Random and targeted transgene insertion in Caenorhabditis elegans using a modified Mos1 transposon
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We have generated a recombinant Mos1 transposon that can insert up to 45-kb transgenes into the Caenorhabditis elegans genome. The minimal Mos1 transposon (miniMos) is 550 bp long and inserts DNA into the genome at high frequency (~60% of injected animals). Genetic and antibiotic markers can be used for selection, and the transposon is active in C. elegans isolates and Caenorhabditis briggsae. We used the miniMos transposon to generate six universal Mos1-mediated single-copy insertion (mosSCI) landing sites that allow targeted transgene insertion with a single targeting vector into permissive expression sites on all autosomes. We also generated two collections of strains: a set of bright fluorescent insertions that are useful as dominant, genetic balancers and a set of lacO insertions to track genome position.

Some DNA transposons can carry nontransposon DNA and still retain the ability to insert themselves randomly into chromosomal DNA. For example, the P element is used extensively to insert transgenes into the fruit fly Drosophila melanogaster1. The P element has also been used in the fly to generate large-scale gene knockout libraries, to drive tissue-specific expression using the Gal4 enhancer trap, to study genomic position effects and to generate targeted transgene insertion sites2–5. Similarly, other DNA-based transposons (such as Sleeping Beauty, piggyBac and Tol2) have successfully been used for transgenesis in a variety of genetically tractable systems including human tissue culture cells, mice, zebrafish, frogs and flies6.

In C. elegans, transgenic animals are most frequently generated by DNA injection into the syncytial germ line to generate extrachromosomal arrays7. Biologic transformation can be used for stable, but random, genomic integration of a single or a small number of plasmids8. The fly transposon Mos1 is active in C. elegans but has limited cargo capacity (~500 bp) and is therefore not used directly for transgenesis9. Instead, excisions of Mos1 inserts are used to generate double-strand DNA breaks, which are repaired from injected template DNA10. Through the use of positive and negative selection markers, a single copy of a transgene can be inserted into the genome directly via injection of mosSCI11,12. An alternative method to modify genomes that does not rely on transposons but on the bacterial clustered, regularly interspaced, short palindromic repeats (CRISPR)-Cas9 system13 has recently been adapted for C. elegans to allow genome editing at endogenous loci14–16.

Here we demonstrate that a modified Mos1 transposon miniMos can carry large fragments of DNA, even 45-kb fosmids, into the C. elegans genome. We show that insertions can be selected using either genetic or antibiotic markers and that the transposon can be mobilized in wild isolates of C. elegans and C. briggsae. We have used miniMos to generate a set of strains with fluorescent markers that can be used as genetic balancers and lacO insertions that can track genome position in the nucleus. Furthermore, we have used the miniMos transposon to generate six universal mosSCI landing sites that allow insertion of a single transgene construct into permissive sites on all autosomes.

RESULTS

A recombinant Mos1 element transposes with exogenous DNA

The requirements for transposition of mariner elements (Mos1 and the closely related Peach transposon) vary depending on whether the transposon is embedded in chromatin or is contained within injected plasmid DNA. Mariner transposons within chromosomes require internal sequences to transpose17 and can carry cargo only if the cargo is flanked by intact transposons18. By contrast, transposons injected as plasmids can transpose efficiently even if they contain internal deletions and carry cargo19. Experiments in vitro have further demonstrated that modifications to the inverted terminal repeats improve transposition frequency20. We tested whether modified Mos1 elements and plasmid injection protocols11 could overcome previously described limitations for Mos1 transposition in C. elegans9. We generated a composite
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Mos1 transposon with a 7.5 kb transgene (containing Ppie-1:GFP: histone and Cbr-unc-119(+)) and tested transposition by plasmid injection (Fig. 1a and Supplementary Fig. 1). We co-injected the composite Mos1 transposon with a helper plasmid expressing the transposase and fluorescent extrachromosomal array markers. We injected 27 unc-119 animals and identified 17 independent lines with recombinant Mos1 insertions (62% P0 insertion frequency). 47% (8 of 17) of the strains expressed GFP in the germ line (Fig. 1c). We mapped four GFP expressors and four non-expressors by inverse PCR to unique insertion sites. Nonfluorescent insertions were found on autosomal arms, which have high levels of repressive chromatin marks, or the X chromosome, which is inactivated in the germ line (Fig. 1f). It is likely that these Ppie-1:GFP:histone insertions are silenced through a combination of small RNAs that detect foreign DNAs and protect endogenous gene expression in the germ line and subsequent modifications to the chromatin environment. We are currently characterizing germline and somatic position effects in detail (C.F.-J. and E.M.J., unpublished data).

The composite Mos1 element was flanked by two essentially full-length Mos1 elements. To identify a miniMos we tested transposition of truncated composite elements. Only 250–300 bp on either side was required for transposition with comparable efficiency to that of the composite transposon (Supplementary Fig. 1).

The composite transposon could also be mobilized from extrachromosomal arrays containing the transposase and the transposase under the control of a heat-shock promoter. From one extrachromosomal line (EG6346) we isolated two insertions from 300 heat-shocked animals (0.7%), and from a second line (EG6347) we isolated 12 insertions from 410 heat-shocked animals (2.9%). All insertions generated by mobilization from arrays were independent and mapped to unique genomic locations. It might be possible to generate large-scale transposon collections using a heat-shock protocol that are similar to the genome-wide collection of wild-type Mos1 inserts. However, it is currently more efficient to generate insertions directly by plasmid injection.

To determine whether composite Mos1 insertions can be remobilized from genomic locations, we tried to remobilize the oxTi51 insert by injection of the transposase gene and use of selection markers to detect germline excision and repair (Supplementary Note). We were unable to detect remobilization from 48 injections.

Thus, in agreement with experiments in flies, (i) composite Mos1 elements were able to transpose at high efficiency from injected plasmids and did not require most internal Mos1 sequences, (ii) composite Mos1 elements transposed at lower efficiency from extrachromosomal arrays and (iii) genomic insertions were not easily remobilized.

### Insertion into natural isolates and C. briggsae

We tested other genetic and antibiotic constructs as selectable markers for miniMos insertion. We generated insertions of otherwise identical constructs using unc-119(+) and antibiotic selection markers G418 (NeoR)30, puromycin (PuroR)31 and hygromycin B (HygroR)32 selection at similar frequencies (Fig. 1e). The genetic marker unc-18(+) was also as efficient as unc-119(+) selection (unc-18(+), 38%, n = 13; unc-119(+), 34%, n = 32) for a different construct. We were unable to generate insertions with two temperature-sensitive selection markers, lin-5 and spd-1, that are necessary in the germ line. Insertions were probably not recovered because miniMos transposition was strongly temperature sensitive, with insertions occurring only at low frequency at 15 °C but at high frequency at 25 °C (2% at 15 °C, n = 114; 62% at 25 °C, n = 102) (Fig. 1f). Extrachromosomal arrays are generally silenced in the germ line, and injected DNA therefore cannot rescue lin-5 and spd-1 animals at 25 °C. Excision of the native Mos1 element for mosSCI transgenesis at ttTi5605 showed no temperature

---

**Figure 1 |** A modified Mos1 transposon can carry cargo. (a) Schematic of the recombinant Mos1 insertion protocol. Transposon DNA is co-injected with a helper plasmid expressing the transposase (Peft-3::Mos1 transposase). Negative selection markers (Psp6-16.41::pie-1, Pmyo-2::mCherry, Prab-3:: mCherry and Pmyo-2::mCherry) were used to select against array-bearing transgenic animals. (b) Genomic locations of insertions identified by Cbr-unc-119(+) rescue of unc-119 mutants. All insertions rescued unc-119, but not all strains expressed GFP-histone in the germ line. Germline fluorescence is indicated with turquoise (GFP positive) or black (no fluorescence) triangles. (c) Fluorescence image of germline expression. Transposon insertion oxTi48 expressed GFP-histone in the germ line (Ppie-1::GFP::H2B). Top, differential interference contrast; bottom, confocal fluorescence image. (d) Schematic of the minimal Mos1 transposon (miniMos). 550 bp was enough to retain full insertion frequency. (e) Insertion frequencies with the genetic marker unc-119(+) and antibiotic selection markers G418 (NeoR), puromycin (PuroR) or hygromycin B (HygroR). Each antibiotic was tested on animals injected on two different days. Values show the average from all injections (n = 45–122 animals), and error bars show the 95% confidence interval (modified Wald method). (f) Insertion frequencies at different temperatures. Values shown are averages of three independent replicates (injections), and error bars represent s.e.m. Statistics: repeated measures ANOVA (F = 0.0017) with Bonferroni post hoc comparison; **P < 0.01.
is comparable to the frequency of generating semistable transgenic animals by simple array injection (10%)\(^7\). All 20 insertions were fluorescent and expressed only one of the fluorophores from the injection mix (Table 1). Insertions from the same injected animal were independent; we determined all seven insertion sites from animal no. 5 by inverse PCR and all mapped to unique positions in the genome (oxTi306–oxTi312; Supplementary Table 1).

We also confirmed that insertion strains contain a single insertion by segregation in crosses (Supplementary Note). How can a single injection generate several independent insertions and yet each strain contain only a single insertion? We determined that this is possible because insertions were generated at relatively low frequency but occurred in the F1 generation when the population expanded (Supplementary Fig. 2).

To facilitate identification of transposon insertion sites, we added new symmetric restriction sites to the miniMos vectors and optimized the inverse PCR protocols (Supplementary Fig. 3 and Supplementary Protocol). We tested the optimized protocol in individual reactions and 96-well reactions on a collection of bright fluorescent Peft-3tdTomato:H2B inserts (where tdTomato is tandem dimer Tomato and H2B is histone H2B), which will be useful as dominant chromosome balancers for C. elegans crosses (Supplementary Fig. 4).

12% of the inverse PCR reactions contained sequences from the injected plasmid backbone, a result indicating that some transpositions included two adjacent miniMos elements (composite transposition; Supplementary Fig. 1). Sequencing showed that the entire backbone of the injected plasmid had inserted. Incorporating the negative Peel-1 selection marker\(^11\), which is heat shock inducible, into the backbone of injected miniMos plasmids effectively selected against these types of complex insertions.

**P-element transgenesis** has been used to generate loss-of-function mutants in *Drosophila*\(^3\). Although we did not directly
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**Table 1 | Recombinant Mos1 transposon inserts at high frequency**

| Injected P0 animal no. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| Singled F1 animals (rescued) | 24 | 45 | 40 | 18 | 29 | 156 |
| Insertions from rescued F1 animals | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 18 |
| Insertions from nonrescued F1 animals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Single fluorophore | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 20 |
| Multiple fluorophores | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Fluorescence of insertions**

Peft-3:GFP:H2B | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
Pcft-3:mgCherry | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
Pcft-3tdTomato:H2B | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

Five unc-119 animals were injected with a mix containing three miniMos elements carrying Cbr-unc-119 and either Peft-3:GFP:H2B, Peft-3:mgCherry or Peft-3:tdTomato:H2B transgenes. Three days later, a single F1-rescued animal was picked to a new plate. One week later, plates were heat shocked to express Peel-1 and kill array-bearing animals, and insertions from rescued F1 animals were screened for the presence of single (“single fluorophore”) or multiple (“multiple fluorophores”) transgenes. All seven insertions from strain no. 5 mapped to independent genomic locations.

---

**Figure 2 | Mosmid insertions are intact.** (a) Schematic of Mos1-based fosmids (Mosmids). Mos1 and Cbr-unc-119(+*) selection recombinered into the backbone of a fosmid carrying a GFP-tagged gene. (b) Fluorescence microscopy of Mosmid insertions. Four different Mosmid insertions with GFP show expression from the tagged genes. (c) Comparative genome hybridization (CGH) of genomic DNA from four independent insertions of the Mosmid WRM0615D002 containing tagged cnd-1. CGH is based on dense oligonucleotide arrays tiled against a genome of interest and labeling of sample DNA and control DNA with different fluorophores. Genomic regions that differ between sample and control will show a difference in the ratio between the two color intensities. The Mosmid with cnd-1::EGFP contained an error rendering the fusion protein nonfluorescent.
screen for mutant phenotypes, we noted that several of the Pefi-3:tdTomato:H2B insertions were inserted into introns and exons of genes with obvious phenotypes: unc-13I, unc-22IV and him-4X. All three insertions showed the phenotypes expected from loss-of-function alleles.

To test whether expression of insertions was affected by neighboring promoters, we generated strains with promoters driving GFP expression in pharyngeal muscles (Pmyo-2, n = 3) and body-wall muscle (Punc-54, n = 3). In this relatively small sample, we were unable to detect misexpression in other tissues (Supplementary Fig. 5). The insertion frequency and fidelity of insertions is robust enough that miniMos transposition could be a convenient alternative to extrachromosomal arrays in cases in which the unstable and multicopy nature of arrays is undesirable (Supplementary Note and Supplementary Fig. 6).

Mos1 can transpose with fosmids and lacO repeats
To determine the maximum cargo capacity of recombinant Mos1 elements, we generated Mos1-based fosmids (Mosmids) by recombineering36. We inserted a cassette with a 1-kb recombinant Mos1 element and Cbr-unc-119(+/-) into the backbone of several fosmids with GFP-tagged genes (Fig. 2). We injected five different Mosmids into unc-119 animals and obtained stable integrated lines at P0 frequencies ranging from 2% to 14% (5% ± 2%; mean ± s.e.m.) of all constructs. The drop-in insertion frequency was likely caused by two effects: larger cargo may inhibit transposition, and Mosmid injections only inefficiently form extrachromosomal arrays. Inserted Mosmids expressed EGFP in the expected tissues, including the germ line (Fig. 2b).

From one Mosmid (air-2:EGFP) we obtained 18 independent insertions that were all fluorescent, which suggests that Mosmid insertions were generally intact. We verified the integrity of the inserted fosmids by comparative genome hybridization (CGH); this method can detect deletions, insertions and even single-base-pair mutations with high sensitivity37,38 (Fig. 2c and Supplementary Fig. 7). In the four lines generated from a tagged cond-1 gene, either a single, fully intact copy or two full copies (into a single location) of the Mosmid were inserted. We observed similar full-length insertions by CGH on lines from gpb-1, his-55 and air-2 inserts (Supplementary Fig. 7).

lacO repeats can be used to visualize chromosome position when they are bound to a fluorescently tagged LacI repressor39. We tested whether a recombinant Mos1 element could insert a large repetitive transgene containing 256× lacO repeats and selection markers. We generated 20 independent insertions (Supplementary Fig. 8). These strains showed two distinct fluorescent dots in embryos when crossed into a line expressing LacI:GFP, corresponding to the two homologous chromosomes containing the lacO repeats (P. Meister, University of Bern, personal communication).

These experiments showed that the miniMos element is compatible with a wide variety of transgenic cargo and selection markers. We have generated a set of 16 standardized miniMos cloning vectors to facilitate use of the technique (Supplementary Fig. 9).

A set of universal mosSCI insertion sites
The ΦC31 recombinase has been used in flies to develop universal insertion sites that are compatible with a single targeting vector40. We unsuccessfully attempted to adapt the ΦC31 system for C. elegans (M.S. and C.F.-J., unpublished observations). As an alternative, we developed a miniMos system that achieves the same goal. We generated a miniMos element containing the ttTi5605 mosSCI site and flanked it with two selection markers, unc-18 and either NeoR or Pmyo-2:GFP:H2B (Fig. 3). The embedded ttTi5605 Mos element within the miniMos transposon can be used as a landing site for single-copy insertion using mosSCI12 and is compatible with previously published targeting vectors (pCFJ150 or pCFJ350) (Fig. 3). Furthermore, mosSCI insertions can be followed in crosses by the adjacent selection marker (NeoR or Pmyo-2:GFP:H2B). We generated a set of validated single-copy, full-length mosSCI universal insertion sites that were permissive for germline expression (Fig. 3). Additionally, we targeted the insertion of a universal landing site into the ttTi25545 Mos1 site at the center of chromosome III by mosSCI because no insertion site on chromosome III was compatible with germline expression (data not shown). All universal landing sites were validated: we could generate single-copy inserts at frequencies similar to those for insertions into the native ttTi5605 site, and a Pdp-30:GFP:H2B transgene was expressed in the germ line (Supplementary Table 1).
**DISCUSSION**

Random insertion of transgenes with the miniMos element has several advantages relative to biolistic transformation\(^6\). First, the exact insertion site can be determined by PCR. Knowledge of the exact insertion site ensures that mutations caused by miniMos insertion, or effects on expression of the transgene by the genomic environment, can be assessed. Second, a single intact copy of the transgene with well-defined end points in the genome is inserted. Third, the miniMos element can insert intact fosmids\(^41\) and is active in other species and natural *C. elegans* isolates\(^42\). Finally, the insertion frequency of the miniMos element is high enough that several insertions are frequently generated from a single injection. Redundant inserts improve the chance of identifying insertions that do not disrupt endogenous genes and that are appropriately expressed.

We imagine miniMos transgenesis will mostly be used to insert single copies of transgenes, but there are at least four additional uses for the miniMos resources described here. (i) The set of dominant chromosome balancers is composed of 158 inserts that express red or green fluorescent proteins in somatic nuclei spaced about every 2–5 map units (Supplementary Fig. 4). These balancers can be used to generate strains with complicated genotypes. (ii) We generated two mapping strains that contain three distinguishable fluorescent markers that cover all six chromosomes in high incidence of male (*him*) mutant backgrounds. These strains are useful for mapping new mutations to chromosomes. (iii) The lacO insertions mark 20 different genomic sites and can be used to locate chromosome positions in the nucleus: for example, during meiosis or differentiation\(^43\). (iv) We generated a set of universal mosSCI insertion sites that are compatible with a single targeting vector. These strains can be used to insert single-copy transgenes at multiple positions in the genome.

In the future, two compelling uses for miniMos will be to probe the genome on a global scale for chromatin effects and to determine expression patterns using gene-trap constructs. First, the preliminary experiments with the composite Mos inserts demonstrate that transgene expression in both the soma and germ line of *C. elegans* is position dependent, with high degrees of silencing on the X chromosome and on autosomal arms. For example, almost all of the nonfluorescent *Ppie-1*-GFP insertions were inserted into the X chromosome, which is inactivated in the germ line\(^23\), or into autosomal arms containing a high incidence of repressive histone marks\(^22\). Second, miniMos constructs can be used to generate enhancer-trap and gene-trap constructs. For determining the expression pattern of a single gene, it will be much more efficient to specifically target the gene with the CRISPR-Cas9 system\(^1,5,16,44\). But for determining the expression patterns of all genes, random insertions with miniMos will be preferable, as has been done in *Drosophila* using P elements\(^5\). The miniMos element could be combined with the Q system\(^45\) to generate strong, inducible driver lines for most tissues. In particular, it may be possible to identify promoters or enhancers that target expression individually to many of the 302 neurons of the adult nervous system.

Protocols, annotated plasmid sequences and a searchable list of strains are available at the Wormbuilder web page (http://www.wormbuilder.org/).

**METHODS**

Methods and any associated references are available in the online version of the paper.
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ONLINE METHODS

Reagents. Please see the web page http://www.wormbuilder.org/ for annotated plasmid sequences, protocols and a searchable list of strains. Plasmids are available from Addgene as a single kit (#1000000031; https://www.addgene.org/minimos/) or as individual plasmids. Strains were maintained using standard methods. Temperature-sensitive strains lin-5 and spd-1 were grown at 15 °C. All other strains were grown at room temperature on OP50 or HB101 bacteria. Fluorescent balancer strains, including the two mapping strains, have been deposited with the Caenorhabditis Genetics Center (CGC).

Molecular biology. Plasmids were designed with ApE (A plasmid Editor, M.W. Davis), which is freely available at http://www.biology.utah.edu/jorgensen/wayned/ape/.

All plasmids were generated by standard molecular techniques, including isothermal assembly and three-fragment Gateway cloning (Life Technologies). PCR amplification was performed using a high-quality DNA polymerase, Phusion (New England BioLabs).

Please see Supplementary Table 1 for GenBank-formatted plasmid sequences of all plasmids used in this study.

Reproducibility. All injections were performed at least in duplicate and usually in triplicate on different days. Only injections with DNA isolated by the same preparation method were compared. The number of injections and the sample size were selected to reach statistical significance in tests that correct for multiple comparisons. Overall, the reproducibility on different days was high. This is particular apparent in the experiment to identify the minimal Mos1 element (miniMos), where all truncated constructs larger than the miniMos transposon show reproducible insertion frequencies (Supplementary Fig. 1).

Exclusion criteria. Plates that did not contain any transgenic F1 progeny as determined by phenotypic rescue (unc-119 injections) or the presence of fluorescent co-injection markers (antibiotic injections) were not counted toward the number of injected animals. This exclusion criteria excluded approximately 5–10% of all injected animals and served to reduce the variability caused by differences in injection needles between separate injections.

Blinding and randomization. No blinding or randomization was performed.

Recombinant Mos1 insertions. miniMos insertions. Insertions were generated and mapped as described in detail in the Supplementary Protocol. In brief, injection strains were maintained on HB101 bacteria at 15–20 °C. An injection mix containing the miniMos transgene at 10–15 ng/µl, red fluorescent co-injection markers pGFIH8 at 10 ng/µl, pCF190 at 2.5 ng/µl and pCF104 at 10 ng/µl, a helper plasmid expressing the Mos1 transposase pCF160 at 50 ng/µl and the negative, heat shock-inducible peel-1 selection marker pMA122 at 10 ng/µl. The remaining volume was made up of milliQ purified water. Injected worms were placed at room temperature for 1–2 h, transferred to individual plates and incubated at 25 °C until starvation (approximately 1 week). For experiments aimed at quantifying insertion frequency, plates were screened for F1 rescue 3 d after injection, and plates with no F1 rescue were discarded. Once starved, plates were heat shocked for 2 h at 34 °C or for 1 h at 37 °C in an air incubator to kill animals with extrachromosomal arrays. All plates were screened for miniMos insertions the day after heat shock on a fluorescence microscope on the basis of rescue and the absence of red co-injection markers. Because of obvious visual differences (state of animals at 25 °C vs. 15 °C or the fluorescence of injected plasmids), the investigator was not systematically blinded to the injected constructs. A single animal from each plate containing insertions was picked for further analysis. The location of miniMos elements was determined by an inverse PCR protocol modified from Boullin and Bessereau1 on genomic DNA isolated with the kits “ZR Tissue and Insect DNA miniprep” or “ZR-96 Genomic DNA Tissue miniprep” (Zymo Research). The DNA was digested with restriction enzymes (New England BioLabs) for 3 h to overnight, ligated with T4 ligase (Enzymatics) and PCR amplified twice with oligos that anneal in the miniMos transposon with Phusion DNA Polymerase. The PCR product was electrophoresed on a 1% agarose gel, and single bands were gel purified with the “Zymoclean Gel DNA Recovery Kit” (Zymo Research). The gel-purified product was Sanger sequenced at the University of Utah Sequencing Core.

We performed two or three independent injections for each set of conditions tested (for example, temperature or length of composite miniMos transposon) to minimize effects of a single bad injection needle. Generally, we observed very little variability between independent injections. Following advice from M. Maduro (UC Riverside), we determined that the largest source of variability was in the quality of injected DNA. We isolated DNA with Spin Miniprep (cat. no. 27106) and Plasmid Plus Midiprep (cat. no. 12943) kits from Qiagen and with a PureLink HQ Mini Plasmid kit from Invitrogen (cat. no. K2100-01). The high-quality DNA kits (Qiagen Midi and Invitrogen Mini kits) resulted in a fourfold increase in F1-rescued animals (20 vs. 5 rescued animals per injection) and a 50% (Qiagen Midi) to 100% (Invitrogen mini) increase in mosSCI insertion frequency (Supplementary Fig. 6). Although we have not tested the effect of DNA purity on miniMos insertion frequency, we generally recommend using DNA of higher purity for injection than what is isolated with the standard Qiagen Miniprep Kit. At the time of injections performed to quantify the insertion frequency of the miniMos transposon, we were not aware of the increased frequency resulting from higher DNA quality, and these injections were therefore all done with the Qiagen miniprep kit.

Quantification of insertions per injection (Table 1). We injected a mix of three different miniMos plasmids carrying Peft-3;GFP::H2B, Peft-3::mCherry or Peft-3::tdTomato:H2B with the Cbr-unc-119(+). Insertion together with the Mos1 transposase and the negative PEEL-1 selection plasmid into unc-119 mutant animals. We picked rescued animals in the F1 generation to individual plates and allowed the animals on these plates to starve out at 25 °C. We heat-shocked plates with rescued F2 or F3 animals to kill animals with extrachromosomal arrays and screened for insertions the following day. We screened each plate containing an insertion for the presence of multiple different fluorescent patterns and picked a single animal from each plate for further analysis. We isolated genomic DNA and performed inverse PCR on all seven different insertions (oxT1306–oxT1312) that originated from injection into P0 animal no. 5. All seven insertions mapped to different genomic locations.
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Universal insertion sites. The universal insertion sites were generated by injection into unc-18(md299) animals following the protocol for miniMos insertions. The internal Mos1 element depressed miniMos insertion frequency from approximately 60% to 12% (n = 180) and resulted in a high frequency of complex insertions (56%, n = 23). Strains with a putative insertion were tested for antibiotic resistance to G418 (NeoR). Genomic DNA was isolated from homozygous, G418-resistant strains and tested by PCR for the presence of the ttTi5605 Mos1 element and the absence of backbone fragments from the cloning vector. Inverse PCR was performed on strains with intact universal insertion sites with oligos that specifically detect the miniMos element and not the wild-type (internal) Mos1 element. The genomic location was determined by Sanger sequencing and verified by oligos designed for each individual insertion (Supplementary Table 1). Strains with universal insertion sites were outcrossed five times against an 11x outcrossed unc-119(ed3) strain, EG6207, derived from PS6038 (a kind gift from A. Sapir and P. Sternberg (Caltech)) by following neomycin resistance. We verified homozygosity of the universal insertion sites in the unc-119 background after out-crossing by PCR. The ability to insert transgenes into all universal landing sites was verified by insertion of pCFJ150-derived constructs with Peft-3-GFP:ttH2B:2 UTR, Pdpy-30:GFPP:ttH2B:ttB-2 UTR or Ppie-1:GFP:ttH2B:pie-1 UTR transgenes.

In one case, oxTi444, a universal insertion site was generated by targeted insertion of the universal landing site into a preexisting mosSCI site, ttTi25545. In this case, the miniMos element was exchanged for left and right homology regions adjacent to ttTi25545 and inserted by the standard mosSCI protocol11.

Antibiotic selection protocol. We used antibiotic selection protocols modified from Giordano-Santini et al.30, Semple et al.31 and Radman et al.32. For G418 selection, we made a 25 mg/ml (Gold Biotechnology) solution in water and filter-sterilized the solution with a 0.2-µm filter. For puromycin selection we purchased a 10 mg/ml solution (InvivoGen) and added 0.1% Triton X-100 (Sigma). For hygromycin B we made a 20 mg/ml (Gold Biotechnology) solution in water and filter-sterilized the solution with a 0.2-µm filter. For use in antibiotic selection, 500 µl of the stock solutions were added directly to plates containing wild-type worms that had been injected 1 or 2 d before. Plates were allowed to dry with the lid off. Dry plates were returned to the 25 °C incubator, and worms were allowed to starve. The animals were heat shocked to remove those with extrachromosomal arrays and were screened for insertions the next day on the basis of survival on antibiotic plates, lack of fluorescent co-injection markers and fluorescence from the miniMos construct carrying Peft-3:GFP(NLS). At least ten animals from each antibiotic selection were propagated and homozygosed by fluorescence to verify true insertions. We note that the antibiotic selection markers are very convenient for injecting into healthier strains, such as wild-type animals, but suffer from the disadvantage that they are harder to homozygose, especially in the absence of a fluorescent insertion marker. In our hands, G418 and hygromycin B killed almost all nontransgenic animals within 2 d, whereas puromycin typically took 3–4 d to kill nontransgenic animals.

Composite Mos1 remobilization. To determine whether composite Mos1 insertions can be remobilized from genomic locations, we generated a strain carrying an insertion (oxTi51; Fig. 1b) and a mutation in the unc-18 gene. A rescuing template containing unc-18(+) was constructed so that a double-strand break generated by transposon excision would be repaired by homologous recombination and copy unc-18(+) into the excision site. From 48 injected animals we did not recover any targeted unc-18(+) insertions. This result is in agreement with similar experiments in Drosophila, where the insertion frequency was intact but genome mobilization was reduced by two orders of magnitude for modified transposons of the same family as Mos1.

Bioinformatic analysis of recombinant Mos1 insertions. The locations of transposons were determined by inverse PCR. Genomic location was determined by identifying the junction between the transposon and genomic DNA. A BLAST search at http://www.wormbase.org/ against genome version WS190 (ce6) was used to determine the genomic position. Generally only uniquely identified insertions were used; however, some insertions that map to several position within a small genomic interval (~10 kb) were included in some figures.

Comparative genome hybridization. Genomic DNA from worms was isolated with the ZR Tissue & Insect DNA MiniPrep kit (Zymo Research) following the manufacturer’s protocol. DNA labeling, sample hybridization, image acquisition and determination of fluorescence were all performed as previously described37,38. We used a 5× high-density (HD) chip divided into three whole-genome sections with 720,000 different oligos for all experiments. The chip design was based on our original whole-genome chip containing 385,000 different oligos. All microarrays were manufactured by Roche-NimbleGen with oligonucleotides synthesized at random positions on the arrays. The chip design name is 90420_Cele_RZ_CGH_HX3. Quantile normalization was performed on the intensity ratios for all experiments. Seven strains—EG7784 (oxTi97), EG7785 (oxTi98), EG7786 (oxTi99), EG7787 (oxTi100), EG6840(oxTi109), EG6731 (oxTi114) and EG6788 (oxTi118)—were tested against wild-type DNA. All strains showed a duplication of the full genomic region contained within the recombinered fosmid, except for the strain EG7787, which contains a dual insertion. PCR amplification from EG7787 showed the presence of backbone DNA, which is consistent with a duplicate insertion into the same genomic locus. For all analyzed Mosmid insertions, the end points of genomic duplications identified by CGH closely matched the ends of recombinered fosmids, and no second-site duplications were detected.

Fosmid recombineering. The fosmids were engineered essentially as in ref. 41, except for the fosmid backbone modification step, where the Mos1 transposon (1,000 bp) with inverted repeats (IR) was added to the Cbr-unc-119-Nat cassette (on each side of the NatR marker). To make the fosmid host bacteria EPI300 (Epimc) proficient for recombineering, we transformed the EPI300 cells with the pRedFlip4 plasmid, which allows for inducible expression of either the λ Red operon+RecA or the FLP recombinase. For gene tagging, a multipurpose tagging cassette that contains the flexible linker peptide TY1, GFP, FR7-flanked positive selection (NeoR), counterselection (rpsL) and the affinity tag 3xFlag was PCR amplified. The PCR used gene-specific primer extensions of 50 bp upstream and downstream of the insertion point that serve as homology arms for recombineering. Recombinants were selected for kanamycin resistance in liquid culture. The rpsL/neo selection-counterselection marker
was removed by Flp/FRT recombination. The homology arms targeting the \textit{Cbr-unc-119}/IR NatR IR cassette to the fosmid backbone were the same for all fosmids and were included in the same plasmid (pCFJ496); this cassette was isolated by restriction digest from pCFJ496 and used for recombineering the fosmid containing a EGFP-tagged gene. Both the template for the multipurpose tagging cassette and the template for inserting the \textit{Mos1} and \textit{Cbr-unc-119} genes were cloned in plasmids with the R6K origin of replication, which is nonfunctional in the fosmid host strain, and removal of the plasmid is thus not required before recombineering. The fosmid modification cassette pCFJ496 is available from Addgene (plasmid \#44488).

Mosmids generally integrate into the genome at lower frequencies than \textit{miniMos} transposons that can be propagated as high-copy plasmids in bacteria. The lower insertion frequency is likely due to (i) lower transposition frequency of the \textit{miniMos} element with larger cargo, (ii) decreased ability of fosmids to form extra-chromosomal arrays owing to reduced homology and (iii) toxic sequences present on the fosmid. Some of the Mosmids that we tested were specifically chosen because integrated lines could not be generated by biolistic transformation despite repeated attempts and appear to be toxic (M.S., unpublished data). For example, we injected 48 and 60 \textit{unc-119} animals with the \textit{his-55}:EGFP and \textit{his-56}:EGFP Mosmids, respectively. From these injections we did not recover a single rescued F1 animal but were able to isolate one \textit{his-55}:EGFP (2%) and two \textit{his-56}:EGFP (3%) rescued insertion lines in the F2 progeny. This suggests that these Mosmids are toxic at high copy number and that higher integration efficiencies may be achieved by titrating the Mosmid concentration. In support of this, we did not observe any toxicity from an \textit{air-2}:EGFP Mosmid and recovered 18 independent insertions from 125 injected \textit{unc-119} animals (14%).
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