Identification of SULF2 as a Novel Transcriptional Target of p53 by Use of Integrated Genomic Analyses
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Abstract

Microarray analysis has been useful for identifying the targets of many transcription factors. However, gene expression changes in response to transcription factor perturbation reveal both direct transcriptional targets and secondary gene regulation. By integrating RNA interference, gene expression profiling, and chromatin immunoprecipitation technologies, we identified a set of 32 direct transcriptional targets of the tumor suppressor p53. Of these 32 genes, 11 are not currently associated with the core p53 pathway. From among these novel pathway members, we focused on understanding the connection between p53 and SULF2, which encodes an extracellular heparan sulfate 6-O-endosulfatase that modulates the binding of growth factors to their cognate receptors and that has been shown to function as a tumor suppressor. Genetic and pharmacologic perturbation of p53 directly influences SULF2 expression, and similar to silencing of TP53, RNA interference–mediated suppression of SULF2 results in an impaired senescence response of cells to genotoxic stress. Thus, our integrated genomic approach has led to the identification of a novel mediator of p53 network biology.

Introduction

Dysregulation of the p53 tumor suppressor pathway interferes with tissue homeostasis, primes cells for tumorigenesis, and is associated with chemotherapy and radiotherapy resistance (1–3). p53 regulates expression of a large network of genes through transcriptional activation. Although the list of p53 downstream effectors that mediate its tumor suppressor function by inducing cell cycle arrest, apoptosis, and senescence is sizable (4–6), therapeutic strategies for cancer around these targets have been limited. Microarray-based gene expression analyses are frequently used to identify potential downstream targets of transcription factors. For p53, gene expression profiling experiments with different modes of activating p53 function have identified overlapping, yet distinct, sets of potential downstream p53 targets (6, 7). However, gene expression profiling reports both direct transcriptional and indirect secondary targets. Overall, systematic validation of direct targets in these previous studies has not been rigorously pursued.

To identify a list of direct transcriptional targets of p53 with high confidence, we interrogated the pathway by use of several genomic technologies and RNA interference (RNAi). RNAi is effective for the engineering of paired cell lines of identical genetic background with and without a defined gene deficiency. To identify changes in the transcriptome that result specifically from perturbation of the p53 pathway, we generated a panel of matched-pair and inducible p53 knockdown cell lines of multiple cancer origins and compared their gene expression profiles. From these steps, we established a set of consensus genes that universally responded to the perturbation of p53. To distinguish direct from indirect targets, we performed chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) surveying both the whole genome and focused loci. Additionally, we confirmed the presence of p53 recognition sites in gene promoters by use of an algorithm that identifies and ranks potential p53 interacting sequences (7). Combining the results from these approaches, we identified a high confidence list of genes that are directly regulated by p53.

Among this set of p53 direct targets, there are known, as well as novel, p53 transcriptional targets. We present results of our follow-up on one such novel pathway member, SULF2. SULF2 and the related protein SULF1 are extracellular heparan sulfate 6-O-endosulfatases that share similar substrate specificity and perform redundant physiologic functions (8). SULF1 and SULF2 remove the sulfate group from the polysaccharide side chain of heparan sulfate proteoglycans and modulate the activity of several signaling proteins including fibroblast growth factors, bone morphogenic proteins, and WNTs (8–12). Relevant to having a role in the p53 pathway, loss of SULF1 and SULF2 has been reported in several types of cancers, and emerging evidence suggests that sulfatases function as tumor suppressors (13–15).

By integrating gene expression profiling, ChIP, and transcription factor binding site prediction, we have effectively identified a “highly interrogated” list of direct downstream targets of an important cancer relevant transcription factor, p53. Furthermore, we have validated SULF2 as a direct transcriptional target of p53 and have provided evidence that SULF2 protein mediates some aspect of p53 function—DNA damage–induced senescence.

Materials and Methods

Plasmids and sequences. pENTR, pLenti6-Block-IT, and pLenti4-Block-IT plasmids were obtained from Invitrogen. Tet repressor (TetR) has been previously described (16). An shRNA targeting the TP53 transcript (p53-1026sh; GACCTCAGTGTTAATCTACATCGAGAATGATTACCACTG- GAGTCT) was subcloned 5′ to an H1 promoter in the pENTR plasmid. To generate inducible shRNA expression plasmids, a TetR binding site (S7) was subcloned 5′ to the H1 promoter. The H1-p53-sh or the TetO7H1-p53-sh was introduced into the pLenti6-Block-IT plasmid through recombination (Invitrogen Clonase). TP53 si1, GACUCGUCGUGAAUCACCTT; SULF2 si1, CCAUCAAGACACUAACATTT; SULF2 si2, GAGUGGUUCGACUC-CUAUATT.

Note: Supplementary data for this article are available at Cancer Research Online (http://cancerres.aacrjournals.org/).
**Chemicals.** Bleomycin, doxorubicin, and doxycline were obtained from Sigma. Nutlin was obtained from Cayman Chemical. The active and inactive enantiomers were separated by supercritical-fluid chromatography using a Chiralcel OD-H column (Chiral Technology). Mouse monoclonal anti-FDXR antibody was purchased from Santa Cruz Biotechnology.

**Tissue culture and cell line generation.** Cell lines were obtained from American Type Culture Collection and cultured as recommended. To generate matched-pair lines and inducible cell lines, lentiviruses expressing p53-1026sh and tT-R were generated according to the manufacturer’s (Invigene) protocol. Knockdown of TP53 message level was determined by quantitative PCR.

**RNA isolation and gene expression analysis.** Total RNA was isolated by RNaseasy (Qiagen) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Microarray analyses were done as previously described (17). Briefly, to identify the p53-regulated genes, ratios of transcript abundance in experimental versus control samples were calculated with normalized intensity data. Gene expression data analysis was done either with the Rosetta Resolver gene expression analysis software (Rosetta BioSoftware) or Matlab (The Mathworks). For each gene sequence on the arrays, statistical significance of differential gene expression was calculated according to the following equation:

\[
P \text{value} = 2 \times [1 - \text{Erf}(\text{xdev})],
\]

where Erf is the error function for a Gaussian distribution of zero mean and xdev is the adjusted difference in fluorescence intensities between C3 and Cy5 intensities.

**ChIP.** Cell pellets were Dounce homogenized after formaldehyde fixing and glycine quenching. DNA was sheared to an average length of 300 to 500 bp by sonication and was precleared with protein A-agarose beads (Invitrogen). p53-bound DNA was isolated with antibodies against p53 (Santa Cruz sc-6243) and protein A-agarose beads. Complexes were washed and DNA was eluted from the beads followed by RNase and proteinase K treatment. ChIP DNA was purified by phenol-chloroform extraction and ethanol precipitation. For ChIP, quantitative PCR reactions were carried out in triplicate on specific genomic regions by use of SYBR Green Supermix (Bio-Rad). The resulting signals were normalized for primer efficiency by quantitative PCR for each primer pair with input DNA. Experimental C\(_i\) values were converted to copy numbers detected by comparison with a DNA standard curve run on the same PCR plates. Copy number values were then normalized for primer efficiency by dividing by the values obtained with input DNA and the same primer pairs. For ChIP-on-chip, ChIP, and input DNA, DNA was amplified by use of random priming amplification. Amplified DNA was fragmented and labeled by use of the DNA Terminal Labeling Kit from Affymetrix and then hybridized to Affymetrix GeneChip. Amplified DNA was fragmented and labeled by use of the DNA Terminal Labeling Kit from Affymetrix and then hybridized to Affymetrix GeneChip. Amplified DNA was fragmented and labeled by use of the DNA Terminal Labeling Kit from Affymetrix and then hybridized to Affymetrix GeneChip. Amplified DNA was fragmented and labeled by use of the DNA Terminal Labeling Kit from Affymetrix and then hybridized to Affymetrix GeneChip. Amplified DNA was fragmented and labeled by use of the DNA Terminal Labeling Kit from Affymetrix and then hybridized to Affymetrix GeneChip.

**Luciferase and \(\beta\)-galactosidase assays.** SULF2 promoter sequence containing the putative p53 consensus site was PCR amplified from human genomic DNA (PCR primer sequence: forward GTACTGAGCTCGAGC- CAAATCTGATTAAAGTGAAGG; reverse GTAGTACGCTGAAGTACACA- CAAAGCCCCAAAAGCC). PCR fragments were subcloned into the open reading frame of firefly luciferase (pGL4.23, Promega). Luciferase activity was measured according to the manufacturer's instructions. \(\beta\)-Galactosidase assays were done with Senescence Detection Kit following the manufacturer's instructions (Calbiochem).

**Results.**

To identify downstream transcriptional targets of p53, we analyzed the gene expression profiles of a panel of cancer cell lines (lung: A549 and NCI-H460, ovarian: OAW42 and A2780, liver: HepG2, and osteosarcoma: U2OS; all of which express wild-type p53) with sustained TP53 silencing mediated by transduction of the cells with a lentiviral vector expressing an shRNA targeting TP53 (16). Silencing of the TP53 transcript in these cell lines was efficient (~20% TP53 mRNA remaining compared with control; Fig. 1A; Supplementary Table S1). To confirm loss of p53 protein function in these cells, we conducted cell cycle analysis following exposure of the cells to DNA-damaging agents. As expected, in p53-deficient cells, p53-dependent G1 arrest was not induced by doxorubicin, verifying loss of p53 function (data not shown). Whole genome gene expression profiling uncovered a set of transcripts that are down-regulated >1.3-fold with \( P < 0.05\) in the p53-deficient lines compared with the corresponding wild-type lines (Fig. 1A; Supplementary Table S1). Annotation of this set of transcripts showed enrichment for genes involved in the DNA damage response, cell cycle, and apoptosis. To distinguish the genes in this set that are direct transcriptional targets of p53 from secondary effects, we performed microarray-based whole genome ChIP (ChIP-on-chip) as well as focused ChIP on promoter regions of selected candidate genes in one of the cell lines (18). We also interrogated ChIP binding sites for the presence of consensus p53 recognition sequences (Table 1). Of these 32 genes, two thirds overlap with or are highly connected to core p53 pathway genes (KEGG, Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes). The remaining one third represents putative novel direct transcriptional targets of p53.

From among this set of genes, we focused on studying the relationship between p53 and SULF2 for the following reasons: (a) The results from the ChIP-on-chip experiment using untreated TOV21G cells and bioinformatic analyses show that there is a consensus p53 binding site in the first intron of SULF2 (Fig. 1B). (b) Two recent reports studying the response of HCT116 p53 somatic knockout matched-pair lines to 5-fluorouracil as well as results with multiple cell lines treated with the p53 activator Nutlin are consistent with SULF2 acting as a potential downstream target of p53 (4, 19). (c) Furthermore, overexpression of either SULF2 or SULF1 inhibited growth of myeloma xenographs in a previous study, providing support for the hypothesis that SULF2 has tumor suppressor function (15). To show that the SULF2 promoter sequence contains a p53-binding site and can respond to activation of p53, we performed ChIP on cells exposed to DNA damage. As shown in Fig. 1C, an increase in the number of p53 binding events in the promoter regions of SULF2 and FDXR (a known direct p53 transcriptional target) was observed compared with a random nontranscribed genomic locus. Such binding events were further increased in response to DNA damage. As expected, an increase of FDXR protein and stabilization of p53 was observed in response to genotoxic stress (Supplementary Fig. S1A and B). (Commercially available SULF2 antibodies did not detect a specific SULF2 band in immunoblot analysis).

For direct manipulation of the p53 response element in the SULF2 promoter, we subcloned the 330-bp genomic region surrounding the putative p53 binding site into a luciferease reporter system. Nutlin is a small molecule that disrupts the interaction between p53 and its negative regulator MDM2 leading to p53 stabilization and activation (20). As shown in Fig. 1D, we observed a 3-fold increase in luciferase activity in response to treatment of cells with active Nutlin but not with an inactive enantiomer. As an additional control, in the p53 knockdown background, the SULF2...
The genomic sequence did not confer transcriptional activity in the presence of Nutlin. Together, the results of gene expression profiling, ChIP, bioinformatic analyses, and luciferase assays led us to conclude that p53 binds to and activates transcription of the SULF2 promoter.

Because direct transcriptional targets of p53 are up-regulated in response to DNA damage, we profiled gene expression changes in TOV21G ovarian carcinoma and A549 non–small cell lung carcinoma cells treated with doxorubicin. We collected RNA at various time points posttreatment to compare the kinetics and magnitude of SULF2 induction (with 0 hour as baseline) with that of three well-established p53-regulated genes, GADD45A, CDKN1A (p21), and FDXR. As negative controls, transcript levels of three non–p53-regulated genes (TP53, ATM, and CHEK2) known to respond posttranscriptionally to DNA damage were determined. In both cell lines, SULF2 induction occurred as early as 12 hours posttreatment and was sustained throughout the 24-hour treatment period. The fold induction of SULF2 transcript was also generally comparable with changes in the three p53-regulated genes whereas transcript levels of the negative controls (TP53, ATM, and CHEK2) did not change in either cell line (Fig. 2A).

DNA damage–induced cellular stress induces changes in many transcripts irrespective of p53 status. To show that DNA damage–induced SULF2 up-regulation is p53 dependent, we studied SULF2 up-regulation in two different p53 matched-pair lines. We engineered HepG2 cells with tetracycline-regulatable knockdown of TP53 that achieves >80% suppression of TP53 mRNA on induction with doxycycline (data not shown). We compared expression changes in SULF2 with that of the same three well-characterized p53 target genes in the p53 wild-type and p53-deficient lines. As shown in Fig. 2B, up-regulation of SULF2 was dampened in p53-deficient lines in the presence of doxorubicin. Therefore, up-regulation of SULF2 in response to DNA damage does depend on direct transcriptional regulation by p53.

In addition to DNA damage, p53 can be activated by inhibition of MDM2, which mediates the ubiquitination and subsequent proteolysis of p53. We used both genetic (RNAi) and pharmacologic approaches (Nutlin) to inhibit MDM2 function. First, we silenced MDM2 by transfecting TOV21G and A549 cells with esiRNAs. esiRNAs comprise pools of small double-stranded RNA fragments generated from bidirectional transcription of a gene-specific cDNA followed by enzymatic digestion with RNase III optimized to yield siRNA-like fragments. This approach elicits potent RNAi of intended
targets and dilutes off-target effects for any given member of the pool (21). As shown in Fig. 3A, silencing of MDM2 by esiRNAs generated from two distinct segments of the MDM2 cDNA resulted in the up-regulation of known p53 targets as well as SULF2. Second, to pharmacologically perturb p53 function, we induced its activity by Nutlin. As shown in Fig. 3B and C, treatment with Nutlin, but not its inactive analogue, resulted in increases in SULF2 and p21 (positive control) expression levels that were dose dependent (Fig. 3B) and had similar kinetics (Fig. 3C). These observations lend further support for the direct regulation of SULF2 by p53.

After establishing a molecular connection between p53 and SULF2, we investigated whether SULF2 protein participates in downstream functions of p53. It is well known that cellular senescence in response to genotoxic stress is p53 dependent. As shown in Fig. 4, cells exposed to doxorubicin or bleomycin underwent senescence as measured by increased β-galactosidase activity. However, when expression of SULF2 or TP53 (control) was silenced by RNAi, the number of cells showing signs of genotoxic stress-

### Table 1. Direct transcriptional targets of p53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession no.</th>
<th>Gene symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contig43039_RC</td>
<td>ALOX5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_138763</td>
<td>BAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_014417</td>
<td>BBC3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_020375</td>
<td>C12orf5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_000389</td>
<td>CDKN1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_001179</td>
<td>DDR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_152873</td>
<td>EAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_004110</td>
<td>FDXR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_001924</td>
<td>GADD45A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_004864</td>
<td>GDF15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_000177</td>
<td>GSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_001553</td>
<td>IGFBP7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_022767</td>
<td>ISG20L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_012396</td>
<td>PHLD3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_003436</td>
<td>PTMA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_015713</td>
<td>RR2M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_007111</td>
<td>TFDPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_147187</td>
<td>TNFRSF10B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_032385</td>
<td>TP53INP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_006074</td>
<td>TRIM22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_152240</td>
<td>ZMAT3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession no.</th>
<th>Gene symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM_004306</td>
<td>ANXA13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_152640</td>
<td>DCP1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_001082</td>
<td>CYPF2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_019000</td>
<td>FAM134B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_018194</td>
<td>HHA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_014278</td>
<td>HISPA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_024430</td>
<td>PSTPIP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_130843</td>
<td>PTPR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_013920</td>
<td>RPS2C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_145263</td>
<td>SPTA18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM_018837</td>
<td>SULF2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. SULF2 up-regulation induced by DNA damage is p53 dependent. A, TOV21G and A549 cells were treated with 200 nmol/L doxorubicin, and RNA was collected at the indicated time points. Fold induction of transcripts was determined by comparison of RNA isolated from treated samples with that of corresponding untreated cells (0 h). TP53, ATM, and CHEK2 negative control transcripts did not change. B, engineered HepG2 cells were left untreated or treated with 100 ng/mL doxycycline for 48 h to induce TP53 silencing. Uninduced or induced cells were exposed to 200 nmol/L doxorubicin, and RNA was collected from samples at the indicated time points. As shown in the heat map, in the p53-deficient background, TP53 was down-regulated and induction of p53 target genes in response to DNA damage (doxorubicin) was hampered.
induced senescence decreased. These data support the idea that SULF2 is not only a direct target of p53 but also functions within the arm of the p53 tumor suppression pathway that leads to senescence.

**Discussion**

Gene expression profiling of matched-pair cell lines generated through RNAi-mediated knockdown of TP53 provided us with a means to probe a defined genetic perturbation in an otherwise identical genetic background. Gene expression profiling identifies direct and indirect downstream effects of transcription factor perturbation, whereas ChIP can reveal the direct genomic binding sites of a factor. Similar to the concept of performing secondary and orthogonal assays to validate hits from a primary small molecule screen, coupling these technologies allowed us to uncover known, as well as novel, direct transcriptional targets of p53 with high confidence. Not only do the promoter regions of these genes contain p53 binding sites but also their expression is lost in response to p53 loss. Two thirds (21 of 32) of the genes have been shown to be directly involved in the currently understood core p53 pathway.

**Figure 3.** SULF2 up-regulation induced by MDM2 inhibition is p53 dependent. A, TOV21G and A549 cells were transfected with two different MDM2 esiRNA pools targeting different regions of the MDM2 transcript, and RNA was collected at the indicated time points. Gene expression of esiRNA-transfected cells was compared with that of mock-transfected cells. B and C, A549 p53-deficient and wild-type cells were treated with increasing doses of Nutlin for 24 h (B) or with 10 μmol/L Nutlin for the indicated times (C). SULF2 and p21 fold induction was determined by quantitative PCR (transcript levels at 0 μmol/L (B) or 0 h (C) were set to 1). Response to inactive Nutlin (B) and transcript regulation in a p53-deficient cell line (C) served as negative controls.

**Figure 4.** Senescence induced by p53 activation depends on SULF2. Activation of p53 leads to increase in growth factor signaling. A549 cells were transfected with siRNAs targeting TP53 or SULF2. Twenty-four hours after transfection, cells were exposed to 50 nmol/L doxorubicin or 35 μmol/L bleomycin for 3 additional days. Cells were then fixed and stained for β-galactosidase (β-gal) activity. A, representative pictures of the doxorubicin-treated samples. B, percentage of β-galactosidase–positive cells (representative of four independent experiments) determined by counting >600 cells.
pathway, and the remaining one third represent potentially novel downstream targets of p53 (Fig. 5; Table 1). Among these 11 target genes, we further validated p53-mediated regulation of SULF2 and suggest a possible link between the p53 growth-suppressing function and the inhibitory role of SULF2 in growth factor signaling pathway.

Because SULF1 and SULF2 modulate growth factor signaling and are deregulated in various cancers, it is thought that aberrant sulfatase function may lead to neoplastic transformation. However, the precise role of these factors in tumorigenesis remains unclear. Overexpression of sulfatases in pancreatic cancers suggested that they regulate tumorigenesis by modulating WNT pathway signaling (11). A number of reports, however, showed that SULF1 loss is associated with a significant fraction of ovarian (75%), breast (60%), and liver cancers (30%; refs. 9, 13, 14). Moreover, reintroduction of SULF1 to hepatocellular cancer cells led to growth inhibition and increased sensitivity to apoptosis (9). Overexpression of SULF1 or SULF2 in a myeloma xenograft model also resulted in reduction of tumor growth (15). These seemingly contradictory findings could result from distinct cellular contexts such as cancer types and the relevant growth factor(s) of a particular tumor.
Our findings show that activation of p53 leads to the up-regulation of SULF2, and silencing of SULF2 compromises cellular senescence induced by p53 activation. Taken together, these results support the notion that SULF2 acts as a downstream effector of p53 tumor suppressor function. Although mice with targeted disruptions in Sulf1 or Sulf2 revealed few developmental phenotypes, Sulf1/Sulf2 knockout mice displayed neonatal/postnatal lethality associated with defects detected in multiple tissues (22–24). Breeding these mice into various tumor model contexts may lead to a better understanding of the role that these genes play in cancer.
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