Oct4 redox sensitivity potentiates reprogramming and differentiation

Zuolian Shen[1,2,¶], Yifan Wu[1,2,¶], Asit Manna[1,2], Kimberly J. Evason[1,2], Mahesh B. Chandrasekharan[2,3] and Dean Tantin[1,2,*]

[1]Department of Pathology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA

[2]Huntsman Cancer Institute, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA

[3]Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA

[*]Correspondence: dean.tantin@path.utah.edu.

[¶]Co-first authors

Running head: Oct4 oxidative regulation in reprogramming

Words in abstract: 208

Abstract

The transcription factor Oct4/Pou5f1 is a key component of the regulatory circuitry governing pluripotency. Oct4 is also widely used to generate induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) from somatic cells. These observations provide compelling rationale to understand Oct4's functions. Here we used domain swapping and mutagenesis to compare Oct4's reprogramming activity with the paralog Oct1/Pou2f1, identifying a redox-sensitive DNA binding domain cysteine residue (Cys48) as a key determinant of both reprogramming and differentiation. In combination with the Oct4 N-terminus, mutating Oct1's serine at this position to cysteine is sufficient to confer strong reprogramming activity. Conversely, Oct4^{C48S} strongly reduces reprogramming potential. Oct4^{C48S} renders the protein insensitive to oxidative inhibition of DNA binding. The same mutation prevents oxidation-mediated protein ubiquitylation. An engineered *Pou5f1^{C48S}* point mutation has little effect on undifferentiated cells embryonic stem cells (ESCs), but upon retinoic acid (RA)-mediated differentiation causes retention of Oct4 expression, decreased proliferation, and increased apoptosis. Transcriptional profiling reveals that the retention of pluripotency also manifests at the RNA level. *Pou5f1^{C48S}* ESCs also contribute poorly to adult somatic tissues and form less differentiated teratomas. Collectively, the data support a model in which Oct4 redox sensing is a positive reprogramming determinant during one or more reprogramming steps, and mediates Oct4 degradation during differentiation.

Keywords Oct4 (Pou5f1); Oct1 (Pou2f1); induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs); oxidative stress; ubiquitylation

Introduction

The early mammalian embryo contains undifferentiated, pluripotent cells capable of generating all embryonic tissue lineages. Cultured embryonic stem cells (ESCs) are derived from the early embryo and have similar capabilities[1]. The transcription factor Oct4/Pou5f1 governs the establishment of pluripotent, undifferentiated inner cell mass and epiblast cells, as well as primordial germ cells, germline progenitor cells and ESCs[2]. Both ESC differentiation in culture and blastocyst implantation in animals are accompanied by Oct4 loss[3]. Together with transcription factors such as Nanog and Sox2, Oct4 forms a network of pluripotency master transcriptional regulators that bind to their own and each other's genes to reinforce transcription[4].

Oct4 is also widely used to generate induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) from somatic cells[5, 6]. Reprogramming methods that omit Oct4 nevertheless rely on activation of the endogenous *Pou5f1* (*Oct4*) gene[7, 8]. These findings pinpoint Oct4 as a central reprogramming component and place priority on understanding its functions. Reprogramming strategies that increase efficiency[9, 10, 11, 12, 13], or improve the quality of iPSC clones[14, 15, 16, 17] reveal difficult trade-offs: efficiently generating iPSC that are of non-optimal quality, or inefficiently generating iPSCs with improved developmental potential.

Pluripotent cells co-express Oct4 together with the widely expressed prototypic POU transcription factor Oct1/Pou2f1[18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. The two proteins share similar DNA binding domains and recognize similar 8-bp 5'ATGCAAAT3' consensus octamer sequences and sequence variants[23]. The two proteins also associate with many of the same target genes[22, 24]. Nevertheless, Oct1 as well as other mammalian Oct4 paralogs do not efficiently reprogram[5, 25]. Oct1 in particular is poor at reprogramming relative to most other Oct transcription factors[26]. In contrast, other reprogramming factors such as Sox2, Klf4 and c-Myc can be replaced by paralogs[27, 28]. Structure/function studies comparing Oct4 with its paralogs have identified Oct4 transcriptional determinants[29, 30, 31]. An example is three residues present in the Oct4 DNA binding domain but absent in Oct6/Pou3f1 needed to form Sox2 heterodimers. Introducing these residues, plus the Oct4 N- and C-termini, results in efficient reprogramming[30]. However, several Oct4 paralogs

including Oct1 contain these residues but are nevertheless reprogramming-incompetent, indicating the presence of additional reprogramming determinants present in Oct4 (and likely Oct6) but absent in Oct1.

Recent studies show that omission of Oct4 from reprogramming cocktails necessitates using target cells of high mitotic potential and higher-than-typical levels of the other factors, and is still inefficient, but results in qualitatively superior iPSC clones with enhanced developmental potential[17, 32]. The counterproductive activities of Oct4 are caused by transient promotion gene expression programs that deviate cells from reprogramming trajectories[17]. A logical extension of these findings is that transient down-regulation of counterproductive Oct4 activities may be an important step in standard reprogramming.

Here, we identify a new central Oct4 reprogramming determinant – a single DNA binding domain cysteine residue (Cys48) – that accounts for much of its differential reprogramming potential vis-à-vis Oct1. A serine residue is present in Oct1 at this position. In the presence of the Oct4 N-terminus, changing the Oct1 serine to cysteine at this position is sufficient to confer levels of reprogramming activity comparable to wild-type Oct4. Conversely, mutating this cysteine to serine in the context of Oct4 reduces reprogramming efficiency by ~60%. Mechanistically, we find that this cysteine sensitizes DNA binding activity to oxidative stress, and mediates Oct4 protein ubiquitylation via a redox regulation mechanism. We generated CRISPR-edited Oct4^{C48S} embryonic stem cell (ESC) lines, which are phenotypically normal until differentiated. Upon differentiation, edited ESC lines abnormally retain Oct4 expression, proliferate less and undergo apoptosis at higher rates compared to unedited parental controls. These cells also form less differentiated teratomas and contribute poorly to the development of viable adult mice. Cumulatively, our findings identify a redox-sensitive Oct4 residue that restrains protein function, but nevertheless functions positively in reprogramming.

Results

Oct4 vs. Oct1 differential reprogramming potential localizes to the DNA binding domain

The POU-specific and POU-homeodomain (POU_S and POU_H) DNA binding subdomains of Oct1 and

Oct4 are similar, with 71% and 59% identity in mouse, respectively. In contrast, the N- and C-termini,

and the linker between the subdomains, are highly divergent (Fig. 1a and not shown). The human proteins

are structured similarly. Because the DNA binding domains are similar, the amino acid numbering can be

standardized by referring to the first amino acid of the POU_S DNA binding domain as residue 1 (Fig. 1a).

To identify Oct4 determinants important for reprogramming, we generated Oct4/Oct1 chimeric constructs

containing the distinct domains (Fig. 1b). Because introducing different domains and epitopes can

confound the analyses with protein-specific antibodies, we included C-terminal FLAG-tags on Oct4, Oct1

and all chimeric proteins to track protein expression. Unlike an N-terminal FLAG tag which was

deleterious (Supplementary Fig. 1), engineering a C-terminal tag results in reprogramming efficiency

similar to untagged Oct4 (Fig. 1c). Prior work comparing Oct4 and another reprogramming-incompetent

POU transcription factor, Oct6, also identified a lysine residue within the POU_S DNA binding subdomain

(position 40 of the Oct4 DNA binding domain, Fig. 1a) as important for reprogramming[31]. We therefore

mutated N40 of the Oct1 DNA binding domain to lysine in some constructs (Fig. 1d-f).

To measure reprogramming efficiency, we transduced primary mouse embryonic fibroblasts

(MEFs) expressing GFP under the control of the endogenous *Pou5f1* gene[33] with mSTEMCCA

lentiviruses express the four Yamanaka factors[34] (Fig. 1b). Substituting Oct1 for Oct4 eliminated all

reprogramming potential in this assay (Fig. 1d,e). The other reprogramming factors (Sox2, Klf4 and c-

Myc) can mediate reprogramming without Oct4[17, 32], however reprogramming is inefficient. The results

are therefore consistent with the original reprogramming findings showing that Oct4 is essential for

conventional reprogramming[5], and set a useful baseline for making domain-swaps and mutations to assess

reprogramming potency.

We then replaced the Oct1 N- and C-termini with that of Oct4, and mutated asparagine 40 of the

Oct1 DNA binding domain to the lysine present in Oct4. Prior work[31] showed that the Oct4 lysine at this

position (Fig. 1a) is important for Oct4 reprogramming. Of these constructs, only fusion of the Oct4 N-

terminus generated detectable colony-forming potential, at ~5% the level of WT Oct4 (Fig. 1d,e). These

findings are consistent with work establishing the importance of the Oct4 N-terminus[35]. Similar data were

obtained at multiple timepoints (not shown), indicating that this result does not simply reflect kinetic

differences in reprogramming. Anti-FLAG immunoblotting showed equivalent expression (Fig. 1f). Viral

titers and expression of Klf4 from the mSTEMCCA vector were also similar (not shown). Because a

construct with both the Oct4 N- and C-termini displayed only ~5% efficiency (Fig. 1d,e), we conclude

that determinants within the Oct4 DNA-binding domain confer the bulk of reprogramming potential.

Oct4 vs. Oct1 differential reprogramming potential concentrates in a DNA binding domain cysteine

The POU DNA binding domain comprises two subdomains connected by a peptide linker. The two

subdomains make separate sequence-specific contacts with DNA[23]. These domains are termed POU_S and

POU_H (Fig. 1a,b). We mutagenized DNA binding domain amino acid residues that differ between Oct1

and Oct4. We focused on possible Oct4 post-translationally modifiable residues: Lys, Ser, Thr and Cys.

This analysis identified 14 possible amino acid substitutions, not including the aforementioned Lys40

(Fig. 1a and not shown). Work from others has shown that Oct6 is capable of reprogramming when

modified to enable Sox2 dimerization[36]. Filtering the data using conservation between Oct4 and Oct6

resulted in just six residues. Replacing one of these, an Oct1 serine at position 48 with the Oct4 cysteine

residue found at this position, and using the Oct4 N-terminus, conferred the majority of the differential

Oct4 activity, increasing activity >7-fold over the "4N" construct containing the Oct4 N-terminus alone

(Fig. 2a,b). We term this the "1-4All" construct. iPSC colonies formed under these conditions showed a

pluripotent morphology and expressed GFP from the endogenous *Pou5f1* locus at levels comparable to

cells reprogrammed with Oct4 (Supplementary Fig. 2). The remaining activity relative to Oct1 appeared

to be concentrated in the linker domain, as a construct containing the Oct4 N-terminus, Cys48 and the

Oct4 linker (4N-S48C-4L) had 100% activity (Fig. 2a,b). The Oct4 linker has been shown to regulate

reprogramming via selective interactions with different cofactors[29, 37]. The differences were maintained

over time, with the 1-4All construct consistently generating ~60% activity over multiple days, indicating

that the differences were qualitative and not simply a function of different colony formation rates

(Supplementary Fig. 3).

Replacing the Oct4 Cys with Ser at this position reduced activity by 60% (Fig. 2a,b), indicating

that more than half of Oct4's differential reprogramming activity vis-à-vis Oct1 is lost by changing this

residue. The converse experiment, replacing Oct1 S48 with cysteine, resulted in no reprogramming

activity (Fig. 2a,b, Oct1-S48C), indicating that Cys48 is important but not sufficient, and highlighting its

combined importance with the Oct4 N-terminus. The chimeric proteins were equivalently expressed (Fig.

2c). These results indicate that in the context of the Oct4 N-terminus, a cysteine residue at position 48

confers robust reprogramming activity. In the co-crystal structure of the Oct1 DNA binding domain bound

to DNA[38], Ser48 hydrogen bonds with the DNA backbone (Fig. 2d). In a recent Oct4:Sox2:nucleosome

structure[39], the Cys48 sulfhydryl also allows for hydrogen bonding. Predictably, mutation of Cys48 to

glycine greatly diminishes Oct4 DNA binding in vitro[40]. Oct6, which can reprogram when changes are

made to POU$_H$ allowing for Sox2 dimerization[30], contains a cysteine at this position (Fig. 2e). These

structural studies along with our findings suggest that Cys48 has minimal effects on DNA binding vis-à-

vis a serine (but not glycine) at this position, but nevertheless plays a role in reprogramming.

Oct4 Cys48 is redox-sensitive and mediates degradation in response to oxidative stress

Oct4 is known to be sensitive to oxidative stress[40, 41, 42] in a manner reversed by thioredoxin[42], implicating

cysteine thiols in redox sensitivity. We reproduced this result (Supplementary Fig. 4), which with the

results above suggested that Cys48 may potentiate reprogramming through a mechanism involving redox

sensitivity. We measured wild-type and C48S mutant Oct4 DNA binding using electrophoretic mobility

shift assays (EMSA) with Cy5-labeled DNA containing a canonical 5'ATGCAAAT octamer element[24].

To measure redox sensitivity, we used methods similar to Guo et al.[42] in which Oct4 is pre-treated with

the oxidizing agent diamide prior to addition of the DNA probe.

We first used lysates from 293T cells transfected with WT or C48S mutant Oct4. 293T cells do

not express Oct4, but do express endogenous Oct1 as an internal control (Fig. 3a, lanes 2-3). Oct4 bound

to octamer DNA specifically (Fig. 3a, lanes 7-8) and was hypersensitive to diamide treatment (lanes 9-

11). Oct4[C48S] bound DNA equivalently (lane 13) and also conferred resistance to oxidation, in particular

at higher concentrations (lanes 14-16). In contrast, little sensitivity was observed with Oct1. Quantification

from three independent replicate experiments is shown in Fig. 3b. The recombinant Oct4 contained a C-

terminal FLAG tag, allowing for purification (Supplementary Fig. 5). Similar relative resistance to

oxidative inhibition of DNA binding was observed using purified C48S recombinant Oct4 protein (Fig.

3c). Quantification from three independent replicates is shown in Fig. 3d. These results indicate that Oct4

cysteine 48 sensitizes Oct4 to oxidative inhibition of DNA binding in vitro.

Oct4 oxidation has been linked to its degradation[40]. In studying recombinant Oct4 expressed in

293T cells, we noted in over-exposed immunoblots the presence of multiple slow-migrating high

molecular weight forms of wild-type Oct4. These high-molecular weight bands were strongly attenuated

with C48S mutant protein (Fig. 3e, lanes 2-3). The bands were also increased by hydrogen peroxide

treatment using wild-type but not mutant protein (lanes 4-5), indicating that they are increased by oxidative

stress in a manner that requires Cys48. They were also specifically increased using the proteasome

inhibitor MG-132, strongly suggesting that the high-molecular weight forms are ubiquitylated species

(lanes 6-7). Interestingly, the combination of both H_2O_2 and MG-132 increased the intensity of the banding

pattern over that observed using either treatment individually (lanes 8-9). These treatments alone and in

combination did not affect short-term viability of the cells (Supplementary Fig. 6).

To identify the nature of the ubiquitylated Oct4 species, we purified Oct4 expressed from 293T

cells using a C-terminal streptavidin tag, and subjected the isolated proteins to immunoblotting using

antibodies specific to different ubiquitin linked chains. Analysis using antibodies to pan linked Ub chains revealed strong diminution with Oct4[C48S] as expected (Fig. 3f, FK2). Strong diminution was observed with K48 linkage-specific polyubiquitin antibodies (Fig. 3f), while K63 linkage-specific antibodies showed more modest differences compared to total Oct4 high-molecular weight bands (Supplementary Fig. 7). Similar results were observed using endogenous Oct4 in wild-type ESCs, where high-molecular weight Oct4 bands could be detected (Fig. 3g, lane 2) that were augmented by H_2O_2 and MG-132 (lanes 4 and 6). We conclude that Cys48 promotes Oct4 ubiquitylation and degradation in response to oxidative stress, largely via catalysis of K48-linked polyubiquitin chains.

ESCs with endogenous Oct4[C48S] mutation differentiate abnormally

The ability of Oct4 Cys48 to promote both pluripotency and redox sensitivity suggested that sensitivity to oxidative stress mediated by Cys48 helps potentiate one or more reprogramming steps. To test if Oct4 oxidative stress sensitivity also regulates forward developmental steps, we studied the role of Cys48 in ESC differentiation. Using CRISPR, we generated ESCs with a single-base missense mutation that converts Cys48 to Ser (see Methods). Two silent point mutations were also engineered in the gRNA that create an *Xba*I site to monitor targeting and facilitate genotyping. Two low-passage parent ESC lines were chosen for targeting, one on a pure C57BL/6 background and one on a mixed BL6/129 background. Multiple independent clones were generated for each line. Homozygous mutation was confirmed by HRMA (not shown) and resequencing (Fig. 4a). Tested clones were confirmed to be karyotypically normal and wild-type for *Tp53* (not shown). Undifferentiated derived ESC clones were phenotypically indistinguishable to the parent clones in terms of Oct4, Sox2 and Nanog expression and morphology (Fig. 4b,c), as well as long-term maintenance of pluripotency factor expression and proliferative capacity (not shown).

To test if C48S mutation protects endogenous Oct4 against oxidative stress, we studied Oct4 ubiquitination in parent and mutant cells with and without H_2O_2 treatment. Oct4 was immunoprecipitated

from ESC lysates, and the resulting material was immunoblotted using pan-Ub (FK2) and Oct4 antibodies.

Ubiquitylation of endogenous Oct4 in ESCs was clearly visualized and was increased with H_2O_2 exposure

(Fig. 4d, lanes 1-4). Ubiquitylation was attenuated in mutant cells (lanes 5-6), and further was not affected

by oxidative stress (lanes 7-8). Oct4 immunoblotting confirmed that the protein was immunoprecipitated,

with decreased parent Oct4 recovered with oxidative stress (presumably due to degradation) and more

Oct4 recovered in mutant cells.

Parent and derived mutant cells were then differentiated in vitro using retinoic acid (RA) to assess

Oct4 expression, morphology and cell counts. Oct4 protein expression was abnormally retained early

during differentiation, mostly at day 2 (Fig. 4e, lanes 3 and 7). Quantification from multiple experiments

revealed that the effect was transient, with a >2.8-fold increase of Oct4 at day 3 that was lost by day 4

(Fig. 4f). These results were recapitulated using a second clone from the same parental ESC line

(Supplementary Fig. 8a,b), as well as a C48S clone from a different 129×C57BL/6 ESC line, G4-N, which

differentiates more slowly and showed even greater differences (Supplementary Fig. 8c).

Because Oct4 is a transcription regulator whose expression is retained during differentiation by

C48S mutation, we performed transcriptional profiling of parent and cells at RA differentiation day 2, as

well as undifferentiated controls. Three replicates per condition were used, which showed tight

concordance (Supplementary Fig. 9a). Between 20 and 31 million sequence reads were generated for each

sample, ~80% of which aligned perfectly to the *mm39* reference genome. We identified 421 genes with

significantly elevated gene expression in differentiating mutant relative to parent cells ($p<0.001$, >2.5-fold

increased, Fig. 4h, Supplementary Table 1). Intersecting these genes with the set of genes normally

decreased upon differentiation of parent cells (1536 genes) showed that 40% of the 421 genes with retained

expression (169 genes) are normally down-regulated with differentiation. These included *Oct4* itself

(*Pou5f1*), as well as *Sox2*, *Nanog* and *Klf4* (Fig. 4h). Comparing these genes with established Oct4 ChIP-

seq [43] identified 114 genes (67%) as direct Oct4 targets. The complete set of 169 genes were enriched for

gene ontology (GO) terms associated with pluripotency such as "response to leukemia inhibitory factor"

and "stem cell population maintenance" (Fig. 4g). Similar results were obtained using a hierarchical clustering approach. Because clustering all differentially expressed genes did not reveal obvious trends (not shown), we utilized just the 100 top differentially expressed genes upon differentiation for both genotypes (150 total genes in the union of the two sets). Although the differentiating parental and mutant replicates clustered together, there was a cohort of pluripotency associated genes (including *Pou5f1*) that shared less down-regulation in mutant cells (Supplementary Fig. 9b). A second cohort of differentiation-specific genes showed poorer expression in mutant cells upon differentiation. These included *Krt18*, *Mest*/*Peg1* and *Dag1* (Supplementary Fig. 9b). Comparing the complete set of 150 genes to Oct4 ChIP-seq [43] 117 genes (78%) as direct Oct4 targets. These results indicate that Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESCs maintains aspects of pluripotency gene expression during differentiation.

The duration of retained Oct4 expression during differentiation can affect lineage specification outcomes[44, 45, 46]. To determine if Oct4^{C48S} mutation affects differentiation, we treated mutant and parental control cells for 12 days with RA. Longer RA-mediated differentiation revealed a significant depletion of cells later in the differentiation timecourse (Fig. 5a,b). The decreased cell numbers observed during differentiation of C48S-edited cells with RA could be due to decreased proliferation, increased death or some combination of the two. To investigate the nature of the effect on differentiation more closely, we studied proliferation using cell trace violet and apoptosis using TUNEL staining. Adherent, viable differentiating C48S cells showed decreased proliferation at days 3 and 4 (Fig. 5c) and increased apoptosis at day 2 (Fig. 5d). These results indicate that C48S-edited ESCs differentiate abnormally.

Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESCs form less differentiated teratomas and contribute poorly to embryonic development

We used these same ESC lines to form teratomas in immunocompromised mice. Parent and derived Oct4^{C48S} mutant clones were injected into contralateral flanks of NOD.*Rag1$^{-/-}$Il2rg$^{-/-}$* (NRG) female mice, which were monitored for two weeks before tumor excision and weighing. Tumors were fixed, H&E

stained, and pathologically scored in a blinded fashion. Parent tumors contained areas of maturing

structures such as squamous tissue, respiratory epithelium (cilia and/or goblet cells), maturing neural

components, gastric foveolar epithelium and fat. In contrast, tumors formed with Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESCs

did not contain maturing components, being entirely comprised of immature neuroepithelial elements,

immature cartilage, embryonal carcinoma and yolk sac. with greater homogeneity and fewer differentiated

structures (Fig. 6a). Representative images are shown in Fig. 6b. Additional images are shown in

Supplementary Fig. 10. At later time points, larger mutant teratomas did begin to accumulate mature

structures, but they remained fewer than parent controls (not shown).

One essential hallmark of pluripotency is the ability to contribute to cells and tissues of the

embryo[47]. We conducted chimerism assays to assess the ability of CRISPR-edited ESCs to contribute to

development. We used nine lines of mutant ESCs, derived from three independent wild-type parent lines

with different strain backgrounds to minimize background and clonal effects. Derived clones had

karyotypes similar to parent clones, with the proportion of diploid cells ranging between 71 and 93%.

Compared to the parent cells, which contributed to offspring at a rate of 10-20% (Fig. 6c, chimerism

estimated to range from 2% to 99%), none of the derived Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESCs were able to contribute

to adult mice (Fig. 6c). The results indicates that Oct4^{C48S} ESCs do not contribute to embryonic

development.

Discussion

Oct4 is a central mediator of pluripotency and is widely used to generate iPSCs from somatic cells[25, 27, 48, 49]. Together with other factors it sustains pluripotency by activating "core" targets such as *Pou5f1* (which encodes Oct4), *Sox2* and *Nanog*[4]. Oct4 also maintains silent targets, including critical developmental regulators, in a readily inducible "poised" state[50, 51]. Yet the mechanisms by which Oct4 is itself regulated, particularly at a post-transcriptional level, are poorly defined. Here, we used Oct4/Oct1 domain-swapping to pinpoint Oct4 redox sensitivity as an important determinant in reprogramming and differentiation. Oct1 itself appears to have no role in pluripotency establishment or maintenance, but upon differentiation and Oct4 loss becomes important for guiding developmental-mediated induction of targets shared with Oct4[22].

Pluripotent cells co-express Oct4 together with the widely expressed prototypic Oct/POU factor Oct1/Pou2f1[21]. Despite having similar DNA binding domains and recognizing the same 8-bp consensus octamer sequence (5'ATGCAAAT3')[23, 52], Oct1 and other Oct4 paralogs do not function in reprogramming[5]. Structure/function studies comparing Oct4 with these paralogs, in particular Oct6, have identified Oct4 transcriptional determinants[29, 30, 31, 35]. An example is three residues (K7,T22,151S) present in the Oct4 DNA binding domain (Fig. 1a) but absent in Oct6 needed to form Sox2 heterodimers. Introducing these residues plus the Oct4 N- and C-termini into Oct6 results in efficient reprogramming[30]. However, several Oct4 paralogs including Oct1 contain these residues and readily heterodimerize with Sox2 but cannot reprogram, indicating that additional reprogramming determinants may be present in Oct4 (and Oct6) but absent in Oct1. We identify an additional central Oct4 reprogramming determinant – a single DNA binding domain cysteine residue that confers redox sensitivity of Oct4.

We found that Oct4 C48S mutation maintains DNA binding and confers resistance of oxidation-induced DNA binding inhibition in vitro, while reducing reprogramming efficiency by more than half. Cys48 is located within helix 3 (the DNA recognition helix) of the POU-specific domain (Fig. 1a). This residue makes hydrogen bond contacts with the DNA phosphate backbone, predicting that any oxidation event will block DNA binding. In the context of the Oct4 N-terminus, a single S48C mutation in the Oct1

DNA binding domain is sufficient to confer reprogramming activity. This result suggests that any unique Oct4 cofactors required for reprogramming vis-à-vis Oct1 are likely to be recruited through the N-terminus. The ability of the Oct4 N-terminus to mediate liquid-liquid phase transitions[35] may also play a role. Mutation of the endogenous Oct4 Cys48 to serine does not appear to affect the undifferentiated state, but results in numerous phenotypes upon RA-mediated differentiation, including abnormal retention of Oct4 expression, decreased proliferation and increased apoptosis. Prominent roles for Oct4 in both cell survival and proliferation during post-implantation embryonic development have been documented[46].

The redox sensitivity of Cys thiols is known to be enhanced by immediately adjacent basic amino acid residues[53], and Cys48 is followed by a conserved Arg (Fig. 1a). In Oct1, this residue is a serine, strengthening hydrogen bonding due to the increased electronegativity of the oxygen in the hydroxyl relative to the sulfur in the sulfhydryl. Redox-regulated transcription factors include Nrf2, Yap1, p53 and HIF-1[54, 55, 56]. A subset of these are regulated by Cys oxidation, including disulfide bond formation[55, 56, 57]. Oct4 is similarly known to be sensitive to oxidative stress[40, 41, 42] in a manner reversed by thioredoxin[42] (Supplementary Fig. 4). Relative to other Oct proteins, mouse Oct4 has unusually high cysteine content in the DNA binding domain, with two cysteines in each subdomain (Fig. 1a), including cysteine 142 (Cys50 of the POU-homeodomain), which also lies in the recognition helix. Cys50 is the distinguishing feature of POU-homeodomains relative to other members of the homeodomain family[23, 52]. All other homeodomains, from bacteria to flies to mammals, have bulkier residues such as Q or K at this position that make base contacts[23]. Yet in Oct4, mutating Cys142 to Gly has no effect on DNA binding[40]. In Oct1, C61A and C142A mutation does not interfere with DNA binding, but rather improves crystallization properties[58]. These findings suggest that variable Cys oxidation interferes with uniform crystal packing.

Prior studies have also identified a link between Oct4 oxidation and degradation[40]. In addition to mediating relative sensitivity to oxidative stress, we found that Cys48 increases protein ubiquitylation, in particular following exposure to oxidative stress or MG-132. Oct4 is known to be ubiquitylated via K63-linked chains by the Stub1 E3 Ub ligase to reduce protein half-life[59], however we found that Oct4 marked

with K48-specific linkages were more strongly affected with mutation of cysteine 48 to serine, suggesting

a possibly related by distinct pathway.

Transcription factors with complex (both positive and negative) roles in reprogramming include

Oct4 and Smad3[17, 32, 60]. Although endogenous Oct4 must be activated and expressed as a key component

of the core pluripotency network, recent studies show that removal of Oct4 from reprogramming cocktails

is highly inefficient but results in qualitatively superior iPSC clones that more closely resemble a

pluripotent "ground state"[17, 32]. As a consequence, the few iPSC colonies derived in the absence of Oct4

have enhanced developmental potential. For example, iPSCs reprogrammed without Oct4 are better able

to generate viable mice in a single generation using tetraploid complementation. The counter-productive

activity of Oct4 is likely due to transient promotion of off-target, ectoderm-specific gene expression[17].

The studies indicate that transient down-regulation of counterproductive Oct4 activities can be an

important step for efficient reprogramming. Our work identifying a role of Oct4 redox sensitivity in

reprogramming may explain this process and may provide a route to generating superior iPSC

reprogramming outcomes with high efficiency.

Methods

Cell culture

ESCs/iPSCs were cultured as described previously[61, 62] with "2iV" supplementation: the MEK inhibitor

PD03259010 (1 μM, LC laboratories) and the glycogen synthase kinase-3β (GSK3β) inhibitor

CHIR99021 (3 μM, LC Laboratories). Culture medium was also supplemented with 50 μg/mL ascorbic

acid (Sigma). H_2O_2 (Sigma) was supplied at 1 mM for 2 hr and MG-132 (Sigma) was supplied at 10 μM

for 2 hr. Cell trace violet proliferation assays were conducted using a kit (Cell Trace Violet Cell

Proliferation Kit for Flow Cytometry, ThermoFisher) according to the manufacturer instructions. TUNEL

assays were conducted using a kit (Apo-Direct, Becton-Dickinson) according to the manufacturer

instructions.

FLAG-tagged and chimeric Oct4/Oct1 constructs for iPSC generation

The "mSTEMCCA" 4-in-1 lentiviral vector expressing Oct4, Klf4, Sox2 and c-Myc was used for these

studies[63]. To identify determinants of reprogramming, the Oct4 cDNA cassette was replaced with c-

terminally FLAG-tagged full-length mouse Oct4, mouse Oct1 or chimeric constructs. FLAG-tagged Oct4

was generated by overlap PCR using overlapping primers containing the FLAG peptide sequence:

DYKDDDDK (Forward: 5'-GATTACAAGGATGACGACGATAAGGGAAGTGGCGTGAAACAGA;

Reverse: 5'-CTTATCGTCGTCATCCTTGTAATCGTTTGAATGCATGGGAGAG). The first fragment

was amplified using a forward primer containing a *Not*I restriction enzyme site (5'-

AATGAAAAAAGCGGCCGCCATGGCTGGACACCT) and overlapping reverse primer containing the

FLAG sequence. A second fragment was amplified using the reverse primer containing an *Nde*I restriction

site (5'-GGGAATTCCATATGTGTGGCCATATTATCATCGTGT) and overlapping forward primer.

Mixed first fragment and second fragment as template and amplified the whole fragment by using forward

and reverse primers containing restriction enzymes (*Not*I and *Nde*I). After purification and digestion with

*Not*I and *Nde*I , the purified fragment was ligated with the mSTEMCCA vector digested by *Not*I and *Nde*I.

A similar strategy was applied to generate other tagged constructs. For point mutation, a site-directed

mutagenesis kit (New England Biolabs Q5 Site-Directed Mutagenesis kit) was used following

manufacturer instructions. When making fusions between the different linker domains and POU_H, we took

care to maintain the "RKRKR" sequence at the N-terminus of Oct4 POU_H, which has been shown to be

important for reprogramming[30]. Chimeric constructs between the Oct1 linker and Oct4 POU_H contained

the amino acid sequence N-AEGLN/ARKRKR as shown in Fig. 1a.

iPSC generation

293T cells were transfected by polycation polyethylenimine (PEI) with mSTEMCCA encoding FLAG-

tagged Oct4, Oct1 and different domain-swaps and mutants as well as the packaging plasmids

(pMDLg/pRRE and pRSV-Rev) and envelope plasmid(VSV-G). Lentiviral supernatants were filtered and

used to transduce passage 3 primary MEFs in which EGFP is expressed from the endogenous *Pou5f1*

locus (Oct4-GFP MEFs, Jackson Labs strain #008214). Cells were cultured in ESC medium (above).

Unless stated otherwise, green iPSC colony emergence was quantified after 12 days using an Olympus

IX-71 epifluorescence microscope.

Immunoblotting

Antibodies for immunoblotting were as follows: Oct4, Santa Cruz sc-5279; Oct1, Bethyl A301-

716A+A301-171A; Nanog, GeneTex GTX100863; Sox2, GeneTex GTX101507; GAPDH, EMD

Millipore MAB374; α-Tubulin, Santa Cruz sc-5286; β-actin, Santa Cruz sc-47778.

Lentiviral Oct1 complementation

The *Oct1* (*Pou2f1*) cDNA and IRES (internal ribosomal entry site) elements were amplified and cloned

together by overlap PCR. In the first PCR, primers to the 5' end of *Oct1* containing a *Not*I restriction site

and to the 3' end of *Oct1* that contained a 5' extension of IRES-complementary DNA were used. The

sequences were: Oct1-NotI-For: 5'-AATGAAAAAAGCGGCCGCCATGAATAATCCATCAGAAAC-

3'; Oct1-Rev-IRES: 5'-TTAGGGGGGGGGGGAGGGATCTTCACTGTGCCTTGGAG-3'. In the second

PCR, an IRES sequence was amplified using primers to the 5' end of the IRES containing a 5' extension

of DNA complementary of the *Oct1* 3' end, and primers to the 3' end of the IRES containing an *Nde*I

restriction site. The sequences were: IRES-overlap-FOR: 5'

AGATCCCTCCCCCCCCCCTAACGTTACTGGCCGAA-3'; IRES-Rev-NdeI: 5'-

GGGAATTCCATATGTGTGGCCATATTATCATCGTGT-3'. The third PCR used as a template the

PCR products from the first two rounds, along with the Oct1-NotI-For and IRES-Rev-NdeI primers. This

process generated a DNA fragment containing an *Oct1* cDNA fused to an IRES at the 3' end, along with

a *Not*I site at the 5' terminus and an *Nde*I site at the 3' terminus. The fragment was cloned into the

optimized, self-inactivating, nonreplicative pHAGE lentiviral vector using the *Not*I and *Nde*I restriction

sites. To insert a *Puro* cassette after the IRES, the cDNA was amplified using primers containing 5' *Nde*I

and 3' *Cla*I restriction sites. The sequences were Puro-NdeI-For: 5'-

GGAATTCCATATGATGACCGAGTACAAGCCCACGGT-3'; Puro-ClaI-Rev: 5'

GGTTTATCGATTCAGGCACCGGGCTTGC-3'. Because the IRES apparently attenuated expression of

the *Puro* resistance cassette in this vector, puromycin selection was performed at 0.75 µg/mL. To generate

an empty vector control, the vector was cut with *Nde*I and *Not*I, filled in with Klenow fragment, and re-

ligated.

Electrophoretic mobility shift assay

EMSA was performed using published methods[64, 65] Briefly, reactions were assembled on ice in 0.6×

buffer D (12 mM HEPES pH 7.9, 60 mM KCl, 0.06 mM EDTA, 12% glycerol, all buffer reagents from

Sigma) supplemented with 0.1 mM dithiothreitol (DTT, Sigma), 0.5 mM phenylmethylsulphonyl fluoride

(PMSF, Sigma), 50 µg/mL poly-dI•dC (Sigma), 1 mg/mL bovine serum albumin (BSA, Sigma) and added

DNA probe and lysate or recombinant protein. Diamide (Sigma) was added at final concentrations ranging

from 0 to 300 µM on ice during reaction assembly. 5'Cy5-labeled double-stranded DNA probes were as

follows: wild-type octamer, 5'-TGTCGAATGCAAATCACT-3'; mutant octamer, 5'-

TGTCGAATGCAAGCCACT-3'. Reactions were incubated for 30 min at room temperature prior to gel

loading. For experiments involving reversal of oxidative inhibition, thioredoxin (Sigma) was supplied at

a final concentration of 0 to 60 µM after 15 min incubation with diamide, and both thioredoxin-treated

and control samples were incubated for a further 15 min at 37°C prior to gel loading. Reactions were

resolved be electrophoresis through 0.5× TBE (45 mM Tris-Cl pH 8.3, 45 mM boric acid, 1 mM EDTA,

all reagents from Sigma), 4% polyacrylamide gels containing 1% glycerol. Gels were run for 90 min at

room temperature. DNA was visualized using a Molecular Dynamics Typhoon system.

Recombinant Oct4 protein

Wild-type and C48S mutant Oct4 constructs were generated bearing dual C-terminal FLAG and Twin-

Strep tags. A g-block (IDT) fragment coding for the Twin-Strep and FLAG epitope tags was inserted

between the *Nco*I and *Kpn*I sites in the transient expression vector pACE-MAM2 (Geneva Biotech). The

resultant construct was then digested with *Nco*I and *Pvu*II to insert the g-block fragment coding for either

wild-type or C48S mutant murine Oct4. After Sanger sequencing to confirm veracity, the plasmids were

transfected into Expi293F cells (ThermoFisher Scientific) using ExpiFectamine 293 Tranfection Kit

(ThermoFisher Scientific) following the manufacturer instructions. After 2 days, transfected cells were

harvested by centrifugation at 4°C for 5 min at 500×g, washed with ice-cold PBS, and centrifuged again

at 4°C for 5 min at 500×g. Cells were resuspended in Buffer A (20 mM HEPES pH 8.0, 1.5 mM MgCl$_2$,

10 mM KCl, 0.25% NP-40, 0.5 mM DTT, 2x protease inhibitor cocktail/Roche), incubated for 10 min on

ice, and homogenized using a Dounce homogenizer (Wheaton). The homogenate was centrifuged at 4°C

for 5 min at 3,800×g). Pelleted nuclei were resuspended in Buffer C (20 mM HEPES pH 8.0, 25% glycerol,

1.5 mM MgCl$_2$, 420 mM KCl, 0.25% NP-40, 0.2 mM EDTA, 0.5 mM DTT, 2x protease inhibitor cocktail)

and homogenized again using a Dounce homogenizer (Wheaton). Nuclei were extracted for 30 min at 4°C

with end-to-end rotation, then centrifuged at 4°C for 30 min at 20,000×g. The nuclear extract was then

subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-FLAG (M2)-agarose beads (Sigma). Bead-bound proteins

were eluted with 200 ng/µL 3×FLAG peptide (Sigma) by incubating at 4°C for 30 min. The protein was

pure and monodisperse as verified using Coomassie blue staining and size exclusion chromatography.

Generation of Oct4^{C48S} mutant mouse ESCs

Mutant ESCs with a single-base missense mutation that converts Cys48 to Ser were generated using a

templated CRISPR approach. Briefly, a gRNA was designed to target Cas9 and cutting near the target

nucleotide, 5' GGCCTCGAAGCGA<u>C</u>AGATGG 3', where the underlined C indicates the target

nucleotide. The sgRNA was ordered as a modified synthetic sgRNA from Synthego and was complexed

with Cas9 protein (IDT). to form a ribonucleoprotein (RNP) complex that was electroporated with

program CG-104 into into 6×10^4 mouse ESCs using a LONZA 4D-Nucleofector X-unit. The RNP was

co-electroporated with a corresponding single-stranded oligodeoxynucleotide (ssODN) with 5' and 3'

phosphorothioate modifications, 5'-

ctcactctgtttgatcggcctttcagGAAAGGTGTTCAGCCAGACCA**CCATCT<u>CT</u><u>A</u>G<u>A</u>TTCGAGGCC**TTGC

AGCTCAGCCTTAAGAACATGTGTAAGCTG-3' where lower-case denotes intronic sequence. The

ssODN contained the target mutation (underlined), silent mutations in the seed region (double underlined)

to block CRISPR re-cutting after incorporation of the donor and to generate a unique *Xba*I restriction

enzyme site for screening purposes (the sgRNA site is in bold). Incorporation of the ssODN sequence was

identified via PCR and restriction enzyme digestion, and confirmed by sanger sequencing of the 709 bp

region flanking the mutation. Mutant clones were generated from a pure C57BL/6 ESC line, a 129/BL6

hybrid line expressing constitutive GFP and a reporter line used to de-differentiate ESCs into a 2C-like

state. Clones were tested by karyotype and any clones with <70% normal diploid content were excluded.

RNA-seq

ESCs were first depleted by feeder cells by incubation on plates coated with gelatin. Parental and derived Oct4^{C48S} ESC lines were differentiated in media lacking LIF and containing 1.5mg/L RA for 2 days. Undifferentiated and RA-differentiated cells were collected, and RNA was prepared using a kit (RNeasy, Qiagen). RNA poly-A selected for mRNA using NEBNext rRNA Depletion Kit v2 (Human, Mouse, Rat) (E7400). Bulk RNA was processed and sequenced as reported previously[22]. Differential genes were identified using 2.5-fold change and $p<0.001$ as cutoffs. GO terms were identified using PANTHER[66]. The high-throughput data have been uploaded to the gene expression omnibus (GEO) server, under series record GSE241332. The data are accessible for download through private token gtyfyseqljufjwz while they remain in private status.

Teratoma formation

Feeder-depleted parental and derived Oct4^{C48S} ESC lines were injected subcutaneously into contralateral flanks of 6-8 week-old female NOD.*Rag1$^{-/-}$Il2rg$^{-/-}$* (NRG, Jackson labs) mice to generate teratomas. 1×10^6 cells were implanted. After two weeks, mice were humanely euthanized, and tumors were excised and weighed. After fixation, embedding and sectioning, slides were stained with H&E and evaluated in a blinded fashion.

Chimeric mouse assays

Targeted or parental ESCs were disassociated into single cell suspension by treatment with 0.05% Trypsin (ThermoFisher). After collection by centrifugation, the cells were resuspended in injection medium consisting of DMEM with HEPES (ThermoFisher) supplemented with 10% FBS (Peak Serum) and 0.1 mM 2-mercaptoethanol (Sigma). C57B6 clones were injected into albino B6 blastocysts, while the G4N and C4 lines (and derived lines, B6:129 and 129:129 in origin, respectively) were injected into B6

492   blastocysts. E3.5 blastocysts were used. 10-25 ESCs were injected into each blastocyst using

493   micromanipulators (Eppendorf) and a Leica inverted microscope. After culturing injected blastocysts in

494   KSOM (CytoSpring), approximately 12 to 18 blastocysts were surgically transferred into the uterine horns

495   of day 2.5 pseudopregnant mice or the oviduct of day 0.5 pseudopregnant mice. Mice were scored based

496   on coat and eye color by members of the transgenic core facility at weaning.

Acknowledgements

We thank S. Buckley for critical reading of the manuscript. We thank C. Davey and the University of Utah Health Sciences Center Mouse Transgenic Core and Mutation Generation Core Facilities for assistance with generating CRISPR-edited ESC lines, chimerism assays and karyotyping. We thank B. Dalley and the High-Throughput Genomics core facility, and Q. Li and the Bioinformatics Analysis core facility for assistance with RNA-seq. We thank D. Lum and the university Preclinical Research Resource core facility for assistance with teratoma formation. We thank B. Weaver and B. Cairns for the gift of the C4 ESC line. This work was supported by NIH/NIGMS grant (R01GM122778) to DT.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

     Figure legends

Fig.1. Oct4's reprogramming activity vis-à-vis Oct1 maps to the DNA binding domain. a Mouse Oct1

vs Oct4 DNA binding domain alignment. Asparagine 40 mutated in some constructs to lysine is shown in

blue. The key Oct1 serine 48 residue (cysteine in Oct4) is shown in blue and boxed in red. **b** Schematic

of the reprogramming vector with C-terminal Oct4 FLAG tag. The different domains of Oct4 and Oct1

are color coded. **c** Reprogramming activity of C-terminally tagged Oct4 relative to the untagged control.

Results show an average of experiments performed in biological triplicate. Error bars show ±standard

deviation. Anti-FLAG and anti-Oct4 immunoblots using tagged and untagged constructs transiently

transfected into 293T cells are shown at right. **d** iPSC formation assay using target primary fibroblasts

with an Oct4-GFP cassette. Reprogramming was assessed using the number of GFP-expressing iPSC

colonies. Oct4 was used as a positive control and Oct1 as a negative control. All constructs bore C-terminal

FLAG-tags. Experiments were performed in biological triplicate. Error bars show ±standard deviation. **e**

Schematic and summary of size and activity of the constructs used in (d). The activity of Oct4 in (d) was

set to 100%. C-terminal FLAG-tags are not shown for simplicity. **f** Anti-FLAG immunoblot showing

expression of the different constructs when transiently transfected into 293T cells. Cells were transduced

with the modified STEMCCA reprogramming vectors similar to the primary Oct4-GFP fibroblasts used

in the reprogramming assays. Histone H3 is shown as a loading control.

Fig.2. Activity of Oct4 cysteine 48 in reprogramming. a iPSC formation assay using Oct1-Oct4

lentiviral constructs that manipulate cysteine 4. Oct4 was used as a positive control and Oct1 as a negative

control. All constructs bore C-terminal FLAG-tags. Experiments were performed in biological triplicate.

Error bars show ±standard deviation. **b** Schematic and summary of size and activity of the constructs used

in (a). The activity of Oct4 in (a) was set to 100%. **c** Anti-FLAG immunoblot showing expression of the

different constructs when transiently transfected into 293T cells. Cells were transduced with the modified

STEMCCA reprogramming vectors similar to the primary Oct4-GFP fibroblasts used in the

reprogramming assays. Histone H3 is shown as a loading control. **d** Detail from an Oct1:octamer DNA

co-crystal structure (PDB ID: 1OCT)[38] showing Ser48 making hydrogen bond contacts with the DNA

backbone. **e** Paralog comparison of mouse POU protein amino acid residues corresponding to α-helix 3

of the POU$_S$ sub-domain.

Fig.3. Oct4 cysteine 48 confers DNA sensitivity to oxidative stress and oxidative stress-induced

ubiquitylation. a EMSA using canonical octamer DNA and wild-type of C48S mutant full-length Oct4.

293T cells were transiently transfected with plasmids encoding C-terminally Twin-Strep-FLAG-tagged

Oct4 constructs. Protein lysates were made and immediately used for EMSA with increasing amounts of

diamide (see methods). The larger redox-resistant Oct1 protein that binds wild-type (WT) but not mutant

(Mut) probe is highlighted with an arrow. Asterisk shows a redox sensitive band with superior binding to

mutant rather than octamer DNA that is presumably nonspecific. Together these proteins serve as loading

controls. **b** Quantification of Oct4 band intensity relative to no diamide, which was set to 100%, from

three independent experiments. Error bars show ±standard deviation. **c** Oct4 containing a C-terminal

streptavidin tag was purified from 293T cell lysates using anti-FLAG beads (see methods). Isolated protein

was used in assays similar to (a). **d** Quantification of (c) and two other similar experiments. Error bars

show ±standard deviation. **e** Highly exposed Oct4 immunoblot using lysates prepared from 293T cells

transfected with constructs expressing C-terminally FLAG/Twin-Strep-tagged Oct4. Subsets of cells were

pre-treated with H_2O_2 (1 mM for 2 hr), MG-132 (10 μM for 2 hr) or both. All samples contained MG-132

in the lysis buffer to prevent degradation. Histone H3 is shown as a loading control. **f** Purified wild-type

and C48S mutant Oct4 was immunoblotted using antibodies against specific ubiquitin linkages. The FK2

antibody (Enzo Life Sciences) detects pan-Ub linkages, and the Ub-K48 antibody (Cell Signaling)

detecting Ub-K48-specific linkages. **g** Oct4 and control immunoprecipitates from wild-type ESCs were

immunoblotted using FK2 antibodies. Cells were treated with 10 µM MG-132 for 2 hr or with 2.5 mM

H_2O_2 for 2 hr.

Fig.4. Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESCs are phenotypically normal but retain Oct4 expression when

differentiated. a *Top:* Schematic for CRISPR-mediated *Pou5f1* (*Oct4*) mutation. A single nucleotide

change (arrow) converts the wild-type cysteine to the serine present in Oct1. Asterisk depict two silent

point mutations present in the guide RNA to monitor mutagenesis. *Bottom:* DNA sequencing trace of

homozygous mutant clone. **b** An example C57BL/6 ESC clone (#46) was immunoblotted for Oct4, Sox2

and Nanog. Histone H3 was used as a loading control. **c** Example images of pluripotent colonies from a

parental ESC line and derived Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESC line (#46). Images were collected at 10×

magnification. Scale bar = 0.2 mm. **d** Pan-Ub and control Oct4 immunoblots of Oct4 immunoprecipitates

from parent and Oct4^{C48S} mutant (clone #2) ESC lines. Cells were grown on gelatin without feeder

fibroblasts. Normal culture medium was replaced with medium lacking supplemental glutamine and β-

mercaptoethanol 2 hr prior to the experiment. Where indicated, cells were treated with 2.5 mM H_2O_2 for

a further 2 hr. Oct4 was immunoprecipitated using a rabbit polyclonal antibody (Abcam) and

immunoblotted using monoclonal mouse antibodies against pan-Ub (FK2, Enzo Life Sciences) and Oct4

(Santa Cruz). **e** Parent or derived Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESCs were differentiated without feeders using retinoic

acid. Lysates were collected at the indicated times and probed for Oct4 by immunoblotting. β-actin was

used as a loading control. **f** Average quantified Oct4/β-actin levels from three replicate immunoblots

conducted with the same mutant ESC clone (#46). Error bars depict ±standard deviation. **g** mRNA from

parental and #46 mutant cells differentiated for 2 days with RA, and undifferentiated controls, were

transcriptionally profiled using RNA-seq. Significantly increased genes in differentiating C48S mutant

cells relative to differentiating parent cells (421 genes) were intersected with the set of genes down

regulated in parental cells upon differentiation (1536 genes), to yield 169 genes. **h** PANTHER GO terms

associated with 169 genes from (g) identified using the "biological process" ontology.

Fig.5. Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESCs differentiate abnormally. a phase-contrast images of parent or derived

Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESCs (clone #46) differentiated using retinoic acid for 12 days. Images were collected at

the indicated times at 10× magnification. Scale bar = 0.2 mm. **b** Differentiating cells were trypsinized and

counted using trypan blue exclusion using a hemacytometer. Cell counts were averaged with two other

biological replicates (n=3) and plotted. Error bars depict ±standard deviation. **c** Proliferation was

measured in parent and C48S mutant ESCs differentiating in the presence of RA at days 2, 3 and 4. Cells

were loaded with cell trace violet (CTV) at day 2. **d** Flow cytometric TUNEL assay showing Oct4^{C48S}

ESCs differentiated using retinoic acid. Cells were differentiated for 2 days and incubated with FITC-

labeled dUTP for 1 hour at 37°C prior to flow cytometry.

Fig.6. Oct4^{C48S} mutant ESCs form immature teratomas and do not contribute to adult chimeric

animals. a 1×10^6 parental or Oct4^{C48S} mutant C57BL/6:129 ESCs (clone G4-N) were injected into

contralateral flanks or NRG mice. After two weeks, tumors were harvested, fixed, sectioned, stained with

H&E, deidentified and scored pathologically. The percent of cells within the tumor containing

undifferentiated components was averaged and plotted. N=5 independent tumors for each condition

combined from two separate experiments. For each tumor, values represent the average from a pair of

slides. Two nonadjacent sections from each tumor were used. Error bars depict ±standard deviation. *P*-

value was generated using an unpaired one-tailed T-test. **b** Representative images are shown. Mature

(differentiated) components, e.g. airway epithelium in teratomas derived from parental ESCs are

highlighted by yellow arrows. Asterisk indicates area of necrosis. **c** Three different parent (left side) or

CRISPR-mutated Oct4^{C48S} ESCs (right side) were injected into recipient blastocysts and implanted in

pseudo-pregnant animals. For each line, the proportion of chimeric offspring at weaning is shown as a pie

chart. All karyotypes were confirmed to be similar to parent lines (between 72% and 92% normal).

References

1. Abranches E*, et al.* Neural differentiation of embryonic stem cells in vitro: a road map to neurogenesis in the embryo. *PLoS ONE* **4**, e6286 (2009).

2. Morey L, Santanach A, Di Croce L. Pluripotency and Epigenetic Factors in Mouse Embryonic Stem Cell Fate Regulation. *Mol Cell Biol* **35**, 2716-2728 (2015).

3. Nichols J*, et al.* Formation of pluripotent stem cells in the mammalian embryo depends on the POU transcription factor Oct4. *Cell* **95**, 379-391 (1998).

4. Boyer LA*, et al.* Core transcriptional regulatory circuitry in human embryonic stem cells. *Cell* **122**, 947-956 (2005).

5. Takahashi K, Yamanaka S. Induction of pluripotent stem cells from mouse embryonic and adult fibroblast cultures by defined factors. *Cell* **126**, 663-676 (2006).

6. Li Y*, et al.* Generation of iPSCs from mouse fibroblasts with a single gene, Oct4, and small molecules. *Cell Res* **21**, 196-204 (2011).

7. Gao Y*, et al.* Replacement of Oct4 by Tet1 during iPSC induction reveals an important role of DNA methylation and hydroxymethylation in reprogramming. *Cell Stem Cell* **12**, 453-469 (2013).

8. Heng JC*, et al.* The nuclear receptor Nr5a2 can replace Oct4 in the reprogramming of murine somatic cells to pluripotent cells. *Cell Stem Cell* **6**, 167-174 (2010).

9. Esteban MA*, et al.* Vitamin C enhances the generation of mouse and human induced pluripotent stem cells. *Cell Stem Cell* **6**, 71-79 (2010).

10. Rais Y*, et al.* Deterministic direct reprogramming of somatic cells to pluripotency. *Nature* **502**, 65-70 (2013).

11. Costa Y*, et al.* NANOG-dependent function of TET1 and TET2 in establishment of pluripotency. *Nature* **495**, 370-374 (2013).

12. Vierbuchen T, Wernig M. Molecular roadblocks for cellular reprogramming. *Mol Cell* **47**, 827-838 (2012).

13. Soufi A, Donahue G, Zaret KS. Facilitators and impediments of the pluripotency reprogramming factors' initial engagement with the genome. *Cell* **151**, 994-1004 (2012).

14. Buganim Y*, et al.* The developmental potential of iPSCs is greatly influenced by reprogramming factor selection. *Cell Stem Cell* **15**, 295-309 (2014).

15. Chen J*, et al.* The combination of Tet1 with Oct4 generates high-quality mouse-induced pluripotent stem cells. *Stem Cells* **33**, 686-698 (2015).

16. Yuan X, Wan H, Zhao X, Zhu S, Zhou Q, Ding S. Combined Chemical Treatment Enables Oct4-Induced Reprogramming from Mouse Embryonic Fibroblasts. *Stem Cells* **29**, 549-553. (2011).

17.   Velychko S*, et al.* Excluding Oct4 from Yamanaka Cocktail Unleashes the Developmental Potential of iPSCs. *Cell Stem Cell* **25**, 737-753 (2019).

18.   Okamoto K, Okazawa H, Okuda A, Sakai M, Muramatsu M, Hamada H. A novel octamer binding transcription factor is differentially expressed in mouse embryonic cells. *Cell* **60**, 461-472 (1990).

19.   Rosner MH*, et al.* A POU-domain transcription factor in early stem cells and germ cells of the mammalian embryo. *Nature* **345**, 686-692 (1990).

20.   Suzuki N, Rohdewohld H, Neuman T, Gruss P, Scholer HR. Oct-6: a POU transcription factor expressed in embryonal stem cells and in the developing brain. *EMBO J* **9**, 3723-3732 (1990).

21.   Shen Z*, et al.* Enforcement of developmental lineage specificity by transcription factor Oct1. *ELife* **6**, e20937 (2017).

22.   Perovanovic J*, et al.* Oct1 cooperates with the Smad family of transcription factors to promote mesodermal lineage specification. *Sci Signal* **16**, eadd5750 (2023).

23.   Tantin D. Oct transcription factors in development and stem cells: insights and mechanisms. *Development* **140**, 2857-2866 (2013).

24.   Ferraris L*, et al.* Combinatorial binding of transcription factors in the pluripotency regions of the genome. *Genome Res* **21**, 1055-1064 (2011).

25.   Feng B*, et al.* Reprogramming of fibroblasts into induced pluripotent stem cells with orphan nuclear receptor Esrrb. *Nat Cell Biol* **11**, 197-203 (2009).

26.   Kim KP*, et al.* Permissive epigenomes endow reprogramming competence to transcriptional regulators. *Nat Chem Biol* **17**, 47-56 (2021).

27.   Nakagawa M*, et al.* Generation of induced pluripotent stem cells without Myc from mouse and human fibroblasts. *Nat Biotechnol* **26**, 101-106 (2008).

28.   Shi Y, Desponts C, Do JT, Hahm HS, Scholer HR, Ding S. Induction of pluripotent stem cells from mouse embryonic fibroblasts by Oct4 and Klf4 with small-molecule compounds. *Cell Stem Cell* **3**, 568-574 (2008).

29.   Esch D*, et al.* A unique Oct4 interface is crucial for reprogramming to pluripotency. *Nat Cell Biol* **15**, 295-301 (2013).

30.   Jerabek S*, et al.* Changing POU dimerization preferences converts Oct6 into a pluripotency inducer. *EMBO Rep* **18**, 319-333 (2017).

31.   Jin W*, et al.* Critical POU domain residues confer Oct4 uniqueness in somatic cell reprogramming. *Sci Rep* **6**, 20818 (2016).

32.   An Z*, et al.* Sox2 and Klf4 as the Functional Core in Pluripotency Induction Without Exogenous Oct4. *Cell Rep* **29**, 1986-2000 (2019).

33. Lengner CJ, *et al.* Oct4 expression is not required for mouse somatic stem cell self-renewal. *Cell Stem Cell* **1**, 403-415 (2007).

34. Sommer CA, Stadtfeld M, Murphy GJ, Hochedlinger K, Kotton DN, Mostoslavsky G. Induced pluripotent stem cell generation using a single lentiviral stem cell cassette. *Stem Cells* **27**, 543-549 (2009).

35. Boija A, *et al.* Transcription Factors Activate Genes through the Phase-Separation Capacity of Their Activation Domains. *Cell* **175**, 1842-1855 e1816 (2018).

36. Kim KP, *et al.* Reprogramming competence of OCT factors is determined by transactivation domains. *Sci Adv* **6**, eaaz7364 (2020).

37. Han D, *et al.* A balanced Oct4 interactome is crucial for maintaining pluripotency. *Sci Adv* **8**, eabe4375 (2022).

38. Klemm JD, Rould MA, Aurora R, Herr W, Pabo CO. Crystal structure of the Oct-1 POU domain bound to an octamer site: DNA recognition with tethered DNA-binding modules. *Cell* **77**, 21-32 (1994).

39. Michael AK, *et al.* Mechanisms of OCT4-SOX2 motif readout on nucleosomes. *Science* **368**, 1460-1465 (2020).

40. Marsboom G, *et al.* Glutamine Metabolism Regulates the Pluripotency Transcription Factor Oct4. *Cell Rep* **16**, 323-332 (2016).

41. Lickteig K, Lamb K, Brigman K, Rizzino A. Effects of oxidation and reduction on the binding of transcription factors to cis-regulatory elements located in the FGF-4 gene. *Mol Reprod Dev* **44**, 146-152 (1996).

42. Guo Y, *et al.* Redox regulation of the embryonic stem cell transcription factor Oct-4 by thioredoxin. *Stem Cells* **22**, 259-264. (2004).

43. King HW, Klose RJ. The pioneer factor OCT4 requires the chromatin remodeller BRG1 to support gene regulatory element function in mouse embryonic stem cells. *Elife* **6**, (2017).

44. Aksoy I, *et al.* Oct4 switches partnering from Sox2 to Sox17 to reinterpret the enhancer code and specify endoderm. *EMBO J* **32**, 938-953 (2013).

45. Wang Z, Oron E, Nelson B, Razis S, Ivanova N. Distinct lineage specification roles for NANOG, OCT4, and SOX2 in human embryonic stem cells. *Cell Stem Cell* **10**, 440-454 (2012).

46. DeVeale B, *et al.* Oct4 is required ~E7.5 for proliferation in the primitive streak. *PLoS Genet* **9**, e1003957 (2013).

47. De Los Angeles A, *et al.* Hallmarks of pluripotency. *Nature* **525**, 469-478 (2015).

751   48.   Okita K, Ichisaka T, Yamanaka S. Generation of germline-competent induced pluripotent stem
752   cells. *Nature* **448**, 313-317 (2007).
753

754   49.   Takahashi K*, et al.* Induction of pluripotent stem cells from adult human fibroblasts by defined
755   factors. *Cell* **131**, 861-872 (2007).
756

757   50.   Meissner A*, et al.* Genome-scale DNA methylation maps of pluripotent and differentiated cells.
758   *Nature* **454**, 766-770 (2008).
759

760   51.   Bernstein BE*, et al.* A bivalent chromatin structure marks key developmental genes in embryonic
761   stem cells. *Cell* **125**, 315-326 (2006).
762

763   52.   Kang J, Shakya A, Tantin D. Stem cells, stress, metabolism and cancer: a drama in two Octs.
764   *Trends Biochem Sci* **34**, 491-499 (2009).
765

766   53.   Britto PJ, Knipling L, Wolff J. The local electrostatic environment determines cysteine reactivity
767   of tubulin. *J Biol Chem* **277**, 29018-29027 (2002).
768

769   54.   Marinho HS, Real C, Cyrne L, Soares H, Antunes F. Hydrogen peroxide sensing, signaling and
770   regulation of transcription factors. *Redox Biol* **2**, 535-562 (2014).
771

772   55.   Brigelius-Flohe R, Flohe L. Basic principles and emerging concepts in the redox control of
773   transcription factors. *Antioxid Redox Signal* **15**, 2335-2381 (2011).
774

775   56.   Delaunay A, Isnard AD, Toledano MB. H2O2 sensing through oxidation of the Yap1 transcription
776   factor. *EMBO J* **19**, 5157-5166 (2000).
777

778   57.   Zheng M, Aslund F, Storz G. Activation of the OxyR transcription factor by reversible disulfide
779   bond formation. *Science* **279**, 1718-1721 (1998).
780

781   58.   Remenyi A, Pohl E, Scholer HR, Wilmanns M. Crystallization of redox-insensitive Oct1 POU
782   domain with different DNA-response elements. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr* **57**, 1634-
783   1638. (2001).
784

785   59.   Mamun MMA*, et al.* Stub1 maintains proteostasis of master transcription factors in embryonic
786   stem cells. *Cell Rep* **39**, 110919 (2022).
787

788   60.   Ruetz T*, et al.* Constitutively Active SMAD2/3 Are Broad-Scope Potentiators of Transcription-
789   Factor-Mediated Cellular Reprogramming. *Cell Stem Cell* **21**, 791-805 e799 (2017).
790

791   61.   Shen Z, Formosa T, Tantin D. FACT Inhibition Blocks Induction But Not Maintenance of
792   Pluripotency. *Stem Cells Dev* **27**, 1693-1701 (2018).
793

794   62.   Shakya A*, et al.* Pluripotency transcription factor Oct4 mediates stepwise nucleosome
795   demethylation and depletion. *Mol Cell Biol* **35**, 1014-1025 (2015).
796

797   63.   Somers A*, et al.* Generation of transgene-free lung disease-specific human induced pluripotent
798   stem cells using a single excisable lentiviral stem cell cassette. *Stem Cells* **28**, 1728-1740 (2010).
799

800   64.   Kang J, *et al.* A general mechanism for transcription regulation by Oct1 and Oct4 in response to
801   genotoxic and oxidative stress. *Genes Dev* **23**, 208-222 (2009).
802

803   65.   Tantin D, Gemberling M, Callister C, Fairbrother W. High-throughput Biochemical Analysis of
804   in-vivo Location Data Reveals Novel Distinct Classes of POU5F1(Oct4)/DNA complexes.
805   *Genome Res* **18**, 631-639. (2008).
806

807   66.   Mi H, Muruganujan A, Casagrande JT, Thomas PD. Large-scale gene function analysis with the
808   PANTHER classification system. *Nat Protoc* **8**, 1551-1566 (2013).

d

e

FSQTTI**S**RFE *Mm* Oct1/Pou2f1 (NP_035267)
FSQTTI**C**RFE *Mm* Oct4/Pou5f1 (NP_038661)
FSQTTI**S**RFE *Mm* Oct2/Pou2f2 (Q00196-1)
FSQTTI**C**RFE *Mm* Oct6/Pou3f1 (P21952)
FSQTTI**S**RFE *Mm* Oct11/Pou2f3 (XP_011240722)
FSQTTI**C**RFE *Mm* Brn2/Pou3f2 (XP_021017060)
FSQTTI**C**RFE *Mm* Pit1/Pou1f1 (Q00286)

Shen et al. Fig.3

a *Pou5f1*:

b

c ESC colonies

d ESCs, IP: Oct4, WB: FK2 (pan-Ub)   ESCs, IP: Oct4, WB: Oct4

e

f Oct4/β-actin intensity

g

h

169 genes – GO biological process complete	FDR
response to leukemia inhibitory factor (GO:1990823)	2.60E-08
cellular response to leukemia inhibitory factor (GO:1990830)	4.74E-08
gastrulation (GO:0007369)	2.74E-06
anatomical structure formation involved in morphogenesis (GO:0048646)	7.64E-06
tissue development (GO:0009888)	2.87E-05
embryonic morphogenesis (GO:0048598)	3.21E-05
anatomical structure morphogenesis (GO:0009653)	3.27E-05
cell differentiation (GO:0030154)	4.52E-05
cellular developmental process (GO:0048869)	4.87E-05
stem cell population maintenance (GO:0019827)	5.05E-05

a

Parent ESC: D0, D1, D3, D6, D9, D12

C48S #46: D0, D1, D3, D6, D9, D12

b Cell numbers

Parent ESC
C48S #46

c D2, D3, D4

CTV

Parent ESC
C48S #46

d Parent ESC, D2 — 0.02   Oct4^{C48S} #46, D2 — 1.09

FITC::dUTP

CTV