p53 inactivation unmasks histone methylation-independent WDR5 functions that drive self-renewal and differentiation of pluripotent stem cells
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SUMMARY

p53 alterations occur during culture of pluripotent stem cells (PSCs), but the significance of these events on epigenetic control of PSC fate determination remains poorly understood. Wdr5 deletion in p53-null (DKO) mouse ESCs (mESCs) leads to impaired self-renewal, defective retinal neuroectoderm differentiation, and de-repression of germ cell/meiosis (GCM)-specific genes. Re-introduction of a WDR5 mutant with defective H3K4 methylation activity into DKO ESCs restored self-renewal and suppressed GCM gene expression but failed to induce retinal neuroectoderm differentiation. Mechanistically, mutant WDR5 targets chromatin that is largely devoid of H3K4me3 and regulates gene expression in p53-null mESCs. Furthermore, MAX and WDR5 co-target lineage-specifying chromatin and regulate chromatin accessibility of GCM-related genes. Importantly, MAX and WDR5 are core subunits of a non-canonical polycomb repressor complex 1 responsible for gene silencing. This function, together with canonical, pro-transcriptional WDR5-dependent MLL complex H3K4 methyltransferase activity, highlight how WDR5 mediates crosstalk between transcription and repression during mESC fate choice.

INTRODUCTION

The interplay of ubiquitous epigenetic factors and transcription factors (TFs) in maintaining pluripotency and directing cell fate is incompletely understood. Pluripotent stem cells (PSCs), such as embryonic stem cells (ESCs) and induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs), maintain stemness through self-renewal and harbor the potential to differentiate into any somatic cell type. During PSC cell fate specification, epigenetic histone modifications such as trimethylated lysine 4 on histone H3 (H3K4me3) and H3K27me3 (bivalent chromatin) on embryonic development-related genes undergo dynamic recruitment to coordinate stemness and lineage differentiation (Bernstein et al., 2006). Occupancy of H3K4me3 on the gene promoter typically correlates with gene transcription (Dou et al., 2005, 2006; Li et al., 2012; Rao and Dou, 2015; Wysoka et al., 2005). In contrast, non-canonical H3K4me3 enrichment associated with transcriptional repression has been reported in pre-implantation embryos (Wu et al., 2016). Therefore, whether H3K4me3 recruitment is a cause or consequence of chromatin accessibility and gene transcription remains controversial. H3K4 methylation is a dynamic process controlled by histone methyltransferases and demethylases (Rao and Dou, 2015). H3K4 methyltransferases mainly refer to KMT2 family members (KMT2A-D, F, G), and gene knockout (KO) experiments demonstrated that functional redundancies exist among different KMT2 members (Rao and Dou, 2015). Therefore, a deeper understanding of how H3K4 methylation contributes to gene regulation will provide deep insights into early PSC fate specification.

In mESCs, WDR5 is highly expressed, decreases during differentiation, but remains active in somatic cells (Ang et al., 2011). Expression of WDR5 across cell types is thought to be related to its “epigenetic housekeeping function”: H3K4me via the KMT2 (MLL) histone methyltransferase family (Xue et al., 2019). Wdr5 loss of function leads to lethality in multiple cell types including mESCs (Ang et al., 2011; Li et al., 2020). The majority of reports focus on a “default” function of WDR5 as an activator for gene regulation via its interaction with MLL1 at critical sites (S91 and Y191) at an arginine pocket of WDR5 to modulate H3K4 methylation activity (Dou et al., 2006; Patel et al., 2008b).

Yet, WDR5 represses gene transcription as well and this depends upon interaction with broadly expressed TFs. For instance, WDR5 is also one key component of non-canonical polycomb repressor complex 1 (ncPRC1). Interestingly, three subunits of ncPRC1: PCGF6, and the broadly
Figure 1. H3K4 methylation-independent function of WDR5 maintains p53-null mESC self-renewal

(A) Western blot of FLAG-tagged WDR5WT or WDR5S91K-Y191F in Wdr5 knockout (KO) and Wdr5/p53 double knockout (DKO) ESCs with Dox-inducible WDR5WT-HA rescue. Histone H4 was used as loading control.

(B) Clonogenicity of KO, DKO mESCs reconstituted with backbone empty vector (EV), WDR5WT or WDR5S91K-Y191F plasmids. Data presented as mean ± SD (n = 3 independent experiments). n.s., no significant difference.

(legend continued on next page)
expressed TFs MAX and E2F6, have been shown to repress germ cell or meiosis (GCM) gene expression and affect primordial germ cell-like cell (PGCLC) differentiation from mESCs (Endoh et al., 2017; Maeda et al., 2013; Stielow et al., 2018; Suzuki et al., 2016; Velasco et al., 2010).

Another critical TF regulator of WDR5 function in PSC cell fate determination is p53. Like WDR5, p53 is highly expressed in ESCs and decreases during differentiation (Lim et al., 2005). We found that WDR5 interacts with p53 (Li et al., 2020). We identified a repressor function for WDR5, in which its transient inhibition triggers mESC mis-specification toward the mesoderm lineage under conditions that normally induce neuroectoderm fate, through a p53-dependent mechanism (Li et al., 2020). p53 is most recognized as a regulator of DNA damage and aberrant p53 loss-of-function and gain-of-function (GoF) mutations contribute to tumorigenesis (Giaccia and Kastan, 1998; Haupt et al., 1997; Sabapathy et al., 1997). p53 GoF mutants, unlike wild-type (WT) p53, preferentially bind MLL1 (KMT2A), MLL2 (KMT2B), and MOZ (KAT6A) genes, which result in genome-wide upregulation of H3K4me and H3 acetylation, and enhanced cancer cell proliferation (Zhu et al., 2015). As cancer stem or progenitor cells harbor several hallmarks of PSCs, such as self-renewal and differentiation, it is not surprising that oncogenic p53 mutations have been also found in multiple mouse and human ESC lines, including those used in ESC-based clinical interventions (Hackett et al., 2018; Merkle et al., 2017). One possible mechanism for accumulation of p53 mutations in PSC is through selective growth advantage, which is further supported by the observation that p53 inactivation favors iPSC reprogramming and PGCLC differentiation (Hackett et al., 2018; Marion et al., 2009). However, in PSCs harboring inactivating p53 mutations, how epigenetic mechanisms modulate self-renewal and cell fate choice remains largely unexplored.

To address these gaps in knowledge related to WDR5-mediated H3K4 chromatin-dependent and/or independent mechanism(s) in p53-null mESC self-renewal and neuroectoderm differentiation, here we pursued a series of studies using Wdr5 and p53 double KO (DKO) mESC lines carrying doxycycline (Dox)-inducible exogenous WDR5 rescue plasmids. We found that deletion of Wdr5 in p53-null mESCs leads to defective self-renewal, impaired retinal neuroectoderm differentiation and de-repression of GCM-specific gene expression. Reconstitution of DKO mESCs with a mutant form of WDR5 that does not support H3K4 methylation activity revealed that mESC self-renewal and repression of GCM-related expression by WDR5 is H3K4 methylation-independent in p53-null mESCs. Furthermore, WDR5-driven, H3K4 methylation-dependent function promotes retinal neuroectoderm differentiation in p53-null mESCs. Finally, our study reveals that co-recruitment of MAX and WDR5 to target loci contributes to repression of a subset of genes underlying germ cell development, via changes in chromatin accessibility. Our findings highlight the functional significance of the interaction between the ubiquitous TF and epigenetic regulator, MAX and WDR5, respectively, for mESC fate determination.

**RESULTS**

WDR5 maintains p53-null mouse embryonic stem cell self-renewal in an H3K4 methylation-independent manner

In our recent report, we found that deletion of p53 in Wdr5 knockout (DKO) pre-retinal organoids (POs) undergoing lineage specification (day 2 following mESC retinal organoid differentiation) rescued up to 60% of dysregulated genes in Wdr5 KO POs (Li et al., 2020). To better understand this mechanism, we further examined self-renewal phenotypes in Wdr5 KO and DKO ESCs carrying with Dox-inducible HA-tagged WT WDR5 (WDR5WT, hereafter referred to as KO or DKO for removal of inducible HA-WDR5WT by Dox washout for 48 h and beyond). Consistent with previous findings (Ang et al., 2011; Gan et al., 2011; Li et al., 2020), Wdr5 KO ESCs lost self-renewal capacity; this defect was rescued by constitutively expressed FLAG-WDR5WT (Figures 1A, 1B, and S1A). The well-established function of WDR5 is to complex with MLL1 through two critical sites (S91 and Y191) on the MLL1-WDR5 binding interface, which promotes MLL1 histone H3K4 methylationtransferase activity (Dou et al., 2006; Patel et al., 2008a, 2008b). A constitutively expressed FLAG-WDR5 compound mutant (i.e., FLAG-WDR5S91K–Y191F) failed to rescue Wdr5 KO mESC clonogenicity, indicating a H3K4 methylation-dependent function for WDR5 on mESC self-renewal, as expected. In contrast, both constitutively expressed FLAG-WDR5 WT and FLAG-WDR5S91K–Y191F were able to rescue self-renewal defects in p53-null (DKO) mESCs (Figures 1A, 1B, and S1A), indicating an H3K4 methylation-independent role of WDR5 for maintaining p53-null mESCs.

To investigate chromatin remodeling secondary to acute loss of WDR5 in p53-null ESCs, we performed ATAC-
Figure 2. In contrast to WDR5WT, WDR5S91K-Y191F targets chromatin at sites largely devoid of H3K4me3 in p53-null mESCs.

(A) Western blot to determine global H3K4me1 and H3K4me3 levels in DKO mESCs reconstituted with WDR5WT or WDR5S91K-Y191F plasmids. Relative H3K4me1 or H3K4me3 levels are normalized by loading control histone H3 and setting DKO ESCs reconstituted with WDR5WT as 1 (arbitrary level).
sequencing (ATAC-seq) in DKO mESCs, by removing Dox for 48 h and in WT parental Rx:GFP mESC controls to assess for differences in chromatin accessibility landscapes (Figure 1C). Interestingly, compared with WT mESC controls, DKO mESCs demonstrated a marked closed chromatin accessibility landscape (20,601 closed peaks representing 9,767 genes and 21 open peaks relative to WT control, respectively; Figure S1B; Table S1). Taking into account that p53 also contributes to chromatin regulation in DKO mESCs, we generated p53-null mESCs from a parental WT Rx:GFP mESC line using CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing (Figure S1C) and found that DKO + WDR5WT and p53-null ESCs are comparable at the levels of chromatin accessibility (ATAC-seq, Figure 1D) and transcriptomic (RNA sequencing [RNA-seq]; Figure S1D) landscapes. Furthermore, both DKO + WDR5WT and p53-null ESCs demonstrated more open chromatin accessibility compared with parental WT Rx:GFP mESCs (column 4 or 5 versus column 1 in Figure 1D), which is consistent with previous findings that p53 binds within structurally inaccessible regions of chromatin (Sammons et al., 2015). Re-introduction of WDR5S91K−Y191F partially reversed closed chromatin accessibility found in DKO ESCs, but this chromatin accessibility “rescue” was to a lesser extent than that of WDR5WT mESCs (Figures 1D and S1E). Together, we conclude that p53 inactivation in Wdr5 KO mESCs unmasks an H3K4 methylation-independent function for WDR5 in self-renewal of p53-null mESCs.

WDR5S91K−Y191F rewrites the WDR5-chromatin interaction to exert H3K4me3-independent function in p53-null mouse embryonic stem cells

As exogenous expression of WDR5S91K−Y191F has been widely used to interrogate H3K4 methylation-independent chromatin function of WDR5 (Dou et al., 2006; Kulkarni et al., 2018; Kulkarni and Khokha, 2018; Patel et al., 2008b), we next asked how WDR5S91K−Y191F directly regulates target gene expression in p53-null mESCs. Expression of WDR5S91K−Y191F reduced global histone H3K4me3 levels compared with expression of WDR5WT in both DKO mESCs and P0s (Figures 2A and S2A), which is consistent with previous findings (Dou et al., 2006). To further investigate these observations at higher resolution, chromatin immunoprecipitation followed by sequencing (ChIP-seq) using antibodies against H3K4me3 and WDR5 was conducted. Among all WDR5 ChIP-seq peaks (n = 36,589), only 3.6% (1,337/36,589) of targets were shared by both WDR5WT and WDR5S91K−Y191F (Figure 2B). Interestingly, shared WDR5WT and WDR5S91K−Y191F peaks were largely co-occupied by H3K4me3 signals (Figure 2B). Within this subset of overlapping peaks at which WDR5WT, WDR5S91K−Y191F, and H3K4me3 all bound, loci encoding ribosomal biogenesis genes Rpl5 and Rpl11 were found (Figure S2B). These data suggest that WDR5 association with particular loci is H3K4 methylation-independent, since both WDR5WT and WDR5S91K−Y191F target H3K4me3-decorated chromatin (Figure S2B). Among differential peaks analyzed, 26.6% (9,733/36,589) were WDR5WT specific (Figure 2C) and 69.7% (25,519/36,589) were WDR5S91K−Y191F specific (Figure 2D). Only ~50% of loci with exclusive WDR5WT occupancy exhibited H3K4me3 modification (Figure 2C), indicating H3K4me3-dependent (Figure S2C) and -independent (Figure S2D) functions of WDR5WT in DKO mESCs. In contrast, most gene loci with exclusive WDR5S91K−Y191F enrichment were without H3K4me3 modifications in DKO mESCs (Figures 2D and 2E). Based on differential WDR5WT versus WDR5S91K−Y191F bound peaks across the genome, and the fact the H3K4me3 was not present at most WDR5S91K−Y191F bound peaks, we concluded that WDR5S91K−Y191F rewires the WDR5-chromatin interaction to exert H3K4me3-independent function in DKO mESCs. Finally, WDR5 ChIP-seq data (Figures 2C and 2D) was integrated with RNA-seq data (Table S2) to identify changes in target gene transcription at loci bound by WDR5WT or WDR5S91K−Y191F in p53-null mESCs (i.e., direct target genes). Lefty1 and Lefty2, among the 30 WDR5WT direct target genes, have been reported to balance ESC self-renewal and differentiation (Kim et al., 2014a) (Figure 2F). Pdmd14, Lin28b, and Bach1, among the 64 WDR5S91K−Y191F direct target genes, regulate PSC reprogramming and chromatin maintenance (Nady et al., 2015; Niu et al., 2021; Shyh-Chang and Daley, 2013) (Figure 2F). Collectively, these data indicate that, by targeting distinct loci compared with WDR5WT, which are largely devoid of H3K4me3, WDR5S91K−Y191F rewires the WDR5-chromatin interaction in an H3K4 methylation-independent manner and regulates target gene expression in p53-null mESCs.
Figure 3. Deletion of Wdr5 and p53 in ESCs and POs leads to distinct chromatin accessibility dynamics
(A and B) Metaprofiles of mESC and PO ATAC-seq signals centered on peaks lost (A) or gained (B) in POs upon deletion of Wdr5 and p53 for 48 h (DKO), and relative to DKO POs.
(C) Morphology of day 5 WT, Wdr5 KO, and DKO POs with or without WDR5WT rescue. Scale bars, 50 μm.

(legend continued on next page)
Deletion of Wdr5 and p53 leads to marked increase of chromatin accessibility during DKO mouse embryonic stem cell-to-organoid differentiation

Having unmasked non-canonical, H3K4 methylation-independent roles for WDR5 in chromatin accessibility and self-renewal of p53-null mESCs (Figures 1, 2, S1, and S2), we next explored potential functions for WDR5 that control chromatin accessibility and cell fate specification during DKO mESC differentiation. To this end, we used a serum-free embryoid body with quick aggregation protocol (SFEBq) to generate 3D retinal neuroectodermal organoids from mESCs, as described previously (Eiraku and Sasai, 2011; Li et al., 2020). To determine whether WDR5- and p53-dependent chromatin accessibility in POs were state-specific or pre-existing in mESCs, we compared ATAC-seq profiles of WT versus DKO mESC and PO states. To this end, we withdrew Dox treatment, resulting in removal of Dox-inducible WDR5WT-HA for 48 h, and then analyzed mESCs and day 2 POs by ATAC-seq. For peaks with reduced chromatin accessibility in DKO POs relative to WT POs (“peaks loss-in-DKO PO”), DKO mESC ATAC-seq signals were also reduced relative to that of in WT E5Cs (Figure 3A). On the other hand, peaks with increased chromatin accessibility in DKO POs relative to WT POs (“peaks gain-in-DKO PO”) showed low signal intensities in mESCs in general and were differentially less accessible in DKO mESCs versus those of WT mESCs (Figure 3B). Distinct chromatin accessibility patterns in WT versus DKO at mESC and PO stages suggested that WDR5 and p53 regulate chromatin accessibility through context-specific manner, which is dependent on differentiation stage (undifferentiated mESCs or differentiating POs). Unlike WT mESC-derived POs, we found that DKO POs did not maintain viability beyond 5 days of SFEBq differentiation (Figure 3C). Indeed, cell proliferation defects were observed at day 6 (Figure 3D). However, we were able to reproducibly recover proliferative day 4 DKO POs, which underwent exit from pluripotency, as signified by reduced NANOG expression (Figures 3E and 3F). Thus, we performed ATAC-seq on DKO PO cells at this time point. Strikingly, day 4 DKO POs showed increased chromatin accessibility relative to day 4 WT POs (Figures 3G, S3A, and S3B). To further exclude that marked open chromatin accessibility observed in DKO POs was not due to artifacts or off-target effects, Dox-inducible WDR5WT-HA was added back to DKO POs at 12 h post differentiation. Of peaks in DKO POs that became accessible (closed-to-open peaks) due to deletion of Wdr5, ~60% and ~90% closed at day 2 and 4 POs, respectively, with WDR5WT-HA rescue (Figures 3G and 3H). We conclude that DKO POs display open chromatin accessibility specific to differentiation stages (e.g., day 2 and 4), while in mESCs with Wdr5 and p53 deletion, regions with closed chromatin accessibility are predetermined at the pluripotent stage.

Wdr5 and p53 deletions trigger mESC misspecification during neuroectoderm differentiation and ectopic repression of germ cell- and meiosis-specific genes

To further understand the implications of WDR5-dependent changes in the chromatin accessibility landscape on lineage specification, we performed RNA-seq to identify differentially expressed genes in WT versus DKO POs at the day 4 time point. When we compared differentially expressed genes between WT and POs from two independently derived DKO mESCs (DKO-A and DKO-B), we found a high confidence set of 1,315 downregulated genes (Figure 4A; Table S3). Upregulated or downregulated mRNA expression determined by RNA-seq correlates to some extent, but not entirely, to open or closed chromatin accessibility states in day 4 WT and DKO POs (Figure S3C). Gene ontology (GO) analysis showed that pathways related to retinal neuroectoderm differentiation including eye development and neurogenesis were affected in DKO POs (Figures 4B and S3D). Indeed, in contrast to our observation of retinal neuroectoderm-specific Rx:GFP (+) cell induction in WT retinal neuroectodermal organoids after 6 days of differentiation, we observed defective Rx:GFP (+) cell induction in DKO organoids (see Figures 5C and 5D). Interestingly, for 680 upregulated genes observed in day 4 DKO POs relative to WT POs (Figure 4C; Table S3), GO analysis indicated that pathways related to GCM and chromosome segregation were over-represented (Figure 4D). Heatmaps demonstrated that 35 representative GCM-related genes, including Ddx4 (Vasa), Dazl, Dppa3, Stag3, Smc1b, and Tex11 were significantly upregulated in DKO POs (Figure 4E), consistent with open chromatin accessibility in promoters of 17 GCM-specific genes such as Tex11 observed in DKO POs (Figure 3H). In summary,
Figure 4. *Wdr5* deletion in *p53*-null P0s leads to impaired retinal neuroectoderm differentiation and de-repression of germ cell/meiosis-related genes

(A and B) Venn diagram (A) and gene ontology analysis (B) of downregulated genes overlapped in two independent DKO mESC lines (DKO-A and DKO-B).

(C and D) Venn diagram (C) and gene ontology analysis (D) of overlapping upregulated genes in two independent DKO mESC lines.

(E) Heatmaps for differential expression of GCM-related genes in WT and two independent DKO mESC lines. Gene labeled with # indicated open ATAC-seq chromatin accessibility in respective gene promoters.
transcriptome analysis indicates that deletion of Wdr5 and p53 leads to impaired retinal ectoderm differentiation and upregulation of GCM-related genes.

**Differential requirement for WDR5-mediated H3K4 methylation in regulating expression of retinal neuroectoderm- versus germ cell and meiosis-related genes**

Induction of GCM-specific genes is required for mESC-to-PGCLC differentiation. This cell fate transition occurs through an epiblast-like cell (EpiLC) transition state (Hayashi et al., 2011). Based on the open chromatin accessibility and upregulation of GCM-related genes in day 4 DKO POs, we performed time course differentiation to analyze dynamic gene markers during this mESC-to-EpiLC-to-PGCLC transition phase. We observed that differentiation-induced silencing of mESC stemness genes Nanog and Rex1 was similar in WT and DKO cells (Figure 5A), indicating proper exit from pluripotency. EpiLCs express OCT4 and FGF5 (Liu et al., 2015). OCT4 silencing was observed in day 4 WT POs while DKO POs showed delayed silencing of OCT4 gene. DKO POs exhibited significant higher induction of Fgf5 than WT control at day 4 POs (Figure 5A). Confocal microscopy of day 4 whole POs with 3D re-construction showed that WT (Video S1) and DKO POs (Video S2) had similar distribution of OCT4*FGF5* double-positive EpiLCs (29% versus 36.3%, respectively). Although day 4 DKO POs had upregulation of Dppa3 (Stella) and GCM-related genes, other bone fide PGCLC markers Prdm1, Prdm14, and Tjap2c were not present (Figures 4E and S3E). Further flow cytometric analysis suggested that there were no SSEA1+/CD61+ PGCLCs detected in both WT and DKO POs (data not shown). These data suggested that day 4 DKO POs may represent an intermediate differentiation state between EpiLCs and PGCLCs (Hayashi et al., 2011).

We next asked whether H3K4 methylation-dependent or -independent chromatin regulation by WDR5 contributes to transcriptional output in day 4 DKO POs. Re-introduction of WDR5WT-HA (Figures 5C and 5D) was able to partially rescue 31 DKO POs (Figures S3F and S3G), respectively. Of note, ~40% (15/35) of GCM-related genes upregulated in day 4 DKO POs were repressed by WDR5S91K-Y191F (Figure 5B). In contrast, of 154 genes responsible for neurogenesis downregulated in DKO POs (Figure S3D), only 1 gene (Ror2) was rescued by WDR5S91K-Y191F in day 4 DKO POs. Thus, these data further supported that impaired retinal neuroectoderm differentiation in DKO by WDR5S91K-Y191F is not the consequence of a dominant-negative effect, as this defect can be rescued by co-expression of Dox-inducible WDR5WT-HA (Figures 5C and 5D).

To determine whether WDR5 alone is sufficient to repress GCM genes, we re-analyzed day 2 PO RNA-seq data from our previous report and found that GCM-related genes, including Dppa3, Stag3, Smc1b, Syce3, Dazl, Rhox5, Spo11, Stk31, Tex101, Tex13c2, Tex19.2, and Tex21 were upregulated in day 2 Wdr5 KO POs (Li et al., 2020). The majority of GCM-specific genes upregulated in day 4 DKO POs (Figure 4E) were also induced in day 6 Wdr5 KO POs (Figure 5E). Derepression of GCM genes in day 2 and day 6 Wdr5 KO supported that WDR5 plays essential roles for GCM-related gene regulation. Integration of WDR5WT-HA ChIP-seq and RNA-seq data from day 6 POs in our previous report was performed and of 29 GCM-specific genes repressed by WDR5 (Figure 5E), we identified four WDR5 direct target genes: Stag3, Smc1b, Ing2, and Dazl (Figure 5F). Together with our Wdr5 KO and DKO PO findings (Figure 3E), we conclude that: (1) a subset of GCM-specific genes are direct WDR5 targets and (2) WDR5-mediated repression of a subset of GCM genes is independent of H3K4 methylation activity. In contrast, in identical differentiation conditions, WDR5-driven activation of retinal neuroectoderm lineage-specifying gene is H3K4 methylation-dependent (Figure 5C).

**Interaction of MAX and WDR5 contributes to chromatin accessibility during early Wdr5 KO pre-organoid differentiation**

WDR5 is a subunit of the ncPRC1 complex and at least three of the ncPRC1 components repress GCM-related...
Figure 6. MAX and WDR5 bind to common gene targets during mESC-to-retinal neuroectoderm differentiation
(A and B) Heatmaps (A) and metaprofiles (B) of MAX and WDR5 CUT&RUN signals centered on MAX bound peaks in day 2 POs.

(C and D) List (C) and metaprofiles (D) for MAX and WDR5 co-bound genes which displayed differential chromatin accessibility upon Wdr5 deletion at day 2 POs. All genes except Tmem143 had increased and open chromatin accessibility.

(legend continued on next page)
gene expression in mESCs: MAX, PCGF6, and E2F6 (Endoh et al., 2017; Maeda et al., 2013; Stielow et al., 2018; Suzuki et al., 2016). Since Wdr5 deletion in mESCs and POs phenocopied Max-null mESCs and EBs (i.e., loss of self-renewal and viability, and de-repression of GCM-related genes), we hypothesized that interaction of MAX and WDR5 mediates GCM-specific gene repression during early retinogenesis (Maeda et al., 2013; Suzuki et al., 2016). To this end, we performed cleavage under targets & release using nuclease (CUT&RUN) on day 2 POs using a validated MAX antibody (Blazevits et al., 2020; Meers et al., 2019a, 2019b). Heatmaps and metaprofiles from CUT&RUN showed that MAX-bound chromatin targets largely overlapped with those of WDR5 bound (Figures 6A and 6B), consistent with a previous report that MAX interacts with WDR5 (Dou et al., 2005) and was further confirmed in our experiments (data not shown). Integration of MAX/WDR5 co-bound genes in day 2 POs (by CUT&RUN) with ATAC-seq of day 2 WT versus Wdr5 KO POs revealed that Wdr5 deletion led to open chromatin accessibility in 49 out of 50 genes bound by both MAX and WDR5 (Figures 6C and 6D). Of those genes, 49334220Rik (Figure 6E) and Tex14 are selectively expressed in the testis, which is largely comprised of germ cells (Greenbaum et al., 2007; Yue et al., 2014). Ccne1 is an important regulator for male meiosis (Martinerie et al., 2014). Lsm4 and Ell are downstream targets of master regulator DAZL, and regulate germ cell differentiation and survival (Zagore et al., 2018). Acute deletion of Wdr5 did not affect general MAX protein level (Figure 6F). MAX recruitment was diminished at a similar set of gene targets (60% overlapping) in both day 2 Wdr5 KO and DKO POs (Figure 6G). Importantly, reduction of both MAX and WDR5 enrichment to 5′ UTR of Lsm4 gene at day 2 Wdr5 KO and DKO POs correlated with upregulated Lsm4 mRNA expression (Figures 6H and 6I). Thus, MAX and WDR5 co-target a common region of the Lsm4 gene to repress or limit its expression in day 2 POs. Taken together, our data indicate that a MAX-WDR5 interaction regulates GCM-related chromatin accessibility and gene expression during early retinal neuroectoderm differentiation. Our findings reveal an H3K4 methylation-independent function of WDR5 in gene regulation and cell fate choice during mESC self-renewal and early differentiation.

**DISCUSSION**

As a core subunit of MLL1 histone methyltransferase complex, WDR5 promotes H3K4 methylation at actively expressed genes and is required for growth for a variety of cancers (Kim et al., 2014b; Rao and Dou, 2015). Thus, WDR5 has attracted intense biopharmaceutical interest as a pharmacologic target (Kim et al., 2014b; Rao and Dou, 2015; Schapira et al., 2017) (https://facit.ca/news/facit-and-triphas-accelerator-announce-new-partnership-celgene-first-class-wdr5-leukemia). Moreover, given the essential role of WDR5 in mESC self-renewal and differentiation and the use of human ESC-derived tissues for therapies, a deeper understanding of the relationship between WDR5 and p53 is important. This is because dominant-negative TP53 mutations have been detected in human ESC lines (H9 line) later used in ESC-derived cell therapy human trials and TP53 mutations exist in approximately 50% of human cancers (Kashani et al., 2018; Li et al., 2020; Merkle et al., 2017; Vogelstein et al., 2000).

To address the gap in knowledge of WDR5 function in ESCs with p53 inactivation, we used Wdr5- and p53-null mESC lines with Dox-inducible WT and mutant forms of WDR5 to address H3K4 methylation-dependent and -independent gene regulation during mESC self-renewal and retinal neuroectoderm differentiation. First, we found that an H3K4 methylation-independent, WDR5-driven mechanism maintains p53-null mESC self-renewal and represses GCM-specific gene expression in p53-null POs under serum-free (SFEBq) conditions that induce retinal neuroectoderm fate. Second, we extended our previous findings (Li et al., 2020) and demonstrated that H3K4 methylation-dependent WDR5 promotes retinal neuroectoderm differentiation in p53-null POs. Finally, we revealed that acute inactivation of WDR5 leads to enhanced chromatin accessibility on most gene targets bound by MAX and WDR5. Thus, our work highlights the poorly understood, non-canonical role of MAX and WDR5 as two components of ncPRC1 for gene silencing/repression during mESC fate determination (Gao et al., 2012; Ogawa et al., 2002).

We found that self-renewal of Wdr5 KO and DKO mESCs showed distinct requirements for WDR5-mediated H3K4 methylation. WDR5Y91K–Y191F harbors defective H3K4 methylation activity but nevertheless supports
self-renewal of Wdr5- and p53-null mESCs, but not Wdr5 KO mESCs. Thus, our data provide evidence that H3K4 methylation- or chromatin-independent mechanisms contribute to self-renewal of p53-null mESCs. An H3K4 methylation-independent function for WDR5 for regulating ciliogenesis and left-right patterning was recently reported in embryonic Xenopus models, with WT p53 background (Kulkarni et al., 2018; Kulkarni and Khokha, 2018). To our knowledge, the current study is the first to demonstrate that H3K4 methylation-independent WDR5 activity regulates distinct functions in ESCs, which can be resolved from its H3K4 methylation-dependent features based on p53 status. As S91 and Y191 occupy pharmacologically relevant positions in the WDR5 arginine pocket for design of WDR5-MLL1 inhibitors for epigenetic treatment of cancer (Grebien et al., 2015; Kara-tas et al., 2017; Patel et al., 2008b), we predict that p53-null cancer stem/progenitor cells might be less sensitive or resistant to WDR5 inhibitors that target S91 and Y191 sites. We observed that both Wdr5 KO and DKO mESCs, which entirely lack WDR5, lose self-renewal capacity, albeit at different rates. Thus, additional strategies, such as PROTAC-mediated protein degradation, may be promising, future areas of exploration for WDR5 inhibition in p53-mutant cancers (Gadd et al., 2017).

During retinal neuroectoderm differentiation, we found that H3K4 methylation-dependent WDR5 functions promote cell fate determination in p53-null mESCs. An H3K4 methylation-dependent mechanism for WDR5-driven retinal neuroectoderm differentiation might be expected, since lineage-specifying loci are decorated by H3K4me3 and H3K27me3 bivalent chromatin in mESCs and developing retina (Bernstein et al., 2006; Popova et al., 2012; Rao et al., 2010). Roles for H3K4 methylation-dependent and -independent WDR5 functions, including WDR5 cytoplasmic roles, have been reported (Bailey et al., 2015; Kulkarni et al., 2018; Kulkarni and Khokha, 2018; Wang et al., 2010). In addition to WDR5, other H3K4 methyltransferase complex subunits, such as RbBP5 and Ash2L, also display dual nuclear and cytoplasmic distribution (Wang et al., 2017). Future studies, such as those employing mass spectrometry-based methods to identify specific WDR5-interacting partners in the cytoplasm of p53-null ESCs, will provide missing insights on how WDR5-driven cytoplasmic function may contribute to pluripotent stem cell fate determination.

A multifaceted protein, WDR5 is a subunit of the ncPRC1 complex and interplay of WDR5 with other ncPRC1 components to mediate transcriptional repression remains poorly understood (Endoh et al., 2017; Gao et al., 2012; Ogawa et al., 2002). Three subunits of ncPRC1, PCGF6, E2F6, and MAX, coordinately function as repressors for GCM-specific gene expression in mESCs (Endoh et al., 2017; Maeda et al., 2013; Stielow et al., 2018; Suzuki et al., 2016). Pcgf6-null mESCs maintain self-renewal while both Max-null or Wdr5-null KO mESCs lose clonogenicity. In this work, the functional significance of the interaction of MAX and WDR5 is demonstrated in GCM-specific gene repression. MAX is commonly studied vis-à-vis transcriptional regulation, as a transactivator dimerized with MYC (Blackwood and Eisenman, 1991). MYC also interacts with WDR5 via the same binding surface as RbBP5 but in a mutually exclusive manner (Thomas et al., 2015). Based on the fact that (1) GCM-related loci derepression is not found in MYC KO ESCs (Maeda et al., 2013) and that (2) WDR5-MYC interaction mutants WDR5N225, WDR5L240K, and WDR5V268E repress GCM-specific gene expression in DKO POs (data not shown), MYC interaction with MAX or WDR5 may not contribute significantly to GCM-related gene repression during differentiation of mESCs to retinal neuroectoderm. Future efforts using Max^Box/Box and Wdr5^Box/Box mESCs would allow us to test whether compound deletion of Max and Wdr5 leads to synergistic de-repression of GCM-related gene induction or further promote PGCLC differentiation from mESCs. Such observations would provide deeper insights into the role of MAX-WDR5 interaction on repression of germ cell and meiosis-related loci.

Although the current study focuses on the chromatin-dependent function of WDR5 in current article, the role of p53 in DKO ESCs/POs deserves future study. During an unbiased loss-of-function CRISPR-Cas9 screening, loss of p53 has been shown to promote PGCLC differentiation from mESCs (Hackett et al., 2018). Growth advantage of mESCs by p53 deletion and upregulation of p53 target gene Nanog may account for enriched PGCLC differentiation (Lin et al., 2005; Murakami et al., 2016). However, Nanog expression was not upregulated in Wdr5- and p53-null POs. A possible mechanism for p53-mediated GCM-related gene repression in Wdr5 KO POs may be through common targets such as Dazl and Rhox5, as those two GCM-related genes, regulated by DNA methylation (Jackson-Grusby et al., 2001), were both upregulated in p53-null cells and day 2 Wdr5 KO POs (data not shown). Future studies that unravel mechanisms by which WDR5 exerts distinct chromatin-dependent and/or independent functions, vis-à-vis p53 activity, to determine pluripotent stem cell fate will be especially important. This is because a subset of the popularly used H1 (WA01) and H9 (WA09) hESC lines, and others, carry inactivating TP53 mutations. These hESC lines are commonly used to model retinogenesis and cell transplantation in the laboratory and have been used in clinical trials (Hackett et al., 2018; Kashani et al., 2018; Phillips et al., 2012).
EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

mESC maintenance, transfection, clonogenicity assay, and differentiation
Parental Rx:GFP (Eiraku et al., 2011) and independent Wdr5 KO, Wdr5, and p53 KO mESC lines (Li et al., 2020) were used for this study. mESCs were maintained in an undifferentiated status and differentiated to retinal neuroectoderm organoids as described previously (Assawachananont et al., 2014; Eiraku et al., 2011; Eiraku and Sasai, 2011; Li et al., 2020). InFusion kit (Takara) was used for WDR5 plasmid subcloning. A nucleofector device (Lonza) and Sasai, 2011; Li et al., 2020). InFusion kit (Takara) was used for mESCs transfection. A clonogenicity assay was used to confirm mESC self-renewal function as described previously (Ying et al., 2003).

ATAC-seq
Chromatin accessibility in undifferentiated mESCs and day 4 retinal neuroectoderm organoids were determined by ATAC-seq (Nextera DNA Library Prep Kit, Illumina).

ChIP-seq and CUT&RUN sequencing
In undifferentiated mESCs, WDR5 and H3K4me3 binding to DNA was determined by ChIP-seq and 1 × 10^6 cells were used. To assess WDR5 and MAX recruitment to DNA at day 2 retinal neuroectoderm differentiation, CUT&RUN assay was performed and 2 × 10^6 cells were used.

RNA-seq
Undifferentiated mESCs, day 4 retinal neuroectoderm organoids were harvested and RNA was extracted for bulk RNA-seq.

Data and code availability
ATAC-seq GEO under accession number GSE178551; ChIP-seq GEO under accession number GSE178552; CUT&RUN GEO under accession number GSE178554; RNA-seq GEO under accession number GSE178555.
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