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SUMMARY
Transforming growth factor beta (TGF-β) signaling, mediated through the transcription factors Smad2 and Smad3 (Smad2/3), directs different responses in different cell types. Here we report that Smad3 co-occupies the genome with cell-type-specific master transcription factors. Thus, Smad3 occupies the genome with Oct4 in embryonic stem cells (ESCs), Myod1 in myotubes, and PU.1 in pro-B cells. We find that these master transcription factors are required for Smad3 occupancy and that TGF-β signaling largely affects the genes bound by the master transcription factors. Furthermore, we show that induction of Myod1 in nonmuscle cells is sufficient to redirect Smad3 to Myod1 sites. We conclude that cell-type-specific master transcription factors determine the genes bound by Smad2/3 and are thus responsible for orchestrating the cell-type-specific effects of TGF-β signaling.

INTRODUCTION
Signaling pathways allow cells to respond to their environment and frequently act by regulating gene expression. The terminal components of these pathways tend to occupy the genes they regulate (Darnell et al., 1994; Jarriault et al., 1995; Kim et al., 1997; Molenar et al., 1996; Pokholok et al., 2006; Sen and Baltimore, 1986; Zawel et al., 1998) and modulate gene expression through activities that include recruitment of coactivators and chromatin-remodeling machinery, modification of transcription factors, and activation of transcription (Clevers, 2006; Guasconi and Puri, 2009; Kopan and Ilagan, 2009; Massagué et al., 2005; Natoli, 2009; O’Shea et al., 2002). In this way, external signals produce transcriptional responses that allow cells to respond to cues from their environment.

Signaling pathways are required throughout development and play essential roles in numerous disease processes. It is notable that any one signaling pathway can direct very different responses in different cell types (Clevers, 2006; Guasconi and Puri, 2009; Kopan and Ilagan, 2009; Massagué et al., 2005; O’Shea et al., 2002). How an extracellular signal produces cell-type-specific responses remains poorly understood, but these diverse responses govern nearly every aspect of cell physiology from growth to differentiation and death.

TGF-β signaling regulates processes that include stem cell maintenance, cell proliferation, differentiation, and apoptosis (Massagué et al., 2005; Ross and Hill, 2008). Activation of the TGF-β receptor by TGF-β, Activin, or Nodal leads to phosphorylation of the transcription factors Smad2 and Smad3 (Smad2/3). Once phosphorylated, these transcription factors accumulate in the nucleus in association with Smad4 (Massagué et al., 2005; Ross and Hill, 2008). Smad3 and the less common isoform of Smad2 can both bind DNA directly through interaction with the Smad-binding element (SBE) (Dennler et al., 1998; Shi et al., 1998; Zawel et al., 1998). However, due to the low affinity of this interaction, Smad transcription factors must interact with additional transcription factors in order to form stable complexes with DNA (Massagué et al., 2005; Ross and Hill, 2008; Shi et al., 1998).

We mapped genome-wide binding of Smad3 in embryonic stem cells (ESCs), myotubes, and pro-B cells and found that a small set of cell-type-specific master transcription factors direct Smad3 to cell-type-specific binding sites and determine cell-type-specific responses to TGF-β signaling. These results are surprising as previous work has suggested that many different transcription factors in a cell are each responsible for directing Smad3 binding to a small number of sites, and it is the sum of these interactions that determines the cell-type-specific response to TGF-β signaling (Massagué and Gomis, 2006; Massagué et al., 2005; Seoane et al., 2004). Furthermore, we find that master transcription factors help direct Smad3 binding by establishing open chromatin that contains SBEs, allowing Smad3 to bind DNA and form a physical complex with the master transcription factors.

RESULTS

SMAD3 Co-occupies the Genome with OCT4 in Human and Murine ESCs
We first investigated whether SMAD3 is directed to DNA sites co-occupied by the master transcription factor OCT4 in human embryonic stem cells (ESCs). We found that SMAD3 co-occupies the genome with OCT4 in both human and murine ESCs. This co-occupancy is highly specific, as SMAD3 binds to a small number of sites that are only shared with OCT4. Moreover, we found that induction of Myod1 in nonmuscle cells is sufficient to redirect Smad3 to Myod1 sites. We conclude that cell-type-specific master transcription factors determine the genes bound by Smad2/3 and are thus responsible for orchestrating the cell-type-specific effects of TGF-β signaling.
ESCs, where activation of SMAD2/3 is required to maintain hESC identity (Beattie et al., 2005; James et al., 2005; Vallier et al., 2005, 2009; Xu et al., 2008). ChIP-seq was performed to determine genome-wide targets of SMAD3 and OCT4 in hESCs. If SMAD3 is directed to DNA targets by the ESC-specific master transcription factor OCT4, we would expect to observe that SMAD3 and OCT4 bind to the same classes of genes across the genome. Analysis of the gene targets showed that SMAD3 and OCT4 were predominantly associated with active genes and had a similar distribution to each other across active, silent, and bivalent genes (Figure 1A).

If SMAD3 is directed to target genes by OCT4, then SMAD3 should co-occupy DNA sites with OCT4, whereas if SMAD3 is directed to target genes by many different transcription factors, the global binding of SMAD3 and OCT4 should not be coincident. Examination of SMAD3 and OCT4 binding at individual hESC genes revealed that SMAD3 occupies sites with OCT4; for example, the two transcription factors bind the same sites at POU5F1 and LEFTY1 (Figure 1B). Furthermore, this binding pattern occurs throughout the genome (Figure 1C; Table S1 available online). Indeed, over 80% of the 1000 highest-confidence SMAD3-bound

See also Figure S1 and Tables S1 and S2.
sites are co-occupied by OCT4 (p < 1e-290, Tables S1 and S2).

It is possible that SMAD3 co-occupies the genome with many different factors, only one of which is OCT4. If this were true, then many different DNA-binding motifs would be present at sites bound by SMAD3. However, if SMAD3 binding is highly associated with OCT4, the OCT4 motif should be most enriched at SMAD3 sites. De novo motif discovery was performed (Bailey and Elkan, 1994) on sites bound by SMAD3 and sites bound by OCT4. The most enriched motif identifiable at sites bound by each factor was indeed the OCT4 motif (Figures 1D and S1). The canonical SBE was not found by de novo motif discovery at sites bound by SMAD3 (Figure 1D, bottom), which likely reflects the difficulty in determining enrichment of a four-nucleotide motif. However, if SMAD3 and OCT4 co-occupy DNA, then SBEs should be enriched at SMAD3 and OCT4 sites. We scanned the DNA sequence around the sites bound by each factor and found that SBEs are enriched at sites bound by SMAD3 and sites bound by OCT4 (Figure 1E). These results are consistent with the model that in hESCs, SMAD3 predominantly occupies sites with OCT4 throughout the genome.

Although human and murine (m) ESCs respond differently to TGF-β signaling (James et al., 2005), both cell types require the master transcription factor Oct4 to maintain cell identity (Chambers and Smith, 2004), so we investigated whether Smad3 also co-occupies sites with Oct4 in mESCs. Global analysis of Smad3 and Oct4 binding in mESCs revealed that these transcription factors occupy the same classes of genes as (Figure 1G) and throughout the genome (Figure 1H, p < 1e-300). Furthermore, the Oct4 DNA motif was the most enriched motif at sites bound by Smad3 and sites bound by Oct4 (Figure 1I), and these sites were also enriched for SBEs (Figure 1J). These results show that Smad3 co-occupies the genome with the master transcription factor Oct4 in both human and murine ESCs (Figure 1K).

Smad2/3 has been shown to interact with many different transcription factors (Massagué et al., 2005; Ross and Hill, 2008), and the analysis described thus far does not eliminate the possibility that Smad3 co-occupies sites with many different transcription factors other than Oct4 in ESCs. To determine whether Smad3 co-occupies sites with other characterized transcription factors, we analyzed ChIP-seq data for six different factors in ESCs. Examination of binding data at individual genes such as that encoding Max (Figure 2A) revealed that Smad3 co-occupied sites with Oct4 and Sox2 and Nanog, which are key ESC transcription factors that occupy the genome together (Boyer et al., 2005; Chen et al., 2008; Marson et al., 2008). In contrast, Smad3 did not occupy sites bound by Ronin, Zfx, or c-Myc, despite previous evidence that c-Myc can interact with Smad2/3 in other cell types (Chen et al., 2008; Dejosez et al., 2010; Feng et al., 2002). Genome-wide analysis confirmed that Smad3 tended to co-occupy sites with Oct4, Sox2, and Nanog but rarely co-occupied sites with Ronin, Zfx, or c-Myc (Figures 2B and S2A; Table S1). We further quantified the preference for Smad3 to co-occupy sites with these factors by calculating the percent of Smad3 sites co-occupied by each factor.
and determining the distance from each Smad3 site to the nearest binding site for each transcription factor (Figure 2D). Over 90% of the top 1000 Smad3 sites were co-occupied by Oct4, Sox2, and Nanog individually, whereas only a small fraction of Smad3 sites were co-occupied by Ronin, Zfx, or c-Myc (Figure 2C). Furthermore, the majority of sites occupied by Ronin, Zfx, or c-Myc are located far from sites occupied by Smad3 (Figure 2D). Thus in mESCs, Smad3 tends to co-occupy the genome specifically at sites bound by Oct4, Sox2, and Nanog.

**Oct4 Recruits Smad3**

If Oct4 directs Smad3 to sites in ESCs, then we would expect Oct4 and Smad3 to co-occupy the same sites at the same time. We performed chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) for Smad3 in mESCs, followed by western analysis to detect Oct4. Whole-cell extract (WCE) was used as a loading control. mESCs were grown under standard culture conditions unless otherwise specified.

We performed ChIP for Smad3 in mESCs, followed by western analysis to detect Oct4 and Smad3. The fold enrichment of Oct4 and Smad3 at the indicated genes (x axis) relative to an unbound control region is shown. Error bars indicate standard deviation.

**Figure 3. Oct4 Recruits Smad3**

(A) Smad3 and Oct4 are part of the same complex. ChIP was performed for Smad3 and IgG in mESCs followed by western to detect Oct4. Whole-cell extract (WCE) was used as a loading control. mESCs were grown under standard culture conditions unless otherwise specified.

(B) pSmad3 interacts with Oct4, and this interaction is dependent on TGF-β signaling. mESCs were grown without (−) or with (+) SB431542 (TGF inhibit) for 24 hr. Co-IPs with antibodies against pSmad3 and IgG were performed on nuclear lysates. Precipitated complexes were probed for Oct4.

(C) Smad3 and Oct4 bind DNA sites at the same time. Oct4 ChIP was performed followed by re-ChIP using antibodies against Smad3 and IgG. qPCR was performed in triplicate to quantify the fold enrichment (y axis) of Smad3 and IgG at the indicated genes (x axis) relative to an unbound control region. Error bars indicate standard deviation.

(D) Smad3 and Oct4 simultaneously occupy the Lefty1 enhancer. A 40 bp probe from the Lefty1 enhancer was incubated with nuclear extracts from mESCs (left lane). Nuclear extracts and probe were also incubated with cold competitor, antibody against Smad3, or antibody against Oct4. The complex formed by Smad3 and Oct4 (Smad/Oct) is supershifted (SS) by both antibodies. mESCs were cultured with SB431542 for 24 hr and then washed to remove inhibitor before treating with Activin for 1 hr to activate TGF-β signaling.

(E) Smad3 levels are not affected by loss of Oct4. ZHBTc4 mESCs were cultured in the absence or presence of dox for 24 hr. Western blot was performed to quantify levels of Smad3 and Oct4. Twenty-five micrograms and five micrograms of cell lysates were loaded. TBP was used as a loading control.

(F) Oct4 is required for Smad3 binding. ChIP was performed for Smad3 in ZHBTc4 mESCs without dox (Smad3 ChIP Oct4 nl) and with dox for 24 hr (Smad3 ChIP Oct4 kd). qPCR was performed to quantify the fold enrichment of Smad3 (y axis) at the indicated genes (x axis). Fold enrichment was normalized to IgG. Error bars indicate standard deviation.

(G) Oct4 is required for genes to respond to TGF-β signaling. ZHBTc4 mESCs were cultured without or with dox for 24 hr. Cells were then washed and treated with Activin for 1 hr prior to analysis of gene expression by qPCR. The fold reduction of Oct4 expression after 24 hr of dox (left) and the fold reduction in TGF-β response for genes co-occupied by Oct4 and Smad3 (right) are shown. Error bars indicate standard deviation.

(H) Oct4 sites are more tightly associated with Sox2 than Smad3. The distances from the Oct4 peak to the peaks of Sox2 (black) and Smad3 (red) were calculated for each region bound by Oct4, Sox2, and Smad3 (1849 regions). The distances between peaks were organized into 5 base pair bins, and the number of peaks in each bin (y axis) is shown over a 0.6 kb window (x axis) centered on the Oct4 peak at position 0. The distance between Oct4 and Sox2 sites is defined as positive.

(I) Oct4 sites are depleted of nucleosomes. ChIP-seq was performed to map genome-wide H3 occupancy. The relative H3 density (y axis) is shown across a 2 kb window (x axis) centered on sites occupied by Oct4.

suggesting that both Oct4 and Smad3 were part of the complex bound to the Lefty1 enhancer (Figure 3D).

To determine whether Oct4 is required for recruiting Smad3 to DNA sites bound by Oct4 in ESCs, we inhibited Oct4 expression in ZHBTc4 mESCs with doxycycline (dox) treatment for 24 hr (Niwa et al., 2000). We found that loss of Oct4 did not affect the levels of Smad3 protein (Figure 3E). However, loss of Oct4 expression did result in a dramatic reduction in Smad3 occupancy at key genes normally co-occupied by Oct4 and Smad3 (Figure 3F). Furthermore, loss of Oct4 resulted in reduced responsiveness to TGF-β signaling at genes normally co-occupied by Oct4 and Smad3 (Figure 3G).

Oct4 might recruit Smad3 through a direct interaction and/or by inducing a more open chromatin state to make SBEs available for Smad3 binding. Our evidence suggests that Oct4 and Smad3 are associated in some fashion (Figures 3A–3F), although analysis of the positions of Oct4 and Smad3 binding peaks indicates that these two proteins do not interact in a unique and direct manner such as that observed for Oct4 and Sox2 (Figure 3H).

Analysis of nucleosome occupancy at sites bound by Oct4 revealed that these sites are relatively depleted of nucleosomes (Figure 3I). These results are consistent with the possibility that Oct4 recruits Smad3 to adjacent SBEs that are available due to nucleosome depletion.

**Smad3 Co-occupies the Genome with Master Transcription Factors in Various Cell Types**

We next investigated whether Smad3 co-occupies the genome of additional cell types with the master transcription factors of those cell types. We performed ChiP-seq analysis for Myod1 in myotubes (Davis et al., 1987; Tapscott, 2005) and PU.1 in pro-B cells (DeKoter and Singh, 2000; Nutt and Kee, 2007) and found that sites bound by Oct4, Myod1, and PU.1 were largely unique (Figure 4A; Table S1). We also performed ChiP-seq analysis of Smad3 binding in myotubes and pro-B cells and found that Smad3 also tends to bind unique sites in these different cell types (Figure 4B).

If Smad3 is recruited to DNA sites by master transcription factors, then we would expect Smad3 sites in each cell type to be occupied by the master transcription factor found in that cell type. We initially analyzed the top 1000 bound sites for Smad3 in mESCs, myotubes, and pro-B cells and asked whether those sites were occupied by master transcription factors (Figures 4C and S3A). Indeed, Oct4 occupied sites with Smad3 in mESCs or pro-B cells but did not occupy sites bound by Smad3 in myotubes or pro-B cells. Myod1 occupied sites with Smad3 in myotubes, and PU.1 occupied sites with Smad3 in pro-B cells. We next analyzed all Smad3 sites in each cell type, which confirmed that Smad3 tends to co-occupy sites with the cell-type-specific master transcription factors (Figure S3B).

The cell-type-specific association of master transcription factors and Smad3 was striking at individual genes (Figure 4D). For example, Smad3 and Oct4 co-occupied sites at the gene encoding Sox2 in mESCs, but these sites were not occupied by Smad3 or Myod1 in myotubes or Smad3 or PU.1 in pro-B cells. The gene encoding Adora1 was uniquely co-occupied by Smad3 and Myod1 in myotubes, and the gene encoding Vpreb2 was uniquely occupied by Smad3 and PU.1 in pro-B cells. Genome-wide analysis confirmed that Smad3 occupied unique sites with Oct4 in mESCs, Myod1 in myotubes, and PU.1 in pro-B cells (Figure 4E). In addition, motif discovery revealed enrichment of the Myod1 motif in Smad3-bound regions of myotubes and the PU.1 motif in Smad3-bound regions of pro-B cells (Figure 4F), further supporting the conclusion that Smad3 co-occupies the genome with cell-type-specific master transcription factors.

We next investigated whether interactions could be detected between Smad3 and the master transcription factors of each cell type and whether Smad3 binding depends on Myod1 in myotubes and PU.1 in pro-B cells. We found that Smad3 immuno-precipitated with Oct4 in mESCs, Myod1 in myotubes, and PU.1 in pro-B cells (Figure 4G). We next asked whether knockdown of Myod1 affected binding of Smad3 in myotubes. Myoblasts were transfected with Myod1 siRNA, and a 52% knockdown of Myod1 was observed after 48 hr of myotube differentiation. The reduction in Myod1 was associated with an intermediate level of myotube differentiation (data not shown) and resulted in decreased Smad3 occupancy at sites normally co-occupied with Myod1 (Figure S3C). Similarly, deletion of PU.1 and the functionally redundant protein Spi-B (DeKoter et al., 2002) in pro-B cells resulted in decreased Smad3 occupancy at sites co-occupied by PU.1 (Figure S3D). Together these results suggest that master transcription factors are required for wild-type levels of Smad3 recruitment.

If Smad3 binds DNA at sites with cell-type-specific master transcription factors, then SBEs should be enriched at these sites. We scanned Oct4, Myod1, and PU.1 sites and found that these sites were each enriched for SBEs (Figure 4H). This result indicates that Smad3 binds a unique subset of SBEs in each cell type, and that this subset is associated with sites bound by the cell-type-specific master transcription factors.

Finally, we investigated whether nucleosome depletion occurs at sites bound by cell-type-specific master transcription factors and Smad3, as increased accessibility of SBEs in these regions may contribute to Smad3 binding. Genome-wide ChiP-seq analysis of histone H3 occupancy revealed that master transcription factors occupied cell-type-specific regions that were relatively depleted of nucleosomes (Figure S3E). In addition, Smad3 and the master transcription factors co-occupied unique nucleosome-depleted regions in each cell type (Figure 4I). For example, in mESCs, Oct4 and Smad3 co-occupied sites that were relatively depleted of nucleosomes (Figure 4I, left, blue), whereas sites occupied by Smad3 and Myod1 in myotubes (purple) or Smad3 and PU.1 in pro-B cells (green) were not associated with significant nucleosome depletion in mESCs. Nucleosome depletion was unchanged when TGF-β signaling was inhibited (Figure S3F), suggesting that Smad3 did not affect nucleosome occupancy but was directed to sites that were already depleted of nucleosomes. Thus, Smad3 appears to bind unique SBEs in nucleosome-depleted regions adjacent to master transcription factors in each cell type (Figure 4J).

**Smad3 Can Occupy Different Cell-Type-Specific Enhancers at the Same Gene**

Master transcription factors can bind cell-type-specific enhancers (Heintzman et al., 2009). Thus, we would expect that
Figure 4. Smad3 Co-occupies DNA with Cell-Type-Specific Master Transcription Factors

(A) Master transcription factors bind unique sites in different cell types. The Venn diagram shows the overlap of sites bound by Oct4 in mESCs (blue), Myod1 in myotubes (purple), and PU.1 in pro-B cells (green) (Table S1). The total number of bound sites is indicated for each shaded area. Three percent of all sites overlap in at least two cell types (indicated by dotted lines).

(B) Smad3 binds unique sites in different cell types. The Venn diagram shows the overlap of Smad3-bound regions between mESCs (blue), myotubes (purple), and pro-B cells (green). One percent of Smad3-bound sites overlap in at least two cell types. Myotubes and Pro-B cells were treated with TGF-β prior to analysis of Smad3 binding.

(C) Smad3 co-occupies sites with master transcription factors that are cell type specific. The 1000 strongest Smad3-binding sites (by peak height) were chosen from each cell type for analysis (top left). The co-occupancy of Oct4 (bottom left), Myod1 (bottom center), and PU.1 (bottom right) with Smad3 in each cell type is shown.
Smad3 could occupy different enhancers of the same gene in different cell types. We analyzed the intersection of genes bound by Smad3 in mESCs, myotubes, and pro-B cells. Whereas only 1% of the Smad3-binding sites were occupied in more than one cell type (Figure 4B), 13% of genes bound by Smad3 were occupied by Smad3 in more than one cell type (Figure 5A). Analysis of individual genes showed that Smad3 could occupy the same gene in different cell types but usually did so by co-occupying cell-type-specific enhancers with the cell-type-specific master transcription factor (Figure 5B). For example, Id3 was occupied by Oct4 in mESCs and PU.1 in pro-B cells. However, Oct4 and PU.1 occupied Id3 at different sites, and Smad3 co-occupied sites with the cell-type-specific master regulators. Thus, for the small fraction of genes that appear to be targeted by TGF-β signaling in multiple cell types, these genes tend to be bound by Smad3 at different enhancers (Figure 5C).

**TGF-β Signaling Regulates Genes Bound by Master Transcription Factors**

If Smad3 is directed to sites occupied by Oct4, then genes bound by Oct4 should be modulated by TGF-β signaling. Genome-wide expression analysis was performed on mESCs under standard conditions and after treatment with the TGF-β inhibitor SB431542 for 24 hr (James et al., 2005; Ross et al., 2006; Vallier et al., 2005; Xu et al., 2008) to identify genes that are modulated by TGF-β signaling. We found that genes bound by Oct4, Sox2, Nanog, or Smad3 were affected by a block in TGF-β signaling (Figures 6A and 6B; Tables S3 and S4). As a control, we also analyzed genes bound by Zfx, a transcription factor that binds a similar number of genes to Oct4 (Tables S1 and S3) but does not co-occupy sites with Smad3. In contrast to genes bound by Oct4, genes bound by Zfx were not affected by TGF-β signaling (Figure 6B, bottom).

To determine whether key ESC genes bound by Smad3 and Oct4 are direct targets of TGF-β signaling, we next asked whether activation of TGF-β signaling resulted in rapid recruitment of transcriptional coactivators (Ross et al., 2006). mESCs were treated with SB431542 for 24 hr before they were washed and retreated with fresh SB431542 or Activin to activate the TGF-β pathway. ChIP was performed for the histone acetyltransferase p300 1 hr after activation and showed that TGF-β signaling
led to rapid recruitment of p300 to genes co-occupied by Oct4 and Smad3 (Figure 6C).

If master transcription factors direct Smad3 to different targets in different cell types, we would expect that the genes regulated by TGF-β signaling are different in different cell types. Genome-wide expression analysis was performed on myotubes and pro-B cells to identify genes that changed in expression after treatment with TGF-β for 12 hr. Expression changes in myotubes and pro-B cells were also compared to changes in mESCs after inhibition of TGF-β signaling for 24 hr. As expected, a largely unique set of genes was found to be affected in each cell type (Figure 6D, left). We next asked whether the set of genes bound by Smad3 or the master transcription factors in each cell type was associated with the set of genes affected by TGF-β signaling in each cell type. In each case, we found that only genes bound by the cell-type-specific master transcription factor or cell-type-specific Smad3 were significantly affected by TGF-β signaling (Figure 6D, right), indicating that TGF-β signaling regulates genes bound by cell-type-specific master transcription factors.

**Induction of Myod1 Redirects Smad3 Binding in mESCs**

If master transcription factors direct Smad3 to their sites of occupancy, then induction of a master transcription factor that is not normally expressed in a specific cell type should direct Smad3 to the unique sites occupied by the induced master transcription factor. To test this idea, we induced expression of Myod1 in mESCs (Figure 7A) (Nishiyama et al., 2009). ChIP-seq was performed for Smad3 in mESCs that were maintained for 5 days in mESC culture conditions with and without induction of Myod1. Despite expression of Myod1, mESCs maintained expression of Oct4 (Figure 7B). However, expression of Myod1 was sufficient to direct a fraction of Smad3 to sites occupied by Myod1 (Figure 7C). Inspection of ChIP-seq profiles showed that Smad3 continued to occupy sites with Oct4 in the setting of Myod1 expression (Figure 7D), while also occupying new sites with Myod1 (Figure 7E).

**DISCUSSION**

Transcription factors bind specific DNA sequences and regulate gene expression (Ptashne, 1988), and master transcription factors are required for establishment, maintenance, and even reprogramming of cell identity (Takahashi and Yamanaka, 2006; Feng et al., 2008; Lassar et al., 1986; Seale et al., 2008; Zhou et al., 2008; Graf and Enver, 2009). Here we report that master transcription factors also are responsible for directing the gene targets of TGF-β signaling and thus determine the cell-type-specific effects of TGF-β signaling. This conclusion is supported by the finding that Smad3 co-occupies the genome with Oct4 in ESCs, Myod1 in myotubes, and PU.1 in pro-B cells. In addition, Smad3 interacts with these master transcription factors and binds accessible DNA sites adjacent to those bound by master transcription factors. Furthermore, the expression of genes bound by master transcription factors is modulated by TGF-β signaling. Finally,
expression of Myod1 in nonmuscle cells can redirect Smad3 to the new sites occupied by Myod1.

If many different transcription factors can interact with Smad2/3 (Chen et al., 1996, 2002, 1997; Germain et al., 2000; Liu et al., 1997; Massague et al., 2005; Seoane, 2004), why do master transcription factors have such a profound effect in determining the genes regulated by TGF-β signaling in each cell type? The answer may lie in the relative concentration of different transcription factors, as master transcription factors tend to be expressed at high levels compared to other transcription factors (Young, 2011). Thus, the abundance of cell-type-specific master transcription factors may allow them to dominate the competition for interactions with Smad2/3. Recent work in mESCs has also suggested that the Wnt, LIF, and BMP pathways target sites bound by mESC master transcription factors (Chen et al., 2008; Cole et al., 2008; Young, 2011). Our findings now suggest that cell-type-specific master transcription factors may operate in many different cell types, including hematopoietic cells (Trompouki et al., 2011), to determine the gene targets of signaling pathways.

TGF-β signaling, through activation of Smad2 and Smad3, plays an essential role in normal development and tissue homeostasis as well as in human diseases from cancer to autoimmunity to cirrhosis (Friedman, 2008; Li and Flavell, 2008; Massague et al., 2005; Padua and Massague, 2009; Wandzioch and Zaret, 2009). It is therefore critical to understand how activation of Smad2/3 can lead to such diverse cellular responses. Our findings reveal that the cell-type-specific effects of TGF-β signaling are determined in large part by the interaction of Smad2/3 proteins with master transcription factors that specify and maintain cell identity. It is through this mechanism that TGF-β signaling is tailored to modulate genes that are most relevant to...
cell identity, which may explain why aberrations in this pathway can have such profound effects in a range of human diseases.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Cell Culture
hESCs (BG03) were maintained as previously described (Ludwig et al., 2006) using mTESR1 media (Stem Cell Technologies), which contains TGF-β. mESCs were cultured as previously described (Marson et al., 2008). mESCs were maintained on murine embryonic fibroblast (MEF) feeder cells and then passaged two times off feeders prior to analysis. Exogenous Activin was not added to mESC cultures unless stated. When indicated, mESCs were treated with SB431542 (10 μM) for 24 hr to inhibit TGF-β signaling. ZHBTc4 mESCs were treated with dox for 24 hr to repress Oct4 expression as previously described (Niwa et al., 2000). Myod1 was induced in ESCs by dox withdrawal as previously described (Nishiyama et al., 2009). Analysis of Myod1 and PU.1 binding was performed under standard culture conditions, and analysis of Smad3 binding was performed after treatment with TGF-β in myotubes and pro-B cells. See Extended Experimental Procedures for additional details.

Chromatin Immunoprecipitation
ChIP and ChIP coupled with massively parallel sequencing (ChIP-seq) were performed as previously described (Marson et al., 2008). Analysis of H3 occupancy was performed by normalizing the average H3 density across all sites co-occupied by the indicated transcription factors. Antibodies and additional information can be found in the Extended Experimental Procedures.

ChIP-Seq Analysis
Analysis methods were derived from previously published methods (Marson et al., 2008). Briefly, the number of extended reads were calculated in bins across the genome, and bins that contained statistically significant ChIP-seq enrichment were identified by comparison to a Poissonian background model. A p value cutoff of 1e-5 was used in order to analyze comparable numbers of transcriptional regulatory circuitry in human embryonic stem cells. Cell 122, 947–956.

Microarray Analysis
Analysis was performed using Agilent Whole-Mouse Genome Microarrays (Agilent, G4122F) as previously described (Cole et al., 2008). A gene was determined to be significantly affected by TGF-β signaling if its expression level changed by at least 1.5-fold with a p value less than or equal to 0.05. Refer to the Extended Experimental Procedures for details.

Coimmunoprecipitation
Co-IP experiments using nuclear extracts were performed as previously described (Kagey et al., 2010). Refer to the Extended Experimental Procedures for details.

Electrophoretic Mobility Shift Assay
A 40 bp sequence containing adjacent Smad and Oct4 binding sites in the murine Lefty1 enhancer was labeled with [γ-32P]-ATP and incubated with nuclear extract from mESCs treated with Activin for 1 hr. Competitor DNA was used at 100-fold excess to labeled DNA. Supershift was performed by incubating the assembled complex with antibodies against Smad3 and Oct4. Refer to the Extended Experimental Procedures for additional details.

Previously Published ChIP-Seq Datasets Used in This Study
The following previously published datasets were used: Oct4, Nanog, and Sox2 in mESCs (Marson et al., 2008), c-Myc and Zfx in mESCs (Chen et al., 2008), and Ronin in mESCs (Dejosez et al., 2010).

ACCESSION NUMBERS
The ChIP-seq and microarray data are deposited in GEO under accession numbers GSE21621 and GSE23830.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
Supplemental Information includes Extended Experimental Procedures, three figures, and four tables and can be found with this article online at doi:10.1016/j.cell.2011.08.050.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
We are grateful to M.S.H. Ko for the gift of ES[MC1R(20)]:tetMyod1 cells, D. Wolft for the gift of Smad2/3 antibody, and H. Singh for providing the 3BB9 cells with permission from N. Rosenberg. We thank T. Lee and L. Lawton for helpful discussions; J. Love, J.A. Kwon, V. Dhanapal, S. Gupta, and T. Volkert for Illumina sequencing and microarray preparation; G. Frampton and B. Yuan for help with computational analysis; and T. DiCesare for help with graphics. We also thank A. Blais for assistance with siRNA transfection. This work was supported by fellowships from the American Gastroenterological Association and NIH grant DK090122 (A.C.M.), the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (S.B.), and NIH grant HG002668 (R.A.Y.).

Received: May 6, 2011
Revised: July 23, 2011
Accepted: August 24, 2011
Published: October 27, 2011

REFERENCES


