Published in final edited form as:

Cancer Res. 2011 April 1; 71(7): 2781–2792. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-10-3483.

p53 binds to and is required for the repression of *Arf* tumor suppressor by HDAC and Polycomb

Yaxue Zeng^{1,2}, Yojiro Kotake^{1,4}, Xin-Hai Pei¹, Matthew D. Smith¹, and Yue Xiong^{1,2,3}

¹Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

²Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

³Program in Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA

Abstract

The expression of tumor suppressor *Arf* is tightly repressed during normal cell growth at a young age, and is activated by oncogenic insults and during aging, resulting in p53 activation and cell cycle arrest to prevent hyperproliferation. The mechanisms of both transcriptional repression and activation of *Arf* are not understood. We show that p53 binds to and represses *Arf* expression and that this repression requires the function of both histone deacetylase (HDAC) and polycomb group (PcG) proteins. Inactivation of *p53* leads to increased *Arf* transcription in both mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) cultured in vitro and in tissues and organs of *p53* null mice. Activation of endogenous p53 enhances *Arf* repression, and reintroduction of p53 back into *p53* null MEFs restores *Arf* repression. Both DNA binding and trans-activation activities of p53 are required for *Arf* repression. We show that p53 is required for both HDAC and PcG to repress *Arf* expression. Bindings of both HDAC and PcG to *Arf* are disrupted by inactivation of p53 and can be restored in *p53* null MEFs by the reintroduction of wild-type, but not mutant, p53. These results indicate that p53 recruits both HDAC and PcG to *Arf* locus to repress its expression, and this repression constitutes a second feedback loop in p53 regulation.

Keywords

Arf; p53; Ring1B; transcriptional regulation; feedback inhibition

Introduction

Transcription factor p53 mediates cellular response to a wide range of genotoxic and growth stresses, including DNA damage and oncogenic insults (1). Activated p53 increases the expression of numerous genes and elicits three distinct types of cellular outcomes—temporary cell cycle arrest, permanent cell senescence and apoptotic cell death—to prevent damaged or stressed cells from continuing proliferation (2). It is generally believed that escape from the p53-mediated checkpoint pathway is a necessary step for the development of most, if not all, types of tumors (3, 4).

Correspondence: yxiong@email.unc.edu.

⁴Current address, Department of Biochemistry 1, Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, Higashi-ku, Hamamatsu, Japan

Much has been learned on the function of p53 in both senescence and apoptosis (5). Equally important is the regulation of p53 in causing temporary cell cycle arrest. Unlike senescence or apoptosis, both of which are irreversible, a mechanism to inhibit activated p53 is critically important in releasing temporarily arrested cells to resume the cell cycle once the damage is repaired or stress is relieved. One such mechanism to reversibly regulate p53 is the feedback inhibition loop in which p53 activates the expression of its principle inhibitor (6-8), MDM2, which binds to and inhibits the function of p53 by both repressing the transactivating activity of p53 (9, 10), as well as targeting p53 for ubiquitin-mediated degradation (11-13).

The *ARF-p16* locus, which is altered in an estimated 30 – 40% of human tumors, encodes two distinct tumor suppressor gene products, p16^{INK4a} and p14^{ARF} (p19 in mouse), via the use of separate promoters and alternative reading frames (14-16). While p16^{INK4a} binds to and inhibits cyclin Ds-dependent CDK4 and CDK6 to retain the growth suppressive activity of Rb family proteins (17), ARF binds to and antagonizes the activity of MDM2, thereby stabilizing and activating p53 (18-20). The *ARF* gene is expressed at a low level in normally growing young cells. Previous studies have linked two histone modifying complexes, histone deacetylases [HDAC, (21-23)] and polycomb proteins [PcG, (24-30)], to the repression of *Arf* expression. How these two histone modifying complexes, which do not recognize a specific DNA sequence, are recruited to *Arf* locus is not known.

ARF is activated by various oncogenic insults or during cell aging, leading to the notion that ARF mediates an oncogene-checkpoint pathway to prevent oncogenic-stimulated cells from hyperproliferating (15, 31). The potent activity of ARF in binding to and inhibiting the function of MDM2 raises the question of how p53 is reversibly regulated in oncogenically insulted cells where ARF, if continuously expressed, would prevent MDM2 from inhibiting p53 and thus disrupt the MDM2-p53 feedback regulatory loop. It was noted early on that in both human (19, 32) and mouse cells (33, 34), *ARF* expression exhibits a strong inverse correlation with the functional status of p53, suggesting a possible feedback repression of *ARF* expression by p53. The molecular mechanism underlying this feedback regulation is unknown and is the focus of this study.

Materials and Methods

Cell culture, western analysis and antibodies

Mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) and 293T cells were cultured in DMEM with 10% FBS. Cells were lysed with RIPA buffer. Antibodies to Bmi1 (F6, Upstate), Ring1B (ab-3832, Abcam), Suz12 (ab-12073, Abcam), Ezh2 (ab-3748, Abcam), HDAC1 (ab-7028, Abcam), Acetyl-Histone H4 (06-598, Upstate), p53 (FL-393X, Santa Cruz), p19^{Arf} (ab-80, Abcam), mouse p16 (M-156; Santa Cruz), 3m-H3K27 (ab-6002, Abcam), E2F3 (sc-878X, Santa Cruz), Tubulin (Ab-2 DM1A, Neomarkers), Normal Mouse IgG (Neomarkers), Normal Rabbit IgG (Neomarkers) and Actin (C-11; Santa Cruz) were purchased commercially.

Retroviral procedures

The retroviral vector expressing mouse Bmi1 and microRNA targeting 3'-UTR of mouse p53 was provided by Dr. Ned Sharpless and Yizhou He, respectively. Human p53 cDNA was cloned into pBabe-puro retrovirus vector, and point mutations were made by site-directed mutagenesis and verified by DNA sequencing. Retroviruses encoding shRNAs silencing *mBmi1*, *mE2f3*, *mHdac1*, and *mHdac2* were constructed by ligating respective oligonucleotides (see details in Supplementary Materials and Methods) into a PMKO-puro vector. Detailed experimental procedures for retroviral production and infection are described in (30).

Quantitative-RT-PCR

Detailed protocol has been described in (30). Sequences of PCR primers are described in Supplementary Materials and Methods. Mean values and standard deviations were calculated from triplicates of 3 independent repeats.

ChIP assay

ChIP analysis was performed as described in (30). PCR was performed using Platinum Taq polymerase (Invitrogen) and primers on mouse *Arf* locus (see more details in Supplementary Materials and Method). For ChIP-Q-PCR, purified DNA was added to a Q-RT-PCR mixture that contained 1× SYBR Green PCR master mix and 150 nM gene-specific primers. Assays were performed in triplicate on a 7900 HT sequence detection system. Mean values and standard deviations were calculated from triplicates of 3 different repeats.

Results

p53 represses *Arf* expression in vivo

Confirming previous observations (33, 35), we found that the steady state level of *Arf* protein is significantly increased in *p53*-deficient MEFs (Fig. 1A). We also observed a clear increase of p16 protein level in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs, which could be caused by the decrease of *p21* expression and then a reduction in function of the Rb pathway, which collaborates with Polycomb Repressive Complex (PRC) to repress *p16* gene transcription in a feedback loop (30). A demonstration of *Arf* repression by p53 in vivo, however, has been lacking. Therefore, we dissected three pairs of age-matched (one pair at 5-weeks of age and two at 8-weeks of age) wild-type (WT) and *p53* null mice and determined the *Arf* expression in 8 different organs/tissues. This study demonstrated that *Arf* expression was significantly increased by *p53* loss in 4 organs (muscle, kidney, heart and lung), moderately in two (liver and spleen) and unchanged in two (thymus and testis) (Fig. 1B). This result provides the first evidence demonstrating p53-dependent repression of *Arf* in vivo.

To exclude the possibility that *Arf* accumulation in *p53*-null MEFs was caused indirectly by other potential mutations and/or adaptive changes accumulated during multiple rounds of cell division, we transduced WT MEFs with a retrovirus expressing the type 16 papilloma virus-encoded E6 oncoprotein that binds to and targets the degradation of p53, or a microRNA retrovirus targeting 3'-UTR of mouse p53. Ectopic expression of E6 or mip53 resulted in a detectable increase of *Arf* protein and mRNA as early as 2 days after viral transduction and a continual increase of *Arf* (Fig. 1C and Supplementary Figure A and B). This result supports a direct role of p53 in the repression of *Arf* transcription and also suggests a continuous need of p53 to maintain the repression.

Nutlins are a group of small compounds that can bind MDM2 in the p53-binding pocket and disrupt the p53-MDM2 interaction, leading to p53 activation (36). We treated WT MEFs at passage 2 with Nutlin-3 (10 μM) or DMSO over 24 hours and then examined *Arf* expression. Confirming the activation of p53, Nutlin-3 increased *p21* mRNA in WT MEFs, but had no effect on *p21* level in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs. Nutlin-3 treatment enhanced *Arf* repression in WT MEFs within 24hs, resulting in a time-dependent decrease of *Arf* expression by 60%, but no effect on *Arf* level in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs despite the much higher *Arf* transcription (Fig. 1D). We thus conclude that p53 represses *Arf* at a level of transcriptional regulation through a mechanism that requires a direct and continuous role of p53

p53 binds to *Arf* locus

That p53 is directly involved in *Arf* repression led us to determine whether p53 binds to the *Arf* locus. We performed ChIP analysis using a panel of 35 pairs of oligonucleotide primers

that span 4kb upstream and 4kb downstream of the transcription start site of mouse *Arf*. We detected direct p53 binding to a region immediately upstream and downstream of exon1 β (amplicons *a*, *b*, *c* for regular PCR; corresponding amplicons *A*, *B*, *C* for Q-PCR) of *Arf* (Fig. 2A). In contrast, there was very little binding of p53 to the *p16* promoter, nor any p53 binding detected by using *p53*^{-/-} MEF as negative control in ChIP analysis. These results demonstrate that p53 affects the expression of *Arf* and *p16* differently and indicate a direct role of p53 in the repression of *Arf* expression.

p53 mediated repression of *Arf* needs both transactivation and DNA binding activity

To provide further evidence supporting a direct role of p53 in *Arf* repression, we examined four p53 mutants in *Arf* repression, including two well-characterized p53 hot-spot mutants—R175H, which grossly disrupts p53's protein conformation and R273H, which retains p53's native conformation but loses contact with DNA [see a recent review on the genetic and biochemical properties of different p53 mutants (37)]. In addition, we also examined a double mutant—L22Q/W23S—which disrupts p53's transcriptional activity, as well as the binding with Mdm2 (38) and a hyperactive p53 mutant—H178Y—that could rescue the inactivated function of a common mutation, G245S (39). *p53*^{-/-} MEFs were transduced with a retrovirus expressing the WT and individual mutants of p53. As expected, the three functional inactivation mutants—p53^{L22Q/W23S}, p53^{R175H} and p53^{R273H}—were expressed at high levels, whereas cells could only tolerate a much lower level expression of both WT p53 and hyperactive p53^{H178Y} mutant (Fig. 2B). The activity of the WT and individual p53 mutants was functionally verified by examining the expression of *p21* (Fig. 2D).

ChIP and qRT-PCR assay showed p53^{H178Y} bound to *Arf* stronger than the WT p53 and p53^{L22Q/W23S} exhibited decreased *Arf* binding. Both p53^{R175H} and p53^{R273H}, however, bound very weakly to *Arf* (Fig. 2C). We then determined if these p53 mutants could restore *Arf* repression in *p53* null MEFs. Starting 5 days after viral transduction, both WT and the hyperactive p53^{H178Y} mutant reduced the *Arf* mRNA level by 50% (Fig. 2D). In contrast, ectopic expression of p53^{L22Q/W23S}, p53^{R175H} and p53^{R273H} at very high levels had little effect in restoring the repression of *Arf*. Together, these results demonstrate that p53 represses *Arf* by directly binding to the *Arf* locus and that both transactivity and DNA binding of p53 are essential to repress *Arf* expression.

HDAC binds to and represses *Arf* and is recruited to *mArf* in a p53-dependent manner

Histone deacetylases (HDACs) associate with many transcriptional repressive complexes and have also been reported to participate in the transcriptional repression of both human and mouse *ARF* genes (22, 23). To determine whether HDACs are involved in p53-mediated repression of *Arf* transcription, we treated WT MEFs with TSA, an inhibitor of class I/II HDACs. A low concentration of TSA (0.1 μ M) increased mouse *Arf* mRNA level by >15-fold within 24hs (Fig. 3A). TSA treatment resulted in a detectable *Arf* protein increase as early as 6 hours, peaking around 25hs and lasting to as long as 60hs (Fig. 3B). These results demonstrate a potent role of HDACs in the repression of mouse *Arf* transcription.

We next tested the binding of HDAC1 on *Arf* in WT MEFs. ChIP showed that HDAC1 directly binds to a region immediately upstream of the transcription starting site of *Arf*, whereas no binding of HDAC1 was detected on the nearby *p16* locus (Fig. 3C). Importantly, the binding of HDAC1 to mouse *Arf* was greatly decreased, by more than 60% (for amplicon A) to 80% (amplicon B), in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs (Fig. 3D) or in WT MEFs with p53 knocked down by microRNA (Supplementary Figure C), providing the first evidence linking HDAC-mediated repression of *Arf* transcription to the function of p53. Supporting a functional dependency of deacetylation of *Arf* promoter on p53 function, activation of p53 by Nutlin-3 in WT MEFs resulted in a 6-fold increase of HDAC1 binding to *Arf* (Fig. 3E)

and reintroduction of WT p53, but not p53^{L22Q/W23S} and p53^{R273H}, back into *p53*^{-/-} MEFs restored the binding of HDAC1 to the *Arf* locus (Fig. 3F). Finally, we showed that H4 acetylation of the *Arf* promoter in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs was 2-fold higher than that in WT MEFs (Fig. 3G). Together, these results demonstrate that HDAC1 directly binds to and deacetylates *Arf* in a p53-dependent manner.

p53 is required for polycomb repressive complex to bind and repress *Arf*

Previous studies have shown that oncogene *Bmi1* promotes cell proliferation and extends the life span of fibroblasts, in part, through repressing both p16^{Ink4a} and p19^{Arf} expression (24, 25). More recently, polycomb group proteins have been shown to directly bind and repress both *p16* and *ARF* in mouse cells (29, 30). To determine the functional interplay between p53 and PcG in repressing *Arf* expression, we transduced both WT and *p53*^{-/-} MEFs with a retrovirus expressing the *Bmi1* gene and determined *Arf* expression. Nine days after retrovirus transduction (passage 5), both the steady state level of the *Arf* protein and mRNA were decreased substantially in *Bmi1*-overexpressing WT MEFs (Fig. 4A). In contrast, although *Arf* is expressed at a much higher level in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs, overexpression of *Bmi1* did not significantly affect either *Arf* protein or mRNA level. To determine the specificity of the functional dependency of *Bmi1*-mediated repression of *Arf* on p53, we examined the expression of two classical *Bmi1* repressive targets—*HoxA9* and *HoxC13* (40). Ectopic expression of *Bmi1* was capable of repressing both *HoxA9* and *HoxC13* genes regardless of the *p53* status (Fig. 4B). Together, these results demonstrate a specific functional dependency of *Bmi1*-mediated repression of *Arf* transcription on p53.

Bracken et al previously found that the Polycomb Repressive Complex (PRC) can bind directly to the mouse *Arf* locus to repress its expression (29). To search for the mechanism of the p53-dependency of *Arf* repression by *Bmi1*, we examined by ChIP and confirmed the binding of *Bmi1* and Ring1B, another component of PRC, to the *Arf* locus in WT and *p53*^{-/-} MEFs. Notably, the bindings of both *Bmi1* and Ring1B to the *Arf* locus were greatly decreased in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs (Fig. 4C). Confirming the p53-dependency, binding of Ring1B to the *Arf* locus in WT MEFs was also greatly reduced after transduction with an E6-expressing or p53-targeting microRNA retrovirus (Fig. 4D and Supplementary Figure C) and conversely increased in WT MEFs when p53 was activated by Nutlin-3 (Fig. 4E). Together, these results demonstrate a requirement of p53 for the binding of PRC1 to *Arf* locus.

Previous studies on *Hox* gene silencing by PRC suggest a sequential model whereby PRC2-mediated H3K27 trimethylation facilitates the recruitment of PRC1, which causes H2A-K119 ubiquitylation to repress *Hox* gene expression (41, 42). We further analyzed the binding of PRC2 and H3K27 trimethylation on *Arf*, and quantification showed a dramatic decrease of this repressive marker in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs to less than 7% (Fig. 4F). Likewise, the binding of two components of PRC2, Ezh2 and Suz12, to the *Arf* locus were also substantially reduced in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs to 29% and 6.7% for Ezh2 and to 43% and 18% for Suz12 of WT MEFs at sites A and C, respectively (Fig. 4F). Hence, the p53 function is required for both PRC1 and PRC2 to bind to the *Arf* locus.

Both transactivity and DNA binding activities of p53 are required for PRC1 binding to *Arf*

To further demonstrate the requirement of p53 in facilitating the binding of PRC1 to the *Arf* locus, we re-introduced p53 back into *p53*^{-/-} MEFs which partially restored the repression of both *Arf* protein and mRNA (Fig. 5A and 5B). The binding of Ring1B to *Arf* was also restored when p53 was ectopically expressed, resulting in a 2- to 3-fold and 4- to 7-fold increase of Ring1B binding to *Arf* in *p53*^{-/-} MEFs after adenovirus- and retrovirus-mediated p53 expression, respectively (Fig. 5A and 5B). We then determined if mutant p53 restored

PcG binding to *Arf*. Both WT p53 and the hyperactive p53^{H178Y} mutant, but not three inactivation mutants, restored Ring1B binding to *Arf*, leading to a 2.4-fold and 1.9-fold increase, respectively (Fig. 5C). Together these results demonstrate that both the trans-activating and DNA binding activities of p53 are required for the binding of PcG to *Arf*.

HDAC function is required for PcG to bind mouse *Arf*

Given that p53 is required for the binding of both HDAC and PcG complexes to the *Arf* locus and that HDAC has been reported to be in the same repressive complex with and facilitates the repressive function of PcG (43, 44), we next determined the requirement of HDAC function for PcG binding on *Arf* by two different approaches, pharmacological inhibition of HDAC activity and shRNA-mediated depletion of HDACs. Treatment of WT MEFs with TSA and another pharmacological inhibitor of HDAC, sodium butyrate (NaB), both significantly increase *Arf* expression, but neither affected Ring1B level (Fig. 6B). Inhibition of HDAC by either TSA or NaB increased H4 acetylation, yet decreased Ring1B binding and H3K27 tri-methylation on *Arf* promoter (Fig. 6A and C).

We then used shRNA to knock down *HDAC1* and *HDAC2* in WT MEFs. Although only a partial depletion was achieved, we observed a decrease of Bmi1 binding to *Arf* and an increase of *Arf* expression (Fig. 6D). These results demonstrate that the activity of HDAC is required for PcG to bind to and repress the expression of *Arf*, and both HDAC1 and HDAC2 contribute to this inhibition.

HDAC and PcG function are required for p53 to repress *Arf* expression

The functional dependency of both HDAC and PcG on p53 in the repression of *Arf* expression led us to determine whether these two histone modifying enzymes are required for p53 to repress *Arf* expression. To this end, we inhibited endogenous HDAC with TSA in WT MEFs and then determined whether activation of endogenous p53 by Nutlin can still repress *Arf*. While activation of p53 by Nutlin-3 resulted in a > 50% decrease of *Arf* expression in control MEFs, it had no detectable effect on *Arf* expression when the HDACs were inhibited by TSA, even though the *Arf* mRNA level was elevated by as much as more than 16-fold in the TSA-treated cells (Fig. 7A). As a control for p53 activation, inhibition of HDACs by TSA did not affect the increase of *p21* expression by Nutlin-activated p53.

To determine whether the function of PcG is required for p53 to repress *Arf* expression, we knocked down the expression of *Bmi1* in WT MEFs and examined the effect of *Bmi1* silencing on *Arf* repression by Nutlin-activated p53. All three shBmi1 viruses efficiently reduced the expression of *Bmi1* (Fig. 7B), and none of them affected the activation of *p21* expression by Nutlin-activated p53. While activation of p53 by Nutlin-3 effectively reduced *Arf* expression by more than 50% in WT MEFs infected with shRNA control virus targeting *Luciferase*, it had no significant effect to reduce *Arf* expression in MEFs transduced with any of the three shRNA virus targeting *Bmi1*. Hence, the function of p53 in the repression of *Arf* expression is also dependent on PcG.

Discussion

The results demonstrate a direct role of p53 in the repression of mouse *Arf* transcription by showing the direct binding of p53 to the mouse *Arf* locus and that p53 is required for recruiting HDAC and PcG proteins to the *Arf* locus. Our results are consistent with a model where p53 binds specifically to the *Arf* locus and then recruits histone deacetylases to deacetylate the *Arf* locus. Deacetylation of the *Arf* locus then facilitates the recruitment of PRC to the *Arf* locus, leading to H3K27 trimethylation and silencing of *Arf* expression (Fig. 7C). This model is supported by three lines of evidence. First, *Arf* expression is elevated in

vivo in multiple *p53*-deficient tissues or organs, is rapidly elevated upon functional inactivation of *p53* and is further repressed upon the activation of endogenous *p53* in early passage of WT MEFs. Second, *p53* directly binds to *Arf* locus, and that both transactivation and DNA binding activities of *p53* are required for the repression of *Arf* and, importantly, for the binding to and repression of *Arf* by both HDAC and PRC. Third, we have also shown that both HDAC and PcG are conversely required for *p53* to repress *Arf* expression.

The findings presented here shed mechanistic insights on the *p53*-mediated oncogenic checkpoint pathway: one on the mechanism of *Arf* activation and the other on the feedback regulation of *p53*. Although it has been observed for more than a decade that many hyperproliferative oncogenes can activate *Arf* expression (31), the molecular mechanism underlying oncogenic activation of *Arf* is unknown. Our demonstration that *Arf* is bound and repressed by *p53* during normal cell growth suggests a critical step—dissociating *p53* from the *Arf* locus—for an oncogene to activate *Arf* expression. It will be interesting to determine how an oncogene causes *p53* dissociation in the presence of increased level of *p53* since *Arf* activation would lead to *p53* stabilization.

Feedback inhibition is a regulatory strategy commonly used in biochemical reactions such as the inhibition of threonine dehydrase by isoleucine (46). The accumulation of an end-product inhibits the enzyme involved in its synthesis to avoid excessive accumulation and waste of resources. A similar strategy is also widely employed in cell regulations, especially those involved in cell growth and proliferation, to ensure a balanced homeostasis and cell physiology. Feedback inhibition is particularly needed for the control of the function of a gene such as *p53* whose activity, if not feedback inhibited, could lead to an irreversible consequence to the cell such as permanent cell cycle arrest or cell death. At low, non-lethal levels of DNA damage, cell cycle progression is delayed by the activation of *p53* and then *p21* to give cells time to repair the DNA and then resumed when the repair is completed. The resumption of cell cycle progression is achieved through the *p53*-MDM2 feedback loop in which *p53* activates the transcription of its primary inhibitor (6-8). *ARF* gene expression exhibits a strong inverse correlation with the functional status of *p53* in both human (19, 32) and mouse cells (33, 34), suggesting a possible feedback repression of *ARF* expression by *p53*. Our results provide a molecular basis supporting this feedback regulation. The significance of evolving this second feedback inhibition loop is that the first *p53*-MDM2 negative feedback loop would not be effective to inhibit *p53* to resume the cell cycle if *ARF* expression is not repressed: the continuously synthesized *ARF* would bind to and prevent MDM2 from degrading *p53* (Fig. 7C).

Our study also adds to the understanding of *p53*-mediated transcriptional repression, an area that is much less understood than *p53*-mediated transcriptional activation although an estimated 15% of genes containing a *p53* response element can be repressed by *p53* [see recent review by (2, 50)]. *p53* has been reported to directly bind with mSin3A, a transcriptional co-repressor and a member of class I HDAC complexes and recruit HDACs to a specific promoter such as *Map4* or *Nanog* (51, 52). We also confirmed the association between *p53* and HDAC by detecting *p53*-HDAC1 binding in WT MEFs (Supplementary Figure D). Our study provides two separate lines of evidence supporting a role of histone deacetylation in *p53*-mediated repression of *Arf*. First, we showed that treatment of MEFs with a low concentration of TSA drastically increased *Arf* mRNA (>15-fold) and this effect is seen as early as 6 hours (Fig. 3). Second, we demonstrate that HDAC1 directly binds to and deacetylates *Arf* in a *p53* dependent manner. We further identify a new mechanism—recruiting PRC—for *p53*-mediated transcriptional repression. To the best of our knowledge, this represents the first evidence that *p53*-mediated repression involves polycomb repressive complex which contains histone modifying activities known to function in silencing gene expression. Conversely, identification of a sequence-specific binding factor—*p53*—in the

recruitment of PRC to a specific locus also helps to better understand how PcG is recruited to their targets, a puzzling issue associated with the repression of many PRC-regulated genes in mammalian cells.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank Yi Zhang, Ned Sharpless and members of Xiong lab for the discussions throughout this study, Yizhou He for providing the retroviral construct targeting p53, and Dr. Zhi Liu for p53^{-/-} mice. This study was supported by NIH grant CA68377 to Y.X.

References

1. Laptenko O, Prives C. Transcriptional regulation by p53: one protein, many possibilities. *Cell Death Differ.* 2006; 13(6):951–61. [PubMed: 16575405]
2. Riley T, Sontag E, Chen P, Levine A. Transcriptional control of human p53-regulated genes. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.* 2008; 9(5):402–12. [PubMed: 18431400]
3. Hollstein M, Sidransky D, Vogelstein B, Harris CC. p53 mutations in human cancers. *Science.* 1991; 253:49–53. [PubMed: 1905840]
4. Levine AJ, Momand J, Finlay CA. The p53 tumour suppressor gene. *Nature.* 1991; 351:453–6. [PubMed: 2046748]
5. Vousden KH, Prives C. Blinded by the Light: The Growing Complexity of p53. *Cell.* 2009; 137(3): 413–31. [PubMed: 19410540]
6. Barak Y, Juven T, Haffner R, Oren M. *Mdm-2* expression is induced by wild-type p53 activity. *EMBO J.* 1993; 12:461–8. [PubMed: 8440237]
7. Otto A, Deppert W. Upregulation of mdm-2 expression in Meth A tumor cells tolerating wild-type p53. *Oncogene.* 1993; 8(9):2591–603. [PubMed: 8361769]
8. Wu X, Bayle JH, Olson D, Levine AJ. The p53-mdm-2 autoregulatory feedback loop. *Genes & Dev.* 1993; 7:1126–32. [PubMed: 8319905]
9. Momand J, Zambetti GP, Olson DC, George D, Levine AJ. The mdm-2 oncogene product forms a complex with the p53 protein and inhibits p53-mediated transactivation. *Cell.* 1992; 69:1237–45. [PubMed: 1535557]
10. Thut CJ, Goodrich JA, Tjian R. Repression of p53-mediated transcription by MDM2, a dual mechanism. *Genes & Dev.* 1997; 11:1974–86. [PubMed: 9271120]
11. Kubbutat MHG, Jones SN, Vousden KH. Regulation of p53 stability by Mdm2. *Nature.* 1997; 387:299–303. [PubMed: 9153396]
12. Haupt Y, Maya R, Kazaz A, Oren M. Mdm2 promotes the rapid degradation of p53. *Nature.* 1997; 387:296–9. [PubMed: 9153395]
13. Honda R, Tanaka H, Yasuda H. Oncoprotein MDM2 is a ubiquitin ligase E3 for tumor suppressor p53. *FEBS Letter.* 1997; 420:25–7.
14. Gil J, Peters G. Regulation of the INK4b-ARF-INK4a tumour suppressor locus: all for one or one for all. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.* 2006; 7(9):667–77. [PubMed: 16921403]
15. Kim WY, Sharpless NE. The Regulation of INK4/ARF in Cancer and Aging. *Cell.* 2006; 127(2): 265–75. [PubMed: 17055429]
16. Sherr CJ. Divorcing ARF and p53: an unsettled case. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2006; 6(9):663–73. [PubMed: 16915296]
17. Serrano M, Hannon GJ, Beach D. A new regulatory motif in cell cycle control causing specific inhibition of cyclin D CDK4. *Nature.* 1993; 366:704–7. [PubMed: 8259215]
18. Pomerantz J, Schreiber-Agus N, Liegeois NJ, et al. The INK4a tumor suppressor gene product, p19Arf, interacts with MDM2 and neutralizes MDM2's inhibition of p53. *Cell.* 1998; 92:713–23. [PubMed: 9529248]

19. Stott FJ, Bates S, James MC, et al. The alternative product from the human CDKN2A locus, p14(ARF), participates in a regulatory feedback loop with p53 and MDM2. *EMBO J.* 1998; 17(17):5001–14. [PubMed: 9724636]
20. Zhang Y, Xiong Y, Yarbrough WG. ARF promotes MDM2 degradation and stabilizes p53: ARF-INK4a locus deletion impairs both the Rb and p53 tumor suppression pathways. *Cell.* 1998; 92(6): 725–34. [PubMed: 9529249]
21. Gonzalez S, Klatt P, Delgado S, et al. Oncogenic activity of Cdc6 through repression of the INK4/ARF locus. *Nature.* 2006; 440(7084):702–6. [PubMed: 16572177]
22. Matheu A, Klatt P, Serrano M. Regulation of the INK4a/ARF locus by histone deacetylase inhibitors. *J Biol Chem.* 2005; 280(51):42433–41. [PubMed: 16251190]
23. Yarosh W, Barrientos T, Esmailpour T, et al. TBX3 is overexpressed in breast cancer and represses p14 ARF by interacting with histone deacetylases. *Cancer Res.* 2008; 68(3):693–9. [PubMed: 18245468]
24. Jacobs JJ, Kieboom K, Marino S, DePinho RA, van Lohuizen M. The oncogene and Polycomb-group gene bmi-1 regulates cell proliferation and senescence through the ink4a locus. *Nature.* 1999; 397(6715):164–8. [PubMed: 9923679]
25. Jacobs JJ, Scheijen B, Voncken JW, Kieboom K, Berns A, van Lohuizen M. Bmi-1 collaborates with c-myc in tumorigenesis by inhibiting c-Myc-induced apoptosis via INK4a/ARF. *Genes & Dev.* 1999; 13:2678–90. [PubMed: 10541554]
26. Bruggeman SW, Valk-Lingbeek ME, van der Stoop PP, et al. Ink4a and Arf differentially affect cell proliferation and neural stem cell self-renewal in Bmi1-deficient mice. *Genes & Dev.* 2005; 19(12):1438–43. [PubMed: 15964995]
27. Molofsky AV, He S, Bydon M, Morrison SJ, Pandal R. Bmi-1 promotes neural stem cell self-renewal and neural development but not mouse growth and survival by repressing the p16^{INK4a} and p19Arf senescence pathways. *Genes & Dev.* 2005; 19(12):1432–7. [PubMed: 15964994]
28. Park IK, Qian D, Kiel M, et al. Bmi-1 is required for maintenance of adult self-renewing haematopoietic stem cells. *Nature.* 2003; 423(6937):302–5. [PubMed: 12714971]
29. Bracken AP, Kleine-Kohlbrecher D, Dietrich N, et al. The Polycomb group proteins bind throughout the INK4A-ARF locus and are disassociated in senescent cells. *Genes & Dev.* 2007; 21(5):525–30. [PubMed: 17344414]
30. Kotake Y, Cao R, Viatour P, Sage J, Zhang Y, Xiong Y. pRB family proteins are required for H3K27 trimethylation and Polycomb repression complexes binding to and silencing p16^{INK4a} tumor suppressor gene. *Genes & Dev.* 2007; 21:49–54. [PubMed: 17210787]
31. Sherr CJ. Tumor surveillance via the ARF-p53 pathway. *Genes Dev.* 1998; 12(19):2984–91. [PubMed: 9765200]
32. Robertson KD, Jones PA. The human ARF cell cycle regulatory gene promoter is a CpG island which can be silenced by DNA methylation and down-regulated by wild-type p53. *Mol Cell Biol.* 1998; 18(11):6457–73. [PubMed: 9774662]
33. Zindy F, Eischen CM, Randle DH, et al. Myc signaling via the ARF tumor suppressor regulates p53-dependent apoptosis and immortalization. *Genes Dev.* 1998; 12(15):2424–33. [PubMed: 9694806]
34. de Stanchina E, McCurrach ME, Zindy F, et al. E1A signaling to p53 involves the p19(ARF) tumor suppressor. *Genes Dev.* 1998; 12(15):2434–42. [PubMed: 9694807]
35. Kamijo T, Weber JD, Zambetti G, Zindy F, Roussel MF, Sherr CJ. Functional and physical interactions of the ARF tumor suppressor with p53 and Mdm2. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 1998; 95(14):8292–7. [PubMed: 9653180]
36. Vassilev LT, Vu BT, Graves B, et al. In vivo activation of the p53 pathway by small-molecule antagonists of MDM2. *Science.* 2004; 303(5659):844–8. [PubMed: 14704432]
37. Lozano G. The oncogenic roles of p53 mutants in mouse models. *Curr Opin Genet Dev.* 2007; 17(1):66–70. [PubMed: 17208429]
38. Lin J, Chen J, Levine AJ. Several hydrophobic amino acids in the p53 amino-terminal domain are required for transcriptional activation, binding to MDM-2 and the adenovirus 5 E1B 55-kD protein. *Genes & Dev.* 1994; 8:1235–46. [PubMed: 7926727]

39. Otsuka K, Kato S, Kakudo Y, Mashiko S, Shibata H, Ishioka C. The screening of the second-site suppressor mutations of the common p53 mutants. *Int J Cancer*. 2007; 121(3):559–66. [PubMed: 17417775]
40. Cao R, Tsukada Y, Zhang Y. Role of Bmi-1 and Ring1A in H2A ubiquitylation and Hox gene silencing. *Mol Cell*. 2005; 20(6):845–54. [PubMed: 16359901]
41. Wang L, Brown JL, Cao R, Zhang Y, Kassis JA, Jones RS. Hierarchical recruitment of polycomb group silencing complexes. *Mol Cell*. 2004; 14(5):637–46. [PubMed: 15175158]
42. Cao R, Tsukada Y, Zhang Y. Role of Bmi-1 and Ring1A in H2A ubiquitylation and Hox gene silencing. *Mol Cell*. 2005; 20(6):845–54. [PubMed: 16359901]
43. van der Vlag J, Otte AP. Transcriptional repression mediated by the human polycomb-group protein EED involves histone deacetylation. *Nat Genet*. 1999; 23(4):474–8. [PubMed: 10581039]
44. Tie F, Furuyama T, Prasad-Sinha J, Jane E, Harte PJ. The Drosophila Polycomb Group proteins ESC and E(Z) are present in a complex containing the histone-binding protein p55 and the histone deacetylase RPD3. *Development*. 2001; 128(2):275–86. [PubMed: 11124122]
45. Aslanian A, Iaquinta PJ, Verona R, Lees JA. Repression of the Arf tumor suppressor by E2F3 is required for normal cell cycle kinetics. *Genes Dev*. 2004; 18(12):1413–22. [PubMed: 15175242]
46. Umbarger HE. Evidence for a negative-feedback mechanism in the biosynthesis of isoleucine. *Science*. 1956; 123(3202):848. [PubMed: 13324101]
47. Kia, S Kheradmand; Kartalaei, P Solaimani; Farahbakhshian, E.; Pourfarzad, F.; von Lindern, M.; Verrijzer, CP. EZH2-dependent chromatin looping controls INK4a and INK4b, but not ARF, during human progenitor cell differentiation and cellular senescence. *Epigenetics Chromatin*. 2009; 2(1):16. [PubMed: 19954516]
48. Agger K, Cloos PA, Rudkjaer L, et al. The H3K27me3 demethylase JMJD3 contributes to the activation of the INK4A-ARF locus in response to oncogene- and stress-induced senescence. *Genes Dev*. 2009; 23(10):1171–6. [PubMed: 19451217]
49. Barradas M, Anderton E, Acosta JC, et al. Histone demethylase JMJD3 contributes to epigenetic control of INK4a/ARF by oncogenic RAS. *Genes Dev*. 2009; 23(10):1177–82. [PubMed: 19451218]
50. Menendez D, Inga A, Resnick MA. The expanding universe of p53 targets. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2009; 9(10):724–37. [PubMed: 19776742]
51. Murphy M, Ahn J, Walker KK, et al. Transcriptional repression by wild-type p53 utilizes histone deacetylases, mediated by interaction with mSin3a. *Genes Dev*. 1999; 13(19):2490–501. [PubMed: 10521394]
52. Lin T, Chao C, Saito S, et al. p53 induces differentiation of mouse embryonic stem cells by suppressing Nanog expression. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2005; 7(2):165–71. [PubMed: 15619621]

Figure 1. p53 represses *Arf* expression

(A) The steady state levels of Arf and p16 proteins were determined in WT and *p53*^{-/-} MEFs at passage 5 (p5) by immunoblotting. (B) 3 pairs of age-matched WT and *p53*^{-/-} mice were dissected and total RNA was extracted from 8 different organ/tissues. The level of *Arf* mRNA was determined by Q-RT-PCR. (C) WT MEFs (p2) were infected with mock or E6-expressing retrovirus and selected by G418 treatment. The level of p53 and Arf proteins or mRNA was determined by immunoblotting or Q-RT-PCR. (D) WT (p2) and *p53*^{-/-} MEFs were treated with 1% DMSO or 10 μ M Nutlin3 and the levels of *Arf* and *p21* mRNA were determined by Q-RT-PCR.

Figure 2. Both transactivation and DNA binding activity of p53 are required for p53 to bind and repress *Arf*

(A) WT p2 and *p53*^{-/-} p3 MEFs were analyzed for p53 binding on *Arf* and *p16* locus. The amount of DNA immunoprecipitated by p53 or rabbit IgG were expressed relative to the percentage of input DNA. (B) *p53*^{-/-} MEFs were infected with mock or WT p53 and mutant p53 retrovirus. Cells were selected by puromycin treatment, collected at indicated time after infection and the expression levels of p53 were determined by immunoblotting. (C) Cells in (B) collected 8 days after infection were analyzed for binding of p53 on *Arf* locus by ChIP-Q-PCR. (D) *p21* mRNA levels of cells in (B) were determined 2 days after infection by Q-RT-PCR, and cells collected at different times after infection were analyzed for *Arf* mRNA levels by Q-RT-PCR.

Figure 3. HDAC1 binds to and represses *Arf* in a p53-dependent manner

(A) WT p3 MEFs were treated with 0.1 μ M TSA for 12hs or 24hs. The levels of Arf protein or mRNA were determined by immunoblotting or Q-RT-PCR. (B) WT p3 MEFs were treated with 0.1 μ M TSA for 0~72hs. Cell pellets were collected at indicated time and steady state level of protein was determined by immunoblotting. (C) Binding of HDAC1 to *Arf* locus was examined in WT p2 MEFs by ChIP analysis. The amount of DNA immunoprecipitated by HDAC1 or rabbit IgG were expressed relative to the percentage of input DNA. (D, G) Binding of HDAC1 on *Arf*, and amount of acetylated histone H4 on *Arf* were quantified in WT and *p53*^{-/-} MEFs by ChIP-Q-PCR. (E) WT p3 MEFs were treated with 1% DMSO or 10 μ M Nutlin-3 and cells were collected after 16hs. The binding of HDAC1 on *Arf* was determined by ChIP-Q-PCR with indicated primers. (F) *p53*^{-/-} MEFs were infected with mock or WT and mutant p53 retrovirus. Cells were selected by puromycin treatment, collected at 5 days post-infection, and analyzed for HDAC1 binding to *Arf* by ChIP-Q-PCR.

Figure 4. p53 is required for PRC to bind and repress *Arf*

(A, B) p2 WT and *p53*^{-/-} MEFs were infected with mock or Bmi1-expressing retrovirus. 9 days after infection, MEFs were collected and the protein levels of Bmi1 and Arf were determined by immunoblotting; the mRNA levels of *Arf* (A), *HoxA9*, and *HoxC13* (B) were determined by Q-RT-PCR. (C) Binding of Bmi1 and Ring1B to *Arf* locus was tested in WT p2 and *p53*^{-/-} MEFs by ChIP. (D) WT p2 MEFs were infected with mock or E6 retrovirus and G418 selected. Cells were collected at indicated time after infection and analyzed for Ring1B binding on *Arf*. (E) WT p3 MEFs were treated with 1% DMSO or 10 μ M Nutlin3, and cells were collected after 16hs. The binding of Ring1B on *Arf* was determined by ChIP-Q-PCR. (F) ChIP-Q-PCR was used to determine the trimethylation of H3K27 and binding of Ezh2 and Suz12 on *Arf* locus in WT p3 and *p53*^{-/-} MEFs.

Figure 5. Both transactivity and DNA binding activity of p53 are required for PRC1 binding to *Arf*

(A) WT (p3) and *p53*^{-/-} MEFs were infected with either GFP- or p53-expressing adenovirus. Two days after infection, cell lysates were analysed by WB for expression of p53 and Arf, and crosslinked cell pellets were collected and analyzed for binding of p53 and Ring1B to *Arf* locus. (B) *p53*^{-/-} MEFs were infected with either mock or p53-expressing retrovirus and selected by puromycin. The levels of p53 and Arf proteins or mRNA were determined by immunoblotting or Q-RT-PCR. Cells collected at 5 day after infection were analyzed for p53 and Ring1B binding on *Arf* by ChIP-Q-PCR. (C) *p53*^{-/-} MEFs were infected with either mock WT or mutant p53 retrovirus. Cells were selected by puromycin and analyzed for bindings of Ring1B to *Arf* by ChIP-Q-PCR using *Arf* amplicon B.

Figure 6. HDAC function is required for PRC to bind *Arf*

(A) WT p3 MEFs were treated with 0.1 μ M TSA for 24hs. Cell pellets were collected and analyzed for binding of Ring1B on *Arf* by ChIP. (B) WT p3 MEFs were treated with 0.1 μ M TSA or 10mM NaB for 30hs, and cells were collected and analyzed for *Arf* mRNA amount by Q-RT-PCR. (C) Cells in (B) were collected and analyzed for histone H4 acetylation, histone H3K27 trimethylation and Ring1B binding on *Arf* locus by ChIP-Q-PCR. (D) WT MEFs were infected with either an sh-Luciferase or shHDAC-expressing retrovirus, selected by puromycin for 2 days and collected 4 days after infection. The mRNA levels of *HDAC1*, *HDAC2* and *Arf* were determined by Q-RT-PCR, and the binding of Bmi1 to *Arf* locus were determined by ChIP-Q-PCR.

Figure 7. HDAC and PcG function are required for p53 to repress *Arf*

(A) WT p2 MEFs were treated with TSA and Nutlin-3 either alone or in combination for 24hs. Cells were collected and analyzed for mRNA levels of *p21* and *Arf* by Q-RT-PCR. (B) WT MEFs (p2) were infected with either an sh-Luciferase or shBmi1-expressing retrovirus, selected by 2 μ M puromycin for 2 days, continuously cultured for 5 days after infection and then treated with Nutlin-3 for 24hs. Cells were collected and analyzed for *Bmi1*, *p21* and *Arf* mRNA level by Q-RT-PCR. (C) A schematic model illustrating p53-mediated *Arf* repression by HDAC and PcG. See text for more details.