is still repressed in one- and two-cell embryos after loss of TOP-2 or SET-25.

One- and two-cell embryos from N2 worms treated with the indicated RNAi were fixed and stained for P-granules (white), RNAPIIpSer2 (red) and DNA (blue). No active RNAPII was observed in the more than 20 samples we examined for both one- and two-cell embryos over 2 replicates. Note the RNAPIIpSer2 signals in the adjacent, older embryo in the upper right panel – this shows that the staining worked efficiently. Scale bar represents a length of 2 μm.

Figure S2: Control experiments for somatic gene expression in 4-cell embryos.

(A) Samples were prepared in the same way as Figure 3B except RNAi against *pie-1* was utilized. Scale bar represents a length of 2 μm.

(B) The same panels as those shown in Figure 3B are displayed without the dashed circles. Scale bar represents a length of 2 μm.

(C) A summary of the data shown in Figures 3B and S2A.

Figure S3: Depletion of MEX-5 and MEX-6 results in PIE-1 presence in all blastomeres of early embryos.

4-cell embryos from WM330 animals optionally treated with either control or *mex-5/6* RNAi

were fixed and stained for P-granules (white), PIE-1::GFP (green), RNAPIIpSer2 (red) and DNA

(blue). Images of the same embryo stained for PIE-1::GFP and RNAPIIpSer2 are shown side by

side. 20 samples were analyzed over 2 independent replicates. Depletion of *mex-5/6* results in

the loss of asymmetric distribution of PIE-1 to the germline. PIE-1 is present in all blastomeres

and that is sufficient to repress transcription in the whole embryo as shown by low RNAPIIpSer2

levels. Scale bar represents a length of 2 µm.

Figure 1

pSer2-postive P₂ after given RNAi:

vector	0/62	0%
top-2	23/41	56.1%
pie-1	9/13	69.2%
capg-2	5/18	27.8%

pSer2-postive P₃ after given RNAi:

vector	1/87	1.1%
top-2	26/52	50%
pie-1	17/18	94.4%
capg-2	16/40	40%

pSer2-postive P₄ after given RNAi:

vector	6/89	6.7%
top-2	26/45	57.8%
pie-1	14/15	93.3%
capg-2	22/42	52.4%

Figure 2

Treatment	Number of EGA::GFP positive P4
Control RNAi	1/20
top-2/capg-2 RNAi	14/20

Figure 3

A

| | *vet-6* RNA-FISH | | DNA |

control   *pie-1*   *top-2*

| EMS | P₂ | EMS | P₂ | EMS | P₂ |

100%   7.5%   100%   85%   100%   57.5%

nuclei positive for *vet-6* RNA-FISH (*n* = 40 all samples)

B

| DNA | F58E6.6 |

control

capg-2

top-2

C

% of cells expressing F58E6.6 transcript

	P₂	EMS	ABa	ABb	*n*
control	20	100	15	10	20
capg-2	82	100	0	18	11
top-2	50	100	40	40	10

Figure 4

A

H3K9me3   DNA

B

H3K9me3   DNA

P₂   EMS

P₃   C

H3K9me3 foci/nucleus
$n = 20$

Germ   Soma

C

RNAPIIpSer2   P-granules   DNA

set-25

0/10 RNAPIIpSer2⁺   0/10 RNAPIIpSer2⁺

Figure 5

A

FLAG-TOP-2   DNA

B

RNAPIIpSer2   P-granules   DNA

top-2^{ts} 15°C control RNAi

top-2^{ts} 24°C control RNAi

top-2^{ts} 15°C *mex-5/6* RNAi

top-2^{ts} 24°C *mex-5/6* RNAi

	pSer2-postive cell after given condition		
	P₂	soma	mixed
control RNAi at 15°C	1/20	18/20	na
control RNAi at 24°C	7/20	17/20	na
mex-5/6 RNAi at 15°C	na	na	2/40
mex-5/6 RNAi at 24°C	na	na	1/40

Figure 6

A

-3 oocyte

-2 oocyte

TOP-2/condensin II
H3K9me/heterochromatin
PIE-1

1- and 2-cell embryos

OMA-1/2

P_2

P_4

TOP-2/condensin II

PIE-1

Z2/Z3 (embryo)

Z2/Z3 (starved L1)

TOP-2/condensin II
H3K9me/heterochromatin

B

wild type

mex-5/6 RNAi

TOP-2 required
for silencing

TOP-2 dispensable
for silencing