Versatile multi-transgene expression using improved BAC TG-EMBED toolkit, novel BAC episomes, and BAC-MAGIC

Binhui Zhao[1][†], Pankaj Chaturvedi[1][†], David L. Zimmerman[1] and Andrew S. Belmont[1],*

[1] Department of Cell and Developmental Biology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 61801, United States of America

* To whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel: 217-244-2311; Email: asbel@illinois.edu

[†]The authors wish it to be known that, in their opinion, the first two authors should be regarded as joint First Authors.

Present Address: David L. Zimmerman, Biology Department, College of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, Missouri, 65726, United States of America

ABSTRACT

Achieving reproducible, stable, and high-level transgene expression in mammalian cells remains problematic. Previously, we attained copy-number-dependent, chromosome-position-independent expression of reporter minigenes by embedding them within a BAC containing the mouse *Msh3-Dhfr* locus (DHFR BAC). Here we extend this "BAC TG-EMBED" approach. First, we report a toolkit of endogenous promoters capable of driving transgene expression over a 0.01-5 fold expression range relative to the CMV promoter, allowing fine-tuning of relative expression levels of multiple reporter genes expressed on a single BAC. Second, we show small variability in both the expression level and long-term expression stability of a reporter gene embedded in BACs containing either transcriptionally active or inactive genomic regions, making choice of BACs more flexible. Third, we describe an intriguing phenomenon in which BAC transgenes are maintained as episomes in a large fraction of stably selected clones. Finally, we demonstrate the utility of BAC TG-EMBED by simultaneously labeling three nuclear compartments in 94% of stable clones using a multi-reporter DHFR BAC, constructed with a combination of synthetic biology and BAC recombineering tools. Our extended BAC TG-EMBED method provides a versatile platform for achieving reproducible, stable simultaneous expression of multiple transgenes maintained either as episomes or stably integrated copies.

INTRODUCTION

Transgene expression has been widely used in both basic research and biotechnology. Applications of transgene expression range from the elucidation of gene function by ectopic expression of selected transgenes, to the expression of transgenes for gene therapy, and to the overexpression of genes for production of biopharmaceuticals (1–5). Examples of such applications include the expression of multiple fluorescent proteins for live-cell imaging (6), the expression of the four or more Yamanaka transcription factors for efficient generation of induced pluripotent stem (iPS) cells (7), and the expression of multiple proteins for reconstitution of protein complexes (8).

Despite the currently widespread use of transgene expression, most transgene expression systems still suffer from serious experimental limitations. Plasmid-, lentivirus- and transposon- based systems, all still show varying degrees of chromosome position effects (9, 10) and position effect variegation (PEV) (11–15). Moreover, foreign sequences by themselves are targets for epigenetic silencing (16–19), and transgene concatamers can induce the formation of heterochromatin (20, 21). Together these transgene silencing mechanisms result in unpredictable transgene expression levels that do not correlate with copy number and are unstable with long-term culture or changes in the cell physiological or differentiated state (22–24).

Such limitations are compounded when the simultaneous and reproducible expression of multiple transgenes is required. For example, a common application in the emerging field of synthetic biology is the design of

novel gene circuits, involving the expression of multiple proteins, in many cases

at precise relative levels (25). While this approach has worked well in

prokaryotes and yeast, it has been difficult to implement in mammalian cells due

to the lack of suitable multi-transgene expression methods which overcome

chromosome position effects and allow expression of different transgenes at

reproducible relative levels.

A commonly used approach to countering transgene silencing and

variegation has been through the inclusion of *cis*-elements. These include

insulators (26, 27), locus control regions (LCRs) (28, 29), scaffold/matrix

attachment regions (S/MARs) (30, 31), ubiquitous chromatin opening elements

(UCOEs) (32, 33) and anti-repressors (34); some of these regulatory elements

have context-dependent and/or vector dependent activity. While these *cis*-

elements improve transgene expression to varying degrees, they are insufficient

for chromosome-position independent, copy-number-dependent transgene

expression (29, 35–37).

Additionally, in some transgene expression applications the ability to avoid

transgene chromosomal integration and eventually eliminate these transgenes

from the cells is highly desirable. Both viral-sequence based and non-viral, pEPI

based episomal vectors have been developed (38–41). Viral-based vectors have

the potential of causing transformation of the transfected cells (42), while pEPI-

like vectors, containing a S/MAR sequence immediately downstream of an active

transcription unit, are mitotically stable without selection (43–47), and thus

cannot be removed from the cells. Moreover, transgenes on these episomal

vectors are still subject to silencing (48), possibly due to the prokaryotic or viral

sequences on these vectors (49, 50).

Bacterial artificial chromosomes (BACs) carrying ~100-200 kb mammalian

genomic DNA inserts harbor most of the *cis*-regulatory sequences required for

expression of the endogenous genes contained within these genomic inserts.

Previously we demonstrated how embedding minigene constructs at different

locations within the DHFR BAC provided reproducible expression of single or

multiple reporter genes independent of the chromosome integration site (51).

Similar approaches were used by other labs for high-level recombinant protein

production (52, 53). Recently, our lab demonstrated stable transgene expression

after cell-cycle arrest or after terminal cell differentiation, using the BAC-TG

EMBED approach (54). All of these studies tested only BACs containing actively

transcribed regions, based on the hypothesis that the expression level of the

transgenes inserted into the BACs was determined by the chromatin

environments reconstituted by the genomic inserts within the BACs. Indeed,

because of this assumption, previous studies have specifically targeted the

inserted transgenes to transcription units and even exons (51–53).

However, this hypothesis has not been tested. Moreover, overexpression

from the genes on the BAC genomic inserts might change the properties of the

transfected cells, or interfere with other assays of a study. Thus, BACs with no

transcription units would be more desirable. Another improvement over our

previous BAC TG-EMBED system (51, 54) would be a toolkit of endogenous

promoters capable of driving transgene expression over a wide range of defined,

relative expression levels. Viral promoters, including the CMV promoter we used

previously, are known to be prone to epigenetic silencing (55, 56), while most

previously used endogenous and synthetic promoters were selected for their

strength (53, 57–60). While high-level transgene expression is preferable in

applications calling for overexpression, a low or near-physiological expression is

important for many other applications, including gene therapy. Additionally,

multiple transgenes may need to be expressed simultaneously but at

reproducible differential levels.

Here we describe further extensions to the BAC TG-EMBED method that

together provide a more versatile BC TG-EMBED toolkit for a range of future

potential applications. First, we describe a toolkit of endogenous promoters, for

which we have measured relative promoter strength, that can drive transgene

expression at reproducible relative levels over a 500-fold range. Second, we

show that multiple BAC scaffolds can be used to drive sustained high-level

transgene expression driven by the UBC promoter without selection for up to 12

weeks, including BAC scaffolds containing no active transcription units. Third,

we describe an episomal version of BAC TG-EMBED, where BAC transgenes

form circular, ~1 Mb episomes and can be eliminated from the cells by removing

selection. Fourth, we developed a "BAC-MAGIC" (**BAC**-**M**odular **A**ssembly of

Genomic loci **I**nterspersed **C**assettes) to more rapidly assemble BACs containing

multiple transgene expression cassettes. Finally, as a proof-of-principle

demonstration of our new, more versatile BAC TG-EMBED toolkit, we

demonstrate simultaneous expression of fluorescently tagged proteins labeling

three different nuclear compartments, achieving >90% optimally labeled cell

clones after a single, stable transfection.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

PCR amplification of endogenous promoters

Primers (Supplementary Table S1) were designed using Primer3 (61) or NCBI primer blast (62) to amplify 1-3 kb promoter regions which included either the entire or part of the 5' UTRs upstream of the first exons of target genes. We used human genomic DNA extracted from BJ-hTERT cells as the template for PCR. However, the UBC promoter, including a partially synthetic intron, was amplified from plasmid pUGG (54).

Construction of dual reporter DHFR BACs

The original dual reporter BAC, DHFR-HB1-GN-HB2-RZ (51), was derived from the CITB-057L22 BAC (DHFR BAC) containing mouse chr13:92992156-93161185 (mm9). DHFR-HB1-GN-HB2-RZ has an EGFP expression cassette inserted 26 kb downstream of the *Msh3* transcription start site, and a mRFP expression cassette inserted at 121 kb downstream of the *Msh3* transcription start site. The EGFP expression cassette contains a CMV promoter-driven EGFP gene and a SV40 promoter-driven Kanamycin/Neomycin resistance gene, while the mRFP expression cassette has a CMV promoter-driven mRFP gene and a SV40-driven Zeocin resistance gene. New dual reporter DHFR BACs were created using a similar strategy to that used to create DHFR-HB1-GN-HB2-RZ, except that new mRFP expression cassettes were used, where the CMV promoter was replaced with alternative, human endogenous promoters. The intermediate DHFR BAC containing only the EGFP expression cassette, DHFR-

HB1-GN (51), was used to insert these new mRFP expression cassettes using λ

Red-mediated homologous recombination (63, 64).

Plasmid p[MOD-HB2-CRZ] (51) contains a CMV driven mRFP and a SV40

driven Zeocin resistance gene, flanked by two ~500 bp regions homologous to

the DHFR BAC target site. Plasmid p[MOD-HB2-RCS-Zeo] was created by

replacing the CMV-mRFP fragment between NotI and NheI sites of p[MOD-HB2-

CRZ] with a synthetic DNA fragment "RCS" containing multiple rare restriction

sites (Supplementary Table S2). The mRFP fragment generated by digesting

p[MOD-HB2-CRZ] with NheI was then inserted into the NheI site of p[MOD-HB2-

RCS-Zeo], yielding plasmid p[MOD-HB2-RCS-RZ]. The PCR-amplified

endogenous promoters were then inserted into the RCS, generating plasmids

p[MOD-HB2-promoter name-RZ]. Promoter functionality was tested by transient

transfection of NIH 3T3 cells with these plasmids.

To insert the new mRFP expression cassettes into the DHFR-HB1-GN

BAC, one round of λ Red-mediated recombination, using Zeocin resistance as

positive selection, was performed according to a published protocol (63). DNA

fragments containing the new mRFP expression cassettes with a given promoter

with flanking homologous arms were excised from p[MOD-HB2-promoter name-

RZ] plasmids by PmeI. SW102, a derivative strain of *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*),

was used for recombination. Recombinants were selected on low-salt LB plates

containing 25 µg/ml Zeocin and 12.5 µg/ml Kanamycin at 32°C for ~20 hours.

Recombinant colonies were screened by PCR amplification of sequences

flanking the site of insertion (primers listed in Supplementary Table S1). The

integrity of BAC constructs was verified by restriction enzyme fingerprinting,

where observed band patterns on agarose gels were compared with predicted

ones.

Construction of BACs containing the UBC-GFP-ZeoR cassette

Construction of pUGG containing the UBC-GFP-ZeoR-FRT-GalK-FRT

cassette was described previously (54). Human BACs RP11-138I1 (UBB BAC),

CTD-2643I7 (HBB BAC), CTD-2207K13 (2207K13 BAC) and mouse BAC RP23-

401D9 (ROSA BAC) were obtained from Thermo Fisher Scientific. Mouse BAC

CITB-057L22 (DHFR BAC) was a gift from Edith Heard (Curie Institute, Paris,

France).

The UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene insertion positions (mm9 or hg19) are

chr17:16,301,887-16,301,888 in the UBB BAC, chr6:113,043,332-113,043,333 in

the ROSA BAC, chr13:93,099,101-93,099,102 in the DHFR BAC,

chr1:79,224,725-79,224,726 in the 2207K13 BAC, and chr11:5,390,233-

5,390,244 in the HBB BAC.

λ Red-mediated BAC recombineering (63, 64) using a *galK*-based dual-

selection scheme was used to introduce the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter cassette

onto the BACs according to published protocols (63). DNA fragments with

homology ends for recombineering were prepared by PCR using primers

(Supplementary Table S1) with 74-bp homology sequences plus 16-bp

sequences (forward, 5'- acagcagagatccagt-3'; reverse, 5'-tgttggctagtgcgt-3') that

amplify the UBC-GFP-ZeoR-FRT-GalK-FRT cassette from plasmid pUGG. *E.*

coli strain SW105 was used for BAC recombineering. Recombinants containing

the UBC-GFP-ZeoR-FRT-GalK-FRT cassette were selected for *galK* insertion at

32°C on minimal medium in which D-galactose was supplied as the only carbon

source. Recombinant colonies were screened using PCR with BAC specific

primers flanking the target regions (Supplementary Table S1). Subsequently,

FLP recombinase-mediated removal of *galK* from selected recombinant clones

was done by inducing actively growing SW105 cells with 0.1% (w/v) L-arabinose.

Negative selection against *galK* used minimal medium containing 2-deoxy-

galactose; deletion of *galK* in recombinants was again verified using BAC specific

primers (Supplementary Table S1). The integrity of BAC constructs was verified

by restriction enzyme fingerprinting.

The UBB, HBB, 2207K13, ROSA, DHFR BACs with the UBC-GFP-ZeoR

reporter gene inserted were named UBB-UG, HBB-UG, 2207K13-UG, ROSA-UG

and DHFR-UG, respectively.

Cell culture and establishment of BAC cell lines

Mouse NIH 3T3 fibroblasts (ATCC CRL-1658[TM]) were grown in Dulbecco's

modified Eagle medium (DMEM, with 4.5 g/l D-glucose, 4 mM L-glutamine, 1 mM

sodium pyruvate and 3.7 g/l NaHCO$_3$) supplemented with 10% HyClone Bovine

Growth Serum (GE Healthcare Life Sciences, Cat. # SH30541.03). Human

HCT116 cells (ATCC CCL-247[TM]) were grown in McCoy's 5A medium

supplemented with 10% Fetal Bovine Serum (Seradigm, Cat. # 1500-500H).

BAC DNA for transfection of mammalian cells was prepared with the

QIAGEN Large Construct Kit (QIAGEN, Cat. # 12462) as per the manufacturer's

instructions. All BACs except DHFR BAC derived BACs were linearized before

transfection: 2207K13-UG BAC with SgrAI (New England Biolabs, Cat. #

R0603S), HBB-UG BAC with NotI (New England Biolabs, Cat. # R3189S) and all

other BACs with the PI-SceI (New England Biolabs, Cat. # R0696S).

Lipofectamine 2000 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat. # 11668019) was used to

transfect the cells with the BACs according to the manufacturer's directions. The

dual reporter DHFR BACs and the BACs containing the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter

gene were transfected into NIH 3T3. The 2207K13-UG BAC was also transfected

into HCT116. The DHFR BACs containing the Lac operator repeats were

transfected into an NIH 3T3 cell clone 3T3_LG_C29 stably expressing the EGFP-

dimer LacI-NLS fusion protein (EGFP-LacI) (65). Mixed clonal populations of

stable transformants were obtained after ~2 weeks of selection (75 µg/ml Zeocin

and 500 µg/ml G418 for NIH 3T3 cells transfected with the dual reporter DHFR

BACs; 75 µg/ml or 200 µg/ml Zeocin for NIH 3T3 or HCT116 cells, respectively,

transfected with the BACs containing the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene; 75

µg/ml Zeocin and 200 µg/ml Hygromycin B for 3T3_LG_C29 transfected with the

DHFR BACs); individual cell clones were obtained by serial dilution or colony

picking using filter discs (66).

To analyze the stability of reporter gene expression in NIH 3T3 cells,

individual cell clones were grown continuously with or without Zeocin (75 µg/ml)

selection for 96 days. We used the following clones (Figure 4 and Supplementary

Figure S1): DHFR-UG BAC- f1-7, f3-13, f3-15 (uniform), f1-6, f2-1, f2-3

(heterogeneous); ROSA-UG BAC- 2D6- 3C11, 3D7 (uniform), 2C12, 3A1

(heterogeneous); UBB-UG BAC- 1C2, 1F1, 1F12, 2F5, 2G4, 4D3, 5C1, 5C7

(uniform), 1A8, 1D5, 6H2 (heterogeneous); 2207K13-UG BAC- 3E3, 5C8, 5E1,

6B9, 6E12, 6F4, 7B2 (uniform), 1E3, 6A2, 6C10, 7B9 (heterogeneous).

Flow cytometry

For analysis of reporter gene expression, cells were grown to ~40%-80%

confluence, trypsinized, and resuspended in growth media at ~0.5-1 million/ml.

For analysis of the expression of mRFP and EGFP, or mRFP alone, cell

suspensions were run on a BD FACS AriaII (BD Biosciences) or a BD LSR

Fortessa (BD Biosciences), using the PE channel (561 nm laser and 582/15 nm

bandpass filter) for mRFP, and the FITC channel (488 nm laser, 505 longpass

dichroic mirror and 530/30 nm bandpass filter) for EGFP. For analysis of GFP

expression alone, the cell suspensions were run on a BD FACS Canto II Flow

Cytometry Analyzer (BD Biosciences), using the FITC/Alexa Fluor-488 channel

(488nm laser, 502 longpass dichroic mirror and 530/30 bandpass filter).

Rainbow fluorescent beads (Spherotech, Cat. # RFP-30-5A) were used as

fluorescence intensity standards. Each sample was run for 1-2 min or until the

number of events after gating reached 10-20 thousand.

For cell sorting, cells were resuspended at ~10 million/ml in growth media

and run on a BD FACS AriaII for up to 30-40 minutes. Sorting windows are

shown in the main and supplementary figures.

Estimation of relative promoter strength

The red and green fluorescence of the mixed-clonal populations stably

transfected with the dual-reporter DHFR BACs was measured by flow cytometry.

The mean florescence values of all gated cells were divided by the bead intensity

values for normalization. The ratio of normalized mRFP to normalized EGFP

was calculated as a measure of promoter strength (Equation 1). All promoter

strengths were then normalized with the CMV promoter strength (comparing the

CMV-driven mRFP to the CMV-driven EGFP expression) to calculate the relative

promoter strength (Equation 2) using the CMV promoter as the reference.

$$\text{promoter strength} = \frac{median(\text{PE}_{\text{cells}})/median(\text{PE}_{\text{beads}})}{median(\text{FITC}_{\text{cells}})/median(\text{PE}_{\text{beads}})} \qquad 1$$

$$\text{relative promoter strength} = \frac{\text{promoter strength}_x}{\text{promoter strength}_{\text{CMV}}} \qquad 2$$

Genomic DNA extraction

Genomic DNA was isolated by phenol/chloroform extraction (67). Cultured

cells were harvested and washed with 1x Cell Culture Phosphate Buffered Saline

(PBS, Corning, Cat. # 21040CV). Sorted cells were pelleted. Up to ~2 million cells

were resuspended in 100 µl High-TE buffer (10 mM Tris-Cl, pH 8, 10 mM EDTA,

25-100 µg/ml RNase A (QIAGEN, Cat. # 19101)) and lysed by adding 2.5 µl 20%

SDS. After incubation at 37°C for several hours, the lysate was digested by ~0.2

mg/ml Proteinase K (New England Biolabs, Cat. # P8102 or P8107S) at 55°C for

~1 day. 1 M Tris-Cl (pH 8.0), 5 M NaCl and nuclease free water were added to

the lysate to bring up the total volume to ~600 µl and final concentrations of Tris-

Cl to ~0.1 M and NaCl to ~0.2 M. The lysate was then extracted once with an

equal volume of phenol/chloroform/isoamyl alcohol (25:24:1 mixture, Fisher

Scientific, Cat. # BP1752I-400) and once with an equal volume of

chloroform/isoamyl alcohol (24:1 mixture, MilliporeSigma, Cat. # C0549). DNA

was precipitated by adding 2.5 volumes of 100% ethanol, washed with 70%

ethanol and resuspended in EB (10mM Tris-Cl, pH 8.5).

Estimation of transgene copy number

BAC or plasmid transgene copy number within individual cell clones or

sorted cells was measured by real-time quantitative PCR (qPCR), using purified

genomic DNA, iTaq universal SYBR Green Supermix (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Cat.

1725121) and a StepOnePlus (Applied Biosystems). Relative quantitation

methods were used for copy number calculation. Primers used for qPCR are

listed in Supplementary Table S1. Mouse genes *Sgk1* and *Hprt1* were used as

endogenous controls, assuming four copies of each gene per cell in NIH 3T3.

For Figure 3d and Figure 5c, a primer pair (Zeo-GFP2for/rev) that binds to the

UBC-GFP-ZeoR region was used to estimate transgene copy number. For Table

2, Table 3 and Supplementary Figure S5, in addition to Zeo-GFP2for/rev, 4

primer pairs binding to the DHFR BAC or 6 primer pairs binding to the HBB BAC

were used to estimate the copy number of DHFR-UG or HBB-UG BAC,

respectively. The ΔC_T method (Equations 3 and 5) was used to estimate the copy

numbers of the PCR amplification regions on the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene

or on the HBB BAC, and $\Delta\Delta C_T$ method (Equations 4 and 6) was used to estimate

the copy numbers of the PCR amplification regions on the DHFR BAC. When

multiple primer pairs were used for a region, the mean copy number of all PCR

amplification regions was calculated as the copy number of that region.

Equations 3 and 7 were used to calculate the fold increase of BAC copy numbers

in H1 and H2 samples relative to L.

$$\Delta C_T = C_{T\,\text{test region}} - (C_{T\,Sgk1} + C_{T\,Hprt1})/2 \qquad\qquad 3$$

$$\Delta\Delta C_T = \Delta C_{T\,\text{transgene clone}} - \Delta C_{T\,\text{NIH 3T3}} \qquad\qquad 4$$

$$\text{copy number}_{\Delta C_T} = 4 \times 1.95^{-\Delta C_T} \qquad\qquad 5$$

$$\text{copy number}_{\Delta\Delta C_T} = 4 \times 1.95^{-\Delta\Delta C_T} \qquad\qquad 6$$

$$\text{BAC fold increase} = 1.95^{\Delta C_{T\,\text{L}} - \Delta C_{T\,\text{H1|H2}}} \qquad\qquad 7$$

Correlation of reporter gene expression and reporter gene copy number

Mean fluorescence intensity (in arbitrary units) of individual clones were

measured by flow cytometry and normalized by fluorescent bead intensity to be

used as a measure of reporter gene expression. To ensure uniform

normalization for all samples, fluorescent beads from the same batch were used

for all measurements. Untransfected cells were used to establish background

fluorescence levels. Linear correlations of GFP expression level versus

transgene copy number for each group of cell clones were calculated using the

linear trend line tool in Microsoft Excel with the y-intercept fixed to 0

(autofluorescence normalized by beads was almost 0).

DNA FISH probes

Biotin or digoxigenin labeled DNA FISH probes were made from BAC

DNA, using a published protocol (68), with the following reagents: AluI, DpnI,

HaeIII, MseI, MspI, RsaI (New England Biolabs, Cat. # R0137S, R0176S,

R0108S, R0525S, R0106S, R0167S, respectively) and CutSmart Buffer (New

England Biolabs); Terminal Deoxynucleotidyl Transferase and reaction buffer

(Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat. # EP0161); dATP (New England Biolabs, Cat. #

N0446S) and Biotin-14-dATP (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat. # 19524016) for

biotin labelling, or dTTP (New England Biolabs, Cat. # N0446S) and Digoxigenin-

11-dUTP (MilliporeSigma, Cat. # 11093088910) for digoxigenin labelling.

3D DNA FISH

DNA FISH of interphase nuclei used published protocols (69, 70) with

small modifications. Cells grown on coverslips (12 mm diameter) were fixed with

3-4% paraformaldehyde in Dulbecco's phosphate buffered saline (DPBS, 8 g/l

NaCl, 0.2 g/l KCl, 2.16 g/l Na_2HPO_4-$7H_2O$, 0.2 g/l KH_2PO_4) for 10 min, followed

by permeabilization with 0.5% Triton X-100 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat. #

28314) in DPBS for 10-15 min. Cells were subjected to six freeze-thaw cycles

using liquid nitrogen, immersed in 0.1M HCl for 10-15 min, and then washed 3x

with 2x saline-sodium citrate (SSC). Freeze-thaw cycles sometimes were

skipped with no noticeable difference in FISH signals. Cells were incubated in

50% deionized formamide (MilliporeSigma, Cat. # S4117)/2x SSC for 30 min at

room temperature (RT), and stored for up to 1 month at 4°C. Each coverslip

used ~4 µl hybridization mixture, consisted of 5-20 ng/µl probes, 10x of mouse

(for NIH 3T3 cells) or human (for HCT116 cells) Cot-1 DNA (Thermo Fisher

Scientific Cat. # 18440016 or 15279011,) per ng probe, 50% deionized

formamide, 10% dextran sulfate (MilliporeSigma, Cat. # D8906) and 2x SSC.

Cells and probes were denatured together on a heat block at ~76°C for 2-3 min

and hybridized at 37°C for 16 hrs-3 days. After hybridization, cells were washed

3 x 5 min in 2x SSC at RT, and for 3 x 5 min in 0.1x SSC at 60°C, and then

rinsed with SSCT (4x SSC with 0.2% TWEEN 20) at RT. FISH signals were

detected by incubation with Alexa Fluor 647 conjugated Strepavidin (1:200;

Jackson ImmunoResearch, Cat. # 016-600-084) or Alexa 594 conjugated

Strepavidin (1:200; Life Technology, Cat. # S11227) for biotin-labeled probes, or

Alexa Fluor 647 conjugated IgG fraction monoclonal mouse anti-digoxin (1:200;

Jackson ImmunoResearch, Cat. # 200-602-156) for digoxigenin labeled probes,

diluted in SSCT with 1% Bovine Serum Albumin (MilliporeSigma, Cat. # A7906),

for 40 min-2 hrs at RT. Coverslips were washed in SSCT for 4 × 5 min, rinsed

with 4x SSC and mounted.

Mitotic FISH

Metaphase spreads were prepared according to a published protocol (71)

with small modifications. Cells grown to 70-80% confluence were incubated with

0.1 µg/ml Colcemid (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Cat. # 15212012) in growth media

for ~1 hr. Cells were then harvested and swollen by incubation in 0.075 M KCl

for 10-20 min at 37°C, followed by fixation with freshly prepared Carnoy's fixative

(3:1 v/v ratio of methanol/acetic acid). Chromosomal spreads were made by

dropping the fixed swollen cells onto cold wet glass slides. DNA FISH of mitotic

spreads was performed using a published protocol (71).

Microscopy and image analysis

For examining EGFP-LacI signals cells were grown on coverslips and

fixed with 3-4% paraformaldehyde in DPBS before mounting. For examining the

expression of the three reporter minigenes, SNAP tagged-Lamin B1, SNAP-

tagged Fibrillarin and mCherry-Magoh, the cells were first labeled with cell-

permeable substrate SNAP-Cell Fluorescein (New England Biolabs, Cat. #

S9107S) overnight at 240 nM concentrations. To reduce background of

unreacted SNAP-tag substrate, cells were incubated 3x 30 mins with media in

the incubator, washed with PBS, and fixed with freshly prepared 4%

paraformaldehyde in PBS for 15 min at RT. All samples- including fixed cells

expressing fluorescently tagged transgenes, 3D DNA FISH, and mitotic FISH

sample- were mounted with a Mowiol-DABCO anti-fade medium (72) containing

~3 µg/ml DAPI (MilliporeSigma, Cat. # D9542).

3D z-stack images were acquired using a Deltavision wide-field

microscope (GE Healthcare), equipped with a Xenon lamp, 60X, 1.4 NA oil

immersion objective (Olympus) and CoolSNAP HQ CCD camera (Roper

Scientific) or a V4 OMX (GE healthcare) microscope, equipped with a 100X, 1.4

NA oil immersion objective (Olympus) and two Evolve EMCCDs (Photometrics).

Images were deconvolved using the deconvolution algorithm (72) provided by the

softWoRx software (GE Healthcare). Gamma = 0.5 was applied to green

channels in Figure 5e, Supplementary Figure S8 and Supplementary Figure S10

for proper display of spots with relatively low signals. All image analysis and

preparation were done using Fiji (73). Images were assembled using Illustrator

(Adobe), Photoshop (Adobe), or GIMP.

For estimation of episome size, the z-sections containing focused episome

images for the DAPI and FISH channels were selected manually from the

deconvolved z-stack image. Chromosomes and FISH spots were segmented by

applying the k-mean clustering algorithm (number of clusters = 3, cluster center

tolerance = 0.0001, randomization seed = 48) from the IJ Plugins Toolkit (http://ij-

plugins.sourceforge.net/plugins/toolkit.html). The smallest chromosome was

identified by manually searching for the chromosome with the smallest area.

Segmented FISH spots overlapping or touching chromosomes were removed

manually. Integrated DAPI intensities of the smallest chromosome and of the

FISH spots not overlapping or touching chromosomes were calculated by

Equation 8 (Mean gray value and Area were measured by Fiji). Average

episome size was calculated by Equation 9 (n is the number of FISH spots, chro

is the smallest chromosome found in the field, 61.4 Mb is the size of chr19 in

mm10).

$$\text{integrated density} = (\text{Mean gray value} - 200) \times \text{Area} \qquad 8$$

$$\text{episome size} = \frac{\text{integrated density}_{\text{FISH}}}{n \times \text{integrated density}_{\text{chro}}} \times 61.4\text{ Mb} \qquad 9$$

Comparison of reporter gene expression levels in for NIH 3T3 cell clones

(Figure 7c) was done by projecting deconvolved images stacks and then

measuring the integrated intensity within individual nuclei after subtracting

background intensity levels measured in the cytoplasm. Regions of interest

circumscribing individual nuclei were drawn manually based on the SNAP-lamin

B1 signal. Linear correlations of the integrated intensities of the nuclear SNAP-

tag and mCherry signals were calculated using Microsoft Excel with the y-

intercept fixed to 0.

A non-linear Gamma correction (0.7) to reduce the grey-scale dynamic

range followed by a maximum intensity projection of 3-4 z-sections was used to

better visualize both lamin and nucleolar staining simultaneously (Figure 7d).

Agarose embedded DNA preparation and S1 Nuclease digestion

Agarose embedded DNA was prepared according to published protocols

(74, 75) with modifications. To prepare mammalian cell suspensions, cells were

grown without selection for 3-4 days after passaging, reaching 80%-90%

confluence. Cells were trypsinized, resuspended in cell media, washed with

PBS, and resuspended in PBS at a concentration of ~8 x 10^6 cells / 100 μl. To

prepare *E. coli* cell suspensions, ~0.1 ml of overnight culture was diluted in 15 ml

fresh LB and grown to an OD$_{600}$ of ~1. Cells were washed with L Buffer (10 mM

Tris-Cl pH7.6, 20 mM NaCl, 100 mM EDTA) once and resuspended in L Buffer at

a concentration of ~10^9/100 µl, assuming a cell concentration of ~8 x 10^7/100 µl

at an OD_{600} of 1.

2% certified low melt agarose (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Cat. # 1613111) was

prepared with L Buffer and kept at 75°C. Equal volumes of the cell suspension

(RT) and the agarose solution (75°C) were mixed and immediately transferred to

plug molds (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Cat. # 1703713), ~100 µl mixture per plug.

The agarose plugs were incubated in L Buffer with 1% Sarcosyl (MilliporeSigma,

Cat. # L5125) and 0.5 mg/ml proteinase K at 55°C for 1-2 days. The agarose

plugs were washed with W Buffer (20 mM Tris-Cl, pH7.6, 50 mM EDTA) for 2 x

15 min, incubated in 1 mM PMSF in W Buffer for 30 min, and washed with W

Buffer again. Prepared agarose plugs were stored in 0.5 M EDTA at 4°C before

use.

For S1 Nuclease (Promega, Cat. # M5761) digestion, agarose plugs were

first washed in TE (10 mM Tris-Cl, 1 mM EDTA, pH 7.6) for 3 x 10 min and in 1x

S1 Nuclease Buffer for 20 min on ice. The agarose plugs were then digested

with 1-16 U/0.4 ml S1 Nuclease in 1x S1 Nuclease Buffer at 37°C for 45 min.

The reaction was stopped by washing the agarose plugs with 0.5 M EDTA or W

Buffer.

Pulsed Field Gel Electrophoresis (PFGE)

PFGE was performed using a CHEF-DR III (Bio-Rad Laboratories)

according to the manufacturer's manual using a 1% certified megabase agarose

(Bio-Rad Laboratories, Cat. # 1613108) gel in 0.5x Tris-borate-EDTA buffer

(TBE), a 0.5x TBE running buffer, and the following parameters: voltage = 6

V/cm, angle = 120°, pulse = 60-120 sec, temperature = 14 °C, run time = 20 or

24 hrs (stopped at 18-20 hrs). Yeast chromosomes (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Cat.

170-3605) were used as DNA size markers.

Southern hybridization probes

Southern hybridization probes were created and labeled with digoxigenin

by PCR using primers listed in Supplementary Table S1. Set 1 contains a 620bp

and a 615 bp fragment amplified from the GFP-ZeoR region; Set 2 contains 525

bp, 534 bp, and 504bp fragments amplified from the BAC vector region; Set 3

contains 446 bp, 681 bp, and 424 bp fragments amplified from the HBB BAC.

Pooled Set 1 and Set 2 fragments were used for detecting the DHFR BAC, and

pooled Set 1 and Set 3 for detecting the HBB BAC. PCR was done using *Taq*

DNA polymerase (New England Biolabs, Cat. # M0267L) with the following

recipe: 1x ThermoPol Buffer, 0.2 mM dATP/dCTP/dGTP (New England Biolabs,

Cat. # N0446S), 0.165 mM dTTP (New England Biolabs, Cat. # N0446S), 0.035

mM Digoxigenin-11-dUTP, 0.5 ng HBB BAC, 1.25 U *Taq* DNA polymerase, 0.5

μM forward/reverse primers, 50 μl total reaction volume. PCR products were

column (QIAGEN, Cat. # 28104) purified. Pooled probes were denatured in

nuclease free water, at ~100°C for ~10 min and snap-chilled on ice before use.

Southern hybridization

Southern blotting used a published protocol (76) with modifications. After

ethidium bromide staining and imaging, the gel was depurinated in 0.25 M HCl

for 2x 30 min, denatured in 0.4 M NaOH for 2x 25 min, neutralized in 0.5 M Tris-

Cl/1.5 M NaCl (pH 7.6) for 2x 20 min and washed in 2x SSC for 2x 20 min. DNA

was transferred to Zeta-Probe membranes (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Cat. #

1620165) using a Model 785 Vacuum Blotter (Bio-Rad Laboratories), with 2x

SSC as transfer buffer, ~5 inches Hg pressure, and ~16 hrs transfer time. A

Stratalinker (Strategene) was used to cross-link DNA to the membrane.

Hybridization used a standard protocol (77) with modifications. The

hybridization buffer was composed of 1:1 volumes of 1 M Na_2HPO_4 (pH 7.2) and

14% (w/v) SDS. Total concentration of pooled probes was ~100 ng/ml.

Hybridization was carried out at 65°C for ~16 hrs. After hybridization, the

membrane was washed with 2x SSC/0.1% SDS for 2 x 5 min at room

temperature, and with 1x SSC/0.1% SDS for 2 x 10 min at 65°C and rinsed with

2x SSC. Signals were detected using the DIG Nucleic Acid Detection Kit

(MilliporeSigma, Cat. # 000000011175041910) according to the manufacturer'

manual, except that in the final step, CDP-*Star* (MilliporeSigma, Cat. #

11685627001) was used instead of NBT/BCIP, and the membrane was imaged

by an iBright system (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

Estimation of average BAC DNA content per episome

To estimate the average BAC DNA content per episome of clone DHFR-

UG-s3 and clone HBB-UG-100d3, cells at the same passage were seeded on

glass coverslips for DNA FISH using BAC probes, and in different plates for

genomic DNA extraction followed by qPCR. The mean number of FISH spots

per nucleus, counted from z-stack projected images, provided the average

episome copy number per cell. For the DHFR-UG clone, 3 was subtracted from

the mean number of FISH spots, as the parental NIH 3T3 cells had ~3 FISH

spots, corresponding to the endogenous DHFR loci, using FISH probes prepared

from the DHFR BAC. qPCR estimation of BAC copy number per cell was

described in section "Estimation of transgene copy number". BAC DNA content

per episome was calculated using equation 10.

$$\text{BAC content per episome} = \frac{\text{BAC copy number per cell}}{\text{episome copy number per cell}} \times \text{BAC size} \quad 10$$

Whole genome sequencing

Clone DHFR-UG-s3 and clone HBB-UG-100d3 were sorted by flow

cytometry using the H1, H2 and L sorting windows shown in Figure 6c and

Supplementary Figure S4a. Cells from the H2 and L regions were sorted in the

same experiment, while cells from the H1 regions were sorted in another

experiment. 100-200 thousand cells were collected from each window. Genomic

DNA from sorted cells was isolated by phenol-chloroform extraction. To prepare

sequencing libraries, genomic DNA was first fragmented to 100-500 bp by

sonication using a Bioruptor Pico (Diagenode), with the following conditions: 4

ng/μl DNA in 120 μl EB, 1.5 ml tube, 10-11 cycles of 30 secs on and 30 secs off.

Next, indexed adaptors was attached to the fragmented DNA using True-Seq

ChIP Sample Preparation kit (Illumina, Cat. # IP-202-1012) according to the

manufacturer's instructions with the following modifications: after the fragmented

DNA was end repaired, 3' end adenylated, and ligated to indexed adaptors

without size selection, the ligation products were PCR amplified for 7~9 cycles.

Libraries were quality checked on a Fragment Analyzer (Agilent) and quantitated

by qPCR. Every 6 libraries were pooled at equal molar ratios and sequenced on

one lane using a HiSeq 4000 for 101 cycles from one end of the fragments using

a HiSeq 4000 sequencing kit version 1. Fastq files were generated and de-

multiplexed with the bcl2fastq v2.20 Conversion Software (Illumina). Library

quality checking, quantitation and sequencing, and fastq file generation and de-

multiplexing were done by the DNA services lab, Roy J. Carver Biotechnology

Center, UIUC. 59-65 million reads with quality score >30 were obtained for each

library.

Sequencing reads processing and copy number variation analysis

Low quality bases and adaptor sequences were trimmed from raw reads

using cutadapt 1.14 with Python 2.7.13 with the following parameters: -a

AGATCGGAAGAGCACACGTCTGAACTCCAGTCAC -q 20,20 -m 20, resulting

in ~0.2% bp being trimmed. Reads were then aligned to a reference genome

(mm10 plus HBB BAC (CTD-2643I7, sequence from hg38), the BAC vector

(pBelo11, GenBank Accession #: U51113) and UBC-GFP-ZeoR, each as an

individual chromosome) using Bowtie2 (version 2.3.2) with default parameters.

Overall alignment rate of each sample was ~98%-99%. Finally, PCR duplicates

were removed by SAMtools rmdup (version 1.7) with default parameters,

resulting in 42-48 million total mapped reads in each sample.

For reads binning, each chromosome of the reference genome was

divided into non-overlapping 3 kb or 30 kb bins; the number of alignments with

centers falling into each bin (binned reads) was counted and then divided by the

mean read count (Equation 11), generating normalized binned reads (normalized

reads, Equation 12), and finally the normalized binned reads of the test sample

(H1 or H2 cells) were divided by that of the reference sample (L cells), generating

the ratio of normalized binned reads (ratio, Equation 13). The mean read count

was ~50 or ~500 for 3 kb or 30 kb bin size, respectively. To reduce noise caused

by extremely low read counts, a threshold for determining outliers was calculated

based on the quantile range (Equation 14). Bins with $\log_2$(reads) smaller than

the threshold in the test sample were removed from further analysis. The

excluded bins took up ~6.0% of total bins for both 3 kb and 30 kb bin sizes,

including zero read count bins, which took up ~5.5% or ~3.5% of total bins for 3

kb or 30 kb bin size, respectively. The maximum number of reads of the

excluded bins were ~7 or ~108 for 3 kb or 30 kb bin size, respectively.

$$\text{mean read count} = \frac{\text{total mapped reads} \times \text{bin size}}{\text{reference genome size}} \qquad 11$$

$$\log_2(\text{normalized reads}) = \begin{cases} \log_2 \dfrac{\text{binned reads}}{\text{mean read count}}, & \text{binned reads} > 0 \\ \log_2 \dfrac{0.1}{\text{mean read count}}, & \text{binned reads} = 0 \end{cases} \qquad 12$$

$$\log_2(\text{ratio}) = \log_2 \frac{\text{reads}_{\text{H1}|\text{H2}}}{\text{reads}_{\text{L}}} \qquad 13$$

$$\text{outlier threshold} = 25\% \text{ quantile} - 4 \times (75\% \text{ quantile} - 25\% \text{ quantile}) \qquad 14$$

A circular binary segmentation algorithm (78, 79) from the R-package

DNAcopy (version 1.52.0) was used to merge bins with similar $\log_2$(ratio) into

segments, with the following parameters for the segment function: verbose = 1,

undo.splits="sdundo", undo.SD=1. The mean $\log_2$(ratio) of each segment was

calculated for identifying episome-localizing regions.

To identify possible episome-localizing regions, we first measured BAC

transgene copy numbers in the H1, H2 and L samples by qPCR and then

calculated the theoretical episome copy numbers using the estimated BAC copy

number per episome of unsorted cells (Table 2). The minimum copy number

increase of episome-localizing host DNA (minimum increase) was then

calculated assuming NIH 3T3 to be tetraploid and each episome to have the

same host DNA sequence (Equation 15). Segments with mean $\log_2$(ratio) equal

to or greater than $\log_2$(minimum increase) in both H1 and H2 samples were

selected as candidate episome-localizing regions.

$$\text{minimum increase}_{\text{H1}|\text{H2}} = \frac{\text{episome copy number}_{\text{H1}|\text{H2}} + 4}{\text{episome copy number}_{\text{L}} + 4} \qquad 15$$

Construction of DHFR BAC deletions

We tested several DHFR BAC deletions- made for other purposes- for their

ability to produce episomes. The DHFR-c27 BAC (51) containing a 256-mer Lac

operator (LacO) repeats and a CMV-mRFP-SV40-ZeoR expression cassette was

derived from the DHFR BAC, and was used for making the DHFR BAC deletions.

DHFR-c27d2 contains a ~70 kb deletion of the 3' part of the *Msh3* gene. DHFR-

c27d3-crz contains a ~80 kb deletion of the whole *Dhfr* gene and the 5' part of the

Msh3 gene, including the CMV-mRFP-SV40-ZeoR expression cassette inserted in

the *Msh3* gene, and contains a new CMV-mRFP-SV40-ZeoR expression cassette

introduced at the remaining part of *Msh3* gene. DHFR-c27d4 contains a ~20 kb

deletion around the divergent promoter region. λ Red-mediated BAC

recombineering with a *galK*-based dual-selection scheme was used to create the

deletion BACs from the DHFR-c27 BAC, as described in "Construction of dual

reporter DHFR BACs" and "Construction of BACs containing the UBC-GFP-ZeoR

cassette". DNA fragments containing either GalK or FRT-GalK-FRT and homology

ends were produced by PCR using either pGalK or pUGG as templates. For

DHFR-c27d2, the GalK cassette was introduced by the first round of recombination

and was subsequently removed by another round of recombination using a DNA

fragment created by a pair of partially overlapping primers. For DHFR-c27d3 and

DHFR-c27d4, the FRT-GalK-FRT cassette was introduced in the first round

instead and was subsequently removed by inducing FLP recombinase as

described in "Construction of BACs containing the UBC-GFP-ZeoR cassette". To

create DHFR-c27d3crz, the CMV-mRFP-SV40-ZeoR cassette was introduced into

DHFR-c27d3 by one round of recombination using Zeocin resistance as positive

selection as described in "Construction of dual reporter DHFR BACs". Each round

of recombination was validated by PCR and restriction enzyme fingerprinting. All

primers are listed in Supplementary Table S1.

Construction of multi-reporter DHFR BAC by BAC-MAGIC

Overview: Construction of the 3-reporter BAC was done by serially

inserting ~10-15 kb DNA cassettes into the DHFR BAC scaffold by BAC

recombineering. These DNA cassettes were constructed from two different DNA

plasmid module types: reporter modules and intervening DHFR sequence

modules. DNA cassettes were inserted sequentially into the DHFR BAC using

multiple rounds of BAC recombineering and positive selection with one of two

different positive selectable markers. After insertion of the first DNA cassette,

each subsequent insertion of the next DNA cassette removed the preceding

positive selectable located at the 3' end of the preceding cassette while inserting

the alternative selectable marker located at the 3' end of the new cassette.

Three reporter gene modules (Rep Mod 01, 02, 03) plus three intervening DHFR

sequence modules (DHFR 02, 03, 04) were constructed and then inserted into

the DHFR BAC using 6 sequential rounds of BAC recombineering. In this way,

45 kb of the original DHFR BAC effectively was reconstructed such that the

original DHFR sequences were retained but the 3 reporter mini-genes were

inserted into this BAC region with each reporter minigene spaced by ~10 kb of

DHFR sequence. We call this overall construction approach BAC-MAGIC (**BAC**-

Modular **A**ssembly of **G**enomic loci **I**nterspersed **C**assettes).

Each DNA cassette was constructed using traditional cloning methods,

Gibson assembly (80), and/or DNA Assembler (81, 82). Three reporter recipient

modules (pRM01-Spec, pRM02-Spec, and pRM03-Spec) were designed to

incorporate a rare AgeI restriction site for insertion of reporter expression

cassettes of choice, in order to create the final reporter modules for BAC

recombineering. Unless mentioned specifically all the enzymes were procured

from New England Biolabs. All primers and oligos are listed in Supplementary

Table S1. Gibson assembly used Gibson assembly cloning kit (New England

Biolabs, Cat. # E5510S) as per the manufacturer's instructions.

DNA Assembler used *Saccharomyces cerevisiae (S. cerevisiae)* strain

VL6-48N (MATα, his3-Δ200, trp1-Δ1, ura3-Δ1, lys2, ade2-101, met14, cir°),

transformed with 43 fmol pRS413 vector backbone and 130 fmol of all other

fragments using the LiAc/SS carrier DNA/PEG method (83). The *S. cerevisiae*

single-copy shuttle vector pRS413 contains CEN6/ARS autonomously replicating

sequence, auxotrophic selection marker *HIS3* for propagation in yeast, and

pMB1 origin of replication and *bla* (Ap^R) marker for selection with ampicillin in *E.*

coli. The 3.8 kb pRS413 vector backbone was PCR amplified from plasmid

pRS413 (New England Biolabs) using primer pair RS413-Fw/RS413-Rev for all

yeast assembly reactions. The vector backbone and all other fragments made by

PCR were digested with DpnI to remove template DNA. Transformants were

selected on SC selection media plates lacking histidine [0.17% Bacto-yeast

nitrogen base without amino acids (MilliporeSigma, Cat. # Y1251-100G), 0.5%

ammonium sulfate, 2% D-glucose, 0.2% Dropout mix (MilliporeSigma, Cat. #

Y2001-20G), 2% agar, 80 mg/l uracil, 80 mg/l L-tryptophan, and 240 mg/l L-

leucine] at 30°C for 3-4 days. Plasmid DNA were prepared using QIAprep Spin

Miniprep Kit (Qiagen, Cat. # 27104) and screened by restriction enzyme

fingerprinting. Plasmid DNA from selected yeast colonies was introduced into *E.*

coli strain DH5α and isolated plasmid DNA then further validated by additional

restriction enzyme fingerprinting.

Below we describe construction of each reporter and intervening spacer

modules and BAC recombineering assembly of these modules to create the 3-

reporter BAC. ApE (M. Wayne Davis, University of Utah,

http://biologylabs.utah.edu/jorgensen/wayned/ape/) and SnapGene (from GSL

Biotech; available at snapgene.com) programs were used to analyze sequence

data, design primers, and design cloning strategies.

Construction of plasmid pRM01-RSLB1-Spec (Reporter module 01):

Plasmid pRM01 was made by sequential addition of two DHFR homology

regions to plasmid pEGFP-C1 (Clontech). First, the 2.1 kb DHFR homology

region (M1F4) was PCR amplified from the DHFR BAC using primer pair M1F4-

BamHIfor/M1F4-AgeIrev, double digested with BamHI/AgeI, and ligated with the

BamHI/AgeI digested pEGFP-C1 to generate intermediate plasmid pEG-Rep-

Module-1a. Next, the 2.0 kb DHFR homology region (M2F12) was PCR

amplified from the DHFR BAC using primer pair M2F12-AgeIFor/M2F12-PshRev,

double digested with AgeI/PshAI and ligated with the AgeI/SnaBI digested

plasmid pEG-Rep-Module-1a to produce plasmid pRM01.

To create plasmid pRM01-Spec (Reporter recipient module 01), a 1.6 kb

Spectinomycin resistance gene expression cassette (SpecR), derived from

plasmid pYES1L (Thermo Fisher Scientific), was inserted into pRM01, 400 bp

upstream of the 3' end of the M2F12 DHFR homology region by two-fragment

Gibson Assembly (80). The two fragments for Gibson assembly were PCR

amplified from pRM01 using primer pair GA-RM01-Spec-For/ GA-RM01-Spec-

Rev (PCR product size: 7.8 kb), or from pYES1L using primer pair

Specfor/SpecRev (PCR product size: 1.6 kb) respectively.

The pRSLB1 (hRPL32-SNAP-Lamin B1) plasmid harboring SNAP-tagged

Lamin B1 reporter expression cassette (RSLB1) was constructed by three-

fragment Gibson assembly. pEGFP-Lamin B1 plasmid vector backbone 5.3 kb

fragment was prepared by AseI/BsrGI double digestion. The hRPL32 promoter

(2.2 kb) and SNAP tag (561 bp) fragments were PCR amplified using primer

pairs GA-hRPL32-fwd/GA-hRPL32-rev (template plasmid pMOD-HB2-hRPL32-

RZ, made in this study), and GA-SNAP-fwd/GA-SNAP-rev (template plasmid

pSNAPf, New England Biolabs).

pRM01-Spec was linearized by AgeI and simultaneously

dephosphorylated by Shrimp Alkaline Phosphatase (New England Biolabs, Cat. #

M0371S). The RSLB1 expression cassette was PCR amplified from plasmid

pRSLB1 using primer pair R32CerLBAgeIfor/newPCFAgeIrev (PCR product size:

4.9 kb) and double digested with DpnI/AgeI. The linearized pRM01-Spec and the

digested RSLB1 PCR product were ligated to produce plasmid pRM01-RSLB1-

Spec, which was digested with AseI to produce the final BAC recombineering

10.3 kb targeting construct.

Construction of plasmid pRM02-PSF-Spec (Reporter module 02):

Plasmid pRM02 was made using similar cloning steps used to produce pRM01

except two different DHFR homology regions were added to pEGFP-C1:   2.0 kb

PCR product M2F4 (primer pair M2F4-BamHIfor/M2F4-AgeIrev) replaced M1F4

and 2.0 kb PCR product M3F1 (primer pair M3F1-AgeIFor/M3F1-PshRev)

replaced M2F12. Plasmid pRM02-Spec was made the same way as pRM01-

Spec except that fragment 1 for Gibson assembly was PCR amplified from

plasmid pRM02 using primer pair GA-RM02-Spec-For/GA-RM02-Spec-Rev

(PCR product size: 7.8 kb). The final plasmid pRM02-Spec (pRep-module 02-

Spec) is Reporter recipient module 02 for the SNAP-tagged Fibrillarin reporter

expression cassette (PSF).

To create plasmid pPSF (pPPIA-SNAP-Fibrillarin), the GFP cassette

between KpnI/HpaI restriction sites of plasmid GFP-Fibrillarin was replaced with

a 730 bp Cerulean cassette PCR amplified from plasmid pCerulean-N1 (New

England Biolabs) using primer pair ForCerFib/RevCerFib, resulting in an

intermediate plasmid pPCF. Next, the CMV promoter between SnaBI/HindIII

sites of pPCF was replaced with the 2.8 kb PPIA promoter PCR amplified from

plasmid p[MOD-HB2-PPIA-RZ] (made in this study) using primer pair

PPIACerFibFor/ PPIACerFibRev, resulting in plasmid pPPIA-Cer-Fib. Finally, the

720 bp Cerulean cassette between the AgeI/HpaI sites of pPPIA-Cer-Fib was

replaced with a 560 bp SNAP tag fragment PCR amplified from plasmid pSNAPf

(New England Biolabs) using primer pair Snap-XmaI-For/Snap-HpaI-Fib-Rev and

double digested with XmaI/HpaI, producing pPSF.

pRM02-Spec was linearized by AgeI and simultaneously

dephosphorylated by Shrimp Alkaline Phosphatase (New England Biolabs, Cat. #

M0371S). The 4.6 kb PSF expression cassette was PCR amplified from pPSF

using primer pair PSF-AgeI-For/ PSF-AgeI-Rev and double digested with

DpnI/AgeI. Their ligation produced plasmid pRM02-PSF-Spec, which provided

the 10.4 kb BAC recombineering targeting construct after BamHI/AatII/RsrII triple

digestion of pRM02-PSF-Spec.

Construction of plasmid pRM03-PCM-Spec (Reporter module 03):

Plasmid pRM03 was made using similar cloning steps used to produce pRM01

except two different DHFR homology regions were added to pEGFP-C1: 2.1 kb

PCR fragment M3F4 (primer pair M3F4-BamHIfor/M3F4-AgeIrev) replaced M1F4

and 2.1 PCR fragment M4F1 (primer pair M4F1-AgeIFor/M4F1-PshRev)

replaced M2F12. Plasmid pRM03-Spec was made the same way as pRM01-

Spec except that fragment 1 for Gibson assembly was PCR amplified from

plasmid pRM03 using using primer pair GA-RM03-Spec-For/ GA-RM03-Spec-

Rev (PCR product size: 7.8 kb). The final plasmid pRM03-Spec (pRep-module

03-Spec) is Reporter recipient module 03 for the mCherry-tagged Magoh reporter

expression cassette (PCM).

Plasmid pPCM (pPPIA-mCherry-Magoh) was created in two steps. First,

the CMV promoter between the NdeI/NheI sites of plasmid pmRFP-Magoh was

replaced with the PPIA promoter (2.8 kb), PCR amplified from plasmid pMOD-

HB2-PPIA-RZ using primer pair PPIA-Magohfor/ PPIA-MagohRev and double

digested with NdeI/NheI, resulting in intermediate plasmid pPMM. Next, the

mRFP tag between the NheI/HindIII sites of pPMM was replaced with a 720 bp

mCherry tag PCR amplified from plasmid pQCXIN-TetR-mCherry using primer

pair mCherry-NheI-Magoh-For/mCherry-H3-Magoh-Rev, resulting in plasmid

pPCM.

To create plasmid pRM03-PCM-Spec (Reporter module 03), plasmid

pRM03-Spec was linearized by AgeI and simultaneously dephosphorylated by

Shrimp Alkaline Phosphatase (New England Biolabs, Cat. # M0371S). A 4.2 kb

PCM expression cassette was PCR amplified form plasmid pPCM using primer

pair MMorCF-AgeIfor/newPCFAgeIrev and double digested with DpnI/AgeI.

pRM03-Spec and the PCM PCR product were ligated, producing plasmid

pRM03-PCM-Spec, which was used as a template for PCR amplification using

primer pair M3F4-PCR-Fw/M4F1-PCR-Rev to produce the 9.9 kb BAC

recombineering target. After PCR, any remaining template plasmid was digested

with DpnI.

Construction of plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-02-Kan (Intervening

DHFR module 02): Plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-02 was made by assembling

the vector backbone with four additional fragments using the DNA assembler

method (81, 82). Fragment 5'-DHM2 (4.3 kb) and fragment 3'-DHM2 (6.3 kb)

with an overlap of 659 bp and were both PCR amplified from the DHFR BAC,

using primer pair M2F12-AgeIfor/M2F1rev or DHM2-Seq2/M2F4-AgeIrev,

respectively.   Two bridging oligomers, with a 125 bp homology to the pRS413

vector backbone, and a 125 bp homology to fragment 5'-DHM2 (oligo M2F1-

pRS413) or fragment 3'-DHM2 (oligo M2F4-pRS413) were synthesized at

Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc. The final Intervening DHFR module 02,

plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-02-Kan, was created by ligating a 2.4 kb Kan/NeoR

cassette derived from DraI digestion of plasmid pEGFP-C1, with the plasmid

pRS413-DHFR-Module-02 linearized by DraIII and blunted by DNA Polymerase

I, Large (Klenow) Fragment.

For BAC recombineering an 11.7 kb of targeting construct was amplified

from plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-02-Kan using primer pair M2F12-

AgeIFor/DH2-4rev and purified by gel extraction after DpnI digestion of the

template plasmid.

Construction of plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-03-Kan (Intervening

DHFR module 03): Plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-03 was made by assembling

the vector backbone with four additional fragments using the yeast DNA

assembler method. Fragment 5'-DHM3 (6.5 kb) and fragment 3'-DHM3 (5.0 kb)

with an overlap of 1553 bp were both PCR amplified from the DHFR BAC using

primer pair M3F1-AgeIFor/M3F3-BamHIrev or M3-F3For/M3F4-AgeIRev,

respectively.   Two bridging oligomers, with a 125 bp homology to the pRS413

vector backbone, and a 125 bp homology to fragment 5'-DHM3 (oligo M3F1-

pRS413) or to fragment 3'-DHM3 (oligo M3F4-pRS413), respectively, were

synthesized at Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc. The final Intervening DHFR

module 03, plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-03-Kan, was created by ligating a 2.4

kb Kan/NeoR cassette derived from DraI digestion of plasmid pEGFP-C1, with

the plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-03 linearized by SmaI.

For BAC recombineering a 12.2 kb targeting construct was amplified from

plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-03-Kan using primer pair DH3-1for/DH3-4rev and

purified by gel extraction after DpnI digestion of the template plasmid.

Construction of plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-04-Zeo (Intervening

DHFR module 04): Plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-04 was made by assembling

the vector backbone plus 5 additional fragments using the yeast DNA assembler

method (4). Fragment 5'-DHM4 (4.9 kb), fragment Mid-DHM4 (5.2 kb) and

fragment 3'-DHM4 (5.2 kb) with an overlap of 2663 bp in between 5'-DHM4 and

Mid-DHM4, and an overlap of 2542 bp in between Mid-DHM4 and 3'-DHM4,

were PCR amplified from the DHFR BAC using primer pair M4F1-

AgeIfor/DHM4F2-R, DHM4F2-Fw/DHM4F3-R, or Fw-M4F2-BamHI/RevM4F5-

MluI, respectively. Two bridging oligomers, with a 125 bp homology to pRS413

vector backbone, and a 125 bp homology to fragment 5'-DHM4 (oligo M4F1-

pRS413), or to fragment 3'-DHM4 (oligo M4F5-pRS413), were synthesized at

Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc. The final Intervening DHFR module 04,

plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-04-Zeo, was created by ligating a 1.1 kb ZeoR

expression cassette PCR amplified from plasmid pSV40/Zeo2 (ThermoFisher

Scientific) using 5' phosphorylated primer pair ZeoMluIFor/ZeoMluIRev, with the

plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Module-04 linearized by BmgBI.

For BAC recombineering an 11.6 kb targeting construct was excised out

from plasmid pRS413-DHFR-Mod-04-Zeo using KpnI/DrdI restriction enzymes

and gel purified.

Assembly of modules to create multi-reporter DHFR BAC: The six

targeting constructs derived from the three reporter modules and the three

intervening DHFR modules were incorporated into the DHFR BAC by BAC

recombineering, with the following order: Reporter module 01, Intervening DHFR

module 02, Reporter module 02, Intervening DHFR module 03, Reporter module

03 and Intervening DHFR module 04. *E. coli* strain SW102 was used for BAC

recombineering. Each round of BAC recombineering used a corresponding

antibiotic (50 μg/ml Kanamycin, 50 μg/ml Spectinomycin, or 25 μg/ml Zeocin) as

positive selection for incorporation of the current targeting construct as described

in section "Construction of dual reporter DHFR BACs". In the second to the last

round of BAC recombineering, colonies were further screened for loss of the

antibiotic resistance gene incorporated in the previous round of BAC

recombineering by streaking colonies onto a plate containing the corresponding

antibiotic. Each round of recombination was validated by restriction enzyme

fingerprinting.

RESULTS

Overview of BAC TG-EMBED toolkit development:

We previously demonstrated the feasibility of the BAC TG-EMBED

approach using both the DHFR BAC (51) and a BAC containing the human

GAPDH gene locus (GAPDH BAC) (54). We set out to extend this BAC TG-

EMBED methodology in two new directions (Figure 1).

First, to better control transgene expression and to be able to express

multiple transgenes at reproducible expression ratios, we explored a set of

constitutive promoters with various strengths for transgene expression. A

previous similar survey of promoters within BAC scaffolds focused only on strong

promoters (53). Moreover this survey compared average expression in pools of

cell colonies containing different copy-number BAC insertions (53). Here we

used a two-reporter, single-cell ratio assay and also examined promoters with a

wide range of promoter strengths. Testing each promoter with each BAC

scaffold would have generated too large a number of possible combinations. We

therefore decided to test a number of different promoters with the original DHFR

BAC.

Second, we used one specific reporter gene construct to survey the effect

of different BAC scaffolds on reporter gene expression. Previous similar

applications used BAC scaffolds containing multiple endogenous genes which

would also be expressed in addition to added transgenes (51–53). Moreover, in

a previous, similar application, different strong promoters were tested by insertion

into the exon of an active BAC gene (53). Here we compared BAC scaffolds

containing expressed genes with BAC scaffolds from gene deserts or regions

containing silenced genes. We assayed the level, stability, and reproducibility of

the embedded reporter gene expression when inserted into different BAC

scaffolds to identify optimal BAC scaffolds for the BAC TG-EMBED system.

A toolset of 7 endogenous promoters for tuning relative transgene

expression levels

We selected 7 endogenous promoters to test, either because of their

known ability and use to drive transgene expression in a range of cell types

(EEF1α, UBC) (60, 84–86), or because these promoters were from

housekeeping genes (RPL32, PPIA, B2M, RPS3A, GUSB) known to be

expressed uniformly across a wide range of tissue types (87–90). We amplified

1-3 kb of regulatory regions upstream of the transcription start sites of these

genes using either human genomic DNA as a template or, for the UBC promoter,

using the pUGG plasmid (54).

To assay relative promoter strength, we used the two-minigene reporter

system developed in our previous study in which we compared expression of

CMV-driven EGFP and mRFP minigenes inserted in the same mouse DHFR

BAC scaffold (51). We previously showed that the mRFP minigene reporter

expression varied less than or equal to 2.4-fold when the mRFP reporter was

inserted at 6 different positions ranging 3-80 kb away from the EGFP reporter

gene location on the same BAC (51). To compare relative promoter strengths,

we fixed the insertion positions of mRFP and EGFP, and measured the relative

fluorescence levels of mRFP and EGFP when they were both driven by the CMV

promoter versus when the mRFP reporter was driven by an endogenous

promoter (Figure 1). Thus our assay measured the strength of different

endogenous promoters relative to the viral CMV promoter, while also measuring

the variation in this relative strength in different cells of a mixed clonal population.

For this assay, the EGFP reporter minigene was inserted 26kb

downstream of the Msh3 transcription start site (51) (Figure 2a). PCR-amplified

promoters from 7 different housekeeping genes were cloned upstream of the

mRFP expression cassette (Figure 2b), and then this mRFP expression cassette

was introduced 121 kb downstream of the Msh3 transcription start site by BAC

recombineering (Figure 2a), generating the dual reporter DHFR BAC. As a

control, we used the dual reporter BAC previously constructed (51) in which the

same mRFP cassette driven by the CMV promoter was inserted at this same

location 121 kb downstream of the Msh3 start site.

Mouse NIH 3T3 fibroblasts were then stably transfected with these

modified BAC constructs. After dual selection with G418 and Zeocin for two

weeks, mixed populations of stable clones carrying the BAC transgenes were

analyzed by flow cytometry to measure the relative expression ratio of mRFP and

EGFP (Figure 2c). Fluorescent beads were used as an invariant fluorescence

standard to calibrate the flow cytometer intensity outputs. The ratio of mRFP to

EGFP expression was then normalized by the ratio observed with the original

dual-reporter BAC construct in which both reporters were driven by CMV

promoter, providing the endogenous promoter strength relative to the CMV

promoter.

We observed an overall variation in promoter strength of over 500-fold,

ranging from the 4-5 fold relative promoter strength of the RPL32 and EEF1α

promoters to the 0.01-fold relative promoter strength for the GUSB promoter as

compared to the CMV promoter (Figure 2d). This expression ratio appeared to be

similar across the cell population.

Reporter gene expression as a function of transcriptionally active and

inactive BAC scaffolds

To find the best BAC scaffold for the BAC TG-EMBED system, we tested

BAC scaffolds from both actively transcribed regions and regions containing

silenced genes or no genes. Specifically, we measured the expression as a

function of copy number of one specific reporter gene construct inserted into

these BAC scaffolds. Previous applications of BAC TG-EMBED showed a linear

relationship between copy number and expression level, largely independent of

the chromosome integration site, demonstrating copy-number dependent,

position independent transgene expression (51, 54). For active chromosomal

regions, we chose the RP11-138I1 BAC containing the human ubiquitin B gene

locus (UBB BAC), the RP23-401D9 BAC containing the "safe-haven" mouse

Rosa26 genetrap locus (ROSA BAC) (91), and the CITB-057L22 BAC carrying

the mouse Dhfr gene locus (DHFR BAC). For inactive chromosomal regions, we

chose the CTD-2207K13 BAC (2207K13 BAC) that contains no known gene or

regulatory element from a gene-desert region from the human genome, and the

CTD-2643I7 (HBB BAC) containing the human HBB gene locus and multiple

olfactory genes, all of which are transcriptionally silenced in fibroblasts (92).

We selected the UBC promoter for this reporter gene cassette as this

promoter had previously been shown to drive high expression across multiple cell

types (86); in our dual reporter system the UBC promoter was 2.6-fold stronger

than the CMV promoter (Figure 2d). Moreover, to eliminate any possible

transcriptional interference from closely spaced reporter and selectable marker

minigenes and to minimize any epigenetic silencing arising from DNA

methylation of this reporter gene-selectable marker construct, we used a

commercially available GFP-ZeoR fusion protein gene construct in which all CpG

dinucleotides had been removed and replaced by synonymous codons (Figure

3a).

We inserted this UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene construct into different

BAC scaffolds by BAC recombineering, using *galK* for positive/negative selection

(63, 64). To eliminate potential artifacts caused by proximity to active promoters,

transcriptional start sites (TSS), or miRNA sequences, we chose insertion sites

flanked on both sides by at least 5 kb free of such sequence elements (Figure

3b). The UBB, HBB, 2207K13, ROSA, DHFR BACs with the UBC-GFP-ZeoR

reporter gene insertion were named as UBB-UG, HBB-UG, 2207K13-UG, ROSA-

UG and DHFR-UG.

After transfection, multiple cell clones (n=20-40) carrying stably integrated

BAC arrays were selected for Zeocin resistance and analyzed for reporter gene

expression by flow cytometry, using untransfected NIH 3T3 cells to determine

background, autofluorescence levels. For each cell clone, we used flow

cytometry to measure the mean GFP reporter expression and qPCR to measure

reporter gene copy number. These cell clones showed GFP fluorescence mean

levels ranging from 10-1000 fold higher than the background autofluorescence.

Our original working hypothesis predicted that the BAC TG-EMBED

reporter expression should be uniform in all cells of the same clone. Also, we

expected to see a linear relationship between mean reporter gene fluorescence

and number of BAC copies, signifying a copy-number-dependent, position

independent expression. Furthermore, we expected that the slope of this linear

relationship would be higher for BAC scaffolds expected to reconstitute an active

chromatin environment permissive for transgene expression as compared to

BAC scaffolds expected to reconstitute a more condensed, inactive chromatin

environment (Figure 1). In contrast, we expected that the reporter gene cassette

transfected without any BAC scaffold would show clonal expression levels that

poorly correlated with reporter gene copy number (copy-number-independent

expression).

Unexpectedly, the stable cell clones we isolated showed two distinct types

of population expression profiles- uniform versus heterogeneous. Uniform clones

showed single, relatively narrow expression peaks in the flow cytometry

histograms, with more than 90% of the cells showing GFP fluorescence varying

only over a 10-fold intensity range (Figure 3c, left). Heterogeneous clones

instead showed two peaks with a range of GFP expression varying ~1000-fold,

with the lower GFP intensity peak overlapping with the autofluorescence

distribution of control cells (Figure 3c, right). We had not previously observed

such heterogeneous expression profile using our original DHFR BAC containing

the CMV-driven mRFP alone or both the CMV-driven EGFP and CMV-driven

mRFP reporter genes (51). However, we had observed ~80% uniform clones for

a GAPDH BAC scaffold with the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene inserted (54).

The percentage of clones showing such heterogeneous expression varied from

58% to 83% for the 5 BAC scaffolds surveyed here (Table 1). No similar

heterogeneous expression profile was observed when the reporter gene

construct was transfected by itself (Table 1).

As expected, the control transfection of the reporter gene cassette by itself

resulted in copy-number-independent expression of the reporter gene (Figure 3d,

R^2=0.09), while the reporter gene embedded within the BACs yielded a linear

relationship between reporter gene fluorescence for both uniform (black) and

heterogeneous (red) BAC transgene clones (Figure 3d, R^2=0.561 to 0.914).

Surprisingly, we observed no more than a 4-fold variation in expression

per copy number among the 5 different BAC scaffolds tested, with no obvious

relationship between the observed slope and the type of BAC scaffold (Figure

3d). Although the transcriptionally active DHFR BAC produced the highest slope,

the transcriptionally inactive HBB BAC and the 2207K13 BAC containing DNA

from a gene desert produced the second and third highest slopes, while the BAC

containing DNA from the "safe haven" mouse *Rosa26* locus produced the lowest

slope.

Overall, these results show that for this UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene,

high-level, copy-number-dependent transgene expression using the BAC TG-

EMBED method does not require BACs containing active, housekeeping

genomic regions, but can also be obtained from a wide range of BAC genomic

DNA inserts, including gene-desert regions. This means BAC TG-EMBED can

be used to drive expression of only the transgenes added to the BAC scaffold,

without overexpression of the genes contained within the BAC scaffold.

1006

Temporal stability of BAC-embedded reporter gene expression in uniform

cell clones

We previously showed that the BAC TG-EMBED method provided long-

term stability of transgene expression in the presence of continued drug selection

(51). However, in the absence of drug selection we observed a 30-80% drop in

expression over several months of cell passaging without any apparent drop in

the integrated BAC copy number (51).

Here we determined the long-term stability of the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter

gene expression for both uniform and heterogeneous clones for four different

BAC scaffolds. Individual clones for each BAC scaffold (3 uniform and 2

heterogeneous for ROSA-UG BAC, 7 uniform and 4 heterogeneous for 2207K13-

UG BAC, 8 uniform and 3 heterogeneous for UBB-UG BAC, and 3 uniform and 3

heterogeneous for DHFR-UG BAC) were passaged up to three months in the

absence or presence of drug selection and analyzed for reporter gene

fluorescence at regular intervals after removal of drug selection.

With the exception of a small number of apparent fluctuations possibly

related to transient changes in culture conditions, clones with uniform reporter

gene expression showed no significant change either in the mean fluorescence

values (Figure 4a) or in the distribution of fluorescence among the same clones

(Figure 4b and Supplementary Figures S1) over time in the absence of selection

for all four BAC scaffolds tested. In the presence of continued selection, uniform

clones containing DHFR-UG or ROSA-UG BACs showed no significant reporter

gene expression change, while an ~50% or 100% increase was observed for the

UBB-UG or 2207K13-UG BAC clones, respectively (Figure 4a). No changes in

estimated BAC copy number based on qPCR measurement were observed for

any of these clones during this time series. This suggests that epigenetic

changes driven by selection pressure may be responsible for these small

increases in reporter gene expression.

Notably, in the absence of selection, heterogeneous clones for all tested

BAC scaffolds showed a significant and progressive loss of reporter gene

expression over time. This led to a significant fraction of cells showing

autofluorescence levels of fluorescence by the end of the experiment (Figure 4a).

Reporter gene expression-level became progressively more homogenous, but at

lower fluorescence levels (Figure 4b and Supplementary Figure S1). With

selection, UBB-UG and DHFR-UG BAC heterogeneous clones showed a 1.6 to

3-fold increase in reporter gene expression, respectively, while the other BAC

scaffold heterogeneous clones showed no significant changes (Figure 4a).

1044

BAC transgenes are maintained as episomes in heterogeneous clones

1045

In our previous work, all stable cell clones obtained after BAC transfection

and drug selection contained single BAC copies or multi-copy BAC arrays that

had integrated into endogenous chromosomes (51, 65, 93–95) consistent with

similar results from numerous laboratories. Thus, we initially assumed that the

broad distribution of reporter gene fluorescence observed in heterogeneous cell

clones was due to position effect variegation (PEV) of the BAC TG-EMBED

reporter genes. We hypothesized that integrations into some chromosome

integration sites led to uniformly-expressing clones, while integration into other

chromosome sites prone to PEV led to heterogeneous clones with variegated

transgene expression.

However, the observation of a progressive loss over time of reporter gene

expression for all heterogeneous clones led us to question the genome stability

of the BAC transgenes in these clones. To test the relationship between

changes in reporter gene expression and BAC copy number, we first sorted cells

from the heterogeneous DHFR-UG-s3 cell clone by fluorescence-activated cell

sorting (FACS), using a narrow sorting-window centered around the GFP peak

fluorescence level (Figure 5a). After cell-sorting, with drug selection the original

heterogeneous reporter gene expression distribution reestablished itself within

one week of culture (Figure 5b). We then resorted cells showing different levels

of GFP fluorescence using four narrow fluorescence windows P1, P2, P3, and P4

(Figure 5b), and then used qPCR to measure the BAC copy number in cells from

each of these sorting windows. Plotting mean cell fluorescence intensity levels

versus copy number for these clonal subpopulations yielded a strikingly linear

relationship (R^2=0.99) (Figure 5c). Thus, the variable reporter gene expression

level in this heterogeneous cell clone is the result of loss of BAC transgenes

rather than chromosome PEV.

To identify the source of this BAC copy-number instability, we next used

DNA FISH to visualize BAC transgenes within interphase nuclei and mitotic

chromosome spreads. We compared the distribution of BAC transgenes within

the heterogeneous clone, DHFR-UG-s3, versus a uniform clone, DHFR-UG-f3-

15.

DNA FISH suggested that whereas the uniform clone contained cells with

an integrated DHFR BAC array, the heterogeneous clone contained cells in

which the DHFR BAC was present as episomes. Specifically, interphase FISH

against the DHFR BAC in the heterogeneous clone revealed multiple,

noncontiguous, small spots distributed randomly throughout the nuclei (Figure

5d). The number of these spots was highly variable in different cell nuclei,

suggesting unequal segregation of BAC transgenes. In contrast, most cells from

the uniform clone showed just one large, fiber-like FISH spot per nucleus (Figure

5e). Moreover, FISH spots in mitotic spreads from the heterogeneous clone

were either touching or spatially separated from the chromosomes (Figure 5f),

whereas FISH spots in mitotic spreads from the uniform clone were always

located within the chromosome (Figure 5g). The number of FISH spots per

mitotic spread was highly variable in the heterogeneous clone, with each spot

much smaller than the single FISH spot visualized within the mitotic chromosome

from the uniform clone. Interestingly, the FISH spots in the heterogeneous clone

mitotic spreads had weak DAPI staining, varying from slightly elevated over

background to no difference from background (Figure 5h), suggesting these

structures are much smaller than previously described double minute

chromosomes (DMs) generated by gene amplification (96–98).

Using DNA FISH of both interphase nuclei and mitotic spreads, we

confirmed this finding of integrated BACs in all uniformly expressing clones

versus episomal BACs in all heterogeneously expressing clones in additional cell

clones carrying BAC transgenes based on three different BAC scaffolds

(Supplementary Figure S2 and data not shown). Specifically, this includes 4

heterogeneous and 4 uniform DHFR-UG BAC clones, 3 heterogeneous and 6

uniform HBB-UG BAC clones, and one heterogenous and 2 uniform COL1A1-UG

BAC clones.

Unequal segregation of these BAC episomes during cell division would

explain the heterogeneity of BAC transgene copy number in the cell population of

heterogeneous clones, leading to variability of reporter gene expression. Indeed,

telophase cells from heterogeneous clones showed unequal numbers of FISH

spots in the two daughter nuclei (Figure 5i). In the absence of continued drug

selection, we would expect cells that have lost BAC transgenes will accumulate if

there is any selective growth advantage for cells with fewer BAC copies.

1111

BAC episomes are circular and ~1 Mb in size

We analyzed the average amount of DNA per BAC episome, using two

independent methods- light microscopy and pulsed-field gel electrophoresis

(PFGE). Both methods produced a similar estimate of ~800-1000 kb per BAC

episome.

Using light microscopy, we measured the average DHFR BAC episome

DAPI integrated staining intensity in mitotic spreads from cell clone DHFR-UG-s3

relative to the smallest mouse chromosome (chr19) with known DNA content of

61.4 Mbp (Figure 6a).   This comparison produced an estimated mean episome

size of 770 kb in this DHFR-UG-s3 clone.

Using PFGE, we observed that the BAC episomes were circular and

estimated the modal BAC episome size to be ~900 kb and 1 Mbp for DHFR-UG

and HBB-UG BAC episomes in cell clones DHFR-UG-s3 and HBB-UG-100d3,

respectively. Two different cell clones, DHFR-UG-f3-1 and HBB-UG-fD2, were

used as negative controls as they contained the same DHFR-UG or HBB-UG

BAC DNA as the cell clones with episomes but the BAC DNA was integrated

within endogenous mouse chromosomes. *E. coli* strains containing the DHFR or

HBB BACs were used as positive controls for detection of circular episomes.

Pulsed-field gels were analyzed by Southern blotting using pooled BAC

DNA PCR products as the hybridization probes. Linear but not circular DNAs

migrate in pulsed-field gels. Similar to the *E. coli* controls containing circular

BACs, the Southern blot signals for the BAC DNA from the two clones containing

episomes did not migrate out of the wells (Figure 6b and Supplementary Figure

S3a-b), consistent with circular rather than linear BAC episomes.

To validate that the BAC episomes are really circular, and to estimate their

size, the agarose-embedded DNA was digested using the ssDNA specific

Nuclease S1 prior to PFGE and Southern blot hybridization. After removal of

proteins, circular DNA episomes in both bacteria and mammalian cells are

typically negatively supercoiled. This supercoiling generates torsional stress

which is relieved by local formation of single-stranded regions. Thus, S1

nuclease has been used to cut these single-stranded regions and linearize

circular DNA episomes (99–101).   After S1 digestion, DNA from the cell clones

carrying BAC episomes now showed DNA smears with peak intensities of ~900

kb and 1 Mb for the DHFR-UG-s3 and HBB-UG-100d3 cell lines, respectively

(Figure 6b and Supplementary Figure S3a-b). In contrast, after S1 nuclease

digestion, DNA from the integrated BAC clones showed signals within the wells

and above 2 Mb, overlapping the smears of fragmented genomic DNA (Figure 6b

and Supplementary Figure S3a-b). DNA of *E. coli* containing DHFR BAC and

HBB BAC episomes produced bands at ~200-300 kb, in addition to signals in the

wells (Figure 6b and Supplementary Figure S3a-b) after S1 nuclease digestion.

These estimated BAC sizes measured slightly larger than the actual BAC sizes

(~200 kb), indicating there might be a slight overestimation of episome sizes

using our PFGE running conditions.

1155

BAC episomes contain no detectable host DNA as revealed by CNV analysis

The propagation of BAC transgenes as episomes was unexpected. A

major question is whether these episomes consist solely of BAC DNA, or

whether host DNA is also included and possibly required for episome

propagation.

We first compared the estimated episome DNA content size with

estimates of BAC copies per episome. BAC episome sizes estimated by either

light microscopy or PFGE were approximately twice as large as predicted from

qPCR BAC copy number estimates (Table 2). The estimated average BAC

content per episome was 445 kb in DHFR-UG-s3 and 716 kb in HBB-UG-100d3.

The difference in the estimated BAC DNA content per episome and the

average episome size is at most a few hundred kb, and may be accounted for by

inaccuracies of the qPCR copy number, PFGE size estimation, and possible

variation in sequence representation within the BAC episomes due to shearing of

DNA and/or recombination during the transfection and creation of the BAC

episomes.

Alternatively, this difference in episome size versus qPCR estimation of

BAC copies per episome could also be caused by presence of host cell genomic

DNA on the episomes. To search with higher sensitivity for the possible presence

of host DNA within the episome, we performed Whole Genome Sequencing

(WGS) based copy number variation (CNV) analysis of the two clones, DHFR-

UG-s3 and HBB-UG-100d3. Genomic regions present on the episomes would

appear amplified in cells containing episomes (test sample), comparing to cells

with no episomes (reference sample). Thus the ratio in the number of reads for a

given bin between the test sample and the reference sample was calculated. To

reduce noise, bins were merged into segments based on the $\log_2$(ratio), using a

circular binary segmentation (CBS) algorithm (78, 79). The mean $\log_2$(ratio) of

each segment was used to estimate the CNV of this segment in the test sample

relative to the reference sample.

Mouse 3T3 cells show genomic instability; therefore we anticipated CNV

between the parental cell line and individual clones. To reduce false-positives

derived from CNV between different 3T3 clones, independent of episome

content, we used cells with low reporter gene fluorescence sorted from the cell

clone containing the episomal BAC transgenes (region L, Figure 6c-d, and

Supplementary Figure S4a) as the reference sample. To further reduce false

positives, we also imposed constraints that copy number increase for true

positive regions should be reproducible between experimental replicates and

correlate with episomal copy number. We calculated the estimated CNV in cells

sorted with high (H2) reporter gene expression, using sorted cells with low (L)

expression as the reference sample (H2, L, Figure 6c-d, and Supplementary

Figure S4a). We also compared the estimated CNV in cells sorted with high

reporter gene expression in an independent experiment (H1, Figure 6c-d, and

Supplementary Figure S4a) with the estimated CNV from the first experiment. All

samples were sequenced to ~2x coverage.

We used 3 and 30 kb bin sizes for analysis. To reduce noise, we excluded

all bins in the test sample with zero reads (5.5% of total bins for 3 kb bin analysis

and 3.5% for 30 kb bin analysis) plus extreme outlier bins, defined by the lower

quantile minus 4 times the interquantile distance, with unusually low read count

(~0.5% of total bins for 3 kb bin analysis and 2.5% for 30 kb bin analysis) in the

test sample before calculating ratios.

As a test of our analysis method, we compared the mean segment

$\log_2$(ratio) of the BAC regions in H1 and H2, generated by the above analysis

method, to the fold increase of BAC regions in H1 and H2 relative to L measured

by qPCR. As expected, the results from the CNV and qPCR analysis were very

similar (Supplementary Figure S5).

We were interested in asking whether a specific host DNA element was

present on each episome copy present within a cell clone. We estimated that on

average the sorted cells with high reporter gene expression had 15-20 episome

copies per cell, depending on the cell clone, based on qPCR of BAC DNA

sequences and the estimated number of BACs per episome (Table 3).

We estimated theoretical minimum copy number increase for episome-

localizing host DNA (minimum increase) in the H1 and H2, based on BAC copy

number measured by qPCR, and assuming the NIH 3T3 to be tetraploid and

each episome to have the same host cell genomic DNA (Table 3). Segments

with mean $\log_2$(ratio) equal to or greater than $\log_2$(minimum increase) in both H1

and H2 samples were selected as candidates for being on the episomes (Figure

6e).

Interestingly, all candidate segments identified belonged to the BAC

regions, including the UBC-GFP-ZeoR and the BAC vector (Figure 6f-g,

Supplementary Figure S4b-c and Supplementary Figure S6), and no other

mouse genomic sequence satisfied all of the above conditions.

In conclusion, we could not detect host cell DNA reproducibly present on

all episomal copies using bin sizes of either 3 or 30 kb. We therefore conclude

BAC DNA itself is sufficient for the creation and propagation of these BAC

episomes. We cannot exclude the possibilities, however, that an unmappable,

repetitive host DNA sequence is present on the episomes and confers their

ability to propagate or that different host DNA sequences are present on each

episome present within a single cell clone.

1234

Multiple promoters added to BACs support formation of episomal BAC

transgenes but only in certain cell lines

Because we did not observe episomal BAC transgenes in our original

BAC-TG EMBED work using the CMV-mRFP-SV40-ZeoR reporter gene (51), we

hypothesized that addition of the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene might be

responsible for BAC episome formation. Our dual-reporter assay showed that

the UBC promoter was much stronger than the CMV promoter; therefore, we

further hypothesized that promoter strength might correlate with the frequency of

BAC episome formation.

To test this hypothesis, we isolated clones stably transfected with the

dual-reporter DHFR BAC transgenes and examined reporter gene expression

patterns in these clones by flow cytometry (Supplementary Figure S7a). As

expected, no heterogeneously GFP/RFP expressing clones where observed

when the mRFP reporter gene was driven by CMV promoter (n=13) or B2M

promoter (n=6). In contrast, we observed ~70% or ~30% heterogeneously

GFP/RFP expressing clones when the mRFP was driven by the EEF1a promoter

(12/18) or the RPL32 promoter (10/29), respectively (Supplementary Figure S7a-

b). We confirmed that BAC transgenes in these heterogeneously expressing

clones were episomal using DNA FISH (Supplementary Figure S7c).

These results using human promoter sequences added to the BACs, did

show a rough correlation of promoter strength with the frequency of clones

containing episomes. However, when we examined a series of DHFR BAC

constructs, we instead observed clones with episomes using BAC transgenes

containing the dual reporter, selectable marker CMV-mRFP-SV40-ZeoR reporter

cassette. This included the identical DHFR BAC construct used in our previous

BAC-TG EMBED work (51), as well as various DHFR BAC deletions

(Supplementary Figure S8a). All the DHFR BAC constructs contain LacO

repeats, and a NIH 3T3 derived clone expressing EGFP-LacI was used for

transfection, so that BAC transgenes could be observed directly in fixed cells.

Although all clones showed a unimodal flow cytometry expression pattern,

explaining why we did not observe this phenomenon previously, a large fraction

(DHFR-c27: 1/2, DHFR-c27d2: 2/10, DHFR-c27d3crz: 2/16, DHFR-c27d4: 7/10)

of clones showed episomal BAC transgenes (Supplementary Figure S8b-c).

Thus, the promoter used to drive reporter and/or selectable markers

appears to determine not whether episomal BAC transgenes are established but

rather whether a unimodal versus bimodal distribution is observed in cells

containing these episomal BAC transgenes. The presence of strong promoters

(UBC, EEF1a and RPL32) appears to allow the formation of bimodal distributions

of reporter gene expression, possibly related to the balance between the

degradation rate of the initially high levels of selectable marker versus the rate of

loss of BAC transgene episomes during cell division.

Next, we tested whether BACs can form episomes in a different cell line

other than mouse NIH 3T3 fibroblasts. Previously, we observed cell clones

containing only integrated BAC transgenes in CHO (93, 95) and mouse ES cells

(54, 94). Reasoning that cancer cells with some level of genomic instability might

be more prone to formation of BAC episomes, we tested the human colorectal

carcinoma epithelial cell line, HCT116, using the 2207K13-UG BAC which

produced 79% episome clones in NIH 3T3 cells.

Four out of 32 stable clones showed a heterogeneous GFP distribution

similar to that observed in NIH 3T3 episome clones, with a broad high fluorescent

peak and a tail/secondary peak near the auto-fluorescence level (Supplementary

Figure S9). However, none of these four clones showed episomal BAC

transgenes by DNA FISH (Supplementary Figure S10a). Instead, most cells in

each clone showed the same number (one or two) of spots, but these spots

varied in size from cell to cell. Therefore, it appears that the broad GFP peaks in

these four clones are due to some form of genomic instability leading to CNV of

integrated transgene arrays. Interestingly, one clone, HCT116-k13_06, out of the

32, which had a single GFP peak, showed a small fraction of cells of with

episomal BAC transgenes, in contrast to the vast majority of cells which

contained integrated BAC transgenes (Supplementary Figure S10b). One out of

24 subclones of this HCT116-k13_06 clone, HCT116-k13_06-10, showed a

similar mixed population with either integrated BACs or episomal BACs, similar to

the parent clone HCT116-k13_06 (Supplementary Figure S10c). The low

frequency of clones with episomal BACs, the variable size of the integrated BAC

transgene arrays, and the co-existence of integrated and episomal BAC

transgenes in the same cells and from the same clone suggests these episomes

might arise from the well-known phenomenon of gene amplification (96–98).

Similarly, a small percentage of clones carrying the GAPDH BAC in stable

mouse ES cell colonies showed broad GFP expression peaks by flow cytometry,

but FISH revealed this was due to variable size, integrated BAC transgene arrays

(Binhui Zhao, Ph.D thesis), due presumably to some type of CNV induced by

genomic instability of these transgene arrays.

In conclusion, the high frequency establishment of BAC transgene

episomes seen in mouse 3T3 cells does not appear to occur in either HCT116 or

mouse ES cells, or at detectable frequency in CHO cells (54, 93–95).

1310

Expression of multiple-reporters by BAC-MAGIC

As a proof-of-principle application of our improved toolkit for BAC TG-

EMBED, we created a multi-transgene BAC to label simultaneously the nuclear

lamina, nucleoli, and nuclear speckles with a single stable transfection. The

original DHFR BAC was used for this multi-transgene expression. A SNAP-

tagged Lamin B1 reporter mini-gene was used to label the nuclear lamina, a

SNAP-tagged Fibrillarin the nucleoli, and an mCherry-Magoh the nuclear

speckles. We used the RPL32 promoter to drive the expression of the SNAP-

tagged Lamin B1, and a promoter of intermediate strength, PPIA, for the SNAP-

tagged Fibrillarin and the mCherry-tagged Magoh, which are both abundant

proteins.

Previously, we used random Tn5 transposition to introduce expression

cassettes into BAC scaffolds (50), but this approach is limited in the number of

serial insertions that can be made due to the remobilization of existing

transposons, its requirement for multiple selectable markers, and the

randomness of the insertion sites. Alternatively, BAC recombineering using

antibiotic resistance genes as positive selectable markers have been used to

insert expression cassettes into precise locations on the BACs. However, like

transposition, this method relies on the availability of multiple selectable markers

and introduces unwanted selectable markers into the BACs. An alternative BAC

recombineering scheme using cycles of *galK*-based positive selection to insert

sequences followed by negative selection to remove *galK* have been used to

make multiple BAC modifications without addition of unwanted selectable

markers. However, the low efficiency of negative selection, due to a high

background of competing, spontaneous deletions of mammalian DNA with its

high repetitive DNA content, makes this approach quite time and labor intensive.

Typically, one month is required for each cycle of insertion of DNA by positive

selection, removal of the selectable marker by negative selection, and

subsequent screening and testing of DNA from colonies that survive the negative

selection to identify the small fraction of colonies containing the desired

homology-driven, specific deletion of just the selectable marker.

To accelerate creation of BACs containing multiple transgene, we created

a new BAC assembly approach, BAC MAGIC (**BAC**-**M**odular **A**ssembly of

Genomic loci **I**nterspersed **C**assettes). BAC MAGIC combines the DNA

assembler method in yeast (81, 82) and/or Gibson assembly (80) with traditional

cloning methods to create a number of BAC recombination modules followed by

sequential rounds of BAC recombineering in which one fragment is inserted

using one selectable marker followed by addition of a new fragment overlapping

the previous fragment using a second positive selectable marker which replaces

the first (102). Each round of fragment insertion only requires ~ 1 week for

transformation and screening of clones. In this way, 45 kb of the DHFR BAC

was effectively reconstructed such that DHFR sequences remained but 3

fluorescent mini-gene expression cassettes were added, each spaced by ~10 kb

of DHFR sequence (Figure 7a-b, Supplementary Figure S11). The large

homologous sequences flanking each expression cassette reduces

recombination between similar sequences in other expression cassettes already

inserted into the BAC, increasing the efficiency of this overall approach.

We began the process using a DHFR BAC. After six rounds of BAC

recombineering, we had created a BAC with four expression cassettes (Figure

7b): a SNAP-tagged Lamin B1 minigene, a SNAP-tagged Fibrillarin minigene, a

mCherry-Magoh minigene, and a ZeoR selectable marker.

We tested simultaneous expression of the three reporters in 17

independent NIH 3T3 cell clones transfected with the multi-reporter BAC by

examining fluorescence in fixed cells under a microscope (SNAP-tagged proteins

1365 were labeled with a Fluorescein conjugated SNAP tag substrate before fixation).

1366 We observed uniform expression of all the three reporters in 16/17 clones. The

1367 loss of SNAP-Lamin B1 expression in one of the clone (Cl#16) may be due to

1368 random breakage of the BAC during transfection, as PCR revealed the absence

1369 of this minigene from the cell clone. Similarly, 12/14 U2OS human osteosarcoma

1370 cell clones showed both SNAP-Lamin B1 and SNAP-Fibrillarin expression after

1371 transfection of a BAC containing only these two expression cassettes (data not

1372 shown).

1373   Within individual cells, a linear correlation was observed between the

1374 integrated fluorescence intensity per cell of SNAP-tagged proteins Lamin B1 and

1375 Fibrillarin versus mCherry-Magoh in 4/4 representative NIH 3T3 clones (04, 08,

1376 13 and 14, Figure 7c). Moreover, these fluorescently tagged proteins showed

1377 uniform rather than variegating expression in different cell nuclei of the same

1378 clone observed under the microscope (Figure 7d).

1379

DISCUSSION

1380

We previously demonstrated the utility of the BAC TG-EMBED method to

achieve position-independent, copy-number-dependent, one-step transgene

expression in mammalian cells (51, 54). Here, we have extended the BAC TG-

EMBED methodology through four new advances and provided a proof-of-

principle demonstration of this new methodology by efficiently creating cell lines

stably expressing uniform levels of three different fluorescently tagged proteins-

Lamin B1, Fibrillarin, and Magoh in a single stable transfection.

First, we describe a toolkit of endogenous promoters providing an ~500-

fold range in promoter strength varying from ~5 fold higher to ~100-fold weaker

than the commonly used viral CMV promoter. As these promoters are from

human genes shown to be expressed in a wide range of cell lines and tissues

(60, 84–90), we expect them to support transgene expression in most cell types

and independent of cell proliferation or differentiation state. While most of the

previous studies on transgene promoters focused on conventional, strong

promoters (53, 57–60), including a similar approach that expressed mini-genes

within BAC scaffold (53), we included moderate-strength and weak promoters in

our survey. The weak promoters we identified, such as GUSB and RPS3A,

could possibly replace the commonly used minimal promoters or inducible

promoters where a sustained low-level of transgene expression is needed.

Moreover, this wide range of promoter strengths allows reproducible expression

of multiple transgenes over a wide range of relative expression levels from a

single BAC scaffold, lending itself to such purposes, for example, as the design

of synthetic gene circuits, which typically requires expression of different

components at reproducible relative expression levels (25).

Second, we show that with the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene, our BAC-

TG EMBED system achieved stable reporter gene expression of integrated BAC

transgenes for several months in the absence of drug selection. This is an

improvement over the 30-80% drop in expression observed originally with the

CMV-mRFP-SV40-ZeoR reporter gene (51). Both the UBC promoter and the

CpG free GFP-ZeoR gene body could be contributing to this improvement.

Third, we show that at least with the UBC-GFP-ZeoR expression cassette,

our BAC TG-EMBED system is not dependent on BAC scaffolds containing

active DNA genomic regions but also works with BAC scaffolds containing

silenced DNA genomic regions as well as gene deserts. UBC may represent a

member of a class of active, house-keeping gene promoters that is relatively

insensitive to chromosome position effects. This allows choice of a BAC scaffold

for the BAC TG-EMBED method that will not co-express any genes other than

the introduced transgene cassettes. In contrast, both our previous BAC TG-

EMBED studies (51, 54) and similar work from other laboratories (52, 53), used

only BACs containing highly-transcribed house-keeping genes, due to the

assumption that either an active chromatin region or active 5' *cis*-regulatory

regions would be required for creating a transcriptionally permissive environment

for transgene expression. Integration of the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene into

the BAC was required for position-independent, copy-number dependent

expression, as its expression was copy-number independent when the same

UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene was stably transfected by itself into cells. The

expression levels of this UBC-GFP-ZeoR were similar, per copy number, in cell

clones with episomal BAC transgenes to levels in clones with integrated BACs.

Fourth, we describe an episome version of our BAC-TG EMBED system.

In a single experiment, clones containing either stably integrated or

extrachromosomally maintained BAC transgenes can be isolated. Most of the

widely used episomal vectors are either based on viral sequences or derived

from the non-viral pEPI plasmid (38–41). A notable feature of the episomes

generated by our BAC TG-EMBED system is that they are lost rapidly in the

absence of drug selection, whereas both of the other two systems show

selection-independent mechanisms for stable episome maintenance (43–47,

103). While episome stability is valuable for certain applications, in other cases

one would like to be able to easily eliminate the episomes as needed. Moreover,

in contrast to the low copy number of episomes per cell produced using the other

two methods, the BAC TG-EMBED method yields tens of BAC copies per cell

allowing for much higher transgene expression levels. Additionally, the sizes of

the episomes generated by the BAC TG-EMBED method are much larger than

those generated by the other two methods. In the two clones we examined, the

episomes were ~1 Mb and containing several copies of the BACs per episome

and no detectable host DNA.

The high frequency creation and simple composition of these BAC

episomes contrasts with human artificial chromosomes (HACs), which are

special episomes, usually 1-10 Mb in size containing centromeric repeat

sequences, mitotically stable, and maintained at low copy number (104–107).

Capable of introducing large DNA sequences into recipient cells, HACs have

shown great potential in a wide range of applications, such as recombinant

protein production, drug selection and gene therapy (108–111). However, the

construction of HACs remains non-trivial: it requires cloning of either telomere

sequences and/or alphoid DNA, the formation of HACs occurs at very low

frequency and only in certain cell lines (112), and the transfer of HACs from

donor cells into recipient cells is difficult (113, 114). Moreover, the presence of

large telomere sequences and/or alphoid DNA on the HACs, and the

heterchromatic state associated with these repeats, increases the likelihood of

transgene silencing.

In contrast, with our BAC-TG EMBED system, 10s-100s of stable cell

clones containing multiple copies of ~Mb-size episomes, likely containing only

BAC DNA, can be obtained from a single transfection. Cells containing high

copy numbers of these BAC episomes can be enriched by flow sorting, while

cells from these clones containing no BAC episomes can be recovered after

removal of drug selection and/or flow sorting. We anticipate that with additional

engineering, these BAC episomes might possibly become a high-capacity

episome system complementary to HACs, assuming they can be isolated from

one cell line and then introduced and propagated in other cell lines.

It remains unclear how these BAC episomes form in NIH 3T3 cells and

why they do not do so in other cell lines. In the two clones we studied, the

episomes were circular DNA and composed of several BAC copies.

Interestingly, previous studies have shown that plasmids containing a MAR that

is also a replication initiation region (IR) could initiate gene amplification in certain

primary cancer cells, forming homogenously staining regions (HSRs), integrating

into existing double minutes (DMs) or forming DMs *de novo* in cells without DMs

(115, 116). It is believed that the IR/MAR plasmids are initially replicated as

extrachromosomal circles, and then they multimerize into larger circular

molecules. These amplified circles further multimerize to form DMs, recombine

with pre-existing DMs or integrate into chromosomes and initiate HSR formation

(117, 118). This model is very similar to the episome model of gene

amplification, where instead of the IR/MAR plasmids, small extrachromosomal

circular DNAs, which are several hundred kb in size and are possibly produced

by small chromosome deletions, initiates DM and HSR formation (97, 98, 119).

Given that both the MAR and IR sequences are ubiquitous in the

mammalian genome, it is likely that the BACs used in this study also contain

MAR and/or IR sequences. However, unlike the MAR/IR plasmids, these BACs

did not generate typical HSRs when integrated into the chromosomes, and the

episomes were much smaller than DMs in NIH 3T3 cells. One possible

explanation is that the BACs undergo initial steps of gene amplification to form

the episomes in NIH 3T3 cells, but the cells have mechanisms to stop the

episomes from further multimerization or amplification. As gene amplification

happens only in cancer cells, perhaps BACs can only form episomes in certain

cell lines. As shown here, BAC transgene formed episomes in a small fraction of

HCT116 cells, which could not be stably maintained even with drug selection.

Further study of this BAC episome phenomenon may provide new insights into

the process of gene amplification.

Alternatively, the formation of BAC transgene episomes in NIH 3T3 cells

might occur through a process completely unrelated to gene amplification.

Future work will be needed to determine the actual mechanism of this BAC

episomal formation in mouse 3T3 cells.

To facilitate the assembly of BACs expressing multiple mini-genes, we

developed BAC-MAGIC, allowing creation of a multi-transgene expressing BAC

in several weeks, rather than the 4-5 months which would have been required by

multiple rounds of DNA insertion using conventional BAC recombineering. Initial

attempts to reassemble large, ~50kb regions of DHFR using yeast DNA

assembly failed, apparently due to recombination between repetitive elements

within the DHFR BAC sequence as well as the expression cassettes. In contrast,

assembly of 10-15 kb modules from several DNA fragments using yeast DNA

assembly worked with high efficiency. BAC-MAGIC exploits Gibson and yeast

DNA assembly to build smaller modules with efficient serial BAC recombineering

to reconstruct large BAC constructs containing multiple mini-gene expression

cassettes. More generally, BAC-MAGIC should provide a tool for reconstruction

of large eukaryotic DNA sequences containing high numbers of repetitive

elements.

Finally, as a demonstration of our new version of BAC TG-EMBED

system, we created cell lines expressing three different fluorescently tagged

proteins in a single stable transfection step requiring just several weeks to isolate

and expand cell clones. Most cell clones expressed all three tagged proteins at

uniform levels and at reproducible relative levels of expression. This contrasts

with the 6-12 months we have devoted in previous studies to create similar cell

lines expressing multiple tagged proteins (120) through a series of individual

transfections followed by extensive screening of colonies to identify the small

fraction expressing suitable levels of tagged proteins with minimal variegation

and/or progressive long-term transgene silencing over time.

We anticipate that our expanded BAC TG-EMBED toolkit similarly will

facilitate a wide range of applications requiring simultaneous expression of

multiple transgenes.

1528

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Two-prong experimental approach. Left: Identification of promoters

of different strengths- We measured relative promoter strengths by embedding

EGFP and mRFP reporter genes into the DHFR BAC, using the CMV promoter

to drive EGFP expression and the test promoter to drive mRFP. The ratio of

mRFP and GFP expression, normalized by this same ratio for a CMV test

promoter, defines promoter strength relative to CMV. Right: Surveying reporter

gene expression in different BAC scaffolds- (Top) The UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter

gene was inserted into BACs carrying DNA from mouse or human genomic

regions corresponding to either transcriptionally active or inactive genomic

regions. (Bottom) Plotting reporter gene expression (y-axis) versus reporter gene

copy number (x-axis) for multiple cell clones stably expressing BAC transgenes:

a linear correlation would indicate copy-number dependent, position independent

expression, while the slope of this linear correlation would measure reporter gene

expression per copy number.

1544

Figure 2. Dual-reporter assay for promoter strength estimation. (a) Dual

reporter DHFR BAC showing the two genes on the BAC, *Dhfr* and *Msh3*, and the

insertion sites of the two reporter expression cassettes. Longer vertical bars-

exons; shorter vertical bars- UTRs; arrows- direction of transcription; green

arrowhead- EGFP expression cassette insertion site; red arrowhead- mRFP

expression cassette insertion site. (b) The two reporter gene/selectable marker

cassettes used in the assay. The EGFP cassette (top) contains an EGFP

minigene, driven by a CMV promoter, and a Kanamycin/Neomycin resistance

gene (Kan/NeoR), driven by a SV40 promoter for expression in mammalian cells,

or by a AmpR promoter for expression in bacteria. The mRFP cassette (bottom)

contains a mRFP minigene and a Zeocin resistance gene (ZeoR). Different

endogenous promoters were inserted immediately upstream of mRFP. ZeoR is

driven by a SV40 promoter for expression in mammalian cells, or by a AmpR

promoter for expression in bacteria. pA- poly(A) signal. (c) Scatter plots showing

mRFP fluorescence (y-axis) vs EGFP fluorescence (x-axis) of cells from the

mixed clonal populations stably transfected with dual reporter DHFR BACs.

Promoters driving the mRFP and the ratio of mRFP/EGFP (promoter strength)

are labeled in each plot. (d) Promoter strengths relative to CMV.

1563

Figure 3. Expression of reporter gene embedded in different BAC

scaffolds. (a) UBC-GFP-ZeoR-FRT-GalK-FRT cassette showing the GFP-ZeoR

minigene driven by the UBC promoter and the *galK* positive/negative selection

marker flanked by 34 bp flippase recognition target (FRT) sites (arrowheads). (b)

Maps of the BACs used in the study. Longer vertical bars- exons; shorter vertical

bars- UTRs; black arrows or arrowheads- direction of transcription; green arrow

heads- UBC-GFP-ZeoR insertion site. (c) GFP fluorescence histograms obtained

by flow-cytometry for "uniform" (left, green, clone DHFR-UG-f3-15) versus

"heterogeneous" (right, green, clone DHFR-UG-f1-6) expressing NIH 3T3 clones

carrying the DHFR-UG BAC. x-axis- fluorescence value, y-axis- cell number;

gray- autofluorescence of untransfected cells. Fluorescence is measured in

arbitrary units. (d) Scatter plots of mean normalized cellular GFP fluorescence

(y-axis) vs reporter gene copy number (x-axis) for clonal populations transfected

with the UBC-GFP-ZeoR cassette alone or with different BAC scaffolds carrying

the UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene. Linear regression fits (black lines, y-

intercepts set to 0) are shown with corresponding R-squared values and

equations. Red circles- heterogeneous clones; Black circles- uniform clones;

Bottom right of plots: Number of clones analyzed.

1582

Figure 4. UBC-GFP-ZeoR reporter gene expression over time. "Uniform"

clones show stable expression with or without expression, while "heterogenous"

clones show progressive loss of expression without selection. (a) Changes in

GFP fluorescence of uniform versus heterogeneous clones, averaged over

multiple clones (2-8), carrying indicated BAC transgenes during 96 days of

continuous passaging with or without Zeocin selection. x-axis- number of days

since removal of Zeocin; y-axis- mean fluorescence values of multiple clones

divided by that at day zero; black- "uniform" expressing clones cultured with

Zeocin; blue- "uniform" expressing clones cultured without Zeocin; red-

"heterogeneous" expressing clones cultured with Zeocin; green-

"heterogeneous" expressing clones cultured without Zeocin; (b) GFP

fluorescence histogram of representative "uniform" and "heterogeneous"

expressing NIH 3T3 clones at day 0, 24, 60 and 96 without selection. Gray-

autofluorescence of untransfected cells; Green- GFP fluorescence of the

indicated clones. x-axis- fluorescence; y-axis- cell number.

1598

Figure 5. BAC transgenes exist as episomes in heterogeneously expressing clones. (a-c) BAC copy number analysis of sub-populations of a heterogeneous clone, DHFR-UG-s3, with different fluorescence levels. (a) GFP fluorescence histogram of DHFR-UG-s3 cells during first sorting (y-axis- cell number; x-axis- GFP fluorescence level). Cells within a narrow peak-window (dotted lines) were sorted by FACS. (b) GFP fluorescence histogram of sorted DHFR-UG-s3 cells after one week of cell growth. Cells within the four colored windows (P1-4) were sorted by FACS and used for BAC copy number estimation by qPCR. (c) Mean GFP fluorescence (y-axis) vs copy number (x-axis) of the four cell sub-populations and the original unsorted population shows linear correlation between fluorescence levels and copy number (R^2=0.99). (d-e) DNA FISH over interphase nuclei of the heterogeneous clone DHFR-UG-s3 (d) and a uniform clone DHFR-UG-f3-15 (e) to visualize the BAC transgenes. Maximum-intensity projections are shown. Gamma=0.5 was applied to FISH channel after projection to better display low intensity FISH spots. (f-g) DNA FISH over mitotic spreads of the heterogeneous clone DHFR-UG-s3 (f) and the uniform clone DHFR-UG-f3-15 (g). (h) DAPI intensity over an episome with strong FISH signal and one with weak FISH signal. Top: enlarged view of the white square area in (f); bottom: DAPI (red) and FISH signal (green) intensity profile along the white arrow in the top panel. (i) A pair of telophase nuclei of the heterogeneous clone, DHFR-UG-s3, showing unequal segregation of episomal BAC transgenes during mitosis. (d-i) Red- DNA DAPI stain; green- BAC FISH signal. Scale bars = 5 μm.

1621

Figure 6. BAC episome size estimation and CNV analysis. (a) Estimation of

average episome size in the DHFR-UG-s3 clone using mitotic FISH. Red- DNA

DAPI stain; Green- BAC FISH signal; Red circles: regions of interest (ROIs) of

FISH spots used for analysis; Yellow circles: ROI of the smallest chromosome in

the field. Scale bars = 5 μm. This panel reuses the image in Figure 5f for

analysis. (b) Southern hybridization using probes prepared from the DHFR BAC

of cellular DNA without enzyme digestion, or digested with increasing amount of

S1 Nuclease, separated by PFGE. Lane 1-4: uniform clone DHFR-UG-f3-1;

Lane 5-8: heterogeneous clone DHFR-UG-s3; Lane 9-12: *E. coli* carrying the

DHFR BAC. (c-g) CNV analysis of the DHFR-UG-s3 clone. (c) Flow chart of the

CNV analysis. (d) Two FACS experiments for collecting cells with high (H1 and

H2), and low (L) fluorescence subpopulation. x-axis- FITC channel intensity; y-

axis- forward scatter; H1, H2, and L- sorting windows. (e) Episome-localizing

genomic regions (pink highlighted regions) are expected to have mean $\log_2$(ratio)

(red line) equal to or greater than $\log_2$(estimated minimum copy number

increase) (blue dashed line). (f) $\log_2$(ratio) of individual bins (dark gray dots) and

the segment mean $\log_2$(ratio) (red lines) around the *Dhfr-Msh3* locus belonging to

the DHFR BAC (pink highlight) in the H1 and H2 subpopulations of the DHFR-

UG-s3 clone. (g) Scatter plot of segment mean $\log_2$(ratio) vs segment mean

$\log_2$(normalized reads) of all segments of the H1 and H2 subpopulations of the

DHFR-UG-s3 clone. Pink dots- segments belonging to the DHFR BAC, including

the *Dhfr-Msh3* locus, UBC-GFP-ZeoR and the BAC vector; Black dots- remaining

segments in the genome. (f-g) Blue dashed line: $\log_2$(estimated minimum copy

number increase).

1646

Figure 7. BAC-MAGIC and simultaneous multi-reporter expression. (a-b)

Construction of the multi-reporter DHFR BAC by BAC-MAGIC. (a) Modular

design of BAC-MAGIC. Reporter module 01, 02 and 03 contain reporter gene

expression cassettes (X), DHFR BAC homologous sequences (dark gray), and

Spectinomycin resistance markers (SpecR, yellow) near the 3' ends for bacterial

selection. Intervening DHFR module 02, 03 and 04 contain DHFR BAC

homologous sequences (dark gray), and antibiotic resistance markers near the 3'

ends (Kanamycin/Neomycin resistance marker (Kan/NeoR, blue) in module 02

and 03 for bacterial selection, and Zeocin resistance marker (ZeoR, dark green)

in module 04 for dual selection in bacterial or mammalian cells). The dotted lines

mark homologous regions between the reporter modules and the intervening

DHFR modules. (b) Six sequential steps of BAC recombineering introduce three

reporter expression cassettes, RPL32-driven SNAP-tagged Lamin B1 (RSLB1),

PPIA-driven SNAP-tagged Fibrillarin (PSF), and PPIA-driven mCherry-Magoh,

onto the DHFR BAC (light gray) with ~10 kb of intervening DHFR BAC

sequences (dark gray). Homologous regions are indicated by crossed lines. (c)

Relative expression of the SNAP-tagged Lamin B1 and Fibrillarin to the mCherry-

Magoh reporter in four representative NIH 3T3 cell clones (04, 08, 13 and 14)

containing the multi-reporter BAC. Integrated fluorescence intensities per cell of

SNAP--fluorescein (y-axis) and mCherry-Magoh (x-axis) are plotted. Linear

regression lines (y-intercepts set to 0) are shown with corresponding R-squared

values. Number of nuclei of each clone analyzed range from 18 to 27. Red-

Clone 04; Blue- Clone 08, Black- Clone 13; Green- Clone 14. (d) Representative

images (maximum intensity projections of 2-3 optical sections) from the four cell

clones (Clone 04, 08, 13 and 14) showing expression of the three reporter genes.

Nuclear lamina is labeled with SNAP-tagged Lamin B1 (green), nucleoli with

SNAP-tagged Fibrillarin (green), and speckles with mCherry-Magoh (red). One

magnified nucleus from each representative field (top panel) is shown in the

bottom panel. Scale bars = 5 µm.

1676

1677

1678

1679   **Table 1.** Percentage of heterogeneously expressing clones transfected with the

1680   UBC-GFP-ZeoR cassette alone or with different BAC scaffolds carrying the UBC-

1681   GFP-ZeoR reporter gene.

1682

1683   **Table 2.** BAC copy number, episome copy number, and BAC DNA content per

1684   episome in clone DHFR-UG-s3 and clone HBB-UG-100d3.

1685

1686   **Table 3.** BAC copy number, estimated episome copy number, and estimated

1687   minimum copy number increase of episome-localizing DNA in H1 and H2

1688   subpopulations relative to L subpopulation of clone DHFR-UG-s3 and clone HBB-

1689   UG-100d3.

1690

1691

FUNDING

This work was supported by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences

[GM098319 to A.S.B. and in part GM58460 to A.S.B]. The content is solely the

responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views

of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences or the National Institutes of

Health.

1698

1699

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Edith Heard (Curie Institute) for providing DHFR BAC (clone

057L22 from CITB mouse library), Veena K Parnaik (CSIR-CCMB, Hyderabad,

India) for GFP-Lamin B1 plasmid, Miroslav Dundr (Rosalind Franklin University of

Medicine and Science) for GFP-Fibrillarin plasmid, Huimin Zhao (University of

Illinois Urbana-Champaign) for pQCXIN-TetR-mCherry plasmid, Peter Adams

(Sanford Burnham Prebys Medical Discovery Institute) for BJ-hTERT cells, and

KV Prasanth (University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign) for mRFP-Magoh

plasmid. Use of the BD FACS AriaII was assisted by the flow cytometry facility

stuff at Roy J. Carver Biotechnology Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-

Champaign (UIUC).

1711

1712

REFERENCES

1. Walsh,G. (2018) Biopharmaceutical benchmarks 2018. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, **36**, 1136–1145.
2. Prelich,G. (2012) Gene overexpression: uses, mechanisms, and interpretation. *Genetics*, **190**, 841–54.
3. Glover,D.J., Lipps,H.J. and Jans,D.A. (2005) Towards safe, non-viral therapeutic gene expression in humans. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, **6**, 299–310.
4. Zhu,J. (2012) Mammalian cell protein expression for biopharmaceutical production. *Biotechnol. Adv.*, **30**, 1158–1170.
5. Wurm,F.M. (2004) Production of recombinant protein therapeutics in cultivated mammalian cells. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, **22**, 1393–8.
6. Rizzo,M.A., Davidson,M.W. and Piston,D.W. (2009) Fluorescent Protein Tracking and Detection: Applications Using Fluorescent Proteins in Living Cells. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, **2009**, pdb.top64-pdb.top64.
7. 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.
8. Machida,K., Masutani,M., Kobayashi,T., Mikami,S. and Nishino,Y. (2012) Reconstitution of the human chaperonin CCT by co-expression of the eight distinct subunits in mammalian cells. *PROTEIN Expr. Purif.*, **82**, 61–69.
9. Akhtar,W., de Jong,J., Pindyurin,A. V., Pagie,L., Meuleman,W., de Ridder,J., Berns,A., Wessels,L.F.A., van Lohuizen,M. and van Steensel,B. (2013) Chromatin position effects assayed by thousands of reporters integrated in parallel. *Cell*, **154**, 914–27.
10. Chen,M., Licon,K., Otsuka,R., Pillus,L. and Ideker,T. (2013) Decoupling Epigenetic and Genetic Effects through Systematic Analysis of Gene Position. *Cell Rep.*, **3**, 128–37.
11. Robertson,G., Garrick,D., Wu,W., Kearns,M., Martin,D. and Whitelaw,E. (1995) Position-dependent variegation of globin transgene expression in mice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **92**, 5371–5.
12. Girton,J.R. and Johansen,K.M. (2008) Chromatin structure and the regulation of gene expression: the lessons of PEV in Drosophila. *Adv. Genet.*, **61**, 1–43.
13. Ramunas,J., Montgomery,H.J., Kelly,L., Sukonnik,T., Ellis,J. and Jervis,E.J. (2007) Real-time fluorescence tracking of dynamic transgene variegation in stem cells. *Mol. Ther.*, **15**, 810–7.
14. Tchasovnikarova,I.A., Timms,R.T., Matheson,N.J., Wals,K., Antrobus,R., Gottgens,B., Dougan,G., Dawson,M.A. and Lehner,P.J. (2015) Epigenetic silencing by the HUSH complex mediates position-effect variegation in human cells. *Science (80-.).*, **348**, 1481–1485.
15. Karpen,G.H. (1994) Position-effect variegation and the new biology of heterochromatin. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.*, **4**, 281–91.
16. He,J., Yang,Q. and Chang,L.-J. (2005) Dynamic DNA Methylation and Histone Modifications Contribute to Lentiviral Transgene Silencing in Murine Embryonic Carcinoma Cells. *J. Virol.*, **79**, 13497–13508.
17. Suzuki,M., Kasai,K. and Saeki,Y. (2006) Plasmid DNA sequences present in

conventional herpes simplex virus amplicon vectors cause rapid transgene silencing by forming inactive chromatin. *J. Virol.*, **80**, 3293–300.

18. Scrable,H. and Stambrook,P.J. (1999) A genetic program for deletion of foreign DNA from the mammalian genome. *Mutat. Res.*, **429**, 225–37.

19. Minoguchi,S. and Iba,H. (2008) Instability of retroviral DNA methylation in embryonic stem cells. *Stem Cells*, **26**, 1166–73.

20. Dorer,D.R. and Henikoff,S. (1997) Transgene repeat arrays interact with distant heterochromatin and cause silencing in cis and trans. *Genetics*, **147**, 1181–90.

21. Garrick,D., Fiering,S., Martin,D.I. and Whitelaw,E. (1998) Repeat-induced gene silencing in mammals. *Nat. Genet.*, **18**, 56–9.

22. Laker,C., Meyer,J., Schopen, a, Friel,J., Heberlein,C., Ostertag,W. and Stocking,C. (1998) Host cis-mediated extinction of a retrovirus permissive for expression in embryonal stem cells during differentiation. *J. Virol.*, **72**, 339–348.

23. Herbst,F., Ball,C.R., Tuorto,F., Nowrouzi,A., Wang,W., Zavidij,O., Dieter,S.M., Fessler,S., van der Hoeven,F., Kloz,U., *et al.* (2012) Extensive methylation of promoter sequences silences lentiviral transgene expression during stem cell differentiation in vivo. *Mol. Ther.*, **20**, 1014–21.

24. Hotta,A. and Ellis,J. (2008) Retroviral vector silencing during iPS cell induction: an epigenetic beacon that signals distinct pluripotent states. *J. Cell. Biochem.*, **105**, 940–8.

25. Brophy,J.A.N. and Voigt,C.A. (2014) Principles of genetic circuit design. *Nat. Methods*, **11**, 508.

26. Pikaart,M.J., Recillas-Targa,F. and Felsenfeld,G. (1998) Loss of transcriptional activity of a transgene is accompanied by DNA methylation and histone deacetylation and is prevented by insulators. *Genes Dev.*, **12**, 2852–2862.

27. Emery,D.W., Yannaki,E., Tubb,J. and Stamatoyannopoulos,G. (2000) A chromatin insulator protects retrovirus vectors from chromosomal position effects. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **97**, 9150–9155.

28. Grosveld,F., van Assendelft,G.B., Greaves,D.R. and Kollias,G. (1987) Position-independent, high-level expression of the human beta-globin gene in transgenic mice. *Cell*, **51**, 975–85.

29. Guy,L.G., Kothary,R., DeRepentigny,Y., Delvoye,N., Ellis,J. and Wall,L. (1996) The beta-globin locus control region enhances transcription of but does not confer position-independent expression onto the lacZ gene in transgenic mice. *EMBO J.*, **15**, 3713–21.

30. Phi-Van,L., von Kries,J.P., Ostertag,W. and Strätling,W.H. (1990) The chicken lysozyme 5' matrix attachment region increases transcription from a heterologous promoter in heterologous cells and dampens position effects on the expression of transfected genes. *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, **10**, 2302–7.

31. Kim,J.M., Kim,J.S., Park,D.H., Kang,H.S., Yoon,J., Baek,K. and Yoon,Y. (2004) Improved recombinant gene expression in CHO cells using matrix attachment regions. *J. Biotechnol.*, **107**, 95–105.

32. Williams,S., Mustoe,T., Mulcahy,T., Griffiths,M., Simpson,D., Antoniou,M.,

Irvine,A., Mountain,A. and Crombie,R. (2005) CpG-island fragments from the HNRPA2B1/CBX3 genomic locus reduce silencing and enhance transgene expression from the hCMV promoter/enhancer in mammalian cells. *BMC Biotechnol.*, **5**, 17.

33. Müller-Kuller,U., Ackermann,M., Kolodziej,S., Brendel,C., Fritsch,J., Lachmann,N., Kunkel,H., Lausen,J., Schambach,A., Moritz,T., *et al.* (2015) A minimal ubiquitous chromatin opening element (UCOE) effectively prevents silencing of juxtaposed heterologous promoters by epigenetic remodeling in multipotent and pluripotent stem cells. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **43**, 1577–92.

34. Kwaks,T.H.J., Barnett,P., Hemrika,W., Siersma,T., Sewalt,R.G.A.B., Satijn,D.P.E., Brons,J.F., van Blokland,R., Kwakman,P., Kruckeberg,A.L., *et al.* (2003) Identification of anti-repressor elements that confer high and stable protein production in mammalian cells. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, **21**, 553–8.

35. Grandchamp,N., Henriot,D., Philippe,S., Amar,L., Ursulet,S., Serguera,C., Mallet,J. and Sarkis,C. (2011) Influence of insulators on transgene expression from integrating and non-integrating lentiviral vectors. *Genet. Vaccines Ther.*, **9**, 1.

36. Truffinet,V., Guglielmi,L., Cogné,M. and Denizot,Y. (2005) The chicken beta-globin HS4 insulator is not a silver bullet to obtain copy-number dependent expression of transgenes in stable B cell transfectants. *Immunol. Lett.*, **96**, 303–4.

37. Bharadwaj,R.R., Trainor,C.D., Pasceri,P. and Ellis,J. (2003) LCR-regulated transgene expression levels depend on the Oct-1 site in the AT-rich region of beta -globin intron-2. *Blood*, **101**, 1603–10.

38. Lufino,M.M.P., Edser,P.A.H. and Wade-Martins,R. (2008) Advances in high-capacity extrachromosomal vector technology: Episomal maintenance, vector delivery, and transgene expression. *Mol. Ther.*, **16**, 1525–1538.

39. Ehrhardt,A., Haase,R., Schepers,A., Deutsch,M.J., Lipps,H.J. and Baiker,A. (2008) Episomal vectors for gene therapy. *Curr. Gene Ther.*, **8**, 147–61.

40. Conese,M., Auriche,C. and Ascenzioni,F. (2004) Gene therapy progress and prospects: episomally maintained self-replicating systems. *Gene Ther.*, **11**, 1735–41.

41. Van Craenenbroeck,K., Vanhoenacker,P. and Haegeman,G. (2000) Episomal vectors for gene expression in mammalian cells. *Eur. J. Biochem.*, **267**, 5665–78.

42. Frappier,L. (2012) Contributions of Epstein-Barr nuclear antigen 1 (EBNA1) to cell immortalization and survival. *Viruses*, **4**, 1537–47.

43. Piechaczek,C., Fetzer,C., Baiker,A., Bode,J. and Lipps,H.J. (1999) A vector based on the SV40 origin of replication and chromosomal S/MARs replicates episomally in CHO cells. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **27**, 426–428.

44. Baiker,A., Maercker,C., Piechaczek,C., Schmidt,S.B., Bode,J., Benham,C. and Lipps,H.J. (2000) Mitotic stability of an episomal vector containing a human scaffold/matrix-attached region is provided by association with nuclear matrix. *Nat. Cell Biol.*, **2**, 182–4.

45. Jenke,A.C.W., Stehle,I.M., Herrmann,F., Eisenberger,T., Baiker,A., Bode,J.,

Fackelmayer,F.O. and Lipps,H.J. (2004) Nuclear scaffold/matrix attached
region modules linked to a transcription unit are sufficient for replication and
maintenance of a mammalian episome. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **101**, 11322–
11327.
46. Stehle,I.M., Postberg,J., Rupprecht,S., Cremer,T., Jackson,D.A. and
Lipps,H.J. (2007) Establishment and mitotic stability of an extra-
chromosomal mammalian replicon. *BMC Cell Biol.*, **8**, 1–12.
47. Argyros,O., Wong,S.P., Niceta,M., Waddington,S.N., Howe,S.J., Coutelle,C.,
Miller, a D. and Harbottle,R.P. (2008) Persistent episomal transgene
expression in liver following delivery of a scaffold/matrix attachment region
containing non-viral vector. *Gene Ther.*, **15**, 1593–1605.
48. Tessadori,F., Zeng,K., Manders,E., Riool,M., Jackson,D. and van Driel,R.
(2010) Stable S/MAR-based episomal vectors are regulated at the chromatin
level. *Chromosome Res.*, **18**, 757–75.
49. Chen,Z.Y., He,C.Y., Meuse,L. and Kay,M. a (2004) Silencing of episomal
transgene expression by plasmid bacterial DNA elements in vivo. *Gene
Ther.*, **11**, 856–864.
50. Riu,E., Chen,Z.-Y., Xu,H., He,C.-Y. and Kay,M. a (2007) Histone
modifications are associated with the persistence or silencing of vector-
mediated transgene expression in vivo. *Mol. Ther.*, **15**, 1348–55.
51. Bian,Q. and Belmont,A.S. (2010) BAC TG-EMBED: one-step method for
high-level, copy-number-dependent, position-independent transgene
expression. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **38**, e127.
52. Blaas,L., Musteanu,M., Eferl,R., Bauer,A. and Casanova,E. (2009) Bacterial
artificial chromosomes improve recombinant protein production in
mammalian cells. *BMC Biotechnol.*, **9**, 3.
53. Zboray,K., Sommeregger,W., Bogner,E., Gili,A., Sterovsky,T., Fauland,K.,
Grabner,B., Stiedl,P., Moll,H.P., Bauer,A., *et al.* (2015) Heterologous protein
production using euchromatin-containing expression vectors in mammalian
cells. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **43**, e102.
54. Chaturvedi,P., Zhao,B., Zimmerman,D.L. and Belmont,A.S. (2018) Stable
and reproducible transgene expression independent of proliferative or
differentiated state using BAC TG-EMBED. *Gene Ther.*, **25**, 376–391.
55. Fitzsimons,H.L., Bland,R.J. and During,M.J. (2002) Promoters and regulatory
elements that improve adeno-associated virus transgene expression in the
brain. *Methods*, **28**, 227–36.
56. Brooks,A.R., Harkins,R.N., Wang,P., Qian,H.S., Liu,P. and Rubanyi,G.M.
(2004) Transcriptional silencing is associated with extensive methylation of
the CMV promoter following adenoviral gene delivery to muscle. *J. Gene
Med.*, **6**, 395–404.
57. Hong,S., Hwang,D.-Y., Yoon,S., Isacson,O., Ramezani,A., Hawley,R.G. and
Kim,K.-S. (2007) Functional analysis of various promoters in lentiviral
vectors at different stages of in vitro differentiation of mouse embryonic stem
cells. *Mol. Ther.*, **15**, 1630–9.
58. Chen,C., Krohn,J., Bhattacharya,S. and Davies,B. (2011) A comparison of
exogenous promoter activity at the ROSA26 locus using a PhiC31 integrase

mediated cassette exchange approach in mouse ES cells. *PLoS One*, **6**,
e23376.
59. Qin,J.Y., Zhang,L., Clift,K.L., Hulur,I., Xiang,A.P., Ren,B.-Z. and Lahn,B.T.
(2010) Systematic comparison of constitutive promoters and the
doxycycline-inducible promoter. *PLoS One*, **5**, e10611.
60. Hong,S., Hwang,D.D., Yoon,S., Isacson,O., Ramezani,A., Hawley,R.G. and
Kim,K. (2007) Functional analysis of various promoters in lentiviral vectors at
different stages of in vitro differentiation of mouse embryonic stem cells. *Mol.*
Ther., **15**, 1630–9.
61. Rozen,S. and Skaletsky,H. (2000) Primer3 on the WWW for general users
and for biologist programmers. *Methods Mol. Biol.*, **132**, 365–86.
62. Ye,J., Coulouris,G., Zaretskaya,I., Cutcutache,I., Rozen,S. and Madden,T.L.
(2012) Primer-BLAST: A tool to design target-specific primers for
polymerase chain reaction. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **13**, 134.
63. Khanna,N., Bian,Q., Plutz,M. and Belmont,A.S. (2013) BAC manipulations for
making BAC transgene arrays. *Methods Mol. Biol.*, **1042**, 197–210.
64. Warming,S., Costantino,N., Court,D.L., Jenkins,N.A. and Copeland,N.G.
(2005) Simple and highly efficient BAC recombineering using galK selection.
Nucleic Acids Res., **33**, e36.
65. Bian,Q., Khanna,N., Alvikas,J. and Belmont,A.S. (2013) β-Globin cis-
elements determine differential nuclear targeting through epigenetic
modifications. *J. Cell Biol.*, **203**, 767–83.
66. Strukov,Y.G. and Belmont, a. S. (2008) Development of Mammalian Cell
Lines with lac Operator-Tagged Chromosomes. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*,
2008, pdb.prot4903-pdb.prot4903.
67. Sambrook,J. and Russell,D.W. (2006) Purification of Nucleic Acids by
Extraction with Phenol:Chloroform. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, **2006**,
pdb.prot4455.
68. Dernburg,A.F. (2011) Fragmentation and labeling of probe DNA for whole-
mount FISH in Drosophila. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, **2011**, 1527–30.
69. Solovei,I. and Cremer,M. (2010) 3D-FISH on cultured cells combined with
immunostaining. *Methods Mol. Biol.*, **659**, 117–26.
70. Cremer,M., Grasser,F., Lanctôt,C., Müller,S., Neusser,M., Zinner,R.,
Solovei,I. and Cremer,T. (2008) Multicolor 3D fluorescence in situ
hybridization for imaging interphase chromosomes. *Methods Mol. Biol.*, **463**,
205–39.
71. Beatty,B.G. and Scherer,S.W. (2002) Human chromosome mapping of single
copy genes. *FISH A Pract. approach. B. Beatty, S. Mai, J. Squire, Ed.*
Oxford Univ. Press. Oxford.
72. Mowiol mounting medium (2006) *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, **2006**,
pdb.rec10255.
73. Schindelin,J., Arganda-Carreras,I., Frise,E., Kaynig,V., Longair,M.,
Pietzsch,T., Preibisch,S., Rueden,C., Saalfeld,S., Schmid,B., *et al.* (2012)
Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nat. Methods*, **9**,
676–82.
74. Khan,S.R. and Kuzminov,A. (2017) Degradation of RNA during lysis of

Escherichia coli cells in agarose plugs breaks the chromosome. *PLoS One*, **12**, e0190177.

75. Sambrook,J. and Russell,D.W. (2006) Preparation of DNA for Pulsed-field Gel Electrophoresis: Isolation of DNA from Mammalian Cells and Tissues. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, **2006**, pdb.prot4030.

76. Kimura,M., Stone,R.C., Hunt,S.C., Skurnick,J., Lu,X., Cao,X., Harley,C.B. and Aviv,A. (2010) Measurement of telomere length by the Southern blot analysis of terminal restriction fragment lengths. *Nat. Protoc.*, **5**, 1596–607.

77. Sambrook,J. and Russell,D.W. (2006) Southern Hybridization of Radiolabeled Probes to Nucleic Acids Immobilized on Membranes. *Cold Spring Harb. Protoc.*, **2006**, pdb.prot4044.

78. Venkatraman,E.S. and Olshen,A.B. (2007) A faster circular binary segmentation algorithm for the analysis of array CGH data. *Bioinformatics*, **23**, 657–663.

79. Olshen,A.B., Venkatraman,E.S., Lucito,R. and Wigler,M. (2004) Circular binary segmentation for the analysis of array-based DNA copy number data. *Biostatistics*, **5**, 557–572.

80. Gibson,D.G., Young,L., Chuang,R.-Y., Venter,J.C., Hutchison,C.A. and Smith,H.O. (2009) Enzymatic assembly of DNA molecules up to several hundred kilobases. *Nat. Methods*, **6**, 343–5.

81. Shao,Z. and Zhao,H. (2012) DNA assembler: A synthetic biology tool for characterizing and engineering natural product gene clusters 1st ed. Elsevier Inc.

82. Shao,Z., Zhao,H.H. and Zhao,H.H. (2009) DNA assembler, an in vivo genetic method for rapid construction of biochemical pathways. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **37**, e16.

83. Gietz,R.D. and Schiestl,R.H. (2007) Large-scale high-efficiency yeast transformation using the LiAc/SS carrier DNA/PEG method. *Nat. Protoc.*, **2**, 38–41.

84. Schorpp,M., Jager,R., Schellander,K., Schenkel,J., Wagner,E.F., Weiher,H. and Angel,P. (1996) The Human Ubiquitin C Promoter Directs High Ubiquitous Expression of Transgenes in Mice. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **24**, 1787–1788.

85. Mizushima,S. and Nagata,S. (1990) pEF-BOS, a powerful mammalian expression vector. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **18**, 5322.

86. Lois,C., Hong,E.J., Pease,S., Brown,E.J. and Baltimore,D. (2002) Germline transmission and tissue-specific expression of transgenes delivered by lentiviral vectors. *Science*, **295**, 868–72.

87. Hong Cai,J., Deng,S., Kumpf,S., Lee,P., Zagouras,P., Ryan,A. and Gallagher,D. (2007) Validation of rat reference genes for improved quantitative gene expression analysis using low density arrays. *Biotechniques*, **42**, 503–512.

88. de Jonge,H.J.M., Fehrmann,R.S.N., de Bont,E.S.J.M., Hofstra,R.M.W., Gerbens,F., Kamps,W. a, de Vries,E.G.E., van der Zee,A.G.J., te Meerman,G.J. and ter Elst,A. (2007) Evidence based selection of housekeeping genes. *PLoS One*, **2**, e898.

89. Zhu,J., He,F., Song,S., Wang,J. and Yu,J. (2008) How many human genes
can be defined as housekeeping with current expression data? *BMC*
Genomics, **9**, 172.
90. She,X., Rohl,C. a, Castle,J.C., Kulkarni,A. V, Johnson,J.M. and Chen,R.
(2009) Definition, conservation and epigenetics of housekeeping and tissue-
enriched genes. *BMC Genomics*, **10**, 269.
91. Zambrowicz,B.P., Imamoto, a, Fiering,S., Herzenberg,L. a, Kerr,W.G. and
Soriano,P. (1997) Disruption of overlapping transcripts in the ROSA beta
geo 26 gene trap strain leads to widespread expression of beta-
galactosidase in mouse embryos and hematopoietic cells. *Proc. Natl. Acad.*
Sci. U. S. A., **94**, 3789–94.
92. Bertulat,B., de Bonis,M.L., Della Ragione,F., Lehmkuhl,A., Milden,M.,
Storm,C., Jost,K.L., Scala,S., Hendrich,B., D'Esposito,M., *et al.* (2012)
MeCP2 Dependent Heterochromatin Reorganization during Neural
Differentiation of a Novel Mecp2-Deficient Embryonic Stem Cell Reporter
Line. *PLoS One*, **7**.
93. Hu,Y., Plutz,M. and Belmont,A.S. (2010) Hsp70 gene association with
nuclear speckles is Hsp70 promoter specific. *J. Cell Biol.*, **191**, 711–9.
94. Sinclair,P., Bian,Q., Plutz,M., Heard,E. and Belmont,A.S. (2010) Dynamic
plasticity of large-scale chromatin structure revealed by self-assembly of
engineered chromosome regions. *J. Cell Biol.*, **190**, 761–76.
95. Hu,Y., Kireev,I., Plutz,M., Ashourian,N. and Belmont,A.S. (2009) Large-scale
chromatin structure of inducible genes: transcription on a condensed, linear
template. *J. Cell Biol.*, **185**, 87–100.
96. Schwab,M. and Amler,L.C. (1990) Amplification of cellular oncogenes: A
predictor of clinical outcome in human cancer. *Genes, Chromosom. Cancer*,
1, 181–193.
97. Carroll,S.M., DeRose,M.L., Gaudray,P., Moore,C.M., Needham-
Vandevanter,D.R., Von Hoff,D.D. and Wahl,G.M. (1988) Double minute
chromosomes can be produced from precursors derived from a
chromosomal deletion. *Mol. Cell. Biol.*, **8**, 1525–33.
98. L'Abbate,A., Macchia,G., D'Addabbo,P., Lonoce,A., Tolomeo,D.,
Trombetta,D., Kok,K., Bartenhagen,C., Whelan,C.W., Palumbo,O., *et al.*
(2014) Genomic organization and evolution of double
minutes/homogeneously staining regions with MYC amplification in human
cancer. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **42**, 9131–45.
99. Marasini,D. and Fakhr,M. (2014) Exploring PFGE for Detecting Large
Plasmids in Campylobacter jejuni and Campylobacter coli Isolated from
Various Retail Meats. *Pathogens*, **3**, 833–844.
100. Barton,B.M., Harding,G.P. and Zuccarelli,A.J. (1995) A general method for
detecting and sizing large plasmids. *Anal. Biochem.*, **226**, 235–40.
101. Walker,P.R., LeBlanc,J. and Sikorska,M. (1997) Evidence that DNA
fragmentation in apoptosis is initiated and propagated by single-strand
breaks. *Cell Death Differ.*, **4**, 506–515.
102. Richardson,S.M., Mitchell,L.A., Stracquadanio,G., Yang,K., Dymond,J.S.,
DiCarlo,J.E., Lee,D., Huang,C.L.V., Chandrasegaran,S., Cai,Y., *et al.* (2017)

Design of a synthetic yeast genome. *Science*, **355**, 1040–1044.

103. Nanbo,A., Sugden,A. and Sugden,B. (2007) The coupling of synthesis and partitioning of EBV's plasmid replicon is revealed in live cells. *EMBO J.*, **26**, 4252–62.

104. Kouprina,N., Earnshaw,W.C., Masumoto,H. and Larionov,V. (2013) A new generation of human artificial chromosomes for functional genomics and gene therapy. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.*, **70**, 1135–48.

105. Mills,W., Critcher,R., Lee,C. and Farr,C.J. (1999) Generation of an approximately 2.4 Mb human X centromere-based minichromosome by targeted telomere-associated chromosome fragmentation in DT40. *Hum. Mol. Genet.*, **8**, 751–61.

106. Harrington,J.J., Van Bokkelen,G., Mays,R.W., Gustashaw,K. and Willard,H.F. (1997) Formation of de novo centromeres and construction of first-generation human artificial microchromosomes. *Nat. Genet.*, **15**, 345–55.

107. Kazuki,Y. and Oshimura,M. (2011) Human artificial chromosomes for gene delivery and the development of animal models. *Mol. Ther.*, **19**, 1591–601.

108. Kim,J.-H., Kononenko,A., Erliandri,I., Kim,T.-A., Nakano,M., Iida,Y., Barrett,J.C., Oshimura,M., Masumoto,H., Earnshaw,W.C., *et al.* (2011) Human artificial chromosome (HAC) vector with a conditional centromere for correction of genetic deficiencies in human cells. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **108**, 20048–53.

109. Hiratsuka,M., Uno,N., Ueda,K., Kurosaki,H., Imaoka,N., Kazuki,K., Ueno,E., Akakura,Y., Katoh,M., Osaki,M., *et al.* (2011) Integration-free iPS cells engineered using human artificial chromosome vectors. *PLoS One*, **6**, e25961.

110. Takahashi,Y., Tsuji,S., Kazuki,Y., Noguchi,M., Arifuku,I., Umebayashi,Y., Nakanishi,T., Oshimura,M. and Sato,K. (2010) Development of evaluation system for bioactive substances using human artificial chromosome-mediated osteocalcin gene expression. *J. Biochem.*, **148**, 29–34.

111. Kazuki,Y., Hiratsuka,M., Takiguchi,M., Osaki,M., Kajitani,N., Hoshiya,H., Hiramatsu,K., Yoshino,T., Kazuki,K., Ishihara,C., *et al.* (2010) Complete genetic correction of ips cells from Duchenne muscular dystrophy. *Mol. Ther.*, **18**, 386–93.

112. Larin,Z. and Mejía,J.E. (2002) Advances in human artificial chromosome technology. *Trends Genet.*, **18**, 313–319.

113. Liskovykh,M., Lee,N.C., Larionov,V. and Kouprina,N. (2016) Moving toward a higher efficiency of microcell-mediated chromosome transfer. *Mol. Ther. Methods Clin. Dev.*, **3**, 16043.

114. Fournier,R.E. and Ruddle,F.H. (1977) Microcell-mediated transfer of murine chromosomes into mouse, Chinese hamster, and human somatic cells. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **74**, 319–23.

115. Shimizu,N., Miura,Y., Sakamoto,Y. and Tsutsui,K. (2001) Plasmids with a mammalian replication origin and a matrix attachment region initiate the event similar to gene amplification. *Cancer Res.*, **61**, 6987–6990.

116. Shimizu,N., Hashizume,T., Shingaki,K. and Kawamoto,J.K. (2003)

Amplification of plasmids containing a mammalian replication initiation region
is mediated by controllable conflict between replication and transcription.
Cancer Res., **63**, 5281–5290.
117. Shimizu,N., Shingaki,K. and Kaneko-sasaguri,Y. (2005) When , where and
how the bridge breaks : anaphase bridge breakage plays a crucial role in
gene amplification and HSR generation. **302**, 233–243.
118. Shimizu,N. (2009) Extrachromosomal double minutes and chromosomal
homogeneously staining regions as probes for chromosome research.
Cytogenet. Genome Res., **124**, 312–326.
119. Schoenlein,P. V, Shen,D.W., Barrett,J.T., Pastan,I. and Gottesman,M.M.
(1992) Double minute chromosomes carrying the human multidrug
resistance 1 and 2 genes are generated from the dimerization of
submicroscopic circular DNAs in colchicine-selected KB carcinoma cells.
Mol Biol Cell, **3**, 507–520.
120. Khanna,N., Hu,Y. and Belmont,A.S.S. (2014) HSP70 Transgene Directed
Motion to Nuclear Speckles Facilitates Heat Shock Activation. *Curr. Biol.*, **24**,
1138–1144.
2098
2099

Table 1

Construct	Heterogeneous clones%	Number of clones
UBC-GFP-ZeoR	0	58
DHFR-UG	60%	30
ROSA-UG	76%	38
UBB-UG	58%	41
2207K13-UG	69%	35
HBB-UG	83%	23

Table 2

Sample Name	BAC copy number per cell	Episome copy number per cell	BAC copy number per episome	BAC size (kb)	BAC content per episome (kb)
DHFR-UG-s3	15.4	6.2 (n=99)	2.5	178	445
HBB-UG-100d3	14.9	4.5 (n=100)	3.3	217	716

Table 3

Sample Name	BAC copy number per cell	Estimated episome copy number per cell	Minimum copy number increase of episome-localizing DNA relative to L
DHFR-UG-s3_H1	49.4	19.8	5.8
DHFR-UG-s3_H2	57.5	23.1	6.6
DHFR-UG-s3_L	0.3	0.1	/
HBB-UG-100d3_H1	48.5	14.7	4.6
HBB-UG-100d3_H2	51.2	15.5	4.8
HBB-UG-100d3_L	0.2	0.1	/

Figure 1

Survey different promoters

Survey different BACs

$$\text{relative promoter strength} = \frac{(\text{mRFP}/\text{EGFP})_{x \text{ promoter}}}{(\text{mRFP}/\text{EGFP})_{\text{CMV promoter}}}$$

EGFP
mRFP
GFP-ZeoR
Different
promoters

CMV promoter
UBC promoter
DHFR BAC
Different
BACs

Reporter gene expression

Reporter gene copy number

Figure 2

(a) mRFP   EGFP   *Dhfr*   *Msh3*   40 kb

(b) CMV EGFP pA SV40 Kan/NeoR pA AmpR

Promoter for testing mRFP pA SV40 ZeoR pA EM7 1 kb

(c)
Auto-fluorescence

CMV 0.070   RPL32 0.38

EEF1a 0.32   UBC 0.21   PPIA 0.12

B2M 0.024   RPS3a 0.0038   GUSB 0.00052

mRFP   EGFP

(d) Promoter Relative Strength

CMV 1   RPL32 5.5   EEF1a 4.6   UBC 3.0   PPIA 1.7   B2M 0.3   RPS3a 0.05   GUSB 0.01

Figure 3

(a)

UBC promoter | GFP-ZeoR | EM7 | *galK*

FRT   FRT

1 kb

(b)

DHFR-UG

Dhfr
Msh3

ROSA-UG

Thumpd3   *Setd5*
Gt(ROSA)26Sor   *Lhfp14*

UBB-UG

PIGL   *UBB*   *TEPV2*
CENPV   *FAM211A*

2207K13-UG

HBB-UG

OR51B6   *OR51M1*

OR51V1 *HBB* *HBG1* *HBE1* *OR51B4* *OR51B2* *OR51B5*
HBD *HBG2*

40 kb

▼ UBC-GFP-ZeoR

(c)

Uniform

DHFR-UG-f3-15

Heterogeneous

DHFR-UG-f1-6

■ BAC clones
□ NIH 3T3

(d)

UBC-GFP-ZeoR Only
y = 0.4244x
R² = 0.09018
N = 58

DHFR-UG BAC
y = 1.9076x
R² = 0.63672
N = 30

ROSA-UG BAC
y = 0.5756x
R² = 0.56087
N = 38

UBB-UG BAC
y = 0.8713x
R² = 0.8554
N = 41

2207K13-UG BAC
y = 1.2099x
R² = 0.75128
N = 35

HBB-UG BAC
y = 1.5051x
R² = 0.91405
N = 23

Mean fluorescence
Transgene copy number

● Heterogeneous clones   ● Uniform clones

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7