

A double take on bivalent promoters

Philipp Voigt,¹ Wee-Wei Tee,¹ and Danny Reinberg²

Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Pharmacology, New York University School of Medicine, New York, New York 10016, USA

Histone modifications and chromatin-associated protein complexes are crucially involved in the control of gene expression, supervising cell fate decisions and differentiation. Many promoters in embryonic stem (ES) cells harbor a distinctive histone modification signature that combines the activating histone H3 Lys 4 trimethylation (H3K4me3) mark and the repressive H3K27me3 mark. These bivalent domains are considered to poise expression of developmental genes, allowing timely activation while maintaining repression in the absence of differentiation signals. Recent advances shed light on the establishment and function of bivalent domains; however, their role in development remains controversial, not least because suitable genetic models to probe their function in developing organisms are missing. Here, we explore avenues to and from bivalency and propose that bivalent domains and associated chromatin-modifying complexes safeguard proper and robust differentiation.

His one proteins and their post-translational modifications have emerged as important players in the regulation of gene expression and other chromatin-associated processes. The four core histones H2A, H2B, H3, and H4 are subject to a host of covalent modifications, including methylation, acetylation, phosphorylation, and ubiquitination, among others (Vaquerio et al. 2003; Campos and Reinberg 2009; Bannister and Kouzarides 2011). These marks are thought to either directly or indirectly modulate the function of chromatin structure and their effector proteins have specific modification-specific binding domains (Tavernier et al. 2007; Voigt and Reinberg 2011). Moreover, several histone modifications have been implicated as carriers of epigenetic information that can be transmitted through cell division, influencing gene expression patterns in the daughter cells (Probst et al. 2009; Margeron and Reinberg 2010).

Genome-wide mapping studies of chromatin modifications in ES cells have revealed the presence of distinctive marks at certain genomic domains, such as H3K4me1 and acetylation of H3K27 (H3K27ac) in active enhancers as well as H3K4me3 and H3K27me3

appear to be exceptions in other organisms. Using gas-
r las age *Xenopus* embryos undergoing the midblas-
lansion, Akkers et al. (2009) detected preferential
bialen domains. Moreover, genes with signals for
H3K4me3 and H3K27me3 originated largely from dis-
inc areas of the embryo, often being expressed in parts of
the embryo, and only a minority of them corresponding
to bialen genes in mouse ES cells (Akkers et al. 2009).
Although the case of late stage *Xenopus* embryos has
already undergone substantial lineage specification
marginally, the plain discrepancy with the zebrafish
species, nevertheless seems plausible. Various modes of
gene regulation differ between *Xenopus*, zebrafish, and
higher vertebrates.

This notion is supported by the comparison of the
appearance of repressive histone marks during lineage
specification in *Xenopus* development (Schneider et al.
2011), suggesting that bialen domains might be re-
served to certain organisms. Indeed, while *Drosophila*
features a repertoire of PcG and rG complexes similar
to that in mammals, bialen domains appear to be
absent. Analysis of *Drosophila* embryos and es-is-
derived stem cells did not yield evidence for significant
coexistence of both marks (Schneberger et al. 2009;
Gane et al. 2010). Inherent differences in gene regulation
between arthropods, lower vertebrates, and mammals
may account for this apparent discrepancy. For example,
CpG island promoters, the sites of bialen domains, are
overwhelmingly more common in mammals. Instead,
regulation of RNA polymerase II (Pol II) pausing may
constitute an alternative means of coordinating the ex-
pression of early development genes in *Drosophila* (Mise

single-cell approaches in genome-wide analyses. First,

H3K4me3-containing nucleosomes (Voigt et al. 2012), in line with MEFs exhibiting fewer bivalent genes.

It has been argued that H3K4me3 and H3K27me3 cannot coexist on nucleosomes because PRC2 is inhibited by the acetylation marks H3K4me3 and H3K36me3 (Schmidt et al. 2011). Moreover, MS-based studies found that H3K4me3 and H3K27me3 do not coexist on individual histones in HeLa cells (Yong et al. 2009). Given the recent observation that sister histones within a nucleosome are often equally modified (Voigt et al. 2012), bivalent domains could feature asymmetrically modified nucleosomes. Indeed, nucleosomes with only one H3K4me3 mark could still be methylated by PRC2, presumably on the unmodified H3 tail, whereas inhibition of PRC2 required the presence of H3K4me3 on both copies of H3 (Voigt et al. 2012). MS analysis of ES cell-derived histones confirmed the presence of these marks on distinct copies of H3 in vivo. In conclusion, these data suggest that bivalent domains feature nucleosomes that carry H3K4me3 and H3K27me3 on opposite H3 copies. Of note, this observed asymmetry in H3K27me3 and H3K4me3 is compatible with the reported reduction in H3K27me3 signals at some H3K4me3-marked nucleosomes relative to their neighbors that do not carry H3K4me3 (Pan et al. 2007; Marks et al. 2012).

Generation of bivalent domains

Controlling their access to genomic loci is thought to be a major role of regulating the activity of TGF and PcG proteins, the central players in setting and maintaining bivalency. Several recruitment mechanisms have been proposed, including specific DNA sequence elements, DNA methylation states, particular histone modifications, TFs, and noncoding RNAs (ncRNAs), among others. Not surprisingly, many of these elements have been implicated in the generation of bivalent domains as well. One of the key clues as to how bivalent domains might be generated came from analyses of their underlying DNA sequences. Initial work reported early on that bivalent domains strongly correlate with CpG islands in ES cells (Bernstein et al. 2006). CpG islands are a prominent feature of promoters in vertebrate genomes and are present at ~70% of all promoters (Sano et al. 2006; Deacon and Bird 2011). Virtually all CpG-rich promoters in ES cells are devoid of DNA methylation (Weber et al. 2007; Fosslee et al. 2008; Meissner et al. 2008; Mohr et al. 2008) while being trimethylated at H3K4 (Gengenher et al. 2007; Mikkelsen et al. 2007). Consistent with this, essentially all H3K4me3 sites map to CpG islands (Mikkelsen et al. 2007; Pan et al. 2007), which consequently

complex has associated with elongating RNA Pol II, mediating recruitment of SET1 to transcribed loci during early elongation (Krogan et al. 2003). A similar mechanism might recruit SET1 and MLL complexes in mammals, leading to additional deposition of H3K4me3 during transcription. Active transcription might therefore reinforce H3K4me3 deposition at actively transcribed genes and, to a lesser extent, at minimally transcribed bivalent loci.

CpG islands and PRCs

CpG islands likely play an important role in establishing and maintaining H3K27me3 at bivalent domains (Fig. 4B). In contrast to H3K4me3, however, not all CpG islands are marked with H3K27me3. Moreover, whereas H3K4me3 is highly localized at promoters and thus marks only a minor fraction of nucleosomes, the distribution patterns of H3K27me3 are more complex. H3K27me3 marks ~10%–15% of all H3 histones in ES cells as assessed by quantitative MS (Peers et al. 2003; Voigt et al. 2012). If considering H3K27me2 as well, ~50% of all nucleosomes in ES cells are modified by PRC2 (Voigt et al. 2012). Many ChIP-seq studies revealed “lands” of H3K27me3 mostly spanning in ergenic regions and inactive genes (e.g., see Paler et al. 2009; Yong et al. 2011; Marks et al. 2012). H3K27me3 is also enriched in subtelomeric regions (Rosenfeld et al. 2009) and a long terminal repeat retrotransposons (Leeb et al. 2010). These regions likely account for the bulk of H3K27me2/3 present in the ES cell genome. In addition, a relatively smaller amount of H3K27me3 also exhibits more localized patterns around the TSS, sometimes extending into the promoter (e.g., see Mikkelsen et al. 2007; Yong et al. 2011). In ES cells, these TSSs are almost exclusively bivalent (Mikkelsen et al. 2007; Ke et al. 2008). In contrast, when analyzing the genomic localization of components of the PRC2 complex, defined peaks are predominantly found around gene promoters (Boer et al. 2006; Brackenhorn et al. 2006; Ke et al. 2008), indicating more efficient recruitment or retention at promoters. PRC2 appears to be more spread over

It has a slight bias toward GC-rich sequences (Fig. 4B; Li et al. 2010). Recruitment of Jarid2 and the PRC2 core component Eed appear to be codependent, but the exact role of Jarid2 in recruiting PRC2 remains unclear. Similarly, AEBP2, a zinc finger protein that binds DNA in locus-specific, intranuclear and colocalizes with PRC2 at some promoters (Kim et al. 2009). PHF1 (PCL1), MTF2 (PCL2), and PHF19 (PCL3), or homologs of *Drosophila* Polycomb-like (PCL), also interact with PRC2 and have been implicated in its recruitment (Margaron and Reinberg 2011; Simon and Kingson 2013). These and other proteins shown to associate with PRC2 may mediate its recruitment to specific loci, but it remains unclear whether any of these proteins can complement the recruitment preference for CpG islands in ES cells.

Targeting of PRC2 complexes to specific genomic sites in mammals likely occurs through multiple means. Given the paucity of sequence-specific factors identified to date, other modes of interaction may explain PRC2 recruitment to CpG islands. PRC2 forms multiple complexes with nucleosomes that generate affinity for chromatin in a sequence-independent fashion (Fig. 4B; see also Margaron and Reinberg 2011). Although each such interaction is of low affinity, the combination of these interactions may allow for a consolidated and spatially accurate recruitment of PRC2 based on local chromatin features, akin to coincidence detection (Margaron and Reinberg 2011; Voigt and Reinberg 2011). Specifically, Jarid2 and AEBP2 each interact with DNA and with PRC2, and the PRC2 core components RbAp46/48 and Eed bind to histones H3 and H4. Whereas Eed also binds to H3K27me3 and might function in perpetuating the mark (Margaron et al. 2009), H3K4me3 abrogates RbAp46/48 recognition of H3 and inhibits PRC2 activity (Schmieg et al. 2011). Similarly, H3K36me3 inhibits PRC2 activity (Schmieg et al. 2011; Yan et al. 2011).

asn78.82and iscompo03.9(s|)0(|co5(781 ha 03.83PRC2))0(R)14B;83.42in ef s5661inhib eea16.73forei781 ha 0s0-1.2203TD(((Schi)2a

ligase and a member of the PCGF protein family, bridging RING1B and its interaction partners. PRC1 forms several subcomplexes in which its subunit composition (Gao et al. 2012; Tares et al. 2012; Simon and Kingson 2013). RING1B occupies ~40%-50% of all bivalent domains in ES cells (Kee et al. 2008; Brookes et al. 2012). RING1B-bound bivalent genes are highly enriched for developmental factors and are well conserved between mice and humans. Moreover, these occupy larger regions of H3K27me3 and are more likely to remain repressed upon differentiation (Kee et al. 2008). PRC1 complexes have a core CBX proteins may be recruited, at least in part, by binding to H3K27me3. In mouse ES cells, CBX7 is likely the predominant CBX protein that helps recruit PRC1 to H3K27me3-containing sites (Moreno et al. 2012, 2013). However, other H3K27me3-independent determinants control PRC1 targeting and depend on the subunit composition of each particular PRC1 complex (Fig. 4B). Candidates include TFs such as E2F6, YY1, and REST as well as ncRNAs (Simon and Kingson 2013).

Noah, Fbxl10/KDM2B as recently shown to recruit some PRC1 complexes to methylated CpG islands via its CXXC domain, rendering it an intriguing candidate for targeting some PRC1 complexes to bivalent promoters (Farcas et al. 2012; He et al. 2013; Wu et al. 2013). KDM2B is present at the methylated CpG islands in ES cells but is excluded from sites of DNA methylation. However, substantial KDM2B-PRC1 binding is observed only at a fraction of all methylated CpG islands. This suggests a "sampling" mechanism whereby KDM2B-PRC1 complexes can in all probe methylated CpG loci for their susceptibility to repression, and stable recruitment may further depend on pre-existing repressive determinants (Farcas et al. 2012). Likewise, factors involved in transcription may prevent accumulation of high levels of these PRC1 complexes at active loci.

Several studies have connected PRCs to H2A.Z. As mentioned above, H2A.Z is enriched at both active and bivalent promoters but not at loci marked exclusively by H3K27me3 (Kee et al. 2012; He et al. 2013). Loss of H2A.Z reduces PRC2 occupancy at both bivalent promoters and enhancers (Creighton et al. 2008; He et al. 2013). Initial reports suggested that targeting of H2A.Z to bivalent promoters may depend on PRC1/2 complexes and vice versa (Creighton et al. 2008). However, recent studies indicate that H2A.Z deposition is independent of the PRCs (Illingworth et al. 2012). Nevertheless, targeting H2A.Z recruitment may shed light on how PRCs are targeted to specific loci. This question is of special interest given that OCT4 targeting is dependent on H2A.Z in ES cells (He et al. 2013). In addition to interacting with the MLL complex, OCT4 has also been shown to interact with PRC1 subcomplexes as well as with the histone deacetylase-containing NRD complex (Pardo et al. 2010; Andersen Berg et al. 2010). The NRD complex facilitates PRC2 recruitment through its deacetylation of H3K27 (Reynolds et al. 2012). Noah, depletion of NRD leads to deregulation of several bivalent genes and is accompanied by increased H3K27ac and reduced H3K27me3 (Reynolds et al. 2012). Taken together, these studies underscore the importance of H2A.Z as a central player orchestrating the deposition of pluripotency factors and epigenetic regulators at bivalent loci.

A model for the generation and maintenance of bivalent domains

SET1A/B/MLL complexes is mediated at least in part by CXXC domain-containing proteins or through the action of TET enzymes, OGT, and histone acetylase. In the presence of activating signals and TFs such as OCT4, H3K4me3 at these promoters is reinforced and sustained by transcriptional deposition. The action of products of transcription as well as the ensemble of TFs and coactivators may suffice to exclude PcG proteins from active genes through competition for binding of the underlying GC-rich DNA sequences or through repression of PRC2 by nucleosomes symmetrically modified with H3K4me3 or H3K36me3. Specific H3K27me3 may be removed from

analysis of PcG and r G gene knockouts. Although loss of H3K4me3 or H3K27me3 is not limited to bivalent loci in these models, available information can be obtained especially for PcG proteins, as the vast majority of their target genes in ES cells correspond to bivalent genes. Nonetheless, the absence of H3K27me3 and PRCs appears to be elements and other target sites to be considered when interpreting PcG-mediated phenotypes. Different groups have observed a general propensity of PcG-mediated ES cells to up-regulate developmental genes, suggesting a crucial role for PcG proteins and histone bivalent domains in development. For instance, several bivalent genes are prematurely repressed in *Eed*^{-/-} ES cells (Arae et al. 2006; Boerger et al. 2006). Likewise, *Suz12*^{-/-} ES cells show higher expression of lineage-specific genes (Pasini et al. 2007). However, despite the misexpression of lineage genes, cell viability and self-renewal are not compromised in PRC2-deficient ES cells (Pasini et al. 2007; Chamberlain et al. 2008; Shen et al. 2008; Leeb et al. 2010). The overall mild defects of PRC2-deficient ES cells in self-renewal may be partially explained by PRC1-mediated compensatory effects and the absence of TFs that would robustly activate the affected genes in the undifferentiated state. Indeed, simultaneous depletion of RING1B and EED in ES cells produces an enhanced proclivity toward differentiation, although self-renewal can still be preserved under careful culture conditions (Leeb et al. 2010). In contrast to the relatively mild effects on self-renewal, all PRC2-deficient ES cells exhibit aberrant differentiation potential (Pasini et al. 2007; Chamberlain et al. 2008; Shen et al. 2008; Leeb et al. 2010), which parallels the post-implantation lethality phenotypes observed in PRC2 knockout mouse models (Fasano et al. 1995; O'Carroll et al. 2001; Pasini et al. 2004). Taken together, these knockout models demonstrate that PRCs presumably to a large degree through control of bivalent target genes encoding developmental factors are critical for proper differentiation.

Notably, the recent discovery that FBXL10/KDM2B is key in targeting a subset of PRC1 complexes to CpG-rich promoters may allow for the specific modulation of PRCs at bivalent loci (Farcas et al. 2012; He et al. 2013; Wu et al. 2013). Its depletion in ES cells causes derepression of PcG target genes comparable to that of RING1B knockout cells and leads to premature and defective differentiation (He et al. 2013; Wu et al. 2013), underscoring the importance of PcG repression as a safeguard mechanism at bivalent loci for proper development, especially in the context of lineage specification.

Histone modifications, binding proteins, and PRCs in reversible silencing at bivalent promoters

Both the histone modifications and the protein complexes present at bivalent promoters likely mediate the impact of bivalent transcription. Many proteins have been described, most of which are associated with active transcription (Fig. 6). The PHD finger of the TAF3 subunit of TFIID recognizes H3K4me3 (Vermeulen et al. 2007),

whereas the TAF1 subunit binds to acetylated lysines on histones H3 and H4 via its bromodomains (Jacobson et al. 2000). These interactions likely contribute to re-

absence of DNA methylation at these sites (Wang and Zhang 2011; Williams et al. 2012). Moreover, H2A.Z at CpG-rich promoters may further antagonize DNA methylation (Zilberman et al. 2008). H3K4me3, possibly along with other factors such as H2A.Z, may thus function to a large degree by keeping genes in a state permissive for activation by precluding irreversible repression through DNA methylation (Fig. 6). Avoidance of DNA methylation is essential for biallelic genes as well, as they are required to remain plastic for subsequent activation or repression.

However, an inevitable consequence of such a permissive chromatin state may be a resultant loss of transcription emanating from these biallelic promoters. Indeed, as previously mentioned, most promoters of protein-coding genes (Guthrie et al. 2007) and essentially all biallelic promoters (Brookes et al. 2012) harbor the initiating (S5P) form of RNA Pol II in ES cells, indicative of transcriptional competence. Furthermore, several groups have ascertained the presence of low but appreciable levels of regulated transcription arising from PRC-bound biallelic loci (Kanhere et al. 2010; Walker et al. 2010; Min et al. 2011; Brookes et al. 2012). In these regards, the

presence of RNA Pol II engaged in e3(e)65.4(e1.7(gr)o13.1(rn65.4(g.1(.1(p h la 6-8(c)-1f)-26.9(nd)]TJO-1.220305.0114mod 119.7(a10.9e

Several studies have shown that PcG proteins are removed from specific loci following developmental signals through the action of TFs, histone demethylases, and enhancers and through the introduction of modifications that confer binding of PcG proteins (Delessalle et al. 2012). Both UTX and JMJD3 are capable of demethylating H3K27me3, and both proteins are required for proper differentiation (Agger et al. 2007; Lee et al. 2007). UTX is part of the MLL3/4 complexes (Lee et al. 2007), whereas JMJD3 interacts with proteins involved in transcriptional elongation, such as the FACT subunit SPT16, and with KIAA1718, a demethylase for H3K9me2, H3K27me2, and H4K20me1 (Chen et al. 2012). In addition, KIAA1718 recognizes H3K4me3 via its PHD finger (Horon et al. 2010), rendering it an ideal candidate for removing H3K27me3 in the context of bivalent. Both UTX and JMJD3 rarely localize to bivalent promoters

bi-allelic genes may likely be included in those regions as well, being subjected to additional means of silencing or their silencing.

Conclusion

In the short history since their discovery, bi-allelic domains have garnered great attention as a means of precise gene expression in ES cells and beyond. Current evidence suggests that bi-allelic domains function in the fine-tuning of gene expression during development. The simultaneous presence of active and repressive modifications and associated complexes helps to maintain bi-allelic loci in a state that is both responsive to developmental cues and at the same time refractory to stochastic noise. Despite tremendous progress toward understanding the establishment of bi-allelic silencing as well as the action of marks and complexes in poising transcription, further work is clearly required to directly probe the importance of bi-allelic silencing in developing organisms and further our knowledge of each locus-specific PcG proteins regulate transcription. The bi-allelic field is still in development.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Liane Vales for critical reading of this manuscript. P.V. is supported by fellowships from the Deutsche Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina (LPDS 2009-5) and the Empire State Training Program in Stem Cell Research (NYSTEM, contract no. C026880). W.W.T. is supported by a Dackmann Miller postdoctoral fellowship from The New York Stem Cell Foundation. Work in the Reinberg laboratory is supported by grants from the National Institutes of Health (GM064844 and R37GM037120) and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

References

- Agger K, Cloos PAC, Christensen J, Pasini D, Rose S, Rappsilber J, Issaia I, Canaani E, Salcini AE, Helin K. 2007. UTX and JMJD3 are histone H3K27 demethylases involved in HOX gene regulation and development. *Nature* 449: 731-734.
- Akkers RC, van Heeringen SJ, Jacobi UG, Janssen-Megens EM, François K-J, Sinnenberg HG, Veensra GJC. 2009. A hierarchy of H3K4me3 and H3K27me3 acquisition in spatial gene regulation in *Xenopus* embryos. *Dev Cell* 17: 425-434.
- Alder O, Lallier F, Helness A, Brookes E, Pinho S, Chandrashekar A, Arnold P, Pombo A, O'Neill L, Ara V. 2010. Ring1B and S39H1 delineate distinct chromatin states at bi-allelic genes during early mouse lineage commitment. *Development* 137: 2483-2492.
- Ang Y-S, Tsai S-Y, Lee D-F, Monk J, Song J, Rankinmar K, Ding J, Ge Y, Darr H, Chang B, et al. 2011. Wdr5 mediates self-renewal and reprogramming in the embryonic stem cell core transcriptional network. *Cell* 145: 183-197.
- Arnold P, Schöler A, Pachko M, Balmer PJ, Jørgensen H, Stadler MB, van Nimwegen E, Schübeler D. 2013. Modeling of epigenome dynamics identifies transcription factors that mediate Polycomb targeting. *Genome Res* 23: 60-73.
- Anasso BS, Kozlov E, Den SY. 2011. The role of deubiquitinating enzymes in chromatin regulation. *FEBS Lett* 585: 2016-2023.
- Ara V, Perrais P, Sauer S, Spikowski M, Jørgensen HF, John RM, Götz M, Casanova M, Warnes G, Merkenschlager M, et al.

2006. Chromatin signatures of pluripotent cell lines. *Nat Cell Biol* 8: 532-538.
- Bach C, Müller D, Bahl S, Garcia-Cellar MP, Slank RK. 2009. Alterations of the CTC domain preclude oncogenic activation of mixed-lineage leukemia 2. *Oncogene* 28: 815-823.
- Badea AI, Shi Y. 2013. Emerging roles for chromatin as a signal in organ and organ development. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 14: 211-224.
- Ballare C, Lange M, Lapina A, Marini GM, Morel L, Pascual G, Liefke R, Simon B, Shi Y, Gani O, et al. 2012. Phf19 links methylation levels of histone H3 to regulation of Polycomb activity. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 19: 1257-1265.
- Bannister AJ, Kouzarides T. 2011. Regulation of chromatin by histone modifications. *Cell Res* 21: 381-395.
- Bapa SA, Jin V, Berron N, Balch C, Sharma N, Kravchenko N, Zhang S, et al. 2011. Maintenance of (H3K9me3)-300.4 (H3K9me3) silencing

- lincRNAs act in the circadian clock by controlling gene expression and differentiation. *Nature* 477: 295-300.
- Hanoier JA, Krause MW, Loh DC. 2012. Bivalent memories: Linking methabolism to epigenetics through O-GlcNAcylation. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 13: 312-321.
- Hanash K, Lopes SM, Tang F, Srinani MA. 2008. Dynamic equilibrium and heterogeneity of mouse pluripotent stem cells in the differentiation and epigenetic states. *Cell Stem Cell* 3: 391-401.
- He J, Shen L, Wan M, Tarantola O, Wang H, Zhang Y. 2013. Kdm2b maintains pluripotent stem cell states by recruiting PRC1 complex to CpG islands of developmental genes. *Nat Cell Biol* 15: 373-384.
- Horowitz JR, Upadhyay AK, Qi HH, Zhang X, Shi Y, Cheng X. 2010. Epigenetic and structural insights for substrate specificity of a family of JmjC domain histone demethylases. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 17: 38-43.

- of the pol comb protein EED in the propagation of repressive histone marks. *Nature* 461: 762-767.
- Marks H, Kalkan T, Menafrá R, Denissou S, Jones K, Hofmeier H, Nichols J, Kranz A, Seifried AF, Smith A, et al. 2012. The transcriptional and epigenomic foundations of ground state pluripotency. *Cell* 149: 590-604.
- McGarra KM, Van Ness L, Cope L, Ohm JE, Herman JC, Van Criekinge W, Schöbel KE, Balin SB. 2008. Defining a chromatin phenotype characterizes DNA-hypomethylated genes in colon cancer cells. *Cancer Res* 68: 5753-5759.
- Meissner A, Mikkelsen TS, Gu H, Wernig M, Hanna J, Sackenberg A, Zhang X, Bernstein BE, Nishida M, Jaffe DB, et al. 2008. Genome-scale DNA methylation maps of pluripotent and differentiated cells. *Nature* 454: 766-770.
- Mendenhall EM, Koche RP, Truong T, Zhou VW, Issac B, Chi AS, Kim M, Bernstein BE. 2010. GC-rich sequence elements recruit PRC2 in mammalian ES cells. *PLoS Genet* 6: e1001244.
- Mercer TR, Makichuk JS. 2013. Structure and function of long noncoding RNAs in epigenetic regulation. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 20: 300-307.
- Mikkelsen TS, Kim M, Jaffe DB, Issac B, Lieberman E, Giannoskos G, Alvarado P, Brockman W, Kim T-K, Koche RP, et al. 2007. Genome-wide maps of chromatin states in pluripotent and lineage-committed cells. *Nature* 448: 553-560.
- Mikkelsen TS, Hanna J, Zhang X, Kim M, Wernig M, Schödel P, Bernstein BE, Jaenisch R, Lander ES, Meissner A. 2008. Dissecting direct reprogramming through integrative genomic analysis. *Nature* 454: 49-55.
- Milne TA, Doherty Y, Martin ME, Brock HW, Roeder RG, Hess JL. 2005. MLL associates specifically with a subset of transcriptionally active genes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 102: 14765-14770.
- Min IM, Wawerfall JJ, Core LJ, Murove RJ, Schimenti J, Lis JT. 2011. Regulating RNA polymerase pausing and transcription elongation in embryonic stem cells. *Genes Dev* 25: 742-754.
- Mohn F, Weber M, Rebhan M, Roloff TC, Richter J, Stadler MB, Bibbel M, Schöbel D. 2008. Lineage-specific pol comb marks and de novo DNA methylation define restriction and potential of neuronal progenitors. *Mol Cell* 30: 755-766.
- Morel L, Pascual G, Corbelli L, Roma G, Wenzel A, Benayahu SA,

recruitment of Pol comb Repressor Comple 2 o direc
gene repression. *EMBO J*

- ransferase Ogo chroma in in embr onic sem cells. *Mol Cell* 49: 645_656.
- Verme len M, M lder KW, Denisso S, Pijnappel WWMP, an Schaik FMA, Varier RA, Bal issen MPA, S nnenberg HG, Mann M, Timmers HTM. 2007. Selec i e anchoring of TFIID on cleosomes b rime h la ion of his one H3 l sine 4. *Cell* 131: 58_69.
- Verme len M, Eberl HC, Ma arese F, Marks H, Denisso S, Ber F, Lee KK, Olsen JV, H man AA, S nnenberg HG, e al. 2010. Q an i a i e in erac ion pro eomics and genome- ide profiling of epigene ic his one marks and heir readers. *Cell* 142: 967_980.
- Vernimmen D, L nch MD, De Gobbi M, Garrick D, Sharpe JA, Sloane-S anle JA, Smi h AJH, Higgs DR. 2011. Pol comb e ic ion as a ne dis an enhancer f nc ion. *Genes Dev* 25: 1583_1588.
- Voig P, Reinberg D. 2011. His one ails: Ideal mo ifs for probing epigene ics hro gh chemical biolog approaches. *Chembiochem* 12: 236_252.
- Voig P, Lero G, Dr r WJ 3rd, Zee BM, Son J, Beck DB, Yo ng