Asymmetric Segregation of PIE-1 in C. elegans Is Mediated by Two Complementary Mechanisms that Act through Separate PIE-1 Protein Domains
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Summary

The CCCH finger protein PIE-1 is a regulator of germ cell fate that segregates with the germ lineage in early embryos. At each asymmetric division, PIE-1 is inherited preferentially by the germline daughter and is excluded from the somatic daughter. We show that this asymmetry is regulated at the protein level by two complementary mechanisms. The first acts before cell division to enrich PIE-1 in the cytoplasm destined for the germline daughter. The second acts after cell division to eliminate any PIE-1 left in the somatic daughter. The latter mechanism depends on PIE-1’s first CCCH finger (ZF1), which targets PIE-1 for degradation in somatic blastomeres. ZF1s in two other germline proteins, POS-1 and MEX-1, are also degraded in somatic blastomeres, suggesting that localized degradation also acts on these proteins to exclude them from somatic lineages.

Introduction

Asymmetric segregation of determinants during cell division is a commonly used mechanism to generate cell diversity during development. Regulatory molecules are segregated asymmetrically during mitosis to generate daughter cells with different intrinsic fates (Guo and Kemphues, 1996; Knoblich, 1997; Shapiro and Losick, 1997; Jan and Jan, 1998). For example, in Drosophila neuroblasts, the transcription factor Prospero is segregated preferentially to the basal daughter where it specifies the “ganglion mother cell” (GMC) fate by activating GMC-specific genes and inhibiting neuroblast-specific genes (Doe et al., 1991; Vaessen et al., 1991; Hirata et al., 1995; Knoblich et al., 1995). Similarly, in haploid cells of S. cerevisiae, the transcriptional repressor Ash1p accumulates preferentially in the newly budded daughter cell where it prevents mating type switching by inhibiting the expression of HO endonuclease (Bobola et al., 1996; Sil and Herskowitz, 1996). Although superficially similar, these two examples of asymmetric segregation are mediated by different mechanisms. In the case of Prospero, asymmetric segregation is dependent on a complex of cortical proteins that target Prospero to a crescent in the basal cortex of the dividing neuroblast.
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involved in later stages. Localized translation of the pie-1 message could also be used to target PIE-1 to the germ lineage. Translational control has been shown to regulate the distributions of GLP-1 and PAL-1, two other maternally encoded proteins that are asymmetrically localized in early C. elegans embryos (Evans et al., 1994; Hunter and Kenyon, 1996). Neither of these proteins, however, is localized in the same pattern as PIE-1:GLP-1 is present in AB-derived blastomeres, and PAL-1 is present in P1-derived somatic and germline blastomeres.

Another possibility is that PIE-1 segregation is regulated by mechanisms that act directly on the PIE-1 protein. In particular, it has been suggested that PIE-1’s ability to associate with centrosomes during mitosis may contribute to its asymmetric distribution (Mello et al., 1996). At the beginning of each mitosis, PIE-1 accumulates around both centrosomes of the nascent spindle. As the spindle rotates in preparation for cleavage, PIE-1 disappears from the centrosome destined for the somatic daughter (“somatic centrosome”) and is retained only on the centrosome destined for the germline daughter (“germline centrosome”) (Mello et al., 1996). After spindle rotation, somatic and germline centrosomes adopt different morphologies (Hyman and White, 1987) and could conceivably affect PIE-1 binding or stability differentially.

To distinguish between these possibilities and begin to identify the mechanisms that localize PIE-1, we have analyzed PIE-1 segregation in live embryos and have identified the domains within PIE-1 responsible for its localization. Our results indicate that PIE-1 asymmetry is regulated at the protein level but does not depend on binding to centrosomes. Instead, we show that PIE-1 segregation is regulated by two independent mechanisms that act before and after cell division to enrich PIE-1 in germline blastomeres and eliminate it from somatic blastomeres.

Results

PIE-1:GFP in Live Embryos

To examine PIE-1 localization in live embryos, we constructed a fusion between pie-1 coding sequences and GFP (green fluorescent protein, [Chalfie et al., 1994]). This fusion (Table 1, A) is functional, as it can rescue the embryonic lethality of a pie-1(0) mutant (data not shown). In all 14 lines examined, GFP fluorescence in the adult germline and in embryos was observed in a pattern identical to that reported for PIE-1 using immunolocalization (Mello et al., 1996; Tenenhaus et al., 1998). In embryos, PIE-1:GFP was found predominantly in the cytoplasm and nuclei of germline blastomeres (Figure 1, B-U). In the cytoplasm, PIE-1:GFP was present both diffusely throughout the cytosol and at higher concentration on P granules (arrows in Figure 1, O, and data not shown). PIE-1:GFP also appeared to associate with discrete foci in nuclei (data not shown). The identity of these foci is not known.

To examine the dynamics of PIE-1 localization, we performed time-lapse imaging on live embryos expressing PIE-1:GFP over several cell divisions (Figure 1, B-U). In oocytes and newly fertilized embryos, PIE-1:GFP was present uniformly throughout the cytoplasm (data not shown and Figure 1B). In the late 1-cell stage after the pronuclei have formed, PIE-1:GFP levels began to decrease in the anterior and increase in the posterior (Figure 1C). By pronuclear meeting, PIE-1:GFP was found predominantly in the posterior (Figure 1E). During mitosis, PIE-1:GFP also accumulated on both centrosomes with higher levels on the posterior centrosome (arrow in Figure 1G). As a result of this asymmetric enrichment, most of the PIE-1:GFP was inherited by the posterior blastomere P1 during the first cleavage (Figure 1H).

In P1, P2, and P3, PIE-1:GFP distribution followed a sequence similar to that observed in the zygote, with the exception that PIE-1:GFP became increasingly more nuclear during each interphase (compare panels J and...
Table 1. Identification of Domains in PIE-1 Required for Localization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Centrosomes</th>
<th>Nucleus</th>
<th>P granules</th>
<th>Enrichment before division</th>
<th>Elimination after division</th>
<th># of lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>pie-1(+) pie-1(-9)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>pie-1(+) pie-1(-9)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>reduced reduced</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>pie-1(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The constructs shown were transformed into pie-1(+) or pie-1(-9) hermaphrodites, and their localization patterns were analyzed in live embryos. Boxes indicate PIE-1 coding regions and thin lines indicate pie-1 noncoding regions (introns were omitted for clarity). All constructs were tagged with GFP at either the amino or carboxyl terminus as described in Experimental Procedures. In K and O, the pie-1 coding region was present out-of-frame with respect to GFP. The following criteria were used to score the localization pattern of each fusion: centrosomes, GFP on two donut-shaped structures associated with mitotic nuclei as shown in Figure 1L. Nuclei, higher levels of GFP in interphase nuclei compared to surrounding cytoplasm in 2-cell and older embryos; “reduced” indicates a reduction in nuclear GFP levels compared to wild type. P granules, GFP on punctate structures associated with mitotic nuclei as shown in Figure 1L. Nuclei, higher levels of GFP in interphase nuclei compared to surrounding cytoplasm in 2-cell and older embryos; “reduced” indicates a reduction in nuclear GFP levels compared to wild type. P granules, GFP on punctate structures in the cytoplasm as shown in Figure 1L; “reduced” indicates that these structures were absent from interphase cells but could still be seen faintly in mitotic cells. Enrichment before division, higher levels of GFP on the germline side of dividing germline blastomeres compared to the somatic side (e.g., Figures 1D, 1L, and 3G); “reduced” indicates the presence of higher levels of GFP in the somatic daughter immediately after division compared to wild type. Elimination after division, absence of GFP in the daughters of AB, EMS, C, and D. (*) This construct could not be expressed in N2 hermaphrodites (data not shown) due to nonsense-mediated mRNA decay, which eliminates messages with abnormally long 3’ UTRs. Therefore, we examined this construct in smg-1 hermaphrodites where nonsense-mediated mRNA decay is inhibited (Pulak and Anderson, 1993). (#) This fusion was expressed at too low levels to determine whether it bound to P granules with normal affinity.
PIE-1 requires an intact actin cytoskeleton to become enriched in the posterior before cell division. These experiments also suggest that intact microtubules may not be essential for this process. However, we cannot rule out their possible involvement since it was not possible to eliminate all microtubules with nocodazole (data not shown), as has also been noted by others (Strome and Wood, 1983).

Noncoding Sequences in the pie-1 RNA are neither Necessary nor Sufficient for Segregation of the PIE-1 Protein to the Germ Lineage

To determine which sequences in pie-1 are required for localization, we generated modified versions of the PIE-1:GFP fusion and analyzed their expression in vivo (Table 1). We began by testing the role of noncoding sequences, since these sequences are often implicated in RNA localization and translation control, two commonly used mechanisms for restricting the distribution of maternal proteins in embryos (Stebbins-Boaz and Richter, 1997; Lasko, 1999).

We first replaced the 3' UTR of pie-1 with that of a let-858, a ubiquitously expressed gene (Kelly et al., 1997). This change did not affect PIE-1:GFP's ability to segregate asymmetrically (Table 1, B), though expression levels were reduced compared to wild-type (data not shown). Asymmetric segregation of the PIE-1:GFP:let-858 3' UTR fusion was not dependent on endogenous PIE-1 since it was also observed in a pie-1(0) mutant background (Table 1, B). We conclude that the pie-1 3' UTR is not essential for asymmetric segregation.

To test other noncoding sequences, we placed the pie-1 ORF fused to the let-858 3' UTR under the control of the ama-1 promoter (Table 1, C). ama-1 encodes the large subunit of RNA polymerase II and is expressed in all cells (Bird and Riddle, 1989). In this construct, the pie-1 5' UTR is replaced with that of ama-1, and the only sequences from the pie-1 gene are coding sequences. Again, in this context PIE-1:GFP's ability to segregate to the germline was not affected (Table 1, C). To test the role of sequences in the pie-1 open reading frame, we removed pie-1 coding sequences from the original PIE-1:GFP fusion, leaving GFP in the context of the pie-1 promoter and 5' and 3' UTRs. GFP expressed from this construct was no longer localized and was found at equal levels in all embryonic blastomeres (Table 1, D). We conclude that noncoding sequences are neither necessary nor sufficient for localization and that pie-1 coding sequences contain all the information required.

Two Separate Domains in PIE-1 Are Required for Localization to the Germ Lineage

To identify domains in PIE-1 required for localization, we divided the pie-1 open-reading frame into three segments (regions 1, 2, and 3) and tested each one individually for its ability to localize GFP in embryos.

Region 1

Fusion of region 1 (amino acids 1-84) to GFP caused GFP to accumulate at equal levels in the cytoplasm of all blastomeres with no preference for germline blastomeres (Table 1, E). In dividing cells, the region 1:GFP fusion became localized around centrosomes (both somatic and germline centrosomes were targeted equally; data not shown). The domain responsible for this localization was narrowed down to 21 amino acids (64-84, Table 1, F). A PIE-1:GFP fusion with this domain deleted.

Asymmetric Enrichment before Cell Division

Is Sensitive to Cytochalasin D but Not to Nocodazole

Segregation of P granules in the 1- and 2-cell stages requires an intact actin cytoskeleton (sensitive to cytochalasin D) but does not require intact microtubules (insensitive to nocodazole) (Strome and Wood, 1983; Hird et al., 1996). To determine whether PIE-1 segregation has similar requirements, we cultured 2-cell embryos expressing PIE-1:GFP in medium containing either cytochalasin D or nocodazole, following established procedures (Strome and Wood, 1983; Edgar, 1995; Shelton and Bowerman, 1996; Schlesinger et al., 1999). Both drugs blocked cell division as expected, but only cytochalasin D blocked PIE-1 enrichment to the posterior (Figure 2). These results indicate that like P granules, PIE-1 requires an intact actin cytoskeleton to become enriched in the posterior before cell division.

Noncoding Sequences in the Pie-1 RNA are neither Necessary nor Sufficient for Segregation of the Pie-1 Protein to the Germ Lineage

To determine which sequences in pie-1 are required for localization, we generated modified versions of the PIE-1:GFP fusion and analyzed their expression in vivo (Table 1). We began by testing the role of noncoding sequences, since these sequences are often implicated in RNA localization and translation control, two commonly used mechanisms for restricting the distribution of maternal proteins in embryos (Stebbins-Boaz and Richter, 1997; Lasko, 1999).

First, we removed the 3' UTR of pie-1 with that of a let-858, a ubiquitously expressed gene (Kelly et al., 1997). This change did not affect PIE-1:GFP's ability to segregate asymmetrically (Table 1, B), though expression levels were reduced compared to wild-type (data not shown). Asymmetric segregation of the PIE-1:GFP:let-858 3' UTR fusion was not dependent on endogenous PIE-1 since it was also observed in a pie-1(0) mutant background (Table 1, B). We conclude that the pie-1 3' UTR is not essential for asymmetric segregation. To test other noncoding sequences, we placed the pie-1 ORF fused to the let-858 3' UTR under the control of the ama-1 promoter (Table 1, C). ama-1 encodes the large subunit of RNA polymerase II and is expressed in all cells (Bird and Riddle, 1989). In this construct, the pie-1 5' UTR is replaced with that of ama-1, and the only sequences from the pie-1 gene are coding sequences. Again, in this context PIE-1:GFP's ability to segregate to the germline was not affected (Table 1, C). To test the role of sequences in the pie-1 open reading frame, we removed pie-1 coding sequences from the original PIE-1:GFP fusion, leaving GFP in the context of the pie-1 promoter and 5' and 3' UTRs. GFP expressed from this construct was no longer localized and was found at equal levels in all embryonic blastomeres (Table 1, D). We conclude that noncoding sequences are neither necessary nor sufficient for localization and that pie-1 coding sequences contain all the information required.

Two Separate Domains in PIE-1 Are Required for Localization to the Germ Lineage

To identify domains in PIE-1 required for localization, we divided the pie-1 open-reading frame into three segments (regions 1, 2, and 3) and tested each one individually for its ability to localize GFP in embryos.

Region 1

Fusion of region 1 (amino acids 1-84) to GFP caused GFP to accumulate at equal levels in the cytoplasm of all blastomeres with no preference for germline blastomeres (Table 1, E). In dividing cells, the region 1:GFP fusion became localized around centrosomes (both somatic and germline centrosomes were targeted equally; data not shown). The domain responsible for this localization was narrowed down to 21 amino acids (64-84, Table 1, F). A PIE-1:GFP fusion with this domain deleted.
(PIE-1:GFP CenD: Table 1, G) still bound to centrosomes, albeit with apparently reduced affinity (data not shown). We found that this localization is dependent on the presence of endogenous PIE-1. When expressed in a pie-1(-) background, PIE-1:GFP CenD was no longer detected on centrosomes (Table 1, G). In both pie-1(-) and pie-1(0) embryos, however, PIE-1:GFP CenD mutant segregated normally to germline blastomeres, although its accumulation in interphase nuclei appeared reduced compared to wild type (Table 1, G and data not shown). We conclude that the centrosome binding domain of PIE-1 is not required for asymmetric localization but may be required for efficient accumulation in nuclei.

Region 2

Fusion of region 2 (amino acids 85-173) to GFP caused GFP to accumulate preferentially in germline blastomeres and their sisters (Table 1, H). Deletion and mutational analysis of region 2 showed that a 36 amino acid domain encompassing the CCCH finger (ZF1, amino acids 97-132) was necessary and sufficient for this pattern when fused in-frame with GFP (Table 1, I and J) but not when fused out-of-frame (Table 1, K). In the zygote, ZF1:GFP remained uniformly distributed throughout the cytoplasm and was partitioned equally to AB and P1 (Figure 3C). In the late 2-cell stage, ZF1:GFP levels remained high in P1 but decreased in AB. In the 4-cell stage, the fusion was present at equal levels in the two P1 daughters (EMS and P2) but was much reduced or absent in the two AB daughters (ABa and ABp) (Figure 3D). This pattern of equal partitioning to both daughters during division followed by elimination from the somatic daughter and its progeny after division was repeated at each asymmetric cleavage. These results suggest that ZF1 is responsible for targeting PIE-1 for degradation in somatic blastomeres. Consistent with this interpretation, Cys-to-Ser mutations in (or deletion of) ZF1 in full-length PIE-1:GFP caused low levels of the fusion to be maintained in somatic blastomeres (Table 1, L and M; Figures 3E and 3F). Like wild-type, the ZF1 mutants became enriched on the germline side of the cell before each asymmetric segregation and were segregated preferentially to the germline daughter with low levels inherited by the somatic daughter. Unlike wild type, however, the ZF1 mutants were not eliminated from the somatic daughter and instead persisted in its descendants (Figure 3F). We obtained direct evidence that ZF1 mutants are impaired in degradation by quantifying GFP fluorescence over time in embryos expressing wild-type and ZF1-mutated PIE-1:GFP fusions (Figure 4). In particular, we found that during the lifetime of EMS, wild-type PIE-1:GFP fluorescence decreased on average by 71% compared to 15% for the ZF1 mutant (Figure 4B). We conclude that, although not essential for asymmetric enrichment before cleavage, ZF1 is required to destabilize PIE-1 in somatic blastomeres after cleavage.

Region 3

Fusion of region 3 (amino acids 174-335) to GFP was sufficient to target GFP preferentially to germline blastomeres (Table 1, N). Before each asymmetric division, region 3:GFP became enriched on the germline side of the cell (Figure 3G) and was segregated preferentially to the germline daughter during cleavage (Figure 3H). This pattern was observed in both pie-1(-) and pie-1(0) embryos and was dependent on region 3 being fused in-frame to GFP (Table 1, N and O). A PIE-1:GFP fusion lacking most of region 3 (Table 1, T) remained uniform before cleavage and was partitioned equally to both daughter (Figure 5I). This fusion, however, was not maintained in somatic blastomeres, indicating that it retained the ability to be degraded specifically in these cells (Figure 5J). We conclude that region 3 is necessary and sufficient for asymmetric enrichment before cleavage but is not required for elimination from somatic blastomeres after cleavage.

In germline blastomeres, region 3:GFP was found diffusely throughout the cytoplasm and on P granules (Figures 3G and 3H). Deletion analysis of region 3 showed
that the CCCH finger within this region (ZF2) is sufficient to target GFP to P granules (Table 1, R; Figure 6B). ZF2, however, was not sufficient to target GFP preferentially to germline blastomeres, suggesting that association with P granules is not sufficient for asymmetric segregation. Surprisingly, Cys/His to Ser mutations in ZF2 did not affect P granule binding significantly (Table 1, S and X). These mutations, however, compromised the asymmetric enrichment of PIE-1:GFP before cell division (Table 1, X). Together, these data suggest that ZF2 participates in two separate processes: binding to P granules and, in combination with other sequences in region 3, asymmetric enrichment before cell division. Neither of these processes, however, is absolutely dependent on ZF2 (or ZF1). PIE-1:GFP lacking both ZF1 and ZF2 still exhibited a weak preference for germline blastomeres and weak binding to P granules in both pie-1(+/-) and pie-1(0) backgrounds (Table 1, Y).

Figure 4. Quantification of ZF1-Dependent Degradation in Living Embryos
GFP fluorescence levels from three-dimensional time lapse movies of embryos expressing either wild-type PIE-1::GFP (squares) or ZF1 mutant PIE-1::GFP (triangles). Plots compare the fraction of GFP fluorescence (y axis) relative to the first time point in a three-dimensional volume bounding the entire embryo (A) or the EMS cell (B) over time (x axis, minutes) starting at telophase of P1 (birth of EMS) and ending at telophase of EMS. Error bars indicate the 95% confidence limits in the mean values (see Experimental Procedures).

Figures 5 and 6. Localization Properties of CCCH Fingers from PIE-1, MEX-1, POS-1, and TTP
Figure 5. par-1 Is Required to Block ZF1-Dependent Degradation in Posterior Blastomeres
(A–F) 4-cell (A, C, and E) and 12-cell (B, D, and F) par-1 (RNAi) embryos expressing (A and B) wild-type PIE-1::GFP; (C and D) PIE-1::GFP with a deletion in region 3; (E and F) PIE-1::GFP lacking ZF1. Scale bar is 10 μm.

Figure 6. Localization Properties of CCCH Fingers from PIE-1, MEX-1, POS-1, and TTP
Four-cell embryos expressing ZF1::GFP, ZF2::GFP, and ZF1 + ZF2::GFP fusions from PIE-1, MEX-1, POS-1, and TTP as indicated. Arrows point to P granules in ZF2::GFP-expressing embryos. All fusions were uniformly distributed in the 1- and 2-cell stages (Figure 3C and data not shown). Scale bar is 10 μm.

Figure 5. par-1 Is Required to Inhibit ZF1-Dependent Degradation in Posterior Cells
par-1 encodes a serine/threonine kinase required for the establishment of anterior/posterior polarity in the early embryo (Guo and Kemphues, 1995). In par-1 mutants, all blastomeres divide equally and PIE-1 is partitioned equally to all cells up to the 4-cell stage (Tenenhaus et al., 1998). After that stage, PIE-1 rapidly disappears and is no longer detected in any cell. These observations suggested that the mechanism that degrades PIE-1 in somatic cells might still be active in par-1 mutants. To test this possibility, we examined the distributions of wild-type PIE-1::GFP, PIE-1::GFP with a deletion in region 3 (PIE-1::GFPRegion 3Δ), and PIE-1::GFP with a deletion that removes ZF1 (PIE-1:

Figure 6. Localization Properties of CCCH Fingers from PIE-1, MEX-1, POS-1, and TTP
Four-cell embryos expressing ZF1::GFP, ZF2::GFP, and ZF1 + ZF2::GFP fusions from PIE-1, MEX-1, POS-1, and TTP as indicated. Arrows point to P granules in ZF2::GFP-expressing embryos. All fusions were uniformly distributed in the 1- and 2-cell stages (Figure 3C and data not shown). Scale bar is 10 μm.
GFPZF1Δ) in animals where par-1 activity was inhibited by RNA-mediated interference (RNAi). As expected, all three fusions were partitioned equally during the first two cleavages (Figures 5A, 5C, and 5E). After the 4-cell stage, wild-type PIE-1:GFP and PIE-1:GFPRegion Δ quickly disappeared from all cells (Figures 5B and 5D). In contrast, PIE-1:GFPZF1Δ continued to be maintained in all cells and could still be detected throughout the embryo past the 28-cell stage (Figure 5F and data not shown). These observations demonstrate that loss of PIE-1 in par-1 mutants is dependent on ZF1 as it is in wild type. We conclude that par-1 activity is not required for ZF1-dependent degradation and that in par-1 mutants, ZF1-dependent degradation is active in all blastomeres.

ZF1-dependent degradation appears to have slower kinetics in par-1 mutants compared to wild type. In par-1 mutants, PIE-1:GFP can still be detected in the 4-cell stage (Figure 5A), whereas in wild-type embryos, PIE-1:GFP is eliminated from the AB lineage before the 4-cell stage (Figure 3B). This difference raises the possibility that par-1 is required not only to exclude ZF1-dependent degradation from germline blastomeres but also to concentrate it in somatic blastomeres.

Localization Properties of CCCH Fingers
The two CCCH fingers in PIE-1 have different properties: ZF1 targets PIE-1 for degradation in somatic blastomeres, and ZF2 targets PIE-1 to P granules. CCCH fingers have also been described in MEX-1 and POS-1, two maternal proteins that, like PIE-1, segregate with the germ lineage in embryos (Guedes and Priess, 1997; Tabara et al., 1998). To test whether the MEX-1 and POS-1 fingers have properties similar to the PIE-1 fingers, we fused these fingers to GFP and examined their localization pattern in vivo. We found that, like PIE-1 ZF1, the ZF1s of MEX-1 and POS-1 were sufficient to target GFP for degradation specifically in somatic blastomeres (Figures 6A, 6D, and 6G). Similarly, like PIE-1 ZF2, the ZF2s of MEX-1 and POS-1 were sufficient to target GFP to P granules (Figures 6B, 6E, and 6H). Fusions containing both fingers exhibited both patterns (Figures 6C, 6F, and 6I).

We also analyzed by the same method the CCCH fingers of mammalian TTP (Dubois et al., 1990; Lai et al., 1990; Varamun et al., 1991). Unlike the other ZF1s we tested, TTP ZF1 was not sufficient to target GFP for degradation in somatic blastomeres; TTP-ZF1:GFP was maintained in all cells at equal levels (Figure 6J). Like the other ZF2s, however, TTP ZF2 was able to target GFP to P granules (Figure 6K).

Discussion
In Drosophila neuroblasts, determinants are segregated asymmetrically by associating with a specific region of the cell cortex (Jan and Jan, 1998). In S. cerevisiae, Ash1p is restricted to daughter cells by a cytoplasmic transport mechanism that localizes ASH1 mRNA to emerging buds (Bobola et al., 1996; Chang and Drubin, 1996). In this study, we show that the PIE-1 employs yet another strategy to regulate its asymmetric distribution in C. elegans embryos. This strategy involves two complementary mechanisms: a first mechanism that acts in the mother cell to enrich PIE-1 in the cytoplasm destined for the germline daughter, and a second mechanism that acts after cell division to degrade any PIE-1 left over in the somatic daughter.

PIE-1 Segregation to the Germ Lineage Depends Primarily on Mechanisms Acting at the Protein Level and Does Not Require Binding to Centrosomes
The presence of maternally encoded pie-1 mRNA in embryos raised the possibility that PIE-1 asymmetry might be regulated at the RNA level. Our results, however, argue against this possibility. First, we found that noncoding sequences in the pie-1 mRNA are neither necessary nor sufficient to localize PIE-1. Second, the two localization domains we identified in the pie-1 open reading frame are functional when fused in-frame to GFP but not when fused out-of-frame. Third, missense mutations predicted to disrupt zinc binding by the CCCH fingers eliminated or reduced the localization properties of each domain. Together, these data indicate that PIE-1 asymmetry is regulated primarily by mechanisms acting on the PIE-1 protein rather than the pie-1 RNA. Our results, however, do not exclude the possibility that RNA-based mechanisms are also functioning in parallel, perhaps to ensure that high levels of PIE-1 are maintained in germline blastomeres. Two lines of evidence support this possibility. First, in situ hybridization studies have shown that after the 4-cell stage pie-1 mRNA is maintained only in germline blastomeres and is lost from somatic lineages (Tenenhaus et al., 1998). Second, as shown in this study, replacement of the pie-1 3′ UTR with the let-858 3′ UTR causes a reduction in PIE-1:GFP levels in germline blastomeres. These observations suggest that mechanisms acting on the pie-1 RNA may exist to reinforce the asymmetry established by mechanisms acting on the PIE-1 protein. A similar situation has been described for Drosophila Prospero. In dividing neuroblasts, Prospero RNA, like Prospero protein, is targeted to a basal crescent during mitosis and is inherited preferentially by the basal daughter (Li et al., 1997; Brodus et al., 1998). Unlike asymmetric segregation of Prospero protein, asymmetric segregation of Prospero RNA is not essential and is only required when Prospero activity has been compromised (Brodus et al., 1998).

During mitosis, PIE-1 accumulates on centrosomes with a preference for the centrosome destined for the germline daughter. We have mapped the domain responsible for this localization down to a 21 amino acid region near the amino terminus of PIE-1. By itself, this domain can target GFP to mitotic centrosomes but shows no preference for germline centrosomes. Deletion of this domain eliminates binding to centrosomes but does not affect PIE-1's ability to segregate asymmetrically. We conclude that association with centrosomes is neither necessary nor sufficient for PIE-1 asymmetry. This finding is in agreement with the results of Schumacher et al. (1998), who showed that PIE-1 asymmetry is maintained in some embryos depleted for AIR-1, a centrosomal kinase essential for PIE-1's interaction with centrosomes.

PIE-1 Segregation Is Mediated by Two Complementary Mechanisms
We have identified two domains in PIE-1 required for asymmetric segregation in embryos. A first domain near the carboxyl terminus including PIE-1's second CCCH
finger is necessary and sufficient to enrich PIE-1 before cell division in the area of the cytoplasm destined for the next germline blastomere ("germline side"). Our observations of PIE-GFP fusion in live embryos indicate that in the 1-cell stage enrichment results from both a decrease in PIE-1 levels in the anterior and an increase in PIE-1 levels in the posterior. This pattern is consistent with the possibility that PIE-1 moves from anterior to posterior. Alternatively, PIE-1 could be degraded locally in the anterior while also being translated throughout the entire cytoplasm. We attempted to address directly whether protein degradation and/or protein synthesis might be involved by treating embryos with proteasome inhibitors (MG 132 and LLnL) and with the protein synthesis inhibitor cycloheximide. These drugs eliminated PIE-1 asymmetry before cleavage but also completely blocked progression through the cell cycle (K. J. R. and G. S., unpublished data), making it difficult to identify any specific storage or shuttling of PIE-1. Although data indicate that localized degradation contributes to PIE-1 asymmetry after cell division (see below), we do not yet know whether PIE-1 asymmetry before cell division is due to localized degradation, movement, or a combination of both.

Enrichment of PIE-1 on the germline side is not absolute; low levels remain on the somatic side at the time of cleavage. Time-lapse recording and quantitation of PIE-1::GFP levels over time reveal that these low levels are inherited by the somatic daughter but are not maintained in that cell. Surprisingly, we found that this loss depends on the first CCCH finger in PIE-1 (ZF1). Cysto-Ser mutations in ZF1 stabilize PIE-1::GFP in somatic blastomeres and their descendants without significantly affecting PIE-1 asymmetry before cell division. Furthermore, fusion of ZF1 to GFP is sufficient to cause GFP to be degraded specifically in somatic blastomeres but is not sufficient to promote asymmetric enrichment before cell division. Since these data demonstrate that predivision enrichment and postdivision degradation can occur independently from one another and require different domains in PIE-1, we conclude that these two processes are mediated by distinct mechanisms.

Regulation of PIE-1 Asymmetry by PAR-1
How do the mechanisms that localize PIE-1 become polarized along the anterior/posterior axis? Establishment of anterior/posterior polarity in the zygote depends on the actin cytoskeleton and on a network of cortical proteins that become asymmetrically localized after fertilization (Rose and Kemphues, 1998). Among these, PAR-1 is essential for most asymmetries that appear in the zygote and its descendants. Consistent with the idea that the mechanisms that localize PIE-1 are dependent on the establishment of A/P polarity, both an intact cytoskeleton and PAR-1 are required for PIE-1 asymmetry (this study; Tenenhaus et al., 1998). PAR-1 localizes to the posterior cortex in the zygote and is segregated into P, during the first cleavage (Guo and Kemphues, 1995). Like PIE-1, PAR-1 initially is uniformly distributed in P, and becomes localized to the posterior (where P, will form) before cell division. Asymmetric segregation of PAR-1 is repeated in each germline blastomere. This dynamic localization pattern suggests the intriguing possibility that PAR-1 regulates PIE-1 asymmetry by creating a local environment where PIE-1 is protected from degradation. In support of this possibility, we have found that in the absence of par-1 activity, ZF1-dependent degradation is activated in all cells. Furthermore, PIE-1 is found in focal domains in par-3 mutants where PAR-1 is mislocalized (Tenenhaus et al., 1998). How PAR-1, a putative serine/threonine kinase enriched on the cortex, influences PIE-1 stability in the cytoplasm remains to be determined. Recently, the cytoplasmic protein MEX-5 and its closely related homolog MEX-6 have been shown to function downstream of PAR-1 to inhibit the expression of PIE-1 and other germline proteins in the anterior (Schubert et al., 2000). These findings raise the possibility that PAR-1 may affect PIE-1 stability indirectly by excluding MEX-5 and MEX-6 from the posterior end of the embryo.

Regulation of Protein Localization by CCCH Fingers
PIE-1 belongs to a large family of proteins characterized by one or more CCCH (cysteine and histidine-rich) zinc fingers. These fingers are linked to motifs containing the amino acids Gly-Ser-Pro and the Zinc finger is necessary and sufficient to enrich PIE-1 before cell division in the area of the cytoplasm destined for the next germline blastomere ("germline side"). Our observations of PIE-GFP fusion in live embryos indicate that in the 1-cell stage enrichment results from both a decrease in PIE-1 levels in the anterior and an increase in PIE-1 levels in the posterior. This pattern is consistent with the possibility that PIE-1 moves from anterior to posterior. Alternatively, PIE-1 could be degraded locally in the anterior while also being translated throughout the entire cytoplasm. We attempted to address directly whether protein degradation and/or protein synthesis might be involved by treating embryos with proteasome inhibitors (MG 132 and LLnL) and with the protein synthesis inhibitor cycloheximide. These drugs eliminated PIE-1 asymmetry before cleavage but also completely blocked progression through the cell cycle (K. J. R. and G. S., unpublished data), making it difficult to identify any specific storage or shuttling of PIE-1. Although data indicate that localized degradation contributes to PIE-1 asymmetry after cell division (see below), we do not yet know whether PIE-1 asymmetry before cell division is due to localized degradation, movement, or a combination of both.

Enrichment of PIE-1 on the germline side is not absolute; low levels remain on the somatic side at the time of cleavage. Time-lapse recording and quantitation of PIE-1::GFP levels over time reveal that these low levels are inherited by the somatic daughter but are not maintained in that cell. Surprisingly, we found that this loss depends on the first CCCH finger in PIE-1 (ZF1). Cysto-Ser mutations in ZF1 stabilize PIE-1::GFP in somatic blastomeres and their descendants without significantly affecting PIE-1 asymmetry before cell division. Furthermore, fusion of ZF1 to GFP is sufficient to cause GFP to be degraded specifically in somatic blastomeres but is not sufficient to promote asymmetric enrichment before cell division. Since these data demonstrate that predivision enrichment and postdivision degradation can occur independently from one another and require different domains in PIE-1, we conclude that these two processes are mediated by distinct mechanisms.

Regulation of PIE-1 Asymmetry by PAR-1
How do the mechanisms that localize PIE-1 become polarized along the anterior/posterior axis? Establishment of anterior/posterior polarity in the zygote depends on the actin cytoskeleton and on a network of cortical proteins that become asymmetrically localized after fertilization (Rose and Kemphues, 1998). Among these, PAR-1 is essential for most asymmetries that appear in the zygote and its descendants. Consistent with the idea that the mechanisms that localize PIE-1 are dependent on the establishment of A/P polarity, both an intact cytoskeleton and PAR-1 are required for PIE-1 asymmetry (this study; Tenenhaus et al., 1998). PAR-1 localizes to the posterior cortex in the zygote and is segregated into P, during the first cleavage (Guo and Kemphues, 1995). Like PIE-1, PAR-1 initially is uniformly distributed in P, and becomes localized to the posterior (where P, will form) before cell division. Asymmetric segregation of PAR-1 is repeated in each germline blastomere. This dynamic localization pattern suggests the intriguing possibility that PAR-1 regulates PIE-1 asymmetry by creating a local environment where PIE-1 is protected from degradation. In support of this possibility, we have found that in the absence of par-1 activity, ZF1-dependent degradation is activated in all cells. Furthermore, PIE-1 is found in focal domains in par-3 mutants where PAR-1 is mislocalized (Tenenhaus et al., 1998). How PAR-1, a putative serine/threonine kinase enriched on the cortex, influences PIE-1 stability in the cytoplasm remains to be determined. Recently, the cytoplasmic protein MEX-5 and its closely related homolog MEX-6 have been shown to function downstream of PAR-1 to inhibit the expression of PIE-1 and other germline proteins in the anterior (Schubert et al., 2000). These findings raise the possibility that PAR-1 may affect PIE-1 stability indirectly by excluding MEX-5 and MEX-6 from the posterior end of the embryo.

Regulation of Protein Localization by CCCH Fingers
PIE-1 belongs to a large family of proteins characterized by one or more CCCH (cysteine and histidine-rich) zinc fingers. These fingers are linked to motifs containing the amino acids Gly-Ser-Pro and the
Cloning

Sequence information from Y49E10 was used to PCR-amplify a 7.7 kb genomic clone containing the pie-1 gene. Oligonucleotides 2430 bases upstream of the pie-1 ATG and 3202 bases downstream of TAA were used as primers. GFP was fused to the PIE-1 open reading frame either immediately after the second ATG (codon 11; pJ H3.99) or immediately before the TAA codon (pJ H3.92). Both fusions gave identical GFP patterns in embryos and could rescue the maternal effect lethality of a pie-1(0) mutation (data not shown). Mutant derivatives of pJ H3.99 (pJ H4.40, pJ H4.87, pJ H4.91, pJ H5.02, pJ H5.43, pJ H5.59, pKR1.38, pKR1.55, pKR1.75) and pJ H3.92 (pKR1.39) were constructed by recombinant PCR using overlapping mutagenic oligos. Replacement of the pie-1 3' UTR with that of let-856 was accomplished by replacing 524 bp directly downstream of the pie-1 TAA with the let-856 3' UTR (Kelly et al., 1997).


The MEX-1, POS-1, and TTP fingers were amplified using oligonucleotides based on published sequences (DuBois et al., 1990; Worthington et al., 1996; Guedes and Priess, 1997; Tabara et al., 1998) and cloned into pKR1.42 for expression in embryos.

Transgenic Lines

All transgenic lines were generated using the complex array method of Kelly et al. (1997), which prevents transgene silencing in the adult germline. In the course of our experiments, we learned that growth at 25°C improves expression from complex arrays (Strome, personal communication and K. J. R., unpublished observations), so some transformants were grown at 25°C before scoring for GFP. The embryos inside a minimum of 6 roller hermaphrodites were examined for each line. In all cases, lines transformed with the same construct exhibited identical patterns, although expression levels often varied significantly between lines. In most lines, GFP expression was maintained only for a few generations (3-4) before being silenced, although exceptional lines that remained GFP positive for more than ten generations were also recovered.

To examine transgenes in the absence of endogenous PIE-1, we either injected pie-1 (zu154) unc-25 (e156)/qC1 animals with the transgene of interest, or alternatively, we crossed stable transgenic lines with dpy-18(e364) pie-1(e1217)/eT1 let-500 or pie-1 (zu154) unc-25 (e156)/qC1 animals. The resulting Dpy Rol or Unc Rol hermaphrodites were examined for expression before being scored for GFP. The eggs inside a minimum of 6 roller hermaphrodites were examined for GFP fluorescence. Only embryos 15-cell and younger were analyzed since later pie-1(0) embryos have lineage defects (Mello et al., 1992).

RNA-Mediated Interference (RNAi)

par-1 sense and antisense transcripts were generated from plasmid ZC22 (Guo and Kemphues, 1995) using the Megascript kit (Ambion). Double-stranded RNA (200 ng/uL) was microinjected into Roller adult hermaphrodites expressing the GFP construct of interest. Embryos within these adults were examined by fluorescence microscopy the next morning. As expected for loss of par-1 activity, 99.8% (562/563) of these embryos failed to hatch (embryonic lethal).

Inhibitor Studies

Early 2-cell stage embryos expressing PIE-1::GFP were processed as described by Edgar (1995) to remove their eggshell and vitelline membrane. Embryos were then washed in simple embryonic growth media (SGM) (Shelton and Bowerman, 1996), placed onto slides in SGM with or without the inhibitor (0.01 mg/ml of Cytochalasin D or Nocodazole [Sigma]), and examined immediately using Nomarski optics. PIE-1::GFP localization was scored 10 min later. At that time in control embryos, AB had completed cleavage, and PIE-1 had become localized to the posterior of P.

Time-Lapse Microscopy and Fluorescence Quantitation

Embryos were mounted on agarose pads as described previously (Waddele et al., 1996) in a media recommended by Lois Edgar, University of Colorado (60 mM NaCl, 32 mM KCl, 3 mM Na2HPO4, 2 mM MgCl2, 2 mM CaCl2, 5 mM HEPES [pH 7.2], 0.2% glucose). Time-lapse microscopy was performed on an Olympus BX51 60X microscope using a MicroMax-S12EBF CCD from Princeton Instruments. For the single focal plane image series shown in Figure 1, Nomarski DIC and GFP epifluorescence images were collected every 5 s using a 60×, 1.4 NA UPlanApo objective and an additional 1.25× magnification. Exposure times were 0.3 s for GFP fluorescence and 0.1 s for Nomarski DIC. Images were acquired with custom software (jImage4D, http://hamon.swmed.edu/~jwaddle/jimage4d.html) and appended into a single multi-image TIFF file using Scion Image for Windows NT (Scion Corporation).

To quantitate GFP fluorescence for the graphs shown in Figure 4, three-dimensional time-lapse imaging was performed on three embryos expressing wild-type PIE-1::GFP and three embryos expressing PIE-1::GFP with ZF1 mutated. Sixteen optical sections, each 1.5 microns apart (256 × 256 pixels at 0.02 micron/pixel) were collected every 60 s from the 2-cell stage to the 12-cell stage; exposure times were 0.25 s for both the fluorescence and the Nomarski DIC channels. In all cases, the raw pixel values were within the linear range of the CCD camera (0-4095). Using a custom program (EditView4D, J. Waddle, unpublished) the image data was subjected to the LLS-MAP deconvolution algorithm to assign out-of-focus light back to its point of origin (Gibson and Lanni, 1991; Preza et al., 1992a, 1992b; the LLS-MAP code was kindly provided by K. Doolittle of the Washington University Biomedical Computer Laboratory: http://www.bio.wustl.edu/bc/xcossm/xcossm.html). After deconvolution, the three-dimensional stacks were cropped to a cubic region that just bound the embryo or the EMS cell. Mean pixel values for GFP fluorescence in the entire embryo or in the EMS cell were calculated for each time point from the sum of the individual pixel values (GFP fluorescence) in the appropriate volume. To correct for autofluorescence, the mean fluorescence from an identically treated non-GFP-expressing embryo was subtracted from the values obtained for the GFP-expressing embryos. Microsoft Excel was used to plot the average (N=3) fluorescence remaining at any time point relative to the birth of EMS. Error bars report the 95% confidence limits in the mean values. Start and end mean pixel values for the plots shown in Figure 4 were as follows: WT PIE-1::GFP, total embryo (17.36, 11.73); EMS (36.22, 10.28); ZF1 mutant, total embryo (60.99, 41.43); EMS (71.29; 60.55).
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