Towards an understanding of cell-specific functions of signal-dependent transcription factors

Dawn X Zhang^{1,2} and Christopher K Glass^{1,3}

¹Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine²Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program³Department of Medicine, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

Correspondence should be addressed to C K Glass

Email
ckg@ucsd.edu

Abstract

The ability to regulate gene expression in a cell-specific manner is a feature of many broadly expressed signal-dependent transcription factors (SDTFs), including nuclear hormone receptors and transcription factors that are activated by cell surface receptors for extracellular signals. As the most plastic cells of the hematopoietic system, macrophages are responsive to a wide spectrum of regulatory molecules and provide a robust model system for investigation of the basis for cell-specific transcriptional responses at a genome-wide level. Here, focusing on recent studies in macrophages, we review the evidence suggesting a model in which cell-specific actions of SDTFs are the consequence of priming functions of lineage determining transcription factors. We also discuss recent findings relating lineage-determining and SDTF activity to alterations in the epigenetic landscape as well as the production and function of enhancer RNAs. These findings have implications for the understanding of how natural genetic variation impacts cell-specific programs of gene expression and suggest new approaches for altering gene expression *in vivo*.

Key Words

- ▶ cell-specific
- ▶ lineage determining transcription factors
- ▶ signal dependent transcription factors
- ▶ genome-wide analyses

Journal of Molecular Endocrinology
(2013) 51, T37–T50

Introduction

A central question in molecular endocrinology is how a single hormone-responsive transcription factor, reading the same DNA template, is capable of regulating different genes in different cell types. For example, activation of the glucocorticoid receptor by endogenous or synthetic glucocorticoids promotes a gluconeogenic program of gene expression in hepatocytes; mediates negative feedback control of adrenocorticotrophic hormone secretion from the corticotrophs of the anterior pituitary; and suppresses pro-inflammatory responses of macrophages (Lazar 2011). In each case, the same glucocorticoid receptor controls the expression of a distinct set of genes that are crucial to the specific biological functions of the corresponding cell type. This ability to regulate gene

expression in a cell-specific manner is shared by many broadly expressed signal-dependent transcription factors (SDTFs), including other nuclear hormone receptors and members of the diverse families of transcription factors that are activated by cell surface receptors for extracellular signals (e.g., STAT transcription factors, NF- κ B family members, CREB, etc.). (For a complete listing of transcription factor names and abbreviations, see Table 1). The development of high-throughput sequencing methods to characterize transcription factor binding, histone modifications, and nascent RNA production at the genome-wide level has provided a powerful array of new tools for investigating the molecular basis for cell-specific transcriptional responses. These tools have been applied in a

Table 1 Abbreviations and full names of transcription factors cited in this review

Abbreviations	Transcription factors
PU.1 or SPI1	Spleen focus-forming virus (SFFV) proviral integration oncogene SPI1
AP1	Activator protein 1 (heterodimeric protein complex)
C/EBPs (CEBPA and CEBPB)	CCAAT-enhancer-binding proteins (α and β)
SOX2	SRY (sex-determining region Y)-box 2
FOXD3	Forkhead box D3
JUN	Jun proto-oncogene
FOS	FBJ murine osteosarcoma viral oncogene homolog
TCF3	Transcription factor 3
EBF1	Early B-cell factor 1
FOXO1	Forkhead box O1
LXR	Liver X receptor
NR1D1 and NR1D2	Nuclear receptor subfamily 1, group D, members 1 and 2 (Rev-Erb α and β)
RELA	V-rel reticuloendotheliosis viral oncogene homolog A (avian)
SRF	Serum response factor
STATs (STAT1, STAT3, etc.)	Signal transducer and activator of transcription (1, 3, etc.)
SMAD3	Mothers against decapentaplegic homolog 3 or SMAD family member 3
HNF4A	Hepatocyte nuclear factor 4, α
FOXA1	Forkhead box A1
JUNB	Jun B proto-oncogene
IRF4	Interferon regulatory factor 4
ATF3	Activating transcription factor 3
RUNX1	Runt-related transcription factor
CBFB	Core-binding factor, β subunit
ETS1	V-ets erythroblastosis virus E26 oncogene homolog 1 (avian)
ELF1	E74-like factor 1 (ets domain transcription factor)
FOXP3	Forkhead box P3
NFAT	Nuclear factor of activated T-cells
BATF	Basic leucine zipper transcription factor, ATF-like
RORC	RAR-related orphan receptor C
MAF	V-maf musculoaponeurotic fibrosarcoma oncogene homolog (avian)
EP300	E1A binding protein p300
GATA3 and GATA4	GATA-binding protein 3 and 4
TBX21	T-box 21
POU5F1 (OCT4)	POU class 5 homeobox 1
MYOD1	Myogenic differentiation 1
ESR1	Estrogen receptor 1
AR	Androgen receptor
TFAP2C	Transcription factor AP2 γ (activating enhancer binding protein 2 γ)
GR	Glucocorticoid receptor
MLL (1/3, 2/4, 3, etc.)	Myeloid/lymphoid or mixed-lineage leukemia (trithorax homolog, <i>Drosophila</i>) (1/3, 2/4, 3, etc.)
LSD1	Lysine (K)-specific demethylase 1A

number of biologically important model systems, including models for cellular differentiation (e.g., embryonic stem cell differentiation, adipogenesis, and hematopoiesis) and signal-dependent gene expression (e.g., macrophage activation and hormone-dependent breast and/or prostate cancers). In this review, we focus on recent insights into the molecular basis of cell-specific functions of broadly expressed SDTFs derived from genome-wide studies on macrophages.

Macrophages were discovered in 1884 by Ilya Mechnikov, a Russian bacteriologist who later shared the 1908 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine with Paul

Ehrlich for their studies in innate immunity (Buryachkovskaya *et al.* 2013). Classically, macrophages differentiate from bone marrow-derived monocytes; however, recent studies have found that at least some tissue-resident macrophages such as microglia, Langerhans cells, and Kupffer cells are derived from hematopoietic stem cells during fetal development (Saijo & Glass 2011, Wynn *et al.* 2013). As mediators of innate immunity and normal homeostatic processes, macrophages are essential to the body's ability to control inflammation. Consequently, these immune cells have been implicated in multiple disease processes such as diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis,

multiple sclerosis, and atherosclerosis (Drexler & Foxwell 2010, Glass & Saijo 2010, Olefsky & Glass 2010). Primary macrophages are easily obtainable for *in vitro* studies (as bone marrow-derived macrophages, thioglycollate-elicited macrophages, circulating monocytes, splenic monocytes, etc.) from wild type and genetically modified animals and can also be differentiated from human blood monocytes. The ability to obtain large numbers of these cells makes them a robust model system for contemporary 'omics' technologies – proteomics (Hettinger *et al.* 2013, Meissner *et al.* 2013), lipidomics (Spann *et al.* 2012, Maurya *et al.* 2013), and genomics (Heinz *et al.* 2010, Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013, Lam *et al.* 2013, Ostuni *et al.* 2013) – for investigating signal-dependent mechanisms.

As the most plastic cells of the hematopoietic system, macrophages are responsive to many regulatory molecules, including growth factors, pro- and anti-inflammatory cytokines, pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs), damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMPs), and nuclear receptor ligands (Smale 2010, Lawrence & Natoli 2011, Murray & Wynn 2011, Shi & Pamer 2011, Sica & Mantovani 2012, Van Dyken & Locksley 2013, Wynn *et al.* 2013). Responses to PAMPs and DAMPs are mediated by pattern recognition receptors that include the family of toll-like receptors (TLRs; Medzhitov *et al.* 2011). TLR4 recognizes lipopolysaccharide (LPS), a component of the cell wall of Gram-negative bacteria. Upon binding LPS, TLR4 signal transduction activates a number of latent transcription factors, which include NF- κ B and interferon regulatory factors (Medzhitov *et al.* 1997, Poltorak *et al.* 1998a,b). These factors subsequently enter the nucleus and regulate the expression of inflammatory response genes, which play essential roles in innate immunity and contribute to the development of adaptive immunity (Medzhitov & Horng 2009). This transcriptional response is among the most dramatic in biology with respect to both the number of genes regulated (thousands) and the magnitude of change in gene expression (>4 orders of magnitude for the most highly regulated genes) (Escoubet-Lozach *et al.* 2011, Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013). This response is also subject to counter-regulation by anti-inflammatory signaling molecules that include ligands for nuclear hormone receptors, such as the glucocorticoid receptor, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptors (PPARs), and liver X receptors (LXRs) (Glass & Saijo 2010). These properties of the macrophage make it a particularly rich cell type for the application of genome-wide approaches.

Recent studies of signal-dependent transcriptional responses in macrophages and B cells have suggested a

Closed chromatin

Collaborative binding
Nucleosome remodeling

Basal enhancer transcription

Low H3K4me1/2
Low H3Ac, H4Ac

Signal-dependent transcription
factor binding

Activated enhancer transcription

Increased H3K4me1/2
Increased H3Ac, H4Ac

Figure 1

Hierarchical organization of transcription factor networks. In the poised or repressed state, closed chromatin at enhancer loci contains motifs for LDTFs. The collaborative binding of LDTFs such as PU.1 and C/EBPs results in nucleosomal-remodeling and basal enhancer RNA transcription at sites containing low H3K4me1/2 and low H3/H4 acetylation. Next, in response to various stimuli, SDTFs, such as LXRs, co-bind with PU.1 and C/EBPs to activate enhancer transcription. Finally, activated eRNA transcription precedes the active deposition of H3K4me1/2 and H3/H4 acetylation. LDTF, lineage-determining transcription factor; SDTF, signal-dependent transcription factor.

general model to explain many of the cell-specific functions of broadly expressed SDTFs (Heinz *et al.* 2010; Fig. 1). In this model, relatively simple combinations of lineage-determining transcription factors (LDTFs) are proposed to function collaboratively to select genomic enhancer-like regulatory regions in a cell-specific manner. The collaborative binding of these factors results in nucleosome remodeling to generate open regions of chromatin that provide access to SDTFs. Thus, SDTFs are directed to the vicinity of target genes in a cell-specific manner as a consequence of the priming functions of the lineage-determining factors for that particular cell type.

Setting the stage: roles of lineage determining factors

It has long been proposed that the functional output of transcription factors is determined by their competitive binding with nucleosomes. Until nucleosomes are displaced and chromatin regions are open, most transcription factors bind transiently to chromatin in a manner insufficient for efficient transcription (Lickwar *et al.* 2012). For example, during hematopoietic stem cell differentiation, nucleosome remodeling by the ATP-dependent, switch/sucrose non-fermentable (SWI/SNF) chromatin-remodeling complex allows for transcription factor binding at erythroid LDTF binding sites (Hu *et al.* 2011). Furthermore, studies utilizing novel high-throughput sequencing methods have been used to define open chromatin regions, which contain important transcriptional regulatory elements that delineate cell-specific identity (Song *et al.* 2011).

Recent studies of the ENCODE consortium estimate that the mammalian genome contains hundreds of thousands of enhancers (Bernstein *et al.* 2012), the majority of which are selected for activity in a cell-specific manner. This process of enhancer selection is proposed to result from collaborative interactions of LDTFs, also referred to as pioneer factors or master regulators. These factors are sequence-specific DNA-binding proteins with the ability to access their binding sites even when those sites are wrapped in nucleosomes. The factors also represent placeholders that can be replaced by other transcription factors at later stages during development (Zaret & Carroll 2011). For example, in embryonic stem cells, developmental pioneer transcription factors, SOX2 and FOXD3, bind at tissue-specific elements, and are replaced by cell-specific transcription factors after differentiation (Liber *et al.* 2010). Currently, two prevailing theories exist to explain how pioneer transcription factors function in defining cell-specificity during development.

In the passive model, pioneer transcription factor occupancy decreases the number of binding events necessary for transcriptional activation (Zaret & Carroll 2011). In contrast, the active model suggests that pioneer transcription factors function by recruiting chromatin-remodeling complexes to activate transcription (Zaret & Carroll 2011).

The roles of LDTFs in priming cell-specific regulatory sites have been well-characterized in cells of the hematopoietic lineage. The LDTF, spleen focus-forming virus (SFFV) proviral integration oncogene, SPI1, more commonly referred to as PU.1, provides a particularly instructive example of an LDTF that is required for specification of more than one hematopoietic cell type; genetic deletion of PU.1 results in loss of macrophages, neutrophils, and B cells (Scott *et al.* 1994, 1997). In myeloid lineage precursor cells, PU.1 instructs hematopoietic progenitors to upregulate myeloid-specific cell surface antigens and to downregulate other cell-specific markers and transcription factors (Nerlov & Graf 1998). Recent studies have shown a dependence on cell cycle lengthening and subsequent PU.1 accumulation, which dictates myeloid differentiation from the common myeloid lymphoid progenitor (Kueh *et al.* 2013). In lymphoid progenitor cells, PU.1 is required for the expression of an alternative set of genes required for the progression to mature B cells (Lin *et al.* 2010). Thus, even a single LDTF can promote distinct programs of gene expression in different cell types.

PU.1 is a member of the E-twenty six (ETS) family of transcription factors, which bind to the canonical ETS-motif, 5'-GGAA-3'. Using genetic and genomic methods, PU.1 was recently shown to select macrophage or B cell-specific enhancers based on the co-occurrence of nearby binding sites for either macrophage or B-cell LDTFs, which are selectively expressed in one or the other cell type (Heinz *et al.* 2010). In macrophages, PU.1 binding occurred at enhancer-like regions exhibiting nearby binding sites for other essential myeloid LDTFs, CCAAT/enhancer binding protein α and β (C/EBPs), and/or AP1 transcription factors, a heterodimeric protein composed of Jun proto-oncogene (JUN) and FBJ murine osteosarcoma viral oncogene homolog (FOS) (Heinz *et al.* 2010). In B cells, PU.1 binds at enhancer-like regions containing binding sites for other B cell LDTFs including TCF3, EBF1, and FOXO1 (Heinz *et al.* 2010, Lin *et al.* 2010). Notably, binding of PU.1 and alternative LDTFs was mutually dependent; genetic deletion of one factor resulted in loss of binding of the other at closely spaced sites (Heinz *et al.* 2010). Although generally within 100 bp

of each other, no strict spacing relationship was observed between PU.1 and collaborative transcription factor binding sites, suggesting a mechanism other than a ternary complex model for enhanced occupancy (Heinz *et al.* 2010). Gain-of-function studies indicated rapid nucleosome remodeling following collaborative binding of PU.1 to the regions destined to acquire enhancer-like features in myeloid cells based on subsequent H3K4 mono-methylation (Heinz *et al.* 2010). Furthermore, PU.1 is required for the maintenance of the macrophage epigenome and its expression in PU.1-negative myeloid progenitors is sufficient to induce nucleosome remodeling and H3K4 mono-methylation at cell-specific sites (Heinz *et al.* 2010).

SDTFs bind in a cell-specific manner

Genome-wide studies to date of SDTFs indicate that while binding at promoters is enriched over that expected by chance, the majority of binding sites for these factors are located at inter- and intra-genic locations that exhibit the features of enhancers. Initially demonstrated for the estrogen receptor (Lupien *et al.* 2008), this pattern of genome-wide binding is also observed for other members of the nuclear receptor family, including the glucocorticoid receptor (Biddie *et al.* 2011), LXRs (Heinz *et al.* 2010), PPARG (Lefterova *et al.* 2008), androgen receptor (AR; Lupien *et al.* 2008, He *et al.* 2010, Wang *et al.* 2011), estrogen receptor-related receptors (Lupien *et al.* 2008, Hurtado *et al.* 2011, Li *et al.* 2013), and nuclear receptor subfamily 1, group D, members 1 and 2 (NR1D1 and NR1D2), known colloquially as Rev-Erbs (Lam *et al.* 2013). Similarly, studies on transcription factors responsive to extracellular signals also primarily localize to distal enhancer-like elements, including the RELA component of NF- κ B (Barish *et al.* 2010, Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013), serum response factor (SRF; Sullivan *et al.* 2011), FOXO1 (Fan *et al.* 2010), STAT1 (Vahedi *et al.* 2012), and SMAD3 (Mullen *et al.* 2011). Although identification of specific enhancer-promoter interactions remain challenging at a genome-wide level, the binding of SDTFs at distal locations is correlated with changes in expression of nearby genes (Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013, Lam *et al.* 2013).

In all of the cases in which the genome-wide locations of SDTFs have been examined in macrophages, a large fraction of the DNA-binding sites are observed to be in close proximity to the binding sites for one or more macrophage LDTFs (PU.1, C/EBPs, and/or AP1 factors) (Heinz *et al.* 2010). Because LDTFs select enhancers in a cell-specific manner, the colocalization of SDTFs implies a

cell-specific binding pattern. Consistent with this, the genomic locations of PPARG and Rev-Erbs in macrophages are very different from their genomic locations in adipocytes (Lefterova *et al.* 2008) and hepatocytes (Cho *et al.* 2012) respectively.

An important question is the hierarchical relationship between LDTFs and SDTFs, as well as their respective roles in the selection of cell-specific enhancers. Studies of LDTFs and SDTFs in macrophages suggest the primary roles of LDTFs, with variable roles of SDTFs that depend on the specific factor analyzed. Genome-wide binding analyses of LXRs indicated that nearly all LXR-binding sites were in close proximity to the binding sites for macrophage LDTFs (PU.1, AP1, C/EBPs) (Heinz *et al.* 2010). Genetic deletion of LXRs had virtually no effect on the overall enhancer atlas in macrophages and did not result in a loss of nearby PU.1 binding (Heinz *et al.* 2010). In contrast, deletion of PU.1 resulted in loss of nearby LXR binding (Heinz *et al.* 2010). Thus, in this case, a clear hierarchy was observed in which the binding of LXRs was dependent on the initial selection of enhancers by LDTFs.

A different picture emerged from studies of the RELA subunit of NF- κ B, which is strongly activated in macrophages by signaling through TLR4. Following activation and nuclear entry, ~85% of RELA binding occurred at pre-existing enhancer-like regions of the genome that were occupied by macrophage LDTFs (Barish *et al.* 2010, Escoubet-Lozach *et al.* 2011, Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013). However, ~15% of the binding sites for RELA occurred at the genomic regions that lacked features of enhancers, but acquired these features subsequent to RELA binding (Escoubet-Lozach *et al.* 2011, Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013). Intriguingly, these binding sites were highly enriched for nearby recognition motifs for the macrophage LDTFs AP1 and PU.1. Subsequent experiments demonstrated that RELA binding required PU.1, while PU.1 binding required nuclear entry of RELA (Escoubet-Lozach *et al.* 2011, Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013). Thus, in this case, RELA acted as both a signal-dependent and collaborating transcription factor to open up regions of chromatin and select new enhancers. The ability of RELA but not LXR to perform this function may relate to relatively higher nuclear concentrations and/or its ability to interact with nucleosome-remodeling factors.

Recent studies have utilized natural genetic variation as an *in vivo* mutagenesis screen to examine the collaborative binding model for LDTFs and the hierarchical relationship with NF- κ B. Genome-wide transcription factor binding and gene expression analyses were used to characterize how genetic variations affect the binding of

LTDFs (PU.1 and CEBPA) and the associated transcriptional output in macrophages derived from two inbred rodent strains, C57BL/6J and BALB/c (Heinz *et al.* 2013). Single nucleotide variations and other noncoding genomic variants were shown to directly perturb LDTF as well as SDTF binding (Heinz *et al.* 2013). However, these studies have also demonstrated that a variant in a binding motif for an LDTF not only affected the binding of that factor but also the binding of nearby LDTFs, even though there were no alterations in the binding motifs for those factors. In the case of differential NF- κ B binding in the two mouse strains, mutations in motifs of LDTFs were three times more likely to result in decreased RELA binding than mutations in the binding sites for RELA itself (Heinz *et al.* 2013). These findings provided genetic evidence that collaborative binding of LTDFs to variably spaced sequences was essential for enhancer selection and subsequent acquisition of histone modifications associated with enhancer activity (Heinz *et al.* 2013). These studies also provided genetic evidence for a hierarchical relationship between LDTFs and the majority of the binding sites for NF- κ B.

From these studies, the authors also formulated a genetic definition of a functional binding matrix that could be used to predict whether a specific variant in an LDTF-binding motif would elicit a functional consequence. These results hint at the potential power of defining functionally important noncoding regulatory variants and suggest a strategy for prioritizing natural genetic variants that may play roles in human disease (Heinz *et al.* 2013).

A similar study detailed the binding profile of three tissue specific transcription factors (HNF4A, CEBPA, and FOXA1) in the livers of six inbred rodents (Stefflova *et al.* 2013). From these studies, the authors describe that although there are extensive transcription factor binding differences among relatively similar species, single nucleotide variation plays only a modest role in these differences (Stefflova *et al.* 2013). Regions that are bound by combinations of LDTFs are more evolutionarily stable; however, binding by a single LDTF can become destabilized through the deletion of one its LDTF co-binding partners (Stefflova *et al.* 2013).

Lineage-determining factors in other cell types

The roles of LDTFs in mediating cell-specific and signal dependent activation of transcription have been described in many cell types. Here, we provide examples derived

from genome-wide studies in dendritic cells, T cells, and in model systems used to study transforming growth factor β (TGF β)-mediated and hormone-dependent gene expression (Table 2).

Dendritic cells

Dendritic cells and macrophages derive from a common myeloid lineage. In support of a LDTF/SDTF regulatory model, H3K4me3, H3K4me1, H3K27Ac, and a comprehensive panel of myeloid transcription factors were utilized to map the promoter and enhancer landscape in dendritic cells (Garber *et al.* 2012). Like in macrophages, the LDTFs in dendritic cells include PU.1 and CEBPB (Garber *et al.* 2012). In this model, a second tier of LDTFs (JUNB, IRF4, and ATF3) exists, termed 'primers', which co-bind with PU.1 and CEBPB at LPS-inducible genes pre-stimulation. Later, these factors become associated with specific and dynamic activation factors, mediating a signal-specific response to stimulation (Garber *et al.* 2012).

T cells

Three seminal papers have described the cell-specific enhancer landscape in T cells, focusing on variations amongst different subsets of T helper (Th) cells. In one study, the authors sought to define the subset-specific enhancer landscape in regulatory T (Treg) cells. LDTFs in the RUNX (Runt-related transcription factor) and ETS families, CBF β , ETS1, and ELF1, were shown to predominantly occupy quiescent Th cell enhancers (Samstein *et al.* 2012). Surprisingly, the majority of FOXP3 binds to both already established and Treg-polarized enhancers (Samstein *et al.* 2012). Only 2% of FOXP3-binding sites appear to be Treg-specific and are highly enriched for an AP1 motif (Samstein *et al.* 2012). In some cases, FOXP3 was found to displace its paralog, FOXO1, or other cofactors that served as placeholders for FOXP3 binding (Samstein *et al.* 2012). Furthermore, during Treg polarization and TCR activation, the SDTF, FOXP3, is primarily recruited to previously established enhancers likely through AP1 and nuclear factor of activated T-cells (NFAT) facilitated chromatin remodeling (Samstein *et al.* 2012). A second study describing the transcriptional network for Th17 polarization has found two previously established LDTFs, BATF and IRF4, to exhibit similar binding patterns between quiescent Th cells and Th17 cells (Ciofani *et al.* 2012). In the presence of Th17-polarizing cytokines, BATF and IRF4 prime pre-established enhancers for SDTF (ROR γ , STAT3, and MAF) recruitment (Ciofani *et al.* 2012).

Table 2 Summary of studies demonstrating signal-dependent cell-specificity in transcription

Cell type	Lineage-determining transcription factors	Stimulus	Stimulus-activated transcription factors	Cell-specific (LDTF-regulated) gene expression	References
Macrophages	PU.1, C/EBPs, AP1	LPS, GW3965 (LXR agonist)	LXR α , RELA, BCL6	<i>Csf1r</i> , <i>Cd14</i> , <i>Ccl3</i> , <i>Ccl4</i> , <i>Cxcl2</i> , <i>Abcg1</i>	Barish <i>et al.</i> (2010) and Heinz <i>et al.</i> (2010)
Dendritic cells	PU.1, CEBPB	LPS	JUNB, IRF4, ATF3	<i>Il1a</i> , <i>Ifit1</i> , <i>Ifit2</i> , <i>Ifit3</i> , <i>Tnf</i> , <i>Stat1</i> , <i>Nfkbiz</i>	Garber <i>et al.</i> (2012)
ES cells	POU5F1	TGFB1	SMAD3	<i>Sox2</i>	Mullen <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Pro-B cells	PU.1	TGFB1	SMAD3	<i>Vpreb2</i>	Mullen <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Myotubes	MYOD1	TGFB1	SMAD3	<i>Adora1</i>	Mullen <i>et al.</i> (2011)
T cells	BATF and IRF4	Th17 polarization	RORG, STAT3, MAF	<i>Il17a</i> , <i>Il12rb1</i>	Ciofani <i>et al.</i> (2012)
T cells	?	Th1 polarization	STAT4, STAT1, TBX21	?	Vahedi <i>et al.</i> (2012)
T cells	CBFB, ETS1, ELF1	Th2 polarization	STAT6, GATA3		
T cells	CBFB, ETS1, ELF1	Treg polarization	FOXP3	<i>Junb</i>	Samstein <i>et al.</i> (2012)
MCF7 cells	FOXA1, TFAP2C	Tamoxifen, 17 β -estradiol	ESR1	<i>Ret</i> , <i>Xbp1</i> , <i>Tff1</i>	Lupien <i>et al.</i> (2008), Hurtado <i>et al.</i> (2011), Tan <i>et al.</i> (2011) and Li <i>et al.</i> (2013)
LNCaP cells	FOXA1	5 α -dihydrotestosterone	AR	<i>Chka</i>	Lupien <i>et al.</i> (2008), He <i>et al.</i> (2010) and Wang <i>et al.</i> (2011)
Murine mammary epithelial cells	AP1	Dexamethasone	Glucocorticoid receptor	<i>Klrb1c</i>	Biddie <i>et al.</i> (2011)
U2OS	GATA4	17 β -estradiol	ESR1	<i>Faslg</i> , <i>Wnt4</i> , <i>Foxc1</i> , <i>Alpl</i> , <i>Runx2</i>	Miranda-Carboni <i>et al.</i> (2011)

Lastly, to define the active enhancer landscape after Th1 or Th2 polarization, a comprehensive analysis of EP300 binding was conducted in the two subsets (Vahedi *et al.* 2012). The two closely related cell subsets display common and distinct EP300 binding (Vahedi *et al.* 2012). Moreover, STAT6 and GATA3 or STAT4/STAT1 and TBX21 were found to activate Th2 or Th1 subset-specific enhancers, respectively, while suppressing those of alternative fates (Vahedi *et al.* 2012).

Embryonic stem cells, pro-B cells, myotubes

Genome-wide binding analyses were conducted for three unique cell types: embryonic stem cells, myotubes, and pro-B cells, each in the quiescent state and after TGF β signaling (Mullen *et al.* 2011). The authors found that the LDTFs for these respective cell types, POU5F1, MYOD1, and PU.1, directed the TGF β -induced SDTF, SMAD3, to unique cell-specific enhancer sites (Mullen *et al.* 2011). Motif-finding at SMAD3 bound sites showed an enrichment for LDTF motifs specific to the cell type in question, highlighting the importance of LDTFs in directing the binding of SDTFs (Mullen *et al.* 2011).

Breast, prostate, and osteoblasts

FOXA1 is essential for the development and differentiation of several organs such as liver, kidney, pancreas, lung, prostate, and mammary gland (Friedman & Kaestner 2006). In breast cancer epithelial (MCF7) cells and prostate cancer (LNCaP) cells, FOXA1 creates a cell-specific enhancer network, which regulates other activating factors such as ESR1 (Lupien *et al.* 2008, Hurtado *et al.* 2011) and AR (He *et al.* 2010, Wang *et al.* 2011) respectively. In estrogen-responsive breast cancer cells, tamoxifen-mediated ESR1 activity is dependent on LDTF FOXA1. In tamoxifen-resistant cells, ESR1 binding occurs independent of ligand but is still dependent on FOXA1 (Hurtado *et al.* 2011). Another transcription factor implicated in breast cancer oncogenesis, TFAP2C, binds to ESR1-binding sites in a ligand-independent manner, colocalizing with FOXA1 and priming enhancer sequences for ESR1 binding (Tan *et al.* 2011). Furthermore, treatment with estradiol results in a global increase in enhancer RNA (eRNA) transcription at enhancers in the vicinity of 17 β -estradiol-regulated genes, which promote specific E2/ESR1/eRNA-induced enhancer-promoter looping

(Li *et al.* 2013). In addition, a recent study conducted in a murine mammary epithelial cell line has found AP1 to be an essential LDTF, mediating GR-chromatin interactions and GR-regulated transcription (Biddie *et al.* 2011).

In U2OS cells, an osteoblast-like cell line, ESR1 binding is preceded by the lineage determining factor, GATA4 (Miranda-Carboni *et al.* 2011). GATA4 is necessary for H3K4me2 deposition at ESR1-binding sites, suggesting that it is a LDTF for ESR1 recruitment in this cell type (Miranda-Carboni *et al.* 2011). Furthermore, these results illustrate the cell-specific nature of priming and activating transcription factors; future studies will help clarify the differences amongst diverse cell types.

Histone modifications associated with active and poised regulatory elements

LDTFs and SDTFs bind at both enhancer and promoter elements to regulate transcription. Enhancers and promoters are associated with distinct chromatin signatures – active promoters are marked by high levels of histone H3 lysine 4 tri-methylation (H3K4me3) relative to mono-methylation (H3K4me1), whereas enhancers are marked by high levels of H3K4me1 relative to H3K4me3 (Heintzman *et al.* 2007; Fig. 2). H3K4me2 occurs at both promoter and enhancer regions (Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013),

which we define here by their distance from a transcription start site (around <2 kb to indicate a promoter and >2 kb to indicate an enhancer). Studies in yeast, *Drosophila*, and humans suggest that the SET domain-containing methyl-transferases are responsible for depositing the majority of H3K4me3 at promoters (Nagy *et al.* 2002, Wu *et al.* 2008, Ardehali *et al.* 2011, Hallson *et al.* 2012).

Mono-methylation at enhancers is dynamic and regulated in a cell-specific manner. Currently, methyl-transferases regulating H3K4me1 at mammalian enhancers include MLL1 (Jeong *et al.* 2011) and MLL1/3 (Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013). At enhancer loci, H3K4me1 functions as an active mark; its de-methylation in mouse embryonic stem cells by LSD1 results in enhancer silencing and cell differentiation. The process by which H3K4me1 is lost at enhancers is called enhancer ‘decommissioning’ and further illustrates the fine tuning mediated by cell-specific enhancers (Whyte *et al.* 2012). Not surprisingly, loss of LSD1 is associated with increased H3K4me1 and H3K4me2 at hematopoietic stem cell promoter and enhancer elements, as well as subsequent gene derepression, resulting in altered transcription and compromised differentiation (Kerenyi *et al.* 2013).

While the presence of H3K4me2 dictates active transcriptional regions, active enhancers are also marked

Figure 2

Histone marks at active and poised promoters and enhancers. Promoters are designated by high levels of H3K4me3, while enhancers contain high levels of H3K4me1/2. In the poised or repressed state, promoters contain histone methylation marks, H3K27me3, and H3K20me3, while enhancers

contain H3K27me3/me1 and H3K9me1. Active promoters and enhancers are marked by H3K4me2 and H3K27Ac. GTF, general transcription factor; LDTF, lineage-determining transcription factor; SDTF, signal-dependent transcription factor.

by EP300 (or CBP) histone acetyl-transferase (Heintzman *et al.* 2007, Ghisletti *et al.* 2010; Fig. 2). EP300/CBP acetylates H3K27 (Tie *et al.* 2009, Pasini *et al.* 2010, Jin *et al.* 2011), a mark for active transcription, which distinguishes active enhancers from poised or disengaged enhancers (Heintzman *et al.* 2009, Creighton *et al.* 2010, Rada-Iglesias *et al.* 2011, Zentner *et al.* 2011) in human and mouse embryonic stem cells (Creighton *et al.* 2010, Rada-Iglesias *et al.* 2011, Zentner *et al.* 2011), as well as adult tissues (Heintzman *et al.* 2009, Creighton *et al.* 2010, Zentner *et al.* 2011).

In contrast to active acetylation marks, the combination of H3K4me3 and H3K27me3 marks promoters that are 'poised' for transcription (Mikkelsen *et al.* 2007; Fig. 2). In mouse and human embryonic stem cells, poised enhancers are marked by H3K4me1, EP300, SMARCA4, and H3K27me3, and are bound by the Polycomb complex (Rada-Iglesias *et al.* 2011). Unable to drive gene expression, poised enhancers transition into active enhancers during differentiation through the acquisition of H3K27ac and the loss of H3K27me3, as well as the recruitment of tissue-specific transcription factors and RNA polymerase II (Rada-Iglesias *et al.* 2011). Furthermore, poised enhancers in hematopoietic stem cells contain H3K27me1 and H3K9me1 before their activation (Cui *et al.* 2009), whereas promoters in embryonic stem cells (Rada-Iglesias *et al.* 2011), hematopoietic stem cells (Cui *et al.* 2009), and adult tissues (De Santa *et al.* 2007), all contain H3K27me3 and may contain other repressive marks such as H3K20me3 (Stender *et al.* 2012; Fig. 2).

Signal-dependent control of the epigenetic landscape

Investigation of macrophage differentiation and activation has provided a powerful experimental system for linking the actions of LDTFs and SDTFs to specific histone modifications and subsequent transcriptional output. Macrophage gene expression is stimulus-specific, gene-specific, cell-specific, and macrophage-subset specific. In early genome-wide studies to study the stimulus-specific nature of gene expression, microarrays were used to systematically examine the response of macrophages to various bacterial pathogens that act through TLRs, comparing the shared and differential transcriptional output (Nau *et al.* 2002). These studies were the first to document the very dramatic transcriptional responses of macrophages to these signals and revealed that these responses were finely tuned to specific pathogens.

Several lines of evidence indicate that the program of macrophage activation is subject to many types of negative regulation that act prior and/or subsequent to stimulus responses. BCL6 has been shown to corepress almost a third of the TLR4 cistrome, such that its loss results in hypersensitivity to pro-inflammatory derepression (Barish *et al.* 2010). The NCOR1/HDAC3 corepressor complex has been proposed to function as a transcriptional checkpoint for some TLR-responsive genes under basal conditions through recruitment to non-phosphorylated forms of AP1. The HDAC3 component of this complex contributes to the repressive functions of the NCOR1 complex by removing histone acetylation marks required for transcriptional activity (Ogawa *et al.* 2004; Fig. 3). Activation of inflammatory genes necessitates signal-dependent phosphorylation of c-Jun and removal of NCOR1 from AP1 target genes (Ogawa *et al.* 2004). Surprisingly, loss of HDAC3 in macrophages results in decreased activation of almost half of the inflammatory program (Chen *et al.* 2012). This phenomenon has been suggested to be the result of decreased *Ifnb1* expression and the secondary STAT1-mediated transcriptional response, a pre-requisite for inflammatory induction (Chen *et al.* 2012). In addition to HDAC3, NCOR1 complexes in macrophages also contain the histone methyl-transferase SMYD5, which contributes to repression by catalyzing H4K20 tri-methylation, inhibiting the expression of TLR4 target genes (Stender *et al.* 2012). Signal-dependent de-methylation of H4K20me3 at promoters occurs through the recruitment of the histone de-methylase PHF2 by the RELA component of NF- κ B (Stender *et al.* 2012; Fig. 3).

After corepressor dismissal from inflammatory genes, transcriptional activation in response to TLR4 signaling occurs in two phases – primary response genes are immediately upregulated in response to stimuli whereas secondary response genes require expression of gene products from the initial wave of transcription, such as the type I interferons. CpG islands are usually found at the promoters of primary response genes and associate with nucleosome-destabilizing elements, allowing these genes to be transcribed at low levels in the basal state. This low level of transcription produces nonfunctional transcripts that are rapidly degraded until the recruitment of the positive transcription elongation factor (P-TEFb) complex, which phosphorylates RNA polymerase II and couples transcriptional initiation with elongation (Hargreaves *et al.* 2009, Ramirez-Carrozzi *et al.* 2009). In contrast, promoters with low CpG content are indicative of secondary response genes, which undergo stimulus-dependent

Figure 3

Mechanisms for regulating gene expression in macrophages: coregulator exchange from corepressor to coactivator. In the poised or repressed state, the NCOR1/HDAC3/SMYD5 complex inhibits active transcription through de-acetylation of histone H3 and H4, as well as tri-methylation of H4K20.

After signal-dependent recruitment of activating transcription factors such as NF-κB, the NCOR1 complex is exchanged for coactivator complexes that remove repressive marks and acetylate histones H3 and H4, recruiting the P-TEFb complex to activate transcriptional elongation.

H3K4me3 and H3 acetylation, requiring selective nucleosome remodeling (Hargreaves *et al.* 2009, Ramirez-Carrozzi *et al.* 2009). Inflammatory genes in macrophages can be further classified into two categories on the basis of function and regulation – genes capable of being induced after stimulation of tolerant macrophages and those that will not be induced during restimulation. Genes capable of being restimulated exhibit more H4 acetylation and maintain H3K4me3 after restimulation (Foster *et al.* 2007). Like the genes in naïve macrophages, these genes are capable of recruiting the SMARCA4 and CHD4 chromatin-remodeling complexes to their promoters; however, they exhibit different transcriptional requirements than those in naïve macrophages (Foster *et al.* 2007).

Macrophage activation results in the sequential binding of lineage-determining and stimulus-activated transcription factors to cell-specific regions, enabling the novel deposition of *cis*-regulatory enhancer marks such as H3K4me1 and H3K27ac (Escoubet-Lozach *et al.* 2011,

Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013, Ostuni *et al.* 2013). In one study, the authors removed the stimuli post-treatment in a 'washout' experiment. Surprisingly, H3K4me1 did not revert to its latent state; instead, it persisted and conditioned a faster and stronger response upon restimulation, suggesting the existence of epigenetic memory in response to stimuli exposure (Ostuni *et al.* 2013).

Recent studies have reported the productive transcription of RNA polymerase II-associated noncoding RNA (De Santa *et al.* 2010) (ncRNA) from *cis*-regulatory enhancers located both intragenically (Kowalczyk *et al.* 2012) and intergenically in response to LPS stimulation (Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013). TLR4 signaling regulates macrophage gene expression through both a pre-existing enhancer landscape as well as the induction of ~3000 eRNAs from *de novo* enhancer regulatory regions (*de novo* eRNAs) (Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013; Fig. 1). In all, ~2200 *de novo* eRNAs are induced greater than twofold in response to TLR4. Regions that show eRNA induction also gain H3K4me2 and are enriched for AP1, NF-κB, C/EBPs,

IRF/STAT, and PU.1 motifs (Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013). Surprisingly, the inhibition of RNA polymerase II elongation and eRNA synthesis at enhancers resulted in decreased H3K4me1 and H3K4me2 deposition without affecting H4K8ac (Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013). This result suggests that enhancer transcription precedes and may be essential for H3K4me1/2 deposition, at least for the set of enhancers that are established *de novo* following TLR4 activation. Systemic depletion of all known H3K4 methyl-transferases indicated that TLR4-induced H3K4 methylation was dependent upon the histone methyl-transferases, MLL1, MLL2/4, and MLL3 (Kaikkonen *et al.* 2013).

Functional roles of eRNAs

It has been proposed that transcription at enhancers maybe due to nonspecific interactions of RNA polymerase II with the genome, thus representing noise rather than biological function (Struhl 2007). Others have speculated that the functional effects of enhancer transcription are due to the transcription process and machinery or RNA polymerase II moving unobstructed in either direction upon binding DNA. In contrast, studies have shown that *in vivo* developmental enhancers have highly conserved noncoding elements (Pennacchio *et al.* 2006, Visel *et al.* 2008), positing that developmental enhancers may have retained their function throughout evolution.

eRNAs are believed to exert their function through two main mechanisms: in *cis*, the eRNAs may act on the same chromatin fiber or in *trans*, the eRNAs may function at distant sites in the genome. Recently, in macrophages, Rev-Erbs (NR1D1 and NR1D2, more commonly referred to as Rev-Erbs, see Table 1) have been described to repress key inflammatory genes through direct promoter-mediated mechanisms as well as in *cis* through eRNAs (Lam *et al.* 2013). Primarily, Rev-Erbs bind at distal elements, which are marked by PU.1 co-binding and H3K4me1 (Lam *et al.* 2013). The binding of Rev-Erbs at enhancer elements inhibits enhancer mediated transcription at two distal *cis* regulatory elements, subsequently decreasing transcription at the nearby protein-coding genes, *Mmp9* and *Cx3cr1* (Lam *et al.* 2013). Genetic studies depleting either Rev-Erbs from these loci or the eRNAs themselves resulted in the subsequent derepression of *Mmp9* and *Cx3cr1* mRNA (Lam *et al.* 2013). Similar studies on multiple cell types have found the transcription of ncRNAs, especially eRNAs, to be essential in promoting (Feng *et al.* 2006, Kim *et al.* 2010, Orom *et al.* 2010, Li *et al.* 2013, Melo *et al.* 2013) and inhibiting (Wang *et al.* 2008) gene expression. Further studies will

help to elucidate the cell-specific mechanisms of enhancers in regulating diverse facets of transcription.

Conclusions

In concert, these studies suggest a general model to explain how genes with a broad distribution of expression can be regulated in a cell-specific manner and how broadly expressed SDTFs are capable of regulating discriminative responses in different cell types. Traditionally, the regulation of transcription is thought to occur primarily at the promoter. The above-described studies show that LDTFs collaboratively select and prime distal enhancer regulatory elements in a cell-specific manner, genome-wide. In a signal-dependent manner or during development, LDTFs may remodel and open chromatin at promoter and enhancer regions, broadly defining the regulatory potential of genes. For example, PU.1 binds to more than two-thirds of enhancer-like regions in macrophages, priming target genes for the subsequent recruitment of SDTFs to their vicinity, and their subsequent activation (Heinz *et al.* 2010). Thus, although transcription can occur at both promoters and enhancers – transcription at promoters is often ubiquitous amongst different cell-types while that at enhancers tends to be cell-specific.

Furthermore, genetic analyses have shown that mutations of SDTF motifs can only account for a small percentage of the variable gene expression that is the result of genetic variation (Kasowski *et al.* 2010, Heinz *et al.* 2013). Understanding how mutations in LDTF and SDTF motifs result in direct and indirect effects on enhancer selection and function is essential to defining relevant noncoding variants in the genome and their impact on human disease (Heinz *et al.* 2013). Comprehension of how key lineage determining transcription factors modulate signal-dependent mechanisms in different cell types may also have cell-specific therapeutic applications. Many human disease states could benefit from cell-specific alterations in gene expression in a manner that would decrease toxicity and increase efficacy. New technologies such as antisense oligonucleotides and small interfering RNAs can be potentially used to modulate cell-specific eRNA transcripts that are associated with malfunctioning genes (Lam *et al.* 2013). In principle, this methodology would enable the cell-specific regulation of aberrant gene expression implicated in disease states such as cancer and chronic inflammatory diseases without adversely modulating normal physiological expression in unaffected cell types.

Declaration of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest that could be perceived as prejudicing the impartiality of the review.

Funding

D X Z is supported by an American Heart Association Predoctoral Fellowship. These studies were also supported by NIH grants DK091183, DK074868, and CA17390 to C K G.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Karmel Allison for the critical reading of this manuscript and Lynn Bautista for her expertise in figure preparation.

References

- Ardehali MB, Mei A, Zobeck KL, Caron M, Lis JT & Kusch T 2011 *Drosophila* Set1 is the major histone H3 lysine 4 trimethyltransferase with role in transcription. *EMBO Journal* **30** 2817–2828. (doi:10.1038/emboj.2011.194)
- Barish GD, Yu RT, Karunasiri M, Ocampo CB, Dixon J, Benner C, Dent AL, Tangirala RK & Evans RM 2010 Bcl-6 and NF- κ B cistromes mediate opposing regulation of the innate immune response. *Genes and Development* **24** 2760–2765. (doi:10.1101/gad.1998010)
- Bernstein BE, Birney E, Dunham I, Green ED, Gunter C & Snyder M 2012 An integrated encyclopedia of DNA elements in the human genome. *Nature* **489** 57–74. (doi:10.1038/nature11247)
- Biddie SC, John S, Sabo PJ, Thurman RE, Johnson TA, Schiltz RL, Miranda TB, Sung MH, Trump S, Lightman SL *et al.* 2011 Transcription factor AP1 potentiates chromatin accessibility and glucocorticoid receptor binding. *Molecular Cell* **43** 145–155. (doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2011.06.016)
- Buryachkovskaya L, Sumarovok A & Lomakin N 2013 Historical overview of studies on inflammation in Russia. *Inflammation Research* **62** 441–450. (doi:10.1007/s00011-013-0597-0)
- Chen X, Barozzi I, Termanini A, Prosperini E, Recchiuti A, Dalli J, Miettton F, Matteoli G, Hiebert S & Natoli G 2012 Requirement for the histone deacetylase Hdac3 for the inflammatory gene expression program in macrophages. *PNAS* **109** E2865–E2874. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1121131109)
- Cho H, Zhao X, Hatori M, Yu RT, Barish GD, Lam MT, Chong LW, DiTacchio L, Atkins AR, Glass CK *et al.* 2012 Regulation of circadian behaviour and metabolism by REV-ERB- α and REV-ERB- β . *Nature* **485** 123–127. (doi:10.1038/nature11048)
- Ciofani M, Madar A, Galan C, Sellars M, Mace K, Pauli F, Agarwal A, Huang W, Parkurst CN, Muratet M *et al.* 2012 A validated regulatory network for Th17 cell specification. *Cell* **151** 289–303. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2012.09.016)
- Creyghton MP, Cheng AW, Welstead GG, Kooistra T, Carey BW, Steine EJ, Hanna J, Lodato MA, Frampton GM, Sharp PA *et al.* 2010 Histone H3K27ac separates active from poised enhancers and predicts developmental state. *PNAS* **107** 21931–21936. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1016071107)
- Cui K, Zang C, Roh TY, Schones DE, Childs RW, Peng W & Zhao K 2009 Chromatin signatures in multipotent human hematopoietic stem cells indicate the fate of bivalent genes during differentiation. *Cell Stem Cell* **4** 80–93. (doi:10.1016/j.stem.2008.11.011)
- De Santa F, Totaro MG, Prosperini E, Notarbartolo S, Testa G & Natoli G 2007 The histone H3 lysine-27 demethylase Jmjd3 links inflammation to inhibition of polycomb-mediated gene silencing. *Cell* **130** 1083–1094. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2007.08.019)
- De Santa F, Barozzi I, Miettton F, Ghisletti S, Polletti S, Tusi BK, Muller H, Ragoussis J, Wei CL & Natoli G 2010 A large fraction of extragenic RNA pol II transcription sites overlap enhancers. *PLoS Biology* **8** e1000384. (doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1000384)
- Drexler SK & Foxwell BM 2010 The role of toll-like receptors in chronic inflammation. *International Journal of Biochemistry & Cell Biology* **42** 506–518. (doi:10.1016/j.biocel.2009.10.009)
- Escoubet-Lozach L, Benner C, Kaikkonen MU, Lozach J, Heinz S, Spann NJ, Crotti A, Stender J, Ghisletti S, Reichart D *et al.* 2011 Mechanisms establishing TLR4-responsive activation states of inflammatory response genes. *PLoS Genetics* **7** e1002401. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1002401)
- Fan W, Morinaga H, Kim JJ, Bae E, Spann NJ, Heinz S, Glass CK & Olefsky JM 2010 FoxO1 regulates Tlr4 inflammatory pathway signalling in macrophages. *EMBO Journal* **29** 4223–4236. (doi:10.1038/emboj.2010.268)
- Feng J, Bi C, Clark BS, Mady R, Shah P & Kohtz JD 2006 The Evf-2 noncoding RNA is transcribed from the Dlx-5/6 ultraconserved region and functions as a Dlx-2 transcriptional coactivator. *Genes and Development* **20** 1470–1484. (doi:10.1101/gad.1416106)
- Foster SL, Hargreaves DC & Medzhitov R 2007 Gene-specific control of inflammation by TLR-induced chromatin modifications. *Nature* **447** 972–978. (doi:10.1038/nature05836)
- Friedman JR & Kaestner KH 2006 The Foxa family of transcription factors in development and metabolism. *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences* **63** 2317–2328. (doi:10.1007/s00018-006-6095-6)
- Garber M, Yosef N, Goren A, Raychowdhury R, Thielke A, Guttman M, Robinson J, Minie B, Chevrier N, Itzhaki Z *et al.* 2012 A high-throughput chromatin immunoprecipitation approach reveals principles of dynamic gene regulation in mammals. *Molecular Cell* **47** 810–822. (doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2012.07.030)
- Ghisletti S, Barozzi I, Miettton F, Polletti S, De Santa F, Venturini E, Gregory L, Lonie L, Chew A, Wei CL *et al.* 2010 Identification and characterization of enhancers controlling the inflammatory gene expression program in macrophages. *Immunity* **32** 317–328. (doi:10.1016/j.immuni.2010.02.008)
- Glass CK & Saijo K 2010 Nuclear receptor transrepression pathways that regulate inflammation in macrophages and T cells. *Nature Reviews. Immunology* **10** 365–376. (doi:10.1038/nri2748)
- Hallson G, Hollebakk RE, Li T, Syrzycka M, Kim I, Cotsworth S, Fitzpatrick KA, Sinclair DA & Honda BM 2012 dSet1 is the main H3K4 di- and tri-methyltransferase throughout *Drosophila* development. *Genetics* **190** 91–100. (doi:10.1534/genetics.111.135863)
- Hargreaves DC, Horng T & Medzhitov R 2009 Control of inducible gene expression by signal-dependent transcriptional elongation. *Cell* **138** 129–145. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2009.05.047)
- He HH, Meyer CA, Shin H, Bailey ST, Wei G, Wang Q, Zhang Y, Xu K, Ni M, Lupien M *et al.* 2010 Nucleosome dynamics define transcriptional enhancers. *Nature Genetics* **42** 343–347. (doi:10.1038/ng.545)
- Heintzman ND, Stuart RK, Hon G, Fu Y, Ching CW, Hawkins RD, Barrera LO, Van Calcar S, Qu C, Ching KA *et al.* 2007 Distinct and predictive chromatin signatures of transcriptional promoters and enhancers in the human genome. *Nature Genetics* **39** 311–318. (doi:10.1038/ng1966)
- Heintzman ND, Hon GC, Hawkins RD, Kheradpour P, Stark A, Harp LF, Ye Z, Lee LK, Stuart RK, Ching CW *et al.* 2009 Histone modifications at human enhancers reflect global cell-type-specific gene expression. *Nature* **459** 108–112. (doi:10.1038/nature07829)
- Heinz S, Benner C, Spann N, Bertolino E, Lin YC, Laslo P, Cheng JX, Murre C, Singh H & Glass CK 2010 Simple combinations of lineage-determining transcription factors prime cis-regulatory elements required for macrophage and B cell identities. *Molecular Cell* **38** 576–589. (doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2010.05.004)
- Heinz S, Romanoski CE, Benner C, Allison KA, Kaikkonen MU, Orozco LD & Glass CK 2013 Impact of natural genetic variation on enhancer selection and function. *Nature* [in press]. (doi:10.1038/nature12615)
- Hettinger J, Richards DM, Hansson J, Barra MM, Joschko AC, Krijgsvel J & Feuerer M 2013 Origin of monocytes and macrophages in a committed progenitor. *Nature Immunology* **14** 821–830. (doi:10.1038/ni.2638)

- Hu G, Schones DE, Cui K, Ybarra R, Northrup D, Tang Q, Gattinoni L, Restifo NP, Huang S & Zhao K 2011 Regulation of nucleosome landscape and transcription factor targeting at tissue-specific enhancers by BRG1. *Genome Research* **21** 1650–1658. (doi:10.1101/gr.121145.111)
- Hurtado A, Holmes KA, Ross-Innes CS, Schmidt D & Carroll JS 2011 FOXA1 is a key determinant of estrogen receptor function and endocrine response. *Nature Genetics* **43** 27–33. (doi:10.1038/ng.730)
- Jeong KW, Kim K, Situ AJ, Ulmer TS, An W & Stallcup MR 2011 Recognition of enhancer element-specific histone methylation by TIP60 in transcriptional activation. *Nature Structural & Molecular Biology* **18** 1358–1365. (doi:10.1038/nsmb.2153)
- Jin Q, Yu LR, Wang L, Zhang Z, Kasper LH, Lee JE, Wang C, Brindle PK, Dent SY & Ge K 2011 Distinct roles of GCN5/PCAF-mediated H3K9ac and CBP/p300-mediated H3K18/27ac in nuclear receptor transactivation. *EMBO Journal* **30** 249–262. (doi:10.1038/emboj.2010.318)
- Kaikkonen MU, Spann NJ, Heinz S, Romanoski CE, Allison KA, Stender JD, Chun HB, Tough DF, Prinzhalka RK, Benner C *et al.* 2013 Remodeling of the enhancer landscape during macrophage activation is coupled to enhancer transcription. *Molecular Cell* **51** 310–325. (doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2013.07.010)
- Kasowski M, Grubert F, Heffelfinger C, Hariharan M, Asabere A, Waszak SM, Habegger L, Rozowsky J, Shi M, Urban AE *et al.* 2010 Variation in transcription factor binding among humans. *Science* **328** 232–235. (doi:10.1126/science.1183621)
- Kerenyi MA, Shao Z, Hsu YJ, Guo G, Luc S, O'Brien K, Fujiwara Y, Peng C, Nguyen M & Orkin SH 2013 Histone demethylase Lsd1 represses hematopoietic stem and progenitor cell signatures during blood cell maturation. *eLife* **2** e00633. (doi:10.7554/eLife.00633)
- Kim TK, Hemberg M, Gray JM, Costa AM, Bear DM, Wu J, Harmin DA, Laptevich M, Barbara-Haley K, Kuersten S *et al.* 2010 Widespread transcription at neuronal activity-regulated enhancers. *Nature* **465** 182–187. (doi:10.1038/nature09033)
- Kowalczyk MS, Hughes JR, Garrick D, Lynch MD, Sharpe JA, Sloane-Stanley JA, McGowan SJ, De Gobbi M, Hosseini M, Vernimmen D *et al.* 2012 Intragenic enhancers act as alternative promoters. *Molecular Cell* **45** 447–458. (doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2011.12.021)
- Kueh HY, Champhekar A, Nutt SL, Elowitz MB & Rothenberg EV 2013 Positive feedback between PU.1 and the cell cycle controls myeloid differentiation. *Science* **341** 670–673. (doi:10.1126/science.1240831)
- Lam MT, Cho H, Lesch HP, Gosselin D, Heinz S, Tanaka-Oishi Y, Benner C, Kaikkonen MU, Kim AS, Kosaka M *et al.* 2013 Rev-Erbs repress macrophage gene expression by inhibiting enhancer-directed transcription. *Nature* **498** 511–515. (doi:10.1038/nature12209)
- Lawrence T & Natoli G 2011 Transcriptional regulation of macrophage polarization: enabling diversity with identity. *Nature Reviews. Immunology* **11** 750–761. (doi:10.1038/nri3088)
- Lazar MA 2011 Mechanism of action of hormones that act on nuclear receptors. In *Williams Textbook of Endocrinology*, 12th edn, pp 52–61. Eds S Melmed & RH Williams. Philadelphia: Elsevier/Saunders.
- Leferova MI, Zhang Y, Steger DJ, Schupp M, Schug J, Cristancho A, Feng D, Zhuo D, Stoeckert CJ Jr, Liu XS *et al.* 2008 PPAR γ and C/EBP factors orchestrate adipocyte biology via adjacent binding on a genome-wide scale. *Genes and Development* **22** 2941–2952. (doi:10.1101/gad.1709008)
- Li W, Notani D, Ma Q, Tanasa B, Nunez E, Chen AY, Merkurjev D, Zhang J, Ohgi K, Song X *et al.* 2013 Functional roles of enhancer RNAs for oestrogen-dependent transcriptional activation. *Nature* **498** 516–520. (doi:10.1038/nature12210)
- Liber D, Domaschensch R, Holmqvist PH, Mazzarella L, Georgiou A, Leleu M, Fisher AG, Labosky PA & Dillon N 2010 Epigenetic priming of a pre-B cell-specific enhancer through binding of Sox2 and Foxd3 at the ESC stage. *Cell Stem Cell* **7** 114–126. (doi:10.1016/j.stem.2010.05.020)
- Lickwar CR, Mueller F, Hanlon SE, McNally JG & Lieb JD 2012 Genome-wide protein–DNA binding dynamics suggest a molecular clutch for transcription factor function. *Nature* **484** 251–255. (doi:10.1038/nature10985)
- Lin YC, Jhunjhunwala S, Benner C, Heinz S, Welinder E, Mansson R, Sigvardsson M, Hagman J, Espinoza CA, Dutkowski J *et al.* 2010 A global network of transcription factors, involving E2A, EBF1 and Foxo1, that orchestrates B cell fate. *Nature Immunology* **11** 635–643. (doi:10.1038/ni.1891)
- Lupien M, Eeckhoutte J, Meyer CA, Wang Q, Zhang Y, Li W, Carroll JS, Liu XS & Brown M 2008 FoxA1 translates epigenetic signatures into enhancer-driven lineage-specific transcription. *Cell* **132** 958–970. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2008.01.018)
- Maurya MR, Gupta S, Li X, Fahy E, Dinasarapu AR, Sud M, Brown HA, Glass CK, Murphy RC, Russell DW *et al.* 2013 Analysis of inflammatory and lipid metabolic networks across RAW264.7 and thioglycolate-elicited macrophages. *Journal of Lipid Research* **54** 2525–2542. (doi:10.1194/jlr.M040212)
- Medzhitov R & Horng T 2009 Transcriptional control of the inflammatory response. *Nature Reviews. Immunology* **9** 692–703. (doi:10.1038/nri2634)
- Medzhitov R, Preston-Hurlburt P & Janeway CA Jr 1997 A human homologue of the *Drosophila* toll protein signals activation of adaptive immunity. *Nature* **388** 394–397. (doi:10.1038/41131)
- Medzhitov R, Shevach EM, Trinchieri G, Mellor AL, Munn DH, Gordon S, Libby P, Hansson GK, Shortman K, Dong C *et al.* 2011 Highlights of 10 years of immunology in Nature Reviews Immunology. *Nature Reviews. Immunology* **11** 693–702. (doi:10.1038/nri3063)
- Meissner F, Scheltema RA, Mollenkopf HJ & Mann M 2013 Direct proteomic quantification of the secretome of activated immune cells. *Science* **340** 475–478. (doi:10.1126/science.1232578)
- Melo CA, Drost J, Wijchers PJ, van de Werken H, de Wit E, Oude Vrielink JA, Elkon R, Melo SA, Leveille N, Kalluri R *et al.* 2013 eRNAs are required for p53-dependent enhancer activity and gene transcription. *Molecular Cell* **49** 524–535. (doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2012.11.021)
- Mikkelsen TS, Ku M, Jaffe DB, Issac B, Lieberman E, Giannoukos G, Alvarez P, Brockman W, Kim TK, Koche RP *et al.* 2007 Genome-wide maps of chromatin state in pluripotent and lineage-committed cells. *Nature* **448** 553–560. (doi:10.1038/nature06008)
- Miranda-Carboni GA, Guemes M, Bailey S, Anaya E, Corselli M, Peault B & Krum SA 2011 GATA4 regulates estrogen receptor- α -mediated osteoblast transcription. *Molecular Endocrinology* **25** 1126–1136. (doi:10.1210/me.2010-0463)
- Mullen AC, Orlando DA, Newman JJ, Loven J, Kumar RM, Bilodeau S, Reddy J, Guenther MG, DeKoter RP & Young RA 2011 Master transcription factors determine cell-type-specific responses to TGF- β signaling. *Cell* **147** 565–576. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2011.08.050)
- Murray PJ & Wynn TA 2011 Protective and pathogenic functions of macrophage subsets. *Nature Reviews. Immunology* **11** 723–737. (doi:10.1038/nri3073)
- Nagy PL, Griesenbeck J, Kornberg RD & Cleary ML 2002 A trithorax-group complex purified from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is required for methylation of histone H3. *PNAS* **99** 90–94. (doi:10.1073/pnas.221596698)
- Nau GJ, Richmond JF, Schlesinger A, Jennings EG, Lander ES & Young RA 2002 Human macrophage activation programs induced by bacterial pathogens. *PNAS* **99** 1503–1508. (doi:10.1073/pnas.022649799)
- Nerlov C & Graf T 1998 PU.1 induces myeloid lineage commitment in multipotent hematopoietic progenitors. *Genes and Development* **12** 2403–2412. (doi:10.1101/gad.12.15.2403)
- Ogawa S, Lozach J, Jepsen K, Sawka-Verhelle D, Perissi V, Sasik R, Rose DW, Johnson RS, Rosenfeld MG & Glass CK 2004 A nuclear receptor corepressor transcriptional checkpoint controlling activator protein 1-dependent gene networks required for macrophage activation. *PNAS* **101** 14461–14466. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0405786101)
- Olefsky JM & Glass CK 2010 Macrophages, inflammation, and insulin resistance. *Annual Review of Physiology* **72** 219–246. (doi:10.1146/annurev-physiol-021909-135846)
- Orom UA, Derrien T, Beringer M, Gumireddy K, Gardini A, Bussotti G, Lai F, Zytnicki M, Notredame C, Huang Q *et al.* 2010 Long noncoding RNAs with enhancer-like function in human cells. *Cell* **143** 46–58. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2010.09.001)

- Ostuni R, Piccolo V, Barozzi I, Polletti S, Termanini A, Bonifacio S, Curina A, Prosperini E, Ghisletti S & Natoli G 2013 Latent enhancers activated by stimulation in differentiated cells. *Cell* **152** 157–171. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2012.12.018)
- Pasini D, Malatesta M, Jung HR, Walfridsson J, Willer A, Olsson L, Skotte J, Wutz A, Porse B, Jensen ON *et al.* 2010 Characterization of an antagonistic switch between histone H3 lysine 27 methylation and acetylation in the transcriptional regulation of Polycomb group target genes. *Nucleic Acids Research* **38** 4958–4969. (doi:10.1093/nar/gkq244)
- Pennacchio LA, Ahituv N, Moses AM, Prabhakar S, Nobrega MA, Shoukry M, Minovitsky S, Dubchak I, Holt A, Lewis KD *et al.* 2006 *In vivo* enhancer analysis of human conserved non-coding sequences. *Nature* **444** 499–502. (doi:10.1038/nature05295)
- Poltorak A, He X, Smirnova I, Liu MY, Van Huffel C, Du X, Birdwell D, Alejos E, Silva M, Galanos C *et al.* 1998a Defective LPS signaling in C3H/HeJ and C57BL/10ScCr mice: mutations in Tlr4 gene. *Science* **282** 2085–2088. (doi:10.1126/science.282.5396.2085)
- Poltorak A, Smirnova I, He X, Liu MY, Van Huffel C, McNally O, Birdwell D, Alejos E, Silva M, Du X *et al.* 1998b Genetic and physical mapping of the Lps locus: identification of the toll-4 receptor as a candidate gene in the critical region. *Blood Cells, Molecules & Diseases* **24** 340–355. (doi:10.1006/bcmd.1998.0201)
- Rada-Iglesias A, Bajpai R, Swigut T, Brugmann SA, Flynn RA & Wysocka J 2011 A unique chromatin signature uncovers early developmental enhancers in humans. *Nature* **470** 279–283. (doi:10.1038/nature09692)
- Ramirez-Carrozzi VR, Braas D, Bhatt DM, Cheng CS, Hong C, Doty KR, Black JC, Hoffmann A, Carey M & Smale ST 2009 A unifying model for the selective regulation of inducible transcription by CpG islands and nucleosome remodeling. *Cell* **138** 114–128. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2009.04.020)
- Saijo K & Glass CK 2011 Microglial cell origin and phenotypes in health and disease. *Nature Reviews. Immunology* **11** 775–787. (doi:10.1038/nri3086)
- Samstein RM, Arvey A, Josefowicz SZ, Peng X, Reynolds A, Sandstrom R, Neph S, Sabo P, Kim JM, Liao W *et al.* 2012 Foxp3 exploits a pre-existent enhancer landscape for regulatory T cell lineage specification. *Cell* **151** 153–166. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2012.06.053)
- Scott EW, Simon MC, Anastasi J & Singh H 1994 Requirement of transcription factor PU.1 in the development of multiple hematopoietic lineages. *Science* **265** 1573–1577. (doi:10.1126/science.8079170)
- Scott EW, Fisher RC, Olson MC, Kehrli EW, Simon MC & Singh H 1997 PU.1 functions in a cell-autonomous manner to control the differentiation of multipotential lymphoid–myeloid progenitors. *Immunity* **6** 437–447. (doi:10.1016/S1074-7613(00)80287-3)
- Shi C & Pamer EG 2011 Monocyte recruitment during infection and inflammation. *Nature Reviews. Immunology* **11** 762–774. (doi:10.1038/nri3070)
- Sica A & Mantovani A 2012 Macrophage plasticity and polarization: *in vivo* veritas. *Journal of Clinical Investigation* **122** 787–795. (doi:10.1172/JCI59643)
- Smale ST 2010 Selective transcription in response to an inflammatory stimulus. *Cell* **140** 833–844. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2010.01.037)
- Song L, Zhang Z, Grassefeder LL, Boyle AP, Giresi PG, Lee BK, Sheffield NC, Graf S, Huss M, Keefe D *et al.* 2011 Open chromatin defined by DNaseI and FAIRE identifies regulatory elements that shape cell-type identity. *Genome Research* **21** 1757–1767. (doi:10.1101/gr.121541.111)
- Spann NJ, Garmire LX, McDonald JG, Myers DS, Milne SB, Shibata N, Reichart D, Fox JN, Shaked I, Heudobler D *et al.* 2012 Regulated accumulation of desmosterol integrates macrophage lipid metabolism and inflammatory responses. *Cell* **151** 138–152. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2012.06.054)
- Stefflova K, Thybert D, Wilson MD, Streeter I, Aleksic J, Karagianni P, Brazma A, Adams DJ, Talianidis I, Marioni JC *et al.* 2013 Cooperativity and rapid evolution of cobound transcription factors in closely related mammals. *Cell* **154** 530–540. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2013.07.007)
- Stender JD, Pascual G, Liu W, Kaikkonen MU, Do K, Spann NJ, Boutros M, Perrimon N, Rosenfeld MG & Glass CK 2012 Control of proinflammatory gene programs by regulated trimethylation and demethylation of histone H4K20. *Molecular Cell* **48** 28–38. (doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2012.07.020)
- Struhl K 2007 Transcriptional noise and the fidelity of initiation by RNA polymerase II. *Nature Structural & Molecular Biology* **14** 103–105. (doi:10.1038/nsmb0207-103)
- Sullivan AL, Benner C, Heinz S, Huang W, Xie L, Miano JM & Glass CK 2011 Serum response factor utilizes distinct promoter- and enhancer-based mechanisms to regulate cytoskeletal gene expression in macrophages. *Molecular and Cellular Biology* **31** 861–875. (doi:10.1128/MCB.00836-10)
- Tan SK, Lin ZH, Chang CW, Varang V, Chng KR, Pan YF, Yong EL, Sung WK & Cheung E 2011 AP-2γ regulates oestrogen receptor-mediated long-range chromatin interaction and gene transcription. *EMBO Journal* **30** 2569–2581. (doi:10.1038/emboj.2011.151)
- Tie F, Banerjee R, Stratton CA, Prasad-Sinha J, Stepanik V, Zlobin A, Diaz MO, Scacheri PC & Harte PJ 2009 CBP-mediated acetylation of histone H3 lysine 27 antagonizes *Drosophila* Polycomb silencing. *Development* **136** 3131–3141. (doi:10.1242/dev.037127)
- Vahedi G, Takahashi H, Nakayamada S, Sun HW, Sartorelli V, Kanno Y & O'Shea JJ 2012 STATs shape the active enhancer landscape of T cell populations. *Cell* **151** 981–993. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2012.09.044)
- Van Dyken SJ & Locksley RM 2013 Interleukin-4- and interleukin-13-mediated alternatively activated macrophages: roles in homeostasis and disease. *Annual Review of Immunology* **31** 317–343. (doi:10.1146/annurev-immunol-032712-095906)
- Visel A, Prabhakar S, Akiyama JA, Shoukry M, Lewis KD, Holt A, Plajzer-Frick I, Afzal V, Rubin EM & Pennacchio LA 2008 Ultraconservation identifies a small subset of extremely constrained developmental enhancers. *Nature Genetics* **40** 158–160. (doi:10.1038/ng.2007.55)
- Wang X, Arai S, Song X, Reichart D, Du K, Pascual G, Tempst P, Rosenfeld MG, Glass CK & Kurokawa R 2008 Induced ncRNAs allosterically modify RNA-binding proteins in *cis* to inhibit transcription. *Nature* **454** 126–130. (doi:10.1038/nature06992)
- Wang D, Garcia-Bassets I, Benner C, Li W, Su X, Zhou Y, Qiu J, Liu W, Kaikkonen MU, Ohgi KA *et al.* 2011 Reprogramming transcription by distinct classes of enhancers functionally defined by eRNA. *Nature* **474** 390–394. (doi:10.1038/nature10006)
- Whyte WA, Bilodeau S, Orlando DA, Hoke HA, Frampton GM, Foster CT, Cowley SM & Young RA 2012 Enhancer decommissioning by LSD1 during embryonic stem cell differentiation. *Nature* **482** 221–225. (doi:10.1038/nature10805)
- Wu M, Wang PF, Lee JS, Martin-Brown S, Florens L, Washburn M & Shilatifard A 2008 Molecular regulation of H3K4 trimethylation by Wdr82, a component of human Set1/COMPASS. *Molecular and Cellular Biology* **28** 7337–7344. (doi:10.1128/MCB.00976-08)
- Wynn TA, Chawla A & Pollard JW 2013 Macrophage biology in development, homeostasis and disease. *Nature* **496** 445–455. (doi:10.1038/nature12034)
- Zaret KS & Carroll JS 2011 Pioneer transcription factors: establishing competence for gene expression. *Genes and Development* **25** 2227–2241. (doi:10.1101/gad.176826.111)
- Zentner GE, Tesar PJ & Scacheri PC 2011 Epigenetic signatures distinguish multiple classes of enhancers with distinct cellular functions. *Genome Research* **21** 1273–1283. (doi:10.1101/gr.122382.111)

Received in final form 11 October 2013

Accepted 15 October 2013

Accepted Preprint published online 15 October 2013