Oct4 redox sensitivity potentiates reprogramming and differentiation

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

[1]Department of Pathology,

[2]Huntsman Cancer Institute,

[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

Characters in title: 68

Word count (excluding STAR Methods, supplemental item legends, and references): 6,287

SUMMARY

The transcription factor Oct4/Pou5f1 is a component of the regulatory circuitry governing

pluripotency and is widely used to generate induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) from somatic

cells. Here we use domain swapping and mutagenesis to compare Oct4's reprogramming activity

with the reprogramming-incompetent paralog Oct1/Pou2f1, identifying a redox-sensitive DNA

binding domain cysteine residue (Cys48) as a key determinant of reprogramming and

differentiation. In combination with the Oct4 N-terminus, mutating Oct1's serine at this position to

cysteine is sufficient to confer reprogramming activity. Conversely, Oct4^{C48S} reduces

reprogramming potential. Oct4^{C48S} desensitizes the protein to oxidative inhibition and prevents

oxidation-mediated protein ubiquitylation. *Pou5f1^{C48S}* point mutation has little effect on

undifferentiated embryonic stem cells (ESCs), but upon retinoic acid (RA) treatment causes

retention of Oct4 expression and deregulated differentiation. *Pou5f1^{C48S}* ESCs also contribute

poorly to adult somatic tissues and form less differentiated teratomas. Collectively, these findings

uncover a new Oct4 redox mechanism involved in both entry into and exit from pluripotency.

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) have similar capabilities.[1] The transcription factor Oct4 governs the establishment of undifferentiated inner cell mass and epiblast cells, as well germline cells and ESCs.[2] Both ESC differentiation and blastocyst implantation are accompanied by Oct4 loss.[3]. Together with transcription factors such as Nanog and Sox2, Oct4 forms a network of pluripotency transcriptional regulators that reinforce their own and each other's expression.[4]

Oct4 is 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] Reprogramming strategies that increase efficiency[9-13], or improve the quality of iPSC clones[14-17] reveal 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.[18-20] The two proteins share similar DNA binding domains (DBDs) and consensus DNA binding sequences.[21] The two proteins also associate with many of the same target genes.[22,23] Nevertheless, Oct1 and other mammalian Oct4 paralogs do not efficiently reprogram.[5,24] Oct1 in particular is poor at reprogramming relative to most other Oct transcription factors.[25] In contrast, other reprogramming factors such as Sox2, Klf4 and c-Myc can be replaced with close paralogs.[26,27] Structure/function studies comparing Oct4 with its paralogs have identified reprogramming determinants.[28-30] An example is three residues present in the Oct4 DBD but absent in Oct6/Pou3f1 needed to form Sox2 heterodimers. Introducing these residues, plus the Oct4 N- and C-termini, results in efficient reprogramming.[29]. 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 Oct6) but absent in Oct1.

Recent studies show that omission of Oct4 from reprogramming cocktails is inefficient, but results in qualitatively superior iPSC clones with enhanced developmental potential.[17,31] 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 enable reprogramming.

Here, we identify an Oct4 DBD cysteine residue (Cys48) as a central reprogramming determinant. A serine residue is present in Oct1 at this position. In the presence of the Oct4 N-terminus, changing Oct1's serine to cysteine confers robust reprogramming activity. Conversely, mutating Oct4's cysteine to serine reduces reprogramming efficiency by ~60%. Cys48 sensitizes DNA binding activity and protein ubiquitylation to oxidative stress. CRISPR-edited Oct4^{C48S} embryonic stem cell (ESC) lines are phenotypically normal until differentiated, following which they abnormally retain Oct4 expression, proliferate less and undergo apoptosis at higher rates compared to 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 and normal differentiation.

RESULTS

Oct4 vs. Oct1 reprogramming potential concentrates in a DBD cysteine

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

and Oct4 share 71% and 59% identity, respectively. In contrast, the N- and C-termini, and the linker

between the subdomains, are divergent (Figure 1A and not shown). The human proteins are structured

similarly. The amino acid numbering of the DBDs can be standardized by referring to the first amino acid

of POU_S as residue 1 (Figure 1A). To identify Oct4 determinants important for reprogramming, we

generated Oct4/Oct1 chimeric constructs containing the distinct domains (Figure 1B). We included C-

terminal FLAG-tags on all proteins to track expression. Unlike an N-terminal FLAG tag which was

deleterious (Figure S1), constructs with engineered C-terminal tags reprogram with similar efficiency

(Figure 1C). Prior work comparing Oct4 to Oct6 also identified a lysine residue within Oct4 POU_S (K40,

Figure 1A) as important for reprogramming.[30] We therefore mutated $Oct1^{N40}$ to lysine in some constructs

(Figure 1D-F).

86   To measure reprogramming efficiency, we transduced mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs)

expressing GFP under the control of endogenous $Pou5f1^{32}$ with a lentivirus expressing the four Yamanaka

factors[33] (Figure 1B). Substituting Oct1 for Oct4 eliminated reprogramming potential (Figure 1D,E),

setting a baseline for domain-swaps and mutations. We then replaced the Oct1 N- and C-termini with that

of Oct4, and mutated $Oct1^{N40}$ to the lysine present in Oct4. Only fusion of the Oct4 N-terminus generated

detectable colony-forming potential, at ~5% the level of WT Oct4 (Figure 1D,E). These findings are

consistent with work establishing the importance of the Oct4 N-terminus.[34] 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 similar expression (Figure 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 (Figure 1D,E), we conclude that

determinants within the Oct4 DNA-binding domain confer the bulk of reprogramming potential vis-à-vis

Oct1.

In the context of the Oct4 N-terminus ("4N"), we mutagenized DBD amino acid residues that

differ between Oct1 and Oct4, focusing on post-translationally modifiable residues: Lys, Ser, Thr and Cys.

This analysis identified 14 different amino acids, not including Lys40 (Figure 1A). Oct6 is capable of

reprogramming when modified to enable Sox2 dimerization.[35] Filtering these residues using conservation

between Oct4 and Oct6 pinpointed six possible residues. Replacing one of these, Oct1 Ser48, with the

Oct4 cysteine residue found at this position increased activity >7-fold over the "4N" construct containing

the Oct4 N-terminus alone (Figure 2A,B, "1-4All"). iPSC colonies formed under these conditions showed

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

Oct4 (Figure S2). The remaining activity was concentrated in the linker domain, as a construct containing

the Oct4 N-terminus, Cys48 and the Oct4 linker (4N-S48C-4L) had 100% activity (Figure 2A,B). The

Oct4 linker has been shown to regulate reprogramming via selective interactions with different

cofactors.[28,36] 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 a

function of differing rates (Figure S3).

An Oct4[C48S] construct reduced activity by 60% (Figure 2A,B), indicating that over half of Oct4's

differential reprogramming activity vis-à-vis Oct1 is lost by mutating this residue. The reciprocal Oct1[S48C]

mutation resulted in no reprogramming (Figure 2A,B, Oct1-S48C), indicating that Cys48 is not sufficient,

and highlighting its combined importance with the Oct4 N-terminus. The proteins were equivalently

expressed (Figure 2C). These results indicate that in the context of the Oct4 N-terminus, Cys48 confers

robust reprogramming activity. In an Oct1 DBD:DNA structure[37], Ser48 hydrogen bonds with the DNA

backbone (Figure 2D). In a recent Oct4:Sox2:nucleosome structure[38], the Cys48 sulfhydryl also allows

for hydrogen bonding. Predictably, Cys48 mutation to glycine greatly diminishes Oct4 DNA binding in

vitro.[39] Oct6 also contains a cysteine at this position (Figure 2E). These structural studies and our findings

indicate that Ser48 and Cys48 have minimal differences in DNA binding, but that Cys48 nevertheless

plays key roles in reprogramming.

Oct4 Cys48 mediates degradation in response to oxidative stress

Oct4 is hypersensitive to oxidative stress[39-41] in a manner reversed by thioredoxin[41], implicating cysteine

thiols in redox sensitivity. We reproduced this result (Figure S4), which suggested that Cys48 may

potentiate reprogramming through a mechanism involving redox sensitivity. We used lysates from 293T

cells transfected with WT or C48S Oct4 to measured DNA binding using electrophoretic mobility shift

assays (EMSA) with DNA containing a canonical binding element.[22] To measure redox sensitivity, we

used methods similar to Guo et al.[41] in which Oct4 is pre-treated with the oxidizing agent diamide prior

to addition of the DNA. 293T cells express endogenous Oct1 as an internal control (Figure 3A, lanes 2-

3). Oct4 bound to octamer DNA specifically (Figure 3A, lanes 7-8) and was hypersensitive to diamide

treatment (lanes 9-11). Oct4^{C48S} bound DNA equivalently (lane 13) and was comparatively resistant to

oxidation (lanes 14-16). In contrast, little sensitivity was observed with Oct1. Quantification from three

replicates is shown in Figure 3B. The recombinant Oct4 contained a C-terminal FLAG tag, allowing for

purification (Figure S5). Similar relative resistance to oxidative inhibition of DNA binding was observed

using purified C48S recombinant Oct4 (Figure 3C). Quantification from three replicates is shown in

Figure 3D. These results indicate that Oct4 Cys48 mediates oxidative inhibition of DNA binding.

Oct4 oxidation has been linked to its degradation.[39] We noted in over-exposed immunoblots the

presence of multiple slow-migrating high molecular weight forms of wild-type Oct4 which were strongly

attenuated with C48S mutation (Figure 3E, lanes 2-3). Hydrogen peroxide treatment augmented the

banding pattern using wild-type but not mutant protein (lanes 4-5). The bands were also increased using

MG-132, consistent with ubiquitylated species (lanes 6-7). H_2O_2 and MG-132 co-treatment further

increased the pattern (lanes 8-9). None of these treatments affected short-term cell viability (Figure S6).

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 species. Antibodies

recognizing mono- or poly-ubiquitylated proteins revealed strong diminution with Oct4^{C48S} as expected

(Figure 3F, FK2). Strong diminution was observed with K48 linkage-specific polyubiquitin antibodies

(Figure 3F), while K63 linkage-specific antibodies showed modest differences (Figure S7). Similar results

were observed using endogenous Oct4 in wild-type ESCs (Figure 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.

Oct4^{C48S} ESCs differentiate abnormally

We generated ESCs with a single-base missense mutation in the endogenous *Oct4* (*Pou5f1*) locus that

converts Cys48 to Ser. Two silent point mutations were also engineered to create an *Xba*I site to monitor

targeting and facilitate genotyping. Three low-passage parent ESC lines of different strain backgrounds

were chosen for targeting. Multiple independent clones were generated for each line. Homozygous

mutation was confirmed by HRMA and resequencing (not shown and Figure 4A). Tested clones were

karyotypically normal, with the proportion of diploid cells ranging between 71 and 93%. Undifferentiated

mutant ESC clones were morphologically indistinguishable from their parent clones and expressed Oct4,

Sox2 and Nanog at similar levels (Figure 4B,C).

To test if C48S mutation protects endogenous Oct4 against oxidative stress, we studied Oct4

ubiquitination in parent and mutant ESCs. 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 increased with H_2O_2 exposure (Figure 4D, lanes 1-

4). Ubiquitylation was attenuated in mutant cells (lanes 5-6), and unaffected by oxidative stress (lanes 7-

8). Oct4 immunoblotting confirmed that the protein was immunoprecipitated, with decreased parent Oct4

recovered with oxidative stress and more Oct4 recovered in mutant cells (Figure 4D, right side).

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

(Figure 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 2 that was lost by day 3 (Figure 4F). These results were

recapitulated using a second clone from the same parental ESC line (Figure S8A,B), as well as a clone

from a different 129×C57BL/6 ESC line, G4-N, which differentiated more slowly and showed greater

differences (Figure S8C).

We performed transcriptional profiling of parent and mutant cells at RA differentiation day 2, as

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

concordance (Figure S9A). 20-31 million sequence reads were generated for each sample, ~80% of which

aligned 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, Figure 4H,

Table S1). Intersecting these genes with the set of genes normally decreased upon differentiation of parent

cells at this timepoint (1536 genes) showed that 40% of the 421 genes with retained expression in mutant

cells (169 genes) are normally down-regulated with differentiation. These included *Oct4* itself (*Pou5f1*),

as well as *Sox2*, *Nanog* and *Klf4* (Figure 4H). Comparing these genes with established Oct4 ChIP-seq[42]

identified 114 of 169 genes (67%) as direct Oct4 targets (Table S1). 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" (Figure 4G). Similar results were obtained

using a hierarchical clustering approach. We utilized the 100 top differentially expressed genes upon

differentiation for both genotypes (150 total genes). Although the differentiating parental and mutant

replicates clustered together, there was a cohort of pluripotency associated genes (including *Pou5f1*) that

were less down-regulated in mutant cells (Figure S9B). A second cohort of differentiation-specific genes

showed poorer expression in mutant cells upon differentiation. These included *Krt18*, *Mest*/*Peg1* and

Dag1 (Figure S9B). Comparing the complete set of 150 genes to Oct4 ChIP-seq[42] identified 117 (78%) as

direct Oct4 targets (Table S1). These results indicate that Oct4^{C48S} ESCs inappropriately delay loss of

pluripotency gene expression signatures during differentiation.

The duration of retained Oct4 expression during differentiation can affect lineage specification.[43-

45] To determine the effects of Oct4[C48S] mutation on long-term differentiation, we visualized cells treated

with RA over 12 days microscopically. These experiments revealed a significant depletion of cells later

during the second half differentiation (Figure 5A,B, D6-D12). The decreased cell numbers observed

during differentiation of C48S-edited cells with RA could be due to decreased proliferation and/or cell

death. We studied proliferation using cell trace violet (CTV) and apoptosis using TUNEL staining.

Adherent, viable differentiating C48S cells showed decreased proliferation at days 3 and 4 (Figure 5C)

and increased apoptosis at day 2 (Figure 5D). These results define a functional role for Oct4 Cys48 in

ESC differentiation.

Oct4[C48S] ESCs form less differentiated teratomas and contribute poorly to embryonic development

We used mutant and control ESC lines to form teratomas in mice, which were monitored for two weeks

before tumor excision. 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] ESCs injected into the contralateral flanks of the same mice were more

homogeneous with few maturing components, instead entirely harboring immature neuroepithelial

elements, immature cartilage, embryonal carcinoma and yolk sac (Figure 6A,B). Additional images are

shown in Figure S10. At later time points, larger mutant teratomas began to accumulate mature structures,

but less robustly than parent controls (not shown).

One hallmark of pluripotency is the ability to contribute to cells and tissues of the embryo.[46] We

conducted chimerism assays to assess the ability of Oct4[C48S] ESCs to contribute to development. We used

eight lines of mutant ESCs, derived from three parent lines of different strain backgrounds to minimize

background and clonal effects. Compared to the parent cells, which contributed to offspring at a rate of

10-20% (Figure 6C), none of the derived Oct4^{C48S} ESCs were able to contribute to adult mice (Figure 6C).

The results indicates that Oct4^{C48S} ESCs contribute poorly to embryonic development. Collectively, these

results uncover a critical role for the redox-sensitive Oct4 Cys48 in reprogramming and development.

DISCUSSION

The mechanisms by which Oct4 is regulated, particularly at a post-transcriptional level, are poorly defined. Here, we pinpoint Oct4 redox sensitivity as an important determinant of both reprogramming and differentiation. Pluripotent cells co-express Oct4 and Oct1.[47] Despite having similar DBDs and recognizing the same 8-bp consensus octamer sequence[21], Oct1 and other Oct4 paralogs do not function in reprogramming.[5] Structure/function studies comparing Oct4 with these paralogs have identified different Oct4 reprogramming determinants.[28-30,34] We identify Cys48 of the Oct4 DBD as a critical reprogramming determinant that sensitizes the protein to oxidative inhibition and degradation. In Oct1, this residue is a serine. Both residues hydrogen bond with the DNA phosphate backbone.

Transcription factors with both positive and negative roles in reprogramming include Oct4 and Smad3.[17,31,48] Recent studies show that removal of Oct4 from reprogramming cocktails is inefficient but results in qualitatively superior iPSC clones.[17,31] Consequently, 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 due to transient promotion of off-target, ectoderm-specific gene expression.[17] These findings suggest that transient down-regulation of counterproductive Oct4 activities may be an important step for efficient reprogramming. Our work identifies Oct4 redox sensitivity as fulfilling such a role. The findings may provide a route to generating superior iPSC reprogramming outcomes with higher efficiency.

Oct4 is hypersensitive to oxidative stress[39-41] in a manner reversed by thioredoxin.[41] Relative to other Oct proteins, Oct4 has unusually high cysteine content in the DBD, with two cysteines in each subdomain, including cysteine 142 (Cys50 of the POU-homeodomain), which lies in the recognition helix of POU_H. Cys142 is the distinguishing feature of POU-homeodomains relative to other members of the homeodomain family.[21] Cys48 is also located within a DNA recognition helix, of the POU_S domain. The hydrogen bond contact between Cys48 and the DNA predicts that cysteine oxidation will block DNA

binding. Consistently, Oct4[C48S] mutation maintains DNA binding and confers resistance to oxidation-

induced DNA binding inhibition in vitro while reducing reprogramming efficiency by more than half.

Cysteine redox sensitivity is known to be enhanced by adjacent basic amino acid residues[49], and Cys48 is

followed by a conserved Arg. Oct1 S48C mutation is sufficient to confer reprogramming activity, but only

in the context of the Oct4 N-terminus. The Oct4 N-terminus is known to mediate liquid-liquid phase

transitions to control target gene transcription.[34]

256  Prior studies have also identified a link between Oct4 oxidation and degradation.[39] In addition to

257 mediating sensitivity to oxidative stress, Cys48 strongly promotes protein ubiquitylation, in particular

258 following exposure to oxidative stress or MG-132. Oct4 is known to be ubiquitylated via K63-linked

259 chains by the Stub1 E3 Ub ligase[50], however we found that Oct4 marked with K48-specific linkages were

260 more strongly affected with Oct4[C48S] mutation, suggesting a distinct pathway.

261  In ESCs, endogenous Oct4[C48S] mutation does not affect the undifferentiated state, but results in

abnormalities upon RA-mediated differentiation, including retention of Oct4 expression, deregulated gene

expression, decreased proliferation and increased apoptosis. Prominent roles for Oct4 in cell survival and

proliferation during post-implantation embryonic development have been documented.[45] Consistent with

their pluripotency, when injected into adult mice, ESCS are normally able to form teratomas containing

differentiating structures representing all three germ layers. When injected into blastocysts, they can

contribute to adult mouse tissues.[46] We found that both of these features become defective with Cys48

mutation. Cumulatively, these results indicate that Cys48 is as important for differentiation and exit of

pluripotency as it is for reprogramming and its establishment, and suggest a physiological role for Oct4

redox regulation through Cys48 during peri-implantation development.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Key Resources table

Key Resources and their catalog numbers are provided in a separate table.

Resource availability, lead contact, materials availability and data and code availability

Further information and requests for reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the lead contact, Dean Tantin, PhD. (dean.tantin@path.utah.edu). All the materials generated in this study are accessible upon request. 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 in private status. This manuscript does not report original code.

Cell culture

ESCs/iPSCs were cultured as described previously[51,52] 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) at 10 μM for 2 hr. CTV proliferation assays were conducted using a kit (CTV Proliferation Kit for Flow Cytometry, ThermoFisher). TUNEL assays were conducted using a kit (Apo-Direct, Becton-Dickinson).

FLAG-tagging lentiviral constructs for iPSC generation

The mSTEMCCA lentiviral vector expressing Oct4, Klf4, Sox2 and c-Myc was used for these studies.[53] 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 primers containing the DYKDDDDK FLAG peptide sequence: (Fwd: 5'-

GATTACAAGGATGACGACGATAAGGGAAGTGGCGTGAAACAGA;   Rev: 5'-

CTTATCGTCGTCATCCTTGTAATCGTTTGAATGCATGGGAGAG). The first fragment was

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

AATGAAAAAGCGGCCGCCATGGCTGGACACCT) and overlapping Rev primer containing the

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

site (5'-GGGAATTCCATATGTGTGGCCATATTATCATCGTGT) and overlapping Fwd primer. The

first and second fragments were mixed as template and amplified Fed and Rev primers containing *Not*I

and *Nde*I. After purification and digestion with *Not*I and *Nde*I , the fragment was ligated with the

mSTEMCCA vector digested by *Not*I and *Nde*I. Similar strategies were applied to generate other

constructs. For point mutation, a site-directed mutagenesis kit (New England Biolabs Q5) was used. When

making fusions between the different linker domains and POU$_H$, we maintained the "RKRKR" sequence

at the N-terminus of Oct4 POU$_H$, which has been shown to be important for reprogramming.[29]

309   Lentiviral IRES-Oct1

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'-AATGAAAAAGCGGCCGCCATGAATAATCCATCAGAAAC-

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, and 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.

iPSC generation

293T cells were transfected 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) using polyethylenimine. Lentiviral supernatants were filtered and used to transduce

passage 3 primary MEFs expressing EGFP from the endogenous *Pou5f1* locus (Jackson Labs strain

#008214). Cells were cultured in ESC medium (above). GFP[+] iPSC colony emergence was quantified

after 12 days using an Olympus IX-71 epifluorescence microscope.

Immunoblotting

Antibodies for immunoblotting were: Oct4, α-tubulin and β-actin, Santa Cruz; Oct1, Bethyl; Nanog and

Sox2, GeneTex; GAPDH, EMD Millipore; FK2 (pan-Ub), Enzo Life Sciences; Ub-K48, Cell Signaling.

Electrophoretic mobility shift assay

EMSA was performed using published methods.[54,55] Diamide (Sigma) was added at final concentration of

up 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. DNA was visualized

using a Molecular Dynamics Typhoon system.

Recombinant Oct4 protein

Wild-type and C48S 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 murine Oct4. After Sanger sequencing to confirm veracity, the plasmids were transfected into

Expi293F cells (ThermoFisher) using ExpiFectamine 293 Tranfection Kit (ThermoFisher) following the

manufacturer instructions. After 2 days, transfected cells were harvested and washed with ice-cold PBS.

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 Dounce

homogenized again. 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} mouse ESCs

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

templated CRISPR. A modified synthetic sgRNA (Synthego) 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 complexed with Cas9 protein (IDT) to form a ribonucleoprotein (RNP)

complex that was electroporated with program CG-104 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'-

ctcactctgtttgatcggcctttcag**GAAAGGTGTTCAGCCAGACCACCATCT<u>CT</u>A<u>G</u>A<u>TTCGAGGCC</u>TTGC**

AGCTCAGCCTTAAGAACATGTGTAAGCTG-3' where lower-case denotes intronic sequence and the

sgRNA site is in bold. 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. Incorporation of the ssODN sequence was

identified via PCR and restriction enzyme digestion, and confirmed by 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.[23] Differential genes were

identified using 2.5-fold change and $p<0.001$ as cutoffs. GO terms were identified using PANTHER.[56]

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. 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 collected and 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 clones (B6:129

and 129 in origin, respectively) were injected into C57B/6 blastocysts. E3.5 blastocysts were used. 10-25

ESCs were injected into each blastocyst using micromanipulators (Eppendorf) and a Leica inverted

microscope. After culturing injected blastocysts in KSOM (CytoSpring), approximately 12 to 18

blastocysts were surgically transferred into the uterine horns of day 2.5 pseudopregnant mice or the

oviduct of day 0.5 pseudopregnant mice. Mice were scored based 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.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

D.T. conceived the study. Z.S., Y.W. and D.T. designed experiments. Z.S., Y.W. and M.B.C. generated new reagents for the study. Z.S., Y.W., A.M. and K.J.E. performed experiments and/or analyzed data. K.J.E. performed blinded pathological analysis of teratoma samples. generated figures. All authors contributed to the writing of the manuscript and read and approved the final version of the manuscript prior to submission for publication.

 FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Oct4 reprogramming activity vis-à-vis Oct1 maps to the DBD

(A) Mouse Oct1 vs Oct4 DBD alignment. POU_S and POU_H refer to the two DNA binding sub-domains.

Asparagine 40 (blue) was mutated to lysine in some constructs. The key Oct1 serine 48 residue (cysteine

in Oct4) is 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 N=3 independent experiments. 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 Oct4-GFP MEFs. 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. N=3 experiments were performed. 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 transduced with the reprogramming vectors. Histone H3 is shown as a loading control.

Figure 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. N=3

experiments. 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 transduced with the reprogramming vectors. Histone H3 is shown as a loading control.

(D) Detail from an Oct1:octamer DNA co-crystal structure (PDB ID: 1OCT)[37] 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.

Figure 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 full-length Oct4. 293T cells were

transiently transfected with plasmids encoding C-terminal FLAG-tagged Oct4 constructs. Protein lysates

were made and immediately used for EMSA with increasing amounts of diamide. 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.

(B) Quantification of Oct4 band intensity relative to no diamide, which was set to 100%. N=3 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. Isolated protein was used in assays similar to A.

(D) Quantification of C and two 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 Oct4 was immunoblotted using antibodies against specific ubiquitin 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 2.5 mM H_2O_2 for 2 hr.

Figure 4. Oct4^{C48S} 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. Asterisks 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, Nanog and Histone H3 as a loading control.

(C) Example images of pluripotent colonies from a parental ESC line and derived Oct4^{C48S} 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} (clone #2) ESC lines. Cells were grown on gelatin without feeders. 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 and Oct4.

(E) Parent or derived Oct4^{C48S} ESCs were differentiated using RA. 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 N=3 immunoblots conducted with 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 relative to 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.

Figure 5. Oct4^{C48S} ESCs differentiate abnormally

(A) Phase-contrast images of parent and derived Oct4^{C48S} ESCs (clone #46) differentiated using RA 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 (N=3) were averaged and plotted. Error bars depict ±standard deviation.

(C) Proliferation was measured in parent and C48S ESCs differentiating with RA at days 2, 3 and 4. Cells

were loaded with cell trace violet (CTV) at day 2.

(D) 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.

Figure 6. Oct4^{C48S} ESCs form teratomas lacking maturing structures and contribute poorly to adult

chimeras

(A) 1×10^6 parental or Oct4^{C48S} 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) N=3 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).

SUPPLEMENTAL ITEM LEGENDS

Figure S1. Effect of N-terminal FLAG-tag on iPSC formation

(A) Similar to Figure 1C, except cells were transduced with lentiviral vectors expressing untagged and N-

terminal rather than C-terminal FLAG-tagged Oct4.

(B) Anti-FLAG and Oct4 immunoblots showing expression of tagged and untagged Oct4. α-tubulin is

shown as a loading control.

Figure S2. iPSC colony morphology and GFP intensity using different chimeric and mutant

reprogramming constructs

Phase-contrast and epifluorescence images are shown of example iPSC colonies generated using the

constructs shown in Figure 2. Scale bar=200 μm

Figure S3. GFP$^+$ iPSC numbers over time using different Oct1-Oct4 chimeric constructs

Similar to Figure 2A except multiple time points are shown. Wild-type Oct4 is shown as a positive control.

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

deviation.

Figure S4. Oxidative inhibition of Oct4 DNA binding can be reversed with the addition of

thioredoxin

EMSA is shown similar to Figure 3C, except that after 15 min incubation with diamide, thioredoxin was

added at the indicated concentrations. Reactions were incubated for a further 15 min at 37°C prior to

native electrophoresis.

Figure S5. Purification of recombinant wild-type and C48S mutant Oct4 from expi-293T cells

Oct4 was FLAG-tagged at the C-terminus. Protein was purified using beads covalently coupled to anti-

FLAG antibodies. Lysates were prepared 48 hr post-transfection.

Figure S6. H_2O_2 and MG-132 treatment of primary MEFs largely maintains viability

Phase-contrast images are shown of Oct4-GFP MEFs treated with the same concentrations and timepoints

of H_2O_2 and MG-132 used in Figure 3E. Scale bar=200 μm.

Figure S7. H_2O_2 and MG-132 treatment of primary MEFs largely maintains viability

Similar to Figure 3F except additional antibodies were used for immunoblotting: an antibody detecting

K63-linked Ub chains (Cell Signaling) and a pan-Oct4 antibody as a positive control (Enzo Life Sciences).

Oct4 was Twin-Strep- and FLAG-tagged at the C-terminus.

Figure S8. The effects of Oct4 C48S mutation are not parent line- or clone-specific

(A) Similar to Figure 4B except a different clone from the same parent line (#2) was tested.

(B) Similar to Figure 4E except a different clone from the same parent line (#2) was tested.

(C) Similar to Figure 4E except a different clone (#18) from a different parent line (G4-N) was tested.

Figure S9. RNA-seq analysis of differentiating parental and Oct4^{C48S} ESCs

(A) Similarity between bulk RNA-seq replicates and conditions. Clustering of the RNA-seq replicates

using Euclidean distance is shown.

(B) The union of the top 100 most differentially expressed genes upon differentiation for both genotypes

(150 genes total) was subjected to hierarchical clustering and displayed as a heat map. Example genes are

shown at right.

Figure S10. Additional tumor images similar to Fig.6D

Asterisk represents necrotic regions.

REFERENCES

1. Abranches, E., Silva, M., Pradier, L., Schulz, H., Hummel, O., Henrique, D., and Bekman, E. (2009). Neural differentiation of embryonic stem cells in vitro: a road map to neurogenesis in the embryo. PLoS ONE *4*, e6286. 10.1371/journal.pone.0006286 [doi].

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

3. Nichols, J., Zevnik, B., Anastassiadis, K., Niwa, H., Klewe-Nebenius, D., Chambers, I., Scholer, H., and Smith, A. (1998). Formation of pluripotent stem cells in the mammalian embryo depends on the POU transcription factor Oct4. Cell *95*, 379-391.

4. Boyer, L.A., Lee, T.I., Cole, M.F., Johnstone, S.E., Levine, S.S., Zucker, J.P., Guenther, M.G., Kumar, R.M., Murray, H.L., Jenner, R.G., et al. (2005). Core transcriptional regulatory circuitry in human embryonic stem cells. Cell *122*, 947-956.

5. Takahashi, K., and Yamanaka, S. (2006). Induction of pluripotent stem cells from mouse embryonic and adult fibroblast cultures by defined factors. Cell *126*, 663-676. DOI 10.1016/j.cell.2006.07.024.

6. Li, Y., Zhang, Q., Yin, X., Yang, W., Du, Y., Hou, P., Ge, J., Liu, C., Zhang, W., Zhang, X., et al. (2011). Generation of iPSCs from mouse fibroblasts with a single gene, Oct4, and small molecules. Cell Res *21*, 196-204. cr2010142 [pii] 10.1038/cr.2010.142 [doi].

7. Gao, Y., Chen, J., Li, K., Wu, T., Huang, B., Liu, W., Kou, X., Zhang, Y., Huang, H., Jiang, Y., et al. (2013). 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.

8. Heng, J.C., Feng, B., Han, J., Jiang, J., Kraus, P., Ng, J.H., Orlov, Y.L., Huss, M., Yang, L., Lufkin, T., et al. (2010). The nuclear receptor Nr5a2 can replace Oct4 in the reprogramming of murine somatic cells to pluripotent cells. Cell Stem Cell *6*, 167-174. 10.1016/j.stem.2009.12.009.

9. Esteban, M.A., Wang, T., Qin, B., Yang, J., Qin, D., Cai, J., Li, W., Weng, Z., Chen, J., Ni, S., et al. (2010). Vitamin C enhances the generation of mouse and human induced pluripotent stem cells. Cell Stem Cell *6*, 71-79. S1934-5909(09)00624-9 [pii] 10.1016/j.stem.2009.12.001 [doi].

10. Rais, Y., Zviran, A., Geula, S., Gafni, O., Chomsky, E., Viukov, S., Mansour, A.A., Caspi, I., Krupalnik, V., Zerbib, M., et al. (2013). Deterministic direct reprogramming of somatic cells to pluripotency. Nature *502*, 65-70. 10.1038/nature12587.

11. Costa, Y., Ding, J., Theunissen, T.W., Faiola, F., Hore, T.A., Shliaha, P.V., Fidalgo, M., Saunders, A., Lawrence, M., Dietmann, S., et al. (2013). NANOG-dependent function of TET1 and TET2 in establishment of pluripotency. Nature *495*, 370-374. nature11925 [pii] 10.1038/nature11925 [doi].

12. Vierbuchen, T., and Wernig, M. (2012). Molecular roadblocks for cellular reprogramming. Mol Cell *47*, 827-838. S1097-2765(12)00784-8 [pii] 10.1016/j.molcel.2012.09.008 [doi].

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

14. Buganim, Y., Markoulaki, S., van Wietmarschen, N., Hoke, H., Wu, T., Ganz, K., Akhtar-Zaidi, B., He, Y., Abraham, B.J., Porubsky, D., et al. (2014). The developmental potential of iPSCs is greatly influenced by reprogramming factor selection. Cell Stem Cell *15*, 295-309. 10.1016/j.stem.2014.07.003.

15. Chen, J., Gao, Y., Huang, H., Xu, K., Chen, X., Jiang, Y., Li, H., Gao, S., Tao, Y., Wang, H., et al. (2015). The combination of Tet1 with Oct4 generates high-quality mouse-induced pluripotent stem cells. Stem Cells *33*, 686-698. 10.1002/stem.1879.

16. Yuan, X., Wan, H., Zhao, X., Zhu, S., Zhou, Q., and Ding, S. (2011). Combined Chemical Treatment Enables Oct4-Induced Reprogramming from Mouse Embryonic Fibroblasts. Stem Cells *29*, 549-553. 10.1002/stem.594 [doi].

17. Velychko, S., Adachi, K., Kim, K.P., Hou, Y., MacCarthy, C.M., Wu, G., and Scholer, H.R.
(2019). Excluding Oct4 from Yamanaka Cocktail Unleashes the Developmental Potential of
iPSCs. Cell Stem Cell *25*, 737-753. 10.1016/j.stem.2019.10.002.

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

19. Rosner, M.H., Vigano, M.A., Ozato, K., Timmons, P.M., Poirier, F., Rigby, P.W., and Staudt,
L.M. (1990). A POU-domain transcription factor in early stem cells and germ cells of the
mammalian embryo. Nature *345*, 686-692. 10.1038/345686a0 [doi].

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

21. Tantin, D. (2013). Oct transcription factors in development and stem cells: insights and
mechanisms. Development *140*, 2857-2866. 10.1242/dev.095927.

22. Ferraris, L., Stewart, A.P., Kang, J., DeSimone, A.M., Gemberling, M., Tantin, D., and
Fairbrother, W.G. (2011). Combinatorial binding of transcription factors in the pluripotency
regions of the genome. Genome Res. *21*, 1055-1064.

23. Perovanovic, J., Wu, Y., Abewe, H., Shen, Z., Hughes, E.P., Gertz, J., Chandrasekharan, M.B.,
and Tantin, D. (2023). Oct1 cooperates with the Smad family of transcription factors to promote
mesodermal lineage specification. Sci. Signal. *16*, eadd5750. 10.1126/scisignal.add5750.

24. Feng, B., Jiang, J., Kraus, P., Ng, J.H., Heng, J.C., Chan, Y.S., Yaw, L.P., Zhang, W., Loh, Y.H.,
Han, J., et al. (2009). Reprogramming of fibroblasts into induced pluripotent stem cells with
orphan nuclear receptor Esrrb. Nat Cell Biol *11*, 197-203.

25. Kim, K.P., Choi, J., Yoon, J., Bruder, J.M., Shin, B., Kim, J., Arauzo-Bravo, M.J., Han, D., Wu,
G., Han, D.W., et al. (2021). Permissive epigenomes endow reprogramming competence to
transcriptional regulators. Nat Chem Biol *17*, 47-56. 10.1038/s41589-020-0618-6.

26. Nakagawa, M., Koyanagi, M., Tanabe, K., Takahashi, K., Ichisaka, T., Aoi, T., Okita, K.,
Mochiduki, Y., Takizawa, N., and Yamanaka, S. (2008). Generation of induced pluripotent stem
cells without Myc from mouse and human fibroblasts. Nat Biotechnol *26*, 101-106.

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

28. Esch, D., Vahokoski, J., Groves, M.R., Pogenberg, V., Cojocaru, V., Vom Bruch, H., Han, D.,
Drexler, H.C., Arauzo-Bravo, M.J., Ng, C.K., et al. (2013). A unique Oct4 interface is crucial for
reprogramming to pluripotency. Nat Cell Biol *15*, 295-301. ncb2680 [pii] 10.1038/ncb2680 [doi].

29. Jerabek, S., Ng, C.K., Wu, G., Arauzo-Bravo, M.J., Kim, K.P., Esch, D., Malik, V., Chen, Y.,
Velychko, S., MacCarthy, C.M., et al. (2017). Changing POU dimerization preferences converts
Oct6 into a pluripotency inducer. EMBO Rep *18*, 319-333.

30. Jin, W., Wang, L., Zhu, F., Tan, W., Lin, W., Chen, D., Sun, Q., and Xia, Z. (2016). Critical POU
domain residues confer Oct4 uniqueness in somatic cell reprogramming. Sci Rep *6*, 20818.
10.1038/srep20818.

31. An, Z., Liu, P., Zheng, J., Si, C., Li, T., Chen, Y., Ma, T., Zhang, M.Q., Zhou, Q., and Ding, S.
(2019). Sox2 and Klf4 as the Functional Core in Pluripotency Induction Without Exogenous Oct4.
Cell Rep *29*, 1986-2000. 10.1016/j.celrep.2019.10.026.

32. Lengner, C.J., Camargo, F.D., Hochedlinger, K., Welstead, G.G., Zaidi, S., Gokhale, S., Scholer,
H.R., Tomilin, A., and Jaenisch, R. (2007). Oct4 expression is not required for mouse somatic
stem cell self-renewal. Cell Stem Cell *1*, 403-415. 10.1016/j.stem.2007.07.020 [doi].

33.   Sommer, C.A., Stadtfeld, M., Murphy, G.J., Hochedlinger, K., Kotton, D.N., and Mostoslavsky,
G. (2009). Induced pluripotent stem cell generation using a single lentiviral stem cell cassette.
Stem Cells *27*, 543-549.

34.   Boija, A., Klein, I.A., Sabari, B.R., Dall'Agnese, A., Coffey, E.L., Zamudio, A.V., Li, C.H.,
Shrinivas, K., Manteiga, J.C., Hannett, N.M., et al. (2018). Transcription Factors Activate Genes
through the Phase-Separation Capacity of Their Activation Domains. Cell *175*, 1842-1855 e1816.

35.   Kim, K.P., Wu, Y., Yoon, J., Adachi, K., Wu, G., Velychko, S., MacCarthy, C.M., Shin, B., Ropke,
A., Arauzo-Bravo, M.J., et al. (2020). Reprogramming competence of OCT factors is determined
by transactivation domains. Sci Adv *6*, eaaz7364. 10.1126/sciadv.aaz7364.

36.   Han, D., Wu, G., Chen, R., Drexler, H.C.A., MacCarthy, C.M., Kim, K.P., Adachi, K., Gerovska,
D., Mavrommatis, L., Bedzhov, I., et al. (2022). A balanced Oct4 interactome is crucial for
maintaining pluripotency. Sci Adv *8*, eabe4375. 10.1126/sciadv.abe4375.

37.   Klemm, J.D., Rould, M.A., Aurora, R., Herr, W., and Pabo, C.O. (1994). Crystal structure of the
Oct-1 POU domain bound to an octamer site: DNA recognition with tethered DNA-binding
modules. Cell *77*, 21-32.

38.   Michael, A.K., Grand, R.S., Isbel, L., Cavadini, S., Kozicka, Z., Kempf, G., Bunker, R.D., Schenk,
A.D., Graff-Meyer, A., Pathare, G.R., et al. (2020). Mechanisms of OCT4-SOX2 motif readout on
nucleosomes. Science *368*, 1460-1465. 10.1126/science.abb0074.

39.   Marsboom, G., Zhang, G.F., Pohl-Avila, N., Zhang, Y., Yuan, Y., Kang, H., Hao, B.,
Brunengraber, H., Malik, A.B., and Rehman, J. (2016). Glutamine Metabolism Regulates the
Pluripotency Transcription Factor Oct4. Cell Rep *16*, 323-332. 10.1016/j.celrep.2016.05.089.

40.   Lickteig, K., Lamb, K., Brigman, K., and Rizzino, A. (1996). 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.

41.   Guo, Y., Einhorn, L., Kelley, M., Hirota, K., Yodoi, J., Reinbold, R., Scholer, H., Ramsey, H., and
Hromas, R. (2004). Redox regulation of the embryonic stem cell transcription factor Oct-4 by
thioredoxin. Stem Cells *22*, 259-264.

42.   King, H.W., and Klose, R.J. (2017). The pioneer factor OCT4 requires the chromatin remodeller
BRG1 to support gene regulatory element function in mouse embryonic stem cells. Elife *6*.
10.7554/eLife.22631.

43.   Aksoy, I., Jauch, R., Chen, J., Dyla, M., Divakar, U., Bogu, G.K., Teo, R., Leng Ng, C.K., Herath,
W., Lili, S., et al. (2013). Oct4 switches partnering from Sox2 to Sox17 to reinterpret the enhancer
code and specify endoderm. EMBO J *32*, 938-953. emboj201331 [pii] 10.1038/emboj.2013.31
[doi].

44.   Wang, Z., Oron, E., Nelson, B., Razis, S., and Ivanova, N. (2012). Distinct lineage specification
roles for NANOG, OCT4, and SOX2 in human embryonic stem cells. Cell Stem Cell *10*, 440-454.
10.1016/j.stem.2012.02.016.

45.   DeVeale, B., Brokhman, I., Mohseni, P., Babak, T., Yoon, C., Lin, A., Onishi, K., Tomilin, A.,
Pevny, L., Zandstra, P.W., et al. (2013). Oct4 is required ~E7.5 for proliferation in the primitive
streak. PLoS Genet *9*, e1003957. 10.1371/journal.pgen.1003957.

46.   De Los Angeles, A., Ferrari, F., Xi, R., Fujiwara, Y., Benvenisty, N., Deng, H., Hochedlinger, K.,
Jaenisch, R., Lee, S., Leitch, H.G., et al. (2015). Hallmarks of pluripotency. Nature *525*, 469-478.

47.   Shen, Z., Kang, J., Shakya, A., Tabaka, M., Jarboe, E.A., Regev, A., and Tantin, D. (2017).
Enforcement of developmental lineage specificity by transcription factor Oct1. ELife *6*, e20937.
10.7554/eLife.20937.

48.   Ruetz, T., Pfisterer, U., Di Stefano, B., Ashmore, J., Beniazza, M., Tian, T.V., Kaemena, D.F.,
Tosti, L., Tan, W., Manning, J.R., et al. (2017). Constitutively Active SMAD2/3 Are Broad-Scope
Potentiators of Transcription-Factor-Mediated Cellular Reprogramming. Cell Stem Cell *21*, 791-
805 e799. 10.1016/j.stem.2017.10.013.

49.   Britto, P.J., Knipling, L., and Wolff, J. (2002). The local electrostatic environment determines
733   cysteine reactivity of tubulin. J Biol Chem *277*, 29018-29027. 10.1074/jbc.M204263200.
734   50.   Mamun, M.M.A., Khan, M.R., Zhu, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhou, S., Xu, R., Bukhari, I., Thorne, R.F., Li,
735   J., Zhang, X.D., et al. (2022). Stub1 maintains proteostasis of master transcription factors in
736   embryonic stem cells. Cell Rep *39*, 110919. 10.1016/j.celrep.2022.110919.
737   51.   Shen, Z., Formosa, T., and Tantin, D. (2018). FACT Inhibition Blocks Induction But Not
738   Maintenance of Pluripotency. Stem Cells Dev *27*, 1693-1701. 10.1089/scd.2018.0150.
739   52.   Shakya, A., Callister, C., Goren, A., Yosef, N., Garg, N., Khoddami, V., Nix, D., Regev, A., and
740   Tantin, D. (2015). Pluripotency transcription factor Oct4 mediates stepwise nucleosome
741   demethylation and depletion. Mol Cell Biol *35*, 1014-1025. 10.1128/MCB.01105-14.
742   53.   Somers, A., Jean, J.C., Sommer, C.A., Omari, A., Ford, C.C., Mills, J.A., Ying, L., Sommer, A.G.,
743   Jean, J.M., Smith, B.W., et al. (2010). Generation of transgene-free lung disease-specific human
744   induced pluripotent stem cells using a single excisable lentiviral stem cell cassette. Stem Cells *28*,
745   1728-1740. 10.1002/stem.495.
746   54.   Kang, J., Gemberling, M., Nakamura, M., Whitby, F.G., Handa, H., Fairbrother, W.G., and Tantin,
747   D. (2009). A general mechanism for transcription regulation by Oct1 and Oct4 in response to
748   genotoxic and oxidative stress. Genes Dev *23*, 208-222. 10.1101/gad.1750709.
749   55.   Tantin, D., Gemberling, M., Callister, C., and Fairbrother, W. (2008). High-throughput
750   Biochemical Analysis of in-vivo Location Data Reveals Novel Distinct Classes of
751   POU5F1(Oct4)/DNA complexes. Genome Res *18*, 631-639.
752   56.   Mi, H., Muruganujan, A., Casagrande, J.T., and Thomas, P.D. (2013). Large-scale gene function
753   analysis with the PANTHER classification system. Nat Protoc *8*, 1551-1566.
754   10.1038/nprot.2013.092.

D
Ser48
3 Å

E

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

Shen et al. Fig.3