Cell cycle-dependent expression of a hairy and Enhancer of split (hes) homolog during cleavage and segmentation in leech embryos
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Abstract

We have cloned genes related to hairy and Enhancer of split (hes) from glossiphoniid leeches, Helobdella robusta and Theromyzon rude. In leech, segments arise sequentially in anteroposterior progression from a posterior growth zone that consists of five bilaterally paired embryonic stem cells called teloblasts. Each teloblast gives rise to segmental founder cells (primary blast cells) that contribute iterated sets of definitive progeny in each segment. Thus, in leech, the “segmentation clock,” is closely identified with the cell cycle clock of the teloblasts. We have characterized normal expression patterns of mRNA and protein for the H. robusta hes-class gene (Hro-hes). Semiquantitative RT-PCR revealed that Hro-hes mRNA levels peak while the teloblasts are actively producing primary blast cells. RT-PCR, in situ hybridization and immunostaining revealed that Hro-hes is expressed as early as the first zygotic mitosis and throughout early development. Hro-hes is expressed in macromeres, pro-teloblasts, teloblasts and primary blast cells. HRO-HES protein is localized in the nuclei of cells expressing HRO-HES during interphase; nuclear HRO-HES is reduced during mitosis. In contrast, Hro-hes is transcribed during mitosis and its transcripts are associated with mitotic apparatus (MA). Thus, Hro-hes transcription cycles in antiphase to the nuclear localization of HRO-HES protein. These results indicate that Hro-hes expression, and thus possibly its biological activity, is linked to the cell cycle.
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Introduction

The Drosophila gene hairy encodes a bHLH transcription factor that functions as a primary pair rule gene in establishing segmental primordia (Carroll et al., 1988; Hooper et al., 1989; Ingham, 1985; Nusslein-Volhard and Wieschaus, 1980) and as a negative regulator of proneural genes in the imaginal disks (Ohsako et al., 1994). Enhancer of split is a structurally related gene required for cell fate specification in the peripheral nervous system in Drosophila (Knut et al., 1987). hairy and Enhancer of split (hes)-related genes are expressed in the posterior growth zones of sequentially segmenting arthropods (short- and intermediary-germ insects, spiders) and often in stripes just anterior to the posterior growth zone (Damen et al., 2000; Sommer and Tautz, 1993).

Vertebrate hes-gene families have been identified, and some family members have been shown to participate in the biochemical oscillations that comprise the “segmentation clock” in the presomitic mesoderm (PSM) and somites of vertebrates (Bessho et al., 2001; Holley et al., 2000; Hirata et al., 2002; Jouve et al., 2000; Muller et al., 1996; Oates and Ho, 2002; Palmeirim et al., 1997; reviewed by Pourquie, 2001a,b; Lewis, 2003). The similarities in expression of hes-class genes among vertebrate and basal arthropods have suggested to some that the last common ancestor of protostomes and deuterostomes was already segmented (De Robertis, 1997; Kimmel, 1996).

On the other hand, recent molecular phylogenies suggest that most bilaterally symmetric animals fall into three superphyla, Deuterostomia, Ecdysozoa and Lophotrochozoa (Aguinaldo et al., 1997; Collins and Valentine, 2001; Ruiz-Trillo et al., 1999), which were already separated from
one another at the time of the Cambrian radiation (Adoutte et al., 2000). Most groups in each of these superphyla are unsegmented. Thus, parsimony favors the notion that segmentation has arisen independently in Deuterostomia (vertebrates), Ecdysozoa (arthropods, onychophorans, tardigrades) and Lophotrochozoa (annelids, including leeches). Comparative studies including segmented and unsegmented taxa in all three superphyla should further our understanding of segmentation mechanisms and the evolution of segmentation.

Toward that end, we have identified hes-class genes (Tru-hes and Hro-hes) from two glossiphoniid leeches, Theromyzon rude and Helobdella robusta, respectively. Embryos of leeches (and other clitellate annelids) generate segments via stereotyped cell lineages (Fig. 1; Shankland, 1999), so that in this group, there is a strict correlation between the “segmentation clock” and the cell cycle clock, in contrast to vertebrates and many arthropods. A key feature of this process is the production of segmental founder cells (blast cells) in anteroposterior progression from a set of 10 identified stem cells (teloblasts) that constitute a posterior growth zone (Fig. 1). In glossiphoniid leeches such as Helobdella, the teloblasts are large and experimentally accessible.

Semiquantitative RT-PCR revealed that mRNA expression of Hro-hes peaks during the period when teloblasts are making blast cells (Fig. 1). In situ hybridization and immunostaining revealed that Hro-hes is expressed throughout cleavage and early development in a variety of cell types, including teloblasts and primary blast cells. Immunostaining shows that HRO-HES is localized in nuclei during interphase but declines or is diluted throughout the cytoplasm during mitosis, whereas in situ hybridization shows that Hro-hes transcripts are associated with the mitotic apparatus of dividing cells. Inhibitor studies coupled with in situ hybridization, and RT-PCR on individually staged zygotes reveal that Hro-hes is transcribed during mitosis. Thus, Hro-hes transcripts and HRO-HES protein exhibit reciprocal nuclear localization during the cell cycle in early development. These results show that expression of this hes-class gene in leech (superphylum Lophotrochozoa) is linked to the cell cycle in a manner that has not been described for the various hes-class genes examined in representatives of Deuterostomia or Ecdysozoa.

Materials and methods

Embryos

Embryos of H. robusta and T. rude were obtained and cultured in Helobdella (HL) saline as described in Song et al. (2002). The embryonic staging system and cell nomenclature are as summarized elsewhere (Weisblat and Huang, 2001). To label particular cell lines, cells of interest were pressure-injected with rhodamine- or fluorescein-conjugated dextran amine (RDA or FDA) as described previously (Smith and Weisblat, 1994).

To block RNA synthesis, embryos were bathed in actinomycin-D mannitol (Sigma), 100–500 µg/ml in HL saline for 2–5 h at room temperature. In some experiments, the incubation medium for both experimental and control embryos included 0.5% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO; Sigma) to accelerate the penetration of the drug into the embryos.
Gene cloning

Candidate gene fragments were amplified from genomic DNA by degenerate PCR. Degenerate oligonucleotides (upstream = 5'-MGIGCIMGIATIAAYRAITSIYT-3'; downstream = 5'-ACIGTYWTYTCIARIATITCIGCYTT-3') were designed by comparing the bHLH domains of the hes-class genes from Drosophila melanogaster and D. virilis (Bier et al., 1992; Rushlow et al., 1989), rat (Feder et al., 1993), human (Feder et al., 1994) Tribolium castaneum (Sommer and Tautz, 1993) and frog (Dawson et al., 1995). Additional sequence was obtained by 5' and 3' and hybridization (RT) was carried out on 9.5

Semiquantitative developmental RT-PCR

Fifty embryos from each stage were collected and processed as in Song et al. (2002). To confirm the relative levels of expression, we amplified two separate regions of Hro-hes cDNA: nt 162–470 (which spans an intron site, to control for genomic DNA contamination of the template) and nt 960–1133. The Hro-hes fragments were amplified using the following PCR cycles: 1 min at 94°C, 1 min at 60°C and 30 s at 72°C for 5 cycles; followed by 1 min at 95°C, 1 min at 58°C and 30 s at 72°C for 30 cycles. The two primer sets gave equivalent results and one sample of each fragment was sequenced to confirm the identity of the amplified PCR products.

Single zygote RT-PCR

Freshly laid zygotes were timed relative to the appearance of the second polar body, defined as 105 min after zygote deposition (AZD). Individual zygotes were lysed at selected time points in 10 μl cell lysis buffer (Cells-to-cDNA kit, Ambion Inc.) by heating at 75°C for 5 min. DNA was digested by the addition of 1 U DNase (Ambion Inc.), followed by incubation at 37°C for 30 min. DNase was then inactivated by heating at 75°C for 5 min. Reverse transcription (RT) was carried out on 9.5 μl of the zygotic lysate using random decamers (Ambion Inc.) and 100 U Superscript Reverse Transcriptase II (Invitrogen Inc.) using reaction conditions as described by manufacturer. RT was allowed to proceed for 1 h at 42°C. PCR for Hro-hes was performed using the same primers (spanning nt 162–470) and amplification conditions as for the developmental RT-PCR described above, except using 3 MgCl2. To increase the sensitivity of the procedure, a second round of amplification was carried out, using the same conditions, starting with 5 μl of the primary PCR as the template. A maternal transcript, Hro-hes-WT, which included in the primary and secondary antibody incubations, excluded the bHLH domain and the asparagine-rich region to avoid cross reactivity. This fragment was cloned into pQE-30 expression vector (Qiagen) for producing N-terminal 6× His-tagged polypeptide. The affinity-purified antibody against Hro-hes antigen was prepared as described previously (Goldstein et al., 2001).

Immunostaining

Embryos were fixed with 4% formaldehyde in 0.25× phosphate-buffered saline (PBS, diluted from 10× stock) for 1 h at RT. Embryos were washed in PBS with 1% Tween-20 (PBTw), devitellinized and incubated for 3 h in a solution of 10% normal goat serum in PBTw (PTN), then in the antibody of Hro-hes (anti-HRO-HES, 1:1000) in PTN at 4°C for 2 days. All incubations and subsequent washes were done with constant agitation. After washing with frequent changes of PBTw at RT for 5 h, embryos were incubated in a peroxidase-conjugated goat anti-rabbit IgG (Jackson Lab, 1:1000) in PTN at 4°C for 2 days, then washed in PBTw and incubated with 0.5 mg/ml diaminobenzidine in PBS and 0.003% H2O2 for color reaction. For zygotes, 1% Triton X-100 was substituted for 1% Tween-20 and also antibody incubation were done overnight at RT, instead of 2 days at 4°C.

To double label for histone and HRO-HES, histone antibody (Chemicon, 1:1000) and Alexa 488 goat antimouse IgG (H + L) (Molecular Probes, 1:1000) were included in the primary and secondary antibody incubations, respectively. After color development, embryos were rinsed with PBS, dehydrated, cleared in benzyl benzoate/benzyl alcohol (3:2) and examined in whole mount by epifluorescence microscopy (Zeiss Axiophot) and photographed on
Results

Identification of hes-class genes from glossiphoniid leeches

We first amplified genomic fragments of hes-class genes from both H. robusta and T. rude. These fragments encode portions of the bHLH domain of the predicted hes-class genes, designated as Hro-hes (accession# AY144625) and Tru-hes (accession#AY144624). Each fragment contains an intron (126 and 324 bp, respectively) at a site that is conserved with respect to other organisms (Fig. 2). For Tru-hes, we obtained only a partial sequence within the bHLH domain. For Hro-hes, we identified another intron (125 bp) within the bHLH domain, also as in other organisms (Fig. 2). The bHLH domains of Hro-hes and Tru-hes are similar, suggesting that we had identified the same subgroup of leech hes-class gene in both. (By comparison with other animals, it seems likely that Helobdella has more than one hes-class gene, but this remains to be determined.) For Hro-hes, we used 5’- and 3’-RACE on cDNA libraries and first-strand cDNAs for additional sequence and obtained an ORF encoding 436 amino acids plus 5’-UTR (189 bp) and 3’-UTR (224 bp). Three in-frame stop codons lie upstream of the presumed start codon, suggesting that we obtained the complete ORF of Hro-hes (Fig. 2A). The 3’-UTR includes one polyadenylation site and also two sites resembling what has been identified in vertebrates as a cytoplasmic polyadenylation element (CPE; Ryskov et al., 1983; Fig. 2C). Like other hes-class genes, Hro-hes also contains a version of the C-terminal WRPW motif that is required for groucho-dependent repression in Drosophila (Aronson et al., 1997). The C-terminal WRPF tetrapeptide in Hro-hes matches that of a spider hes-class gene (Cs-H) (Damen et al., 2000). The bHLH domain of Hro-hes is quite divergent, showing only 51% identity with Drosophila hairy and 61% identity with chick c-hairy1 (Fig. 2B). Apart from the bHLH and WRPW domains, we were unable to make reliable alignments between Hro-hes and other hes-class genes. A phylogram [PAUP 4.0 b4a (PPC)] using only bHLH domains reliably places Hro-hes within the class of hes-related genes, but offers little regarding the phylogenetic relationships within that group (Fig. 3).

Hro-hes transcript levels peak during production of segmental founder cells

Semiquantitative RT-PCR (Spencer and Christensen, 1999) was used to estimate the relative levels of Hro-hes mRNA accumulation during development (see Fig. 1 for description of relevant developmental stages). As an internal control for variations in efficiency of RNA extraction and cDNA synthesis, we also performed submaximal PCR

Fig. 2. A hes-class gene from H. robusta. (A) Comparison of Hro-hes and other selected hes-class genes showing overall domain structure; numbers indicate the amino acid residue corresponding to the start of the bHLH (gray) and C-terminal (black) domains, where known. (B) Amino acid alignments for the bHLH and C-terminal domains for the proteins in A plus the gene fragment obtained from T. rude. Residues identical to those in Hro-hes are highlighted; known intron sites are indicated in red. (C) Part of the Hro-hes 3’-UTR showing cytoplasmic polyadenylation element (CPE) consensus sites (boxes) and polyadenylation site (underlined). Tru, Tru-hes [from Theromyzon (leech)]; Hro, Hro-hes (leech); Csa, spider hairy; Dme, Drosophila hairy; Tca, beetle hairy; Cel, lin22 (nematode); Mmu, hes1 (mouse); Dre, her1 (zebrafish); Gga, chick c-hairy1.
amplification of 18S rRNA fragments for each stage sampled. The oligos were chosen to span introns in *Hro-hes*, so that PCR fragments arising from genomic DNA contamination could be distinguished by their larger size. To further confirm the relative levels of expression, we amplified two separate regions of *Hro-hes* using two independent pairs of primers, which produced equivalent results.

By this assay, *Hro-hes* mRNA was not detected during cleavage until stage 5 or 6 (approximately 15–20 h AZD; Figs. 1 and 4). Transcript levels peak during stage 7 (approximately 40–50 h AZD) and then decline during stage 8 (60–90 h AZD; Fig. 4). This period of peak expression corresponds to the stage in which the teloblasts are making segmental founder cells.

**Immunohistochemical characterization of HRO-HES expression**

Attempts to quantify HRO-HES protein expression by developmental Western blot analysis were unsuccessful because of the limited numbers of embryos available. So we characterized HRO-HES expression immunohistochemically (Fig. 5), starting with stages 7 and early 8, in which
strong expression was expected from the RT-PCR results described above. Immunostaining at these stages revealed HRO-HES in nuclei, as expected for a transcription factor. Anti-HRO-HES uniformly labeled most teloblasts and primary blast cells in all lineages (Figs. 5F–I), including supernumerary blast cells that do not contribute progeny to definitive segments. We observed no alternating patterns of HRO-HES expression among primary blast cells or their progeny that might indicate a pair rule function for \textit{Hro-hes} (Figs. 5F–I). Moreover, examination of other embryonic stages revealed anti-HRO-HES staining of interphase nuclei as early as the two-cell stage (Fig. 5C) and including macromeres and micromeres (Figs. 5E, F). Thus, HRO-HES expression is not correlated with decisions as to either cell type or segmental vs. nonsegmental cell fates in the \textit{Helobdella} embryo.

HRO-HES immunostaining of nuclei disappeared or was greatly reduced during mitosis, which is not surprising given the nuclear envelope breakdown during this phase of the cell cycle. The correlation between cell cycle and HRO-HES immunostaining was easily seen in embryos double-stained for HRO-HES (visualized by the DAB reaction) and chromatin (visualized by either a fluorescent DNA stain or anti-histone primary antibody and a fluoresceinated secondary antibody). Chromatin fluorescence was obscured by the DAB reaction product over the nuclei of cells in interphase, but not for those in mitosis (Fig. 5G). Whether the loss of HRO-HES immunostaining during mitosis is solely attributable to its dilution in the cytoplasm upon nuclear envelope breakdown remains to be determined.

As described above, HRO-HES immunostaining of interphase nuclei began as early as the two-cell stage, and there also appeared to be staining above background levels in the teloplasm of the two-cell embryo as well (Figs. 5C, D). No HRO-HES immunostaining above background was observed in the cytoplasm or nucleus of the zygote, however (Figs. 5A, B). This point is critical for experiments in the last part of the Results section.

\textit{HRO-HES levels decline as segmental founder cells divide in later development}

As described above, the DAB reaction product from HRO-HES immunostaining of nuclei obscured chromatin fluorescence of interphase segmental founder cells (primary blast cells; Figs. 5G, H). In addition to highlighting the cell cycle dependence of the HRO-HES signal, double-staining also revealed a decline in HRO-HES levels as segmental founder cell clones developed. Previous studies have shown that blast cell clones undergo stereotyped division patterns with mitoses at fixed positions relative to the parent teloblast.
in each lineage (Bissen and Weisblat, 1989; Zackson, 1984; Fig. 1). In older blast cell clones, the levels of nuclear HRO-HES declined, as judged by the increasing fluorescence breakthrough in interphase nuclei and decreasing intensity of immunostaining in nuclei versus cytoplasm (Figs. 5H–J). This could represent a systematic shift of HRO-HES from nucleus to cytoplasm, but we interpret it as reflecting a decline in HRO-HES levels in older blast cells, consistent with the decline in \(Hro-hes\) mRNA levels during stage 8 (Fig. 4). Teloblasts gradually cease making primary blast cells during this time (Desjeux and Price, 1999), so if the developing blast cell clones gradually cease expressing \(Hro-hes\), it would explain the observation that overall expression levels gradually decline.

**Hro-hes transcripts associate with the mitotic apparatus**

On the basis of the immunostaining results, we carried out in situ hybridization for \(Hro-hes\) on embryos at stages 1–8. Consistent with the immunostaining patterns, we detected \(Hro-hes\) transcripts in blastomeres throughout cleavage and in teloblasts and primary blast cells. Similar to our observations for an \(even-skipped\)-class gene (\(Hro-eve\)) in \(Helobdella\) (Song et al., 2002), we saw no evidence of a pair-rule type pattern of transcription (e.g., periodic variations in expression within the bandlets or germinal bands) for \(Hro-hes\) (Figs. 6A, B).

Also as for \(Hro-eve\), \(Hro-hes\) transcripts were associated with the mitotic apparatus (MA) of cells undergoing divi-

---

**Fig. 5.** HRO-HES is expressed beginning in the two-cell stage and through the production of segmental founder cells. (A) Zygote immunostained for HRO-HES (visualized with DAB histochemistry) before first mitosis (approximately 200 min AZD) reveals no detectable nuclear staining. (B) Sibling zygote processed as in (A), but immunostained for histone instead of HRO-HES shows that antibodies were able to penetrate the embryo. (C) Slightly older zygote (250 min AZD) fixed during cytokinesis and processed as in (A); the first mitosis is complete and both interphase nuclei have localized HRO-HES. (Insets at right in (A–C) show nuclear regions at higher magnification). (D) Late two-cell embryo (320 min AZD) double-stained for HRO-HES (left) and histone (right, visualized with a fluoresceinated secondary antibody); cell AB is still in interphase (arrows) and stains for HRO-HES, whereas cell CD has entered mitosis (arrowheads). Note that the DAB reaction product obscures the histone fluorescence in AB (white arrow), but not in CD (white arrowhead). (E) Four-cell embryo (410 min AZD) processed and photographed as in (D); cells A, B and C are in interphase and stain for HRO-HES (arrows), whereas cell D has entered mitosis (arrowheads) and does not. The DAB reaction product obscures the histone fluorescence in A, B and C, but not in D. (F) Stage 7 embryo (approximately 30 h AZD) shows HRO-HES in nuclei of teloblasts (horizontal arrows), blast cells (arrowheads) and micromere derivatives (vertical arrows). (G) Higher magnification view of a similar stage 7 embryo double-stained as in (D and E), focusing on the left M teloblast and the column of m blast cells. The DAB reaction product obscures the histone fluorescence in interphase primary blast cells (horizontal arrows) and their progeny (vertical arrows), but not in the M teloblast (horizontal arrowhead) or in the oldest primary blast cell (vertical arrowhead), both of which are in mitosis. (H) An m bandlet from another embryo, immunostained for HRO-HES as above but in this case counterstained with a low-molecular-weight DNA stain (SYTOX Green). Here, the DAB reaction product obscures the DNA fluorescence in the primary blast cells (horizontal arrows), but not in their daughter cells (vertical arrows). (I and J) Close-up views showing portions of the germinal bands of a stage 8 embryo (approximately 65 h AZD) double-stained as in (D and E). In posterior, younger portions of the germinal band (I, see Fig. 1), weak DAB staining indicates the continuing presence of HRO-HES in primary blast cells (arrows) and their progeny (arrowheads), but histone fluorescence breaks through in both interphase and mitotic cells. In more anterior portions of the germinal band, corresponding to older blast cell clones (J, see Fig. 1), nuclear HRO-HES is hardly detected. Scale bar, 100 \(\mu\)m in A–F; 25 \(\mu\)m in insets; 50 \(\mu\)m in G–J.
tion, including primary blast cells within the germinal bands (Figs. 6B, D–F). Various criteria allowed us to identify mitotic cells, including the predictable timing of mitoses in precisely staged embryos (Bissen and Weisblat, 1989; Huang et al., 2002; Fig. 1), and the position within the bandlet at which each class of primary blast cells undergoes its first mitosis (Zackson, 1984; Fig. 1). Such cells typically showed an intense, punctate in situ staining pattern for Hro-hes.

For example, the columns of primary blast cells produced by the N teloblasts comprise distinct nf and ns blast cells as defined by mitotic pattern and definitive fates (Bissen and Weisblat, 1987, 1989; Weisblat et al., 1984; Zackson, 1984). By labeling an N teloblast with lineage tracer, we were able to observe prominent nuclear in situ signals in two nearby cells in the n bandlet within the germinal band (Figs. 6D, F). The rounded morphology of these cells, as revealed by the RDA lineage tracer, indicated that they were in mitosis and the cells were at the positions where nf and ns blast cells undergo their first mitoses, approximately 26 and 28 h, respectively, after they are born from the N teloblast (Fig. 6E; Bissen and Weisblat, 1989; Zackson, 1984).

As another example, primary m blast cells undergo their first mitoses about 10 h after they are born, which is before their entry into the germinal band. Thus, a dividing primary m blast cell can be identified by its position in the bandlet relative to the teloblast and by its rounded morphology.
Punctate Hro-hes in situ staining was frequently associated with m blast cells at this position (Fig. 7B).

Two different probes for Hro-hes (see Materials and methods) were used; both gave the same pattern, although sense probe gave no staining (data not shown). Moreover, probes for Helobdella homologs of cyclinA (Fig. 6C), nanos (data not shown) and twist (Ping Xiao, personal communication) gave distinct expression patterns without staining the MA. Thus, the association of Hro-hes transcripts with MA is not an artifact of the in situ hybridization protocol.

The severe conditions used for the in situ hybridization were not compatible with simultaneous immunostaining of histones or microtubules, or even DAPI staining for chromatin (data not shown). Thus, although the staining patterns observed were often suggestive of chromatin fixed at different phases of mitosis [e.g., prophase (Figs. 6D, 7B), metaphase (Figs. 7A, B) or telophase (Figs. 6B)], we cannot be sure if the in situ staining is associated with the chromatin or the spindle of the MA, or both.

Hro-hes is transcribed during mitosis: actinomycin D sensitivity of MA staining

One explanation for the association of Hro-hes transcripts with the MA of dividing cells is that cytoplasmic transcripts were binding to the MA following nuclear membrane breakdown at the onset of mitosis. Alternatively, it could be that Hro-hes was being transcribed during mitosis. To begin to distinguish these possibilities, we carried out in situ hybridization for Hro-hes on embryos treated with actinomycin D to inhibit transcription. In one set of experiments, we focused on the easily observed primary m blast cell divisions. Roughly 30% of the m bandlets in control embryos contained punctate in situ staining at the site where the primary m blast cells undergo mitosis. This is in accord with the duration of mitosis (approximately 30 min) relative to the rate at which m blast cells are produced from the M teloblasts in H. robusta (one cell per approximately 90 min). Actinomycin D treatment eliminated the punctate in situ staining from the embryo overall, including the primary m blast cells at the site of their first mitosis, without affecting the diffuse staining of adjacent, interphase cells (Fig. 7B).

One interpretation of these results is that Hro-hes is transcribed primarily during mitosis, and that the in situ signal in adjacent cells represents the perdurance of the mitotic transcripts during interphase. This interpretation is called into question, however, by the slow onset of the actinomycin D effect; roughly 4-h exposure is required to eliminate the MA staining. This delay may arise in part from the time required for the actinomycin D to reach effective levels within the yolky Helobdella embryos. But the delay could also be interpreted to mean that Hro-hes is transcribed during interphase, and that the actinomycin D sensitivity of the MA in situ staining reflects a transcriptional requirement for the synthesis of other molecules that stabilize and localize the preexisting Hro-hes transcripts to the MA during mitosis.

Hro-hes is transcribed during mitosis: single cell RT-PCR

To examine this issue further, we took advantage of the observations that: (1) in situ staining for Hro-hes labels the MA during the first zygotic mitosis (Fig. 7A); (2) actinomycin D treatment also eliminated this MA staining (Fig. 7A), and (3) in situ signal for Hro-hes was detected before first mitosis, other than a background staining of teloplasma also seen in controls (data not shown). The simplest interpretation of these results, that Hro-hes transcripts appear at the first mitosis, is also consistent with the finding that HRO-HES immunostaining labels nuclei at the two-cell stage, but not the one-cell stage (Fig. 5A). Alternatively, it could be that: (1) Hro-hes transcripts are present in the cytoplasm of the zygote but too diffusely distributed to be detected until they are localized to the MA during mitosis; (2) transcription is required for the synthesis of molecules that localize preexisting Hro-hes transcripts to the mitotic apparatus during mitosis, and (3) expression of HRO-HES is regulated posttranscriptionally, beginning at the two-cell stage.

To investigate this alternative, we undertook an RT-PCR analysis of Hro-hes expression using single embryos at selected time points during the first cell cycle, taking advantage of the fact that there is only one nuclear assembly per embryo during this time. Individual zygotes were staged relative to the time of emergence of the second polar body (approximately 100 min AZD). To increase the sensitivity of the method and to confirm the identity of the amplified bands, the resultant gels were blotted and hybridized with a 32P-labeled Hro-hes probe. The probe was designed to correspond to a fragment internal to the primers used for

![Fig. 8. Hro-hes is transcribed during mitosis: single cell RT-PCR/Southern analysis. Individual embryos were staged to within ±5 min and lysed for RT at indicated time points [minutes after zygote deposition (min AZD); the time line is not linear] during the first cell cycle (see Materials and methods for details). The corresponding cell cycle phases are indicated by the colored bar. The resultant gel was blotted and probed with a 32P-labeled Hro-hes probe; the next two rows show 6- and 2-h exposures of the southern blot. As a control for the RT reaction, PCR for cDNAs derived from abundant maternal Hro-nos transcripts was carried out on the same set of RT samples (bottom row).](image-url)
the RT-PCR (see Materials and methods for details). The Southern blot revealed bands of the expected size at three of the six time points sampled during mitosis and at none of the five points sampled during interphase (Fig. 8). Investigating the interesting possibility that Hro-hes transcription is further restricted to certain phases of mitosis requires further refinement of the protocol and is beyond the scope of the present work.

The central conclusion of these experiments is that Hro-hes mRNA is transcribed and accumulates during the first zygotic mitosis in Helobdella. These results do not preclude the possibility that Hro-hes is being transcribed before mitosis; but if so, the transcripts must be broken down so rapidly as to be undetectable even by the highly sensitive combination of RT-PCR and Southern blot analysis employed here. We cannot extend the RT-PCR/Southern analysis to multicellular stages of development because cell cycles in Helobdella are asynchronous beginning with the two-cell stage. Given the similar in situ patterns at the different stages, however, and the similar results with actinomycin D treatment, it seems likely that mitotic transcription of Hro-hes is occurring at later stages as well. This pattern of expression has not been observed for any of the hes-class genes characterized in vertebrates, arthropods or nematodes.

Discussion

Hro-hes is transcribed during mitosis and transcripts localize to the MA

We report here the first characterization of an hes-class gene from a segmented lophotrochozoan, the glossiphoniid leech H. robusta. The peak of Hro-hes transcript accumulation coincides with the production of segmental founder cells (blast cells) by embryonic stem cells (teloblasts), but Hro-hes is also expressed in teloblast precursors and nonsegmental lineages throughout early development. Hro-hes is expressed in the teloblasts and primary blast cells of all five segmental lineages (M, N, O, P and Q). No striped pattern suggestive of a pair-rule function was observed for the expression of either Hro-hes or HRO-HES.

In situ hybridization also revealed that Hro-hes transcripts are associated with the MA of dividing cells, beginning with the first zygotic cell division. We have previously found a similar distribution of transcripts for an eve-class gene in Helobdella (Song et al., 2002). Curiously, transcripts for an eve-class gene were found to be localized to the centrosomes during the micromere-forming cleavages of another spiral cleaver, the snail Ilyanassa obsoleta (Lambert and Nagy, 2002). Both Helobdella (phylum Annelida) and Ilyanassa (phylum Mollusca) are grouped in the superphylum Lophotrochozoa. No such transcript localizations have been observed for either hes- or eve-class genes in arthropods or nematodes (superphylum Ecdysozoa) or vertebrates (superphylum Deuterostomia). Hro-eve is also expressed in a subset of developing neurons during stages 9–10, but the expression of Hro-hes has not yet been characterized at the cellular level for these stages.

Subcellular localization of mRNAs has been reported for many genes and is usually linked with translational regulation of the mRNA (reviewed by Kloek and Etkin, 1994). Of particular relevance to our results is the finding that Xbab3 and cyclinB1 mRNAs are localized to the MA of Xenopus embryos during cleavage; both transcripts contain cytoplasmic polyadenylation elements (CPEs) within their 3′-UTRs and their translation is regulated by CPE binding protein (CPEB) and maskin, both of which are located on the MA (Groisman et al., 2000). We note that both Hro-hes and Hro-eve contain putative CPEs within their 3′-UTRs; we speculate that the translation of these genes may be similarly controlled. The association of Hro-hes mRNA with the MA of dividing cells suggested that this gene might be transcribed during mitosis. The sensitivity of this in situ staining to actinomycin D supported this interpretation, and RT-PCR/Southern analysis of individual zygotes provides definitive evidence that Hro-hes is transcribed during the first mitosis. Mitotic transcription is unexpected but not without precedent. Of the approximately 6220 ORFs in yeast, approximately 55–195 are identified as being transcribed during mitosis (Krebs et al., 2000; Spellman et al., 1998).

Antiphase oscillation of Hro-hes transcription and nuclear HRO-HES levels

In contrast to the case for Hro-hes transcripts, the immunohistochemical signal for HRO-HES protein is strongest in the nucleus during interphase and declines during mitosis. This could reflect dilution into cytoplasm following nuclear breakdown, protein turnover and/or masking of HRO-HES during mitosis. Whatever the cause, this means that Hro-hes transcription and HRO-HES nuclear protein levels cycle antiphasically in strict correlation with the cell cycle during cleavage, during the stem cell divisions by which teloblasts produce segmental founder cells (blast cells) and during the initial divisions leading from blast cells to definitive segmental tissues in Helobdella.

One interpretation of these observations is that Hro-hes transcription and HRO-HES protein localization are regulated by the cell cycle, independently of each other. By analogy with other systems, a more likely possibility is that HRO-HES represses Hro-hes transcription, either directly or indirectly. Repression by Hairy and other HES-class proteins has been clearly demonstrated (Barolo and Levine, 1997; Takebayashi et al., 1994); aspects of HES repression are mediated by binding a Groucho-class co-repressor to the C-terminal WRPW domain (Fisher et al., 1996) and also by interacting with the SIR2-class of histone deacetylase (Rosenberg and Parkhurst, 2002). In addition, autoinhibition of mammalian hes1 transcription by binding of HES1 protein to its own promoter has been shown (Takebayashi...
et al., 1994) and an oscillating antiphasic expression of hesl transcripts and HES1 protein has been demonstrated in serum-stimulated cells in culture; these oscillations also require the turnover of HES1 via the ubiquitinylilation pathway (Hirata et al., 2002). These authors have also presented evidence that such autoinhibition functions in regulating hesl transcription in mouse, apparently contrary to previous conclusions for mouse (Jouve et al., 2000) and chick (Palmeirim et al., 1997). Our observations of antiphasiscally oscillating HRO-hes transcription and nuclear HRO-HES protein lead us to speculate that Hro-hes expression is regulated in part by autoinhibition, in tight conjunction with the cell cycle.

Evolution of segmentation

In recent years, three hypotheses have been offered to explain the relationship between segmentation in annelids, arthropods and vertebrates. The “Articulata hypothesis” originated with classical, character-based phylogenies; it holds that annelids and arthropods have evolved from a common segmented ancestor and that segmentation arose independently in chordates (Cuvier, 1817; reviewed by Scholtz, 2002). In contrast, the current consensus of molecular phylogenies holds that modern bilaterian animals represent three ancient clades (superphyla Deuterostomia, Ecdysozoa and Lophotrochozoa). If this is true, parsimony dictates that segmentation has evolved independently in annelids, arthropods and vertebrates because segmented phyla are a distinct minority in each clade (Brusca and Brusca, 1990). Finally, similarities between the expression patterns of engrailed- and hes-class genes in arthropods (Ecdysozoa) and chordates (Deuterostomia) have led some to propose that the last common ancestor of all three major groups was already segmented (De Robertis, 1997; Holland et al., 1997; Kimmel, 1996; Palmeirim et al., 1997).

Segmental structures arise sequentially in anteroposterior progression in most vertebrates, annelids and arthropods. As noted above, hes-class genes are expressed in the posterior growth zone of arthropods (Damen et al., 2000) and in the PSM of vertebrates (Bessho et al., 2001; Hirata et al., 2002; Holley et al., 2000; Jouve et al., 2000; Muller et al., 1996; Oates and Ho, 2002; Palmeirim et al., 1997; Pourquie, 2001a,b). Here, we have shown that an hes-class gene is also expressed in the posterior growth zone (i.e., the teloblasts and blast cells) of H. robusta, representing the third major group of segmented animals. We speculate that Hro-hes is part of a molecular network that operates under the control of the cell cycle and regulates cell fate decisions during cleavage and segmentation in the early Helobdella embryo.

However, we do not believe our results necessarily support the hypothesis of a segmented common ancestor for bilaterians, or even among the protostomes. Another scenario is that: (1) stem cells (a prominent feature of basally branched groups such as Porifera and Cnidaria) were a feature of the urbilaterian and that segmentation has arisen independently in a minority of modern phyla; (2) the inherent periodicity of gene expression and cell fate decisions associated with ancestral stem cell processes were modified in various ways during evolution to generate the repeating definitive structures we identify as segments in adult animals; (3) hes-class genes were involved in ancestral stem cell cycle and cell fate decisions and have been retained in all three of the major groups; (4) hes genes have acquired distinct roles during the independent evolution of segmentation in vertebrates, annelids and arthropods.

Thus, we propose that the stem cell populations in the ancestor bilaterian had properties that were modified to generate overt segmentation independently in a minority of taxa in the three major descendant groups. A prediction of this model is that genes involved in ancestral stem cell processes should be present in both segmented and unsegmented animals. We note that the hes-class gene (lin-22) exhibits a role in the A–P body pattern by regulating stem cell differentiation in the unsegmented nematode (Wrischnik and Kenyon, 1997). In this regard, it will be of interest to determine if hes-class genes are expressed in stem cells of other unsegmented taxa.
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