

Synopses of Research Articles

Newly Sequenced Worm a Boon for Worm Biologists

Caenorhabditis elegans, a 1-mm soil-dwelling roundworm with 959 cells, may be the best-understood multicellular organism on the planet. As the most “pared-down” animal that shares essential features of human biology—from embryogenesis to aging—*C. elegans* is a favorite subject for studying how genes control these processes. The way these genes work in worms helps scientists understand how diseases like cancer and Alzheimer’s develop in humans when genes malfunction. With the publication of a draft genome sequence of *C. elegans*’ first cousin, *C. briggsae*, Lincoln Stein and colleagues have greatly enhanced biologists’ ability to mine *C. elegans* for biological gold.

Every organism carries clues to its molecular operating system and evolutionary past embedded in the content and structure of its genome. To unearth these clues, scientists examine different regions of the genome, assembling data on sequences, genes, functional elements that are not genes (but that regulate them, for example), repeated sequences, and so on. By comparing the genomes of related organisms, researchers can see what parts of the genomes are conserved—highly conserved genes tend to be important—and then focus on these regions to track down genes and determine how they function.


To construct a draft sequence of the *C. briggsae* genome, the researchers merged genomic data from three sources—one derived from whole-genome shotgun sequencing, another from physical genome mapping, and the third from regions of a previously “finished” sequence. For the shotgun sequence, the researchers extracted DNA from worms, randomly cut it into short pieces, sequenced them, and then assembled overlapping sequences to create thousands of stretches of contiguous DNA sequence. To help fill in the gaps between these “contigs,” Stein and colleagues developed a “fingerprint” map of the genome as a guide for aligning the shorter fragments. The map also helped them identify inconsistencies and misalignments in the genome assembly. Finally, they integrated the previously finished sequence to improve the draft genome sequence. Using these massive datasets, the authors produced a high-quality genome sequence; although it does not quite meet the gold standard of a “finished” sequence, it covers 98% of the genome and has an accuracy of 99.98%.

After confirming the accuracy of the draft, the researchers turned to the substance of the genome. Examining two species side by side, scientists can quickly spot genes and flag interesting regions for further investigation. Analyzing the organization of

the two genomes, Stein et al. not only found strong evidence for roughly 1,300 new *C. elegans* genes, but also indications that certain regions could be “footprints of unknown functional elements.” While both worms have roughly the same number of genes (about 19,000), the *C. briggsae* genome has more repeated sequences, making its genome slightly larger.

Because the worms set out on separate evolutionary paths about the same time mice and humans parted ways—about 100 million years ago, compared to 75 million years ago—the authors could compare how the two worm genomes have diverged with the divergence between mice and humans. The worms’ genomes, it seems, are evolving faster than their mammalian counterparts, based on the change in the size of the protein families (*C. elegans* has more chemosensory proteins than *C. briggsae*, for example), the rate of chromosomal rearrangements,

and the rate at which silent mutations (DNA changes with no functional effect) accumulate in the genome. This would be expected, the researchers point out, because generations per year are a better measure of evolutionary rate than years themselves. (Generations in worms are about three days; in mice, about three months.) What is surprising, they say, is that despite these genomic differences, the worms look nearly identical and occupy similar ecological niches; this is obviously not the



Sequence comparison between the two worm genomes

case with humans and mice, which nevertheless have remarkably similar genomes. Both worm pairs—as well as mouse and human—also share similar developmental pathways, suggesting that these pathways may be controlled by a relatively small number of genes and that these genes and pathways have been conserved, not just between the worms, but also between the nematodes and mammals. This question, along with many others, can now be explored by searching the two species’ genomes and comparing those elements that have been conserved with those that have changed.

With the nearly complete *C. briggsae* genome in hand, worm biologists have a powerful new research tool. By comparing the genetic makeup of the two species, *C. elegans* researchers can refine their knowledge of this tiny human stand-in, fill in gaps about gene identity and function, as well as illuminate those functional elements that are harder to find, and study the nature and path of genome evolution.

Stein LD, Bao Z, Blasiar D, Blumenthal T, Brent MR, et al. (2003) The genome sequence of *Caenorhabditis briggsae*: A platform for comparative genomics. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0000045



Retraining the Brain to Recover Movement

Some 200,000 people live with partial or nearly total permanent paralysis in the United States, with spinal cord injuries adding 11,000 new cases each year. Most research aimed at recovering motor function has focused on repairing damaged nerve fibers, which has succeeded in restoring limited movement in animal experiments. But regenerating nerves and restoring complex motor behavior in humans are far more difficult, prompting researchers to explore alternatives to spinal cord rehabilitation. One promising approach involves circumventing neuronal damage by establishing connections between healthy areas of the brain and virtual devices, called brain-machine interfaces (BMIs), programmed to transform neural impulses into signals that can control a robotic device. While experiments have shown that animals using these artificial actuators can learn to adjust their brain activity to move robot arms, many issues remain unresolved, including what type of brain signal would provide the most appropriate inputs to program these machines.

As they report in this paper, Miguel Nicolelis and colleagues have helped clarify some of the fundamental issues surrounding the programming and use of BMIs. Presenting results from a series of long-term studies in monkeys, they demonstrate that the same set of brain cells can control two distinct movements, the reaching and grasping of a robotic arm. This finding has important practical implications for spinal-cord patients—if different cells can perform the same functions, then surgeons have far more flexibility in how and where they can introduce electrodes or other functional enhancements into the brain. The researchers also show how monkeys learn to manipulate a robotic arm using a BMI. And they suggest how to compensate for delays and other limitations inherent in robotic devices to improve performance.

While other studies have focused on discrete areas of the brain—the primary motor cortex in one case and the parietal cortex in another—Nicolelis et al. targeted multiple areas in both regions to operate robotic devices, based on evidence indicating that neurons involved in motor control are found in many areas of the brain. The researchers gathered data on both brain signals and motor coordinates—such as hand position, velocity, and gripping force—to create multiple models for the BMI. They used

different models according to which task the monkeys were learning—a reaching task, a hand-gripping task, and a reach-and-grasp task.

The BMI worked best, Nicolelis et al. show, when the programming models incorporated data recorded from large groups of neurons from both frontal and parietal brain regions, supporting the idea that each of these areas contains neurons directing multiple motor coordinates. When the researchers combined all the motor parameter models to optimize the control of the robotic arm through the BMI, they fixed those parameters and transferred control to the BMI and away from the monkeys' direct manipulation via a pole. The monkeys quickly learned that the robotic arm moved without their overt manipulations, and they periodically stopped moving their arms. Amazingly, when the researchers removed the pole, the monkeys were able to make the robotic arm reach and grasp without moving their own arms, though they did have visual feedback on the robotic arm's movements. Even more surprising, the monkeys' ability to manipulate the arm through "brain control" gradually improved over time.



Monkey learns to control BMI

One way the brain retains flexibility in responding to multiple tasks is through visual feedback. The researchers suggest that the success of the model may be the result of providing the monkeys with continuous feedback on their performance. This feedback may help integrate intention and action—including the action of the robotic arm—in the brain, allowing the monkey to get better at manipulating the robotic arm without moving.

By charting the relationship between neural signals and motor movements, Nicolelis et al. demonstrate how BMIs can work with healthy neural areas to reconfigure the brain's motor command neuronal elements and help restore intentional movement. These findings, they say, suggest that such artificial models of arm dynamics could one day be used to retrain the brain of a patient with paralysis, offering patients not only better control of prosthetic devices but the sense that these devices are truly an extension of themselves.

Carmena JM, Lebedev MA, Crist RE, O'Doherty JE, Santucci DM, Dimitrov DF, Patil PG, Henriquez CS, Nicolelis MAL (2003) Learning to control a brain-machine interface for reaching and grasping by primates. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0000042

Computer Model Predicts How the Brain Controls Limb Dynamics

If you have ever spent an evening hoisting brews with your pals at the corner pub, chances are you never stopped to think—gee, how do I lift my glass now that it's only half full? It seems like a simple task—you raise that glass reflexively, whether it is empty or full—yet the neural calculations that determine the force needed to lift your arm smoothly to your lips in each case

are anything but simple.

The brain, it seems, operates like a computer to process variable cues—such as the weight of a glass and the position of your arm—to generate an appropriate response: lifting the glass. Neuroscientists believe the brain builds a kind of internal software program based on past experience to transform such variable cues into motor commands. The brain's

software, or internal model, depends on specialized sets of instructions, or "computational elements," in the brain. But exactly how the brain organizes these elements to process sensory variables that affect arm movements is far from clear.

Eun Jung Hwang and colleagues predict that these computational elements are based on a multiplicative mechanism, called a *gain field*, through



which sensory signals to the brain are amplified by signals from the eye, head, or limbs. In this way, the brain can rely on past experience of one kind of sensory cues to predict how to respond to new but similar situations. While previous studies had established that some visual cues are combined through a gain field, this study shows that motor commands may also be processed via gain fields. This finding, the researchers demonstrate, accounts for a range of behaviors.

Based on previous studies showing that when people reach to various directions in a small space, they can extrapolate what they learn about the forces in one starting position to a significantly different position, it has been proposed that the way the brain computes movement is not terribly sensitive to limb position. Citing other

research with seemingly contrary conclusions—that the brain can be highly sensitive to limb position in calculating force and movement—Hwang et al. set out to investigate whether—and how—the brain creates a template to translate sensory variables (limb position and velocity) into motor commands (force). They created a computer model to mimic the reaching behaviors observed by people in their experiments and found that the most accurate model used computational elements that are indeed sensitive to both limb position and velocity. If the brain processes these two independent variables through a gain field, it can use the relationship of the two variables—that is, the strength of the gain field—to adapt information about the force needed to move or lift something in one situation to accomplish

a wide range of similar movements. When the researchers compared their model to previously published results, they found their model accounted for seemingly disparate findings. They explain that the brain's sensitivity to limb position can be either low or high after a task has been learned because the gain field itself is adjustable.

The authors note that neurophysiological experiments suggest that the motor cortex may be one of the crucial components of the brain's internal models of limb dynamics. The next step will be to track the motor cortex neurons to see whether their activity supports this model. Hwang et al. predict they will.

Hwang EJ, Donchin O, Smith MA, Shadmehr R (2003) A gain-field encoding of limb position and velocity in the internal model of arm dynamics. DOI:10.1371/journal.pbio.0000025

Underlying Principles of Motor System Organization Revealed

Time after time in biology, revelations about structure lead to insights about corresponding functional mechanisms. While evolution throws in the occasional spandrel, more often organizational structure serves a practical purpose. So naturally, neuroscientists wonder, does the architectural organization of the motor system reveal an underlying functional organization?

Progress on this question has been complicated by the fact that there appears to be no clear correspondence between the development of motor neurons centrally and their target muscles in the periphery. In the visual system, for example, retinal ganglion cells send axons in an ordered manner into the brain, where they form connections with neurons of the primary visual center in the brain responsible for detecting visual targets. The arrangement of these connections mirrors the neighboring relationships of the neurons in the retina, and so the neural map of connections in the brain is an “anatomical correlate” of the arrangements in the retina. The origin of these anatomical relationships can be traced

through the process of development, allowing scientists to link the assembly of this sensory system with the function of the neurons involved. Matthias Landgraf and colleagues now report that in the fruitfly *Drosophila* the arrangement of motor neurons corresponds to the distribution of their target muscles. Thus, anatomical correlates also exist in the motor system, in the form


of a “myotopic map,” where the arrangement of motor neuron dendritic branches in the central nervous system reflects the distribution of their target body wall muscles in the periphery.

Starting with the larger question of how the neural networks governing locomotion are specified and assembled during development, the researchers decided to see if they could identify an elementary principle of motor system organization.

Working in *Drosophila*, they examined motor neurons and the body wall muscles they innervate. With an eye toward understanding the mechanisms directing the assembly of the motor system, the researchers concentrated on the early stages of development, when the motor neurons first establish their characteristic dendritic territories. They found that the dendrites of motor neurons innervating internal muscles and that those innervating external muscles do in fact project into distinct regions, corresponding to the distinct mapping of the muscles themselves. Surprisingly, the arrangement of the dendrites in the myotopic

map forms independently of the muscles they innervate. It may be, the researchers suggest, that the initial signals charting the location of the dendrites are set very early in development, when the coordinates for other structural elements are established. But that question requires further investigation.

The researchers are among the first to reveal such an orderly



Organization of *Drosophila* motorneurons and their target muscles

connection between patterns of motor neuron dendrites and patterns of muscles. This organization, in the form of the myotopic map, may be mirrored by the patterning of processes of higher-order neurons, which form connections with the motor neuron dendrites themselves. In vertebrates, studies have shown that motor neurons are grouped into “pools” and “columns” that correlate with the muscles they innervate. But because these pools and columns represent the location of the cell bodies and not the areas of the spinal cord where the neurons receive most of their inputs, that is, their dendritic branches, scientists could not say whether the pools and columns are simply spandrels—

an incidental result of the way motor neurons are generated—or mirror a functional organization of the motor system. This novel finding in *Drosophila* will pave the way for future studies on the relationship between anatomy and physiology during development. It will be particularly interesting to discover whether such myotopic arrangements of motor neuron dendrites are unique to insects or whether this organizational principle occurs in other motor systems, including vertebrates.

Landgraf M, Jeffrey V, Fujioka M, Jaynes JB, Bate M (2003) Embryonic origins of a motor system: Motor dendrites form a myotopic map in *Drosophila*. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0000041

Novel “Checkpoint” Mechanism Mediates DNA Damage Responses

Of all the tasks a cell must accomplish day in and day out, protecting its genome may be the most important. Genomes confront all manner of potential assaults, from the strand-splitting action of gamma-radiation to the simple copying mistakes sometimes made when DNA replicates before a cell divides. Though some mutations are harmless, others can disrupt gene action, leading to cancer and other diseases. To guard against such events, healthy cells maintain quality-control “checkpoints” that sense and respond to DNA injuries, as well as to defects in DNA replication, and that prevent cell division until the DNA can be repaired. If the damage is beyond repair, apoptosis pathways set about the business of destroying the afflicted cell.

Many of the genes and protein complexes involved in these checkpoint responses have been identified, but the biochemical mechanisms that in some cases trigger cell cycle arrest are not fully understood. Experiments by Philip Hanawalt and his student David Pettijohn at Stanford University in 1963 suggested that the molecular machinery of DNA replication and repair—which they discovered at sites of damage—are quite similar and closely linked. While many studies have since supported that link, Viola Ellison and Bruce Stillman, the director of the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, have found new evidence that the two processes may indeed coincide by showing that protein complexes regulating a cellular checkpoint in DNA repair operate much like similar complexes involved in DNA replication.

The molecular pathways governing the

replication of DNA before cell division are well known. As the double-stranded DNA molecule unwinds, different protein complexes step in to ensure that each strand is faithfully reproduced. Two protein complexes required for this process are replication factor C (RFC) and proliferating cell nuclear antigen (PCNA). In the 1980s, Stillman’s laboratory isolated PCNA and RFC and showed that they function together to “load” PCNA onto a structure in DNA that is created after DNA synthesis begins. PCNA forms a clamp around the DNA strand and regulates the


and RSR favor different DNA structures for clamp loading. While it was known that the RSR/RHR complexes exist in human cells, it had not been established that the two types of clamps prefer different DNA targets. The researchers also show that the RSR/RHR biochemistry depends on RPA, a protein known to be involved in the DNA damage-response pathway.

The discovery that RSR loads its RHR clamp onto a different DNA structure was unexpected; it suggests not only that the two clamp loaders have distinct replication and repair functions, but

also how the checkpoint machinery might work to prevent DNA damage from being passed on to future generations. By establishing the chemical requirements of RSR/RHR interactions as well as the preferred DNA-binding substrate, the researchers have charted the way for determining the different functions of these cell cycle checkpoint complexes and how the complexes’ different subunits affect these functions.

The researchers propose that the role of this checkpoint machinery is not as an initial sensor of DNA damage, but rather as a facilitator of DNA repair, stepping in after preliminary repairs to DNA lesions have been made. Ellison and Stillman’s work helps establish a biochemical model for studying how both of these checkpoint complexes function to coordinate replication and repair—and promise to help scientists understand how cancer develops when the checkpoint repair mechanisms fail.

Ellison V, Stillman B (2003) Biochemical characterization of DNA damage checkpoint complexes: Clamp loader and clamp complexes with specificity for 5’ recessed DNA. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0000033



Possible targets for the RHR checkpoint clamp

DNA polymerases that duplicate the DNA double helix.


Studies in yeast had identified a series of proteins required for the DNA synthesis phase of the cell cycle and the DNA damage checkpoint pathways; mutations in these proteins’ genes make cells very sensitive to radiation (hence the name *Rad* genes). A subset of these proteins, which are conserved in human cells, form two protein complexes—RSR and RHR—that function like RFC and PCNA, respectively, with RSR loading the RHR clamp onto DNA. Ellison and Stillman demonstrate that both pairs of “clamp-loading” complexes follow similar biochemical steps, but, significantly, RFC

slik Gene Controls Cell Growth and Survival

During animal development, cells gradually grow, multiply, and specialize to create the tissues and organs that shape and sustain multicellular organisms. The progression from a single cell to a thousand-, million-, or trillion-celled animal follows an exacting schedule and plan involving an elaborate network of genes and proteins. One of the primary mechanisms coordinating this process is cell-to-cell communication. Cellular signaling regulates two crucial development mechanisms, apoptosis (programmed cell death) and cell proliferation, which work like chisel and clay to sculpt multiplying masses of cells into, say, a fly wing or a human finger. Controlled by multiple signals operating at fixed intervals, the entwined pathways can be steered off-course by a single defect in the communication network, resulting in the death of a healthy cell, for example, or the survival of a damaged cell. Such disruptions can lead to physical abnormalities, such as webbed hands and feet, when cells that should die remain alive; degenerative nerve disease, when healthy cells are killed; and cancer, when damaged cells survive and evade normal growth limitations.

Researchers have uncovered some of the mechanisms underlying these processes by studying genes involved in fruitfly (*Drosophila*) development. Following that tradition, Stephen Cohen and David Hipfner have identified a gene critical to *Drosophila* development that juggles cell growth and survival signals to help promote cell growth and prevent inappropriate apoptosis. They searched for genes associated with changes in tissue growth in fruitfly wings and identified some that can cause tissue “overgrowth”—abnormally large masses resulting either from cells growing faster than they divide or from cells escaping proliferation controls when they are overexpressed. Among these is a gene that encodes a newly

identified kinase that contributes to the regulation of cell proliferation and survival (or death, depending on the circumstance) during *Drosophila* development. Cohen and Hipfner called



***slik* overexpression induces apoptosis**

the gene *slik* based on its similarity to two human kinase-coding genes (*SLK* and *LOK*). Little is known about these human proteins, though previous studies suggest they may affect cytoskeletal dynamics and cell adhesion. In this paper, the authors report preliminary evidence supporting the notion that *slik* may regulate the cytoskeleton, the “backbone” of the cell that confers structure and motility. Interestingly, disturbances to cell adhesion and cytoskeletal structure are known triggers of apoptosis and are being explored as potential anticancer agents.

Kinases make up one of the largest families of proteins and are important regulators of cell signaling. To investigate the function of *slik* in *Drosophila*, the researchers removed the gene and then studied the physical and cellular effects. They found striking delays in growth and developmental timing and showed that these effects result largely from the demise of the *slik*-deficient cells. While cells deprived of *slik* can grow,

divide, and differentiate, most respond to the defect by killing themselves, even under conditions that normally promote survival. Thus, cells without *slik* appear to have an intrinsic survival defect, suggesting that *slik* prevents apoptosis. When *slik* is overexpressed, cell proliferation increases, but so does apoptosis. Only when apoptosis was blocked did the cells form tumor-like growths. This coupling of cell growth and cell death is characteristic of oncogenes (cancer-causing genes), and *slik* also seems to function in both pathways. The authors point out that the signal to proliferate may inherently sensitize cells to apoptosis, as has been shown previously for some cancer cells. This may keep an individual cell under the control of its neighbors, who collectively monitor the needs of the organism. For a cell to respond to a signal by dividing rather than dying, it must get the appropriate signs from its comrades. *slik*, the

authors demonstrate, is a key factor in determining whether a cell lives or dies. Whether its mammalian counterparts play a similar role is yet to be determined.

Hipfner DR, Cohen SM (2003) The *Drosophila* Sterile-20 kinase Slik controls cell proliferation and apoptosis during imaginal disc development. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0000035

Gene Chip for Viral Discovery

West Nile virus. Monkey pox. SARS. If the ever-growing list of public health scares has taught us anything, it's that we need quick, effective tools for detecting emerging viral threats. Researchers led by Joseph DeRisi of the University of California at San Francisco have combined genome databases of sequenced viruses with DNA microarray technology to create such tools.

The viral gene chip they created can



Extraction, amplification, and decoding of viral sequences

rapidly identify known viruses and classify new ones based on their genetic makeup. This was validated in March when the viral chip contributed to the identification of the cause for severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) as a novel coronavirus. In the article published in this issue, the researchers describe the chip (or microarray), how it was used in the classification of the SARS virus, and how it provides direct access to viral genomic sequence.

Microarray technology works by taking advantage of the structural properties of DNA. DNA molecules normally exist as double helices, two complementary strands of nucleotides wrapped around each other. The microarray consists of a large number of single DNA strands attached to a solid base. These probes (which in case of the viral chip represent sequences from all fully sequenced reference viruses) can be used to interrogate unknown sequences: if a solution containing such sequences is passed over the chip, similar sequences will “hybridize,” or bond in a signature double helix.

Known viruses hybridize in a characteristic pattern and can be identified quickly. Because bonding occurs even when the match between probe and sample sequence is not perfect, new relatives of known viruses can be identified as belonging to a particular family (such as coronaviruses, in the case of SARS).

To quickly obtain more information on a novel virus, it is then possible to “syphon off” those viral sequences that stuck to their respective counterparts on the chip and to use the material to determine part of the genomic sequence. Such sequence information provides more detail on how the new virus relates to known ones, which might provide clues about its origin and possible treatment strategies.

A Single Protein in Yeast Can Fine-Tune an Environmental Response

One might not expect that yeast lead terribly eventful lives, yet the single-celled fungus must struggle to survive just like everyone else. And for yeast—like everyone else—survival means being able to detect and coordinate a rapid response to changes in its environment. Though survival for humans is a bit more complicated, our cells use the same regulatory networks, which maintain cell growth and health when they work and contribute to diseases, from asthma to cancer, when they break down.

Given the variety of conditions even the lowly yeast is likely to encounter during its life, one might expect to find a multitude of molecules mobilizing a response. But yeast cells, it turns out, are fairly resourceful. As Erin O’Shea and colleagues report, just one protein in

yeast activates different groups of genes in response to different amounts of an environmental stimulus. The researchers focused on how yeast responds to various levels of phosphate, an essential nutrient for all cells.

One way that cells regulate responses to environmental stimuli is through the transcription (activation) of genes. These transcriptional responses are often controlled by a multistep process that shuttles gene-activating proteins into the nucleus, where they can generate the appropriate response for a given stimulus, or confines them to the cytoplasm if their gene products are not needed. During this process, called phosphorylation, the addition of a phosphate group to a protein—such as a receptor or transcription factor—acts as a mechanism for controlling gene expression.

O’Shea’s team demonstrated that phosphorylation of a transcription factor called Pho4 controls gene expression by

controlling where that protein resides in the cell—in the cytoplasm or in the nucleus. As is the case with many proteins, Pho4 can accept phosphate groups at multiple sites. To see whether the location of phosphorylation affects the action of Pho4, O’Shea’s team exposed yeast to different levels of phosphate and tracked the cellular response.

They found that when yeast is deprived of phosphate, Pho4 has no phosphate groups at any of its binding sites and enters the nucleus, where it binds to DNA and activates a set of genes whose products can scavenge for phosphate or otherwise compensate for the scarcity. When yeast has ample supplies of phosphate, Pho4 is phosphorylated and remains in the cytoplasm—unable to influence transcription—suggesting that the cells can absorb plenty of nutrients from their environs without having to engage a specialized foraging team. When the researchers exposed the yeast to intermediate amounts of phosphate, the results were surprising. Middling concentrations of phosphate produced different forms of phosphorylated Pho4, which varied in their ability to activate genes, and so added to the number of possible responses. Pho4 partially phosphorylated at one site, for example, could still enter the nucleus, but activated only one type of phosphate-recovery gene and not others.

While it is not unexpected that differential phosphorylation could have different functional outcomes, the authors say, it is surprising that one enzyme acting on one transcription factor can create different phosphorylation patterns—and therefore different gene-expression patterns—in response to different amounts of a single stimulus. Their results show that cells rely on a highly regulated series of interactions that induce subtle changes in gene expression to fine-tune their response to small environmental changes. And they do this in a remarkably efficient manner, relying on a small cast of characters to orchestrate the responses essential for survival.

Springer M, Wykoff DD, Miller N, O’Shea EK (2003) Partially phosphorylated Pho4 activates transcription of a subset of phosphate-responsive genes. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0000028



Basal Signaling Suppresses RAG Genes during T Cell Development


Faced with all manner of potential threats in the form of billions of different viral, bacterial, and chemical pathogens, the mammalian immune system relies on a “safety in diversity” strategy for protection. With two distinct subsystems—one innate, the other adaptive—the immune system can recognize some 100 trillion antigens. The innate system deploys cells programmed to quickly recognize microbes with a particular set of conserved molecular structures. The adaptive system relies on billions of uniquely outfitted lymphocytes (white blood cells) to identify just as many pathogens through their protein fragments, or antigens. A human being grinds out billions of these cells every day. In the absence of threats, the immune system maintains a quiescent state and many of these cells are discarded. But for the immune system, doing nothing takes a concerted effort.

Lymphocytes originate in the bone marrow, though not all differentiate there. One class of lymphocytes, called T cells, develops in the thymus, where every T cell acquires a one-of-a-kind receptor, called a T cell receptor (TCR), designed to recognize a different antigen. When an antigen gets bound by a TCR (a bound molecule is called a ligand), the antigen triggers a signaling cascade that tells the T cell either to attack the infected cell or to alert other immune cells of the infiltrator. But as Jeroen Roose, Arthur Weiss, and colleagues report, signaling pathways activated by bound TCRs appear to influence gene expression even in the absence of antigen or other receptor ligands, a process called ligand-independent signaling. These findings lend support to the notion that cellular signaling pathways regulated by surface receptors, like TCRs, exhibit a continuous low-level signaling (known as basal signaling) in the absence of a stimulus and that this continuous signaling, by influencing gene expression, has significant influence on cellular differentiation.

Roose, Weiss, et al. focused on the TCR signaling pathway that regulates the expression of a group of genes, including *RAG-1* and *RAG-2*, that are activated in two distinct waves during

T cell development. *RAG* genes play a crucial role in T cell development, a highly complex, multistage process that involves a reshuffling, or recombination, of TCR genes and the activation of different proteins and genes at different stages. *RAG* genes regulate the genetic recombination and ultimate cell surface expression of TCRs. Using chemical inhibitors and mutant human T cell lines deficient in critical signaling components involved in antigen receptor-dependent pathways, the researchers found that the loss of specific functions or specific proteins affected an unexpected set of target genes. Notably, when downstream components (the protein kinases Erk and Abl) were disabled in the basal signaling pathway, the researchers saw a resurgence of *RAG* gene expression. While Erk was already known to play a prominent role in signaling pathways downstream of the TCR, it now appears that Abl may also be regulated in TCR pathways. Most importantly, these findings suggest that signaling pathways thought to be triggered only by ligated receptors can influence gene expression on their own. And it may be through this type of signaling that TCR pathways help regulate T cell development by repressing *RAG* gene activity.

These basal signals, the researchers postulate, may in effect save the *RAG* expression machinery until recombination is called for. If *RAG* genes were expressed at the wrong time, they could cause inappropriate genetic recombination and create T cells that either lack function or attack healthy cells, as happens in immunodeficiency and autoimmune diseases. Elucidating the mechanisms



Basal signaling suppresses *RAG* gene

and components of this basal pathway will contribute important insights into the development and function of the immune system. But these studies also establish a model for investigating other signaling systems, to determine whether biologically functional basal signaling is a rare phenomenon or whether it is a fundamental cell process needed to control the profile of gene expression in the quiescent state.

Roose JP, Diehn M, Tomlinson MG, Lin J, Alizadeh AA, et al. (2003) T cell receptor-independent basal signaling via Erk and Abl kinases suppresses *RAG* gene expression. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0000053

Development of Vascular Smooth Muscle Cells Depends on Signaling Synergy

A multicellular organism can have more than 200 different types of cells and as many as 100 trillion altogether. During the process of development, an organism enlists the service of hundreds of signaling molecules and thousands of receptors to direct cell growth, differentiation, and morphological destiny. Any given cell has no use for most of these signals and gets by with just a limited repertoire of receptors on its surface. Once a signal reaches a receptor, it triggers a series of biochemical reactions as different molecules transform the external signal into a biological response, in a process called signal transduction. One cell type controls all of its cellular functions—both universal and specialized—with just a few dozen receptors; each receptor elicits a wide range of responses by triggering a small number of interacting pathways. Exactly how a receptor produces the right response at the right time is a fundamental question in biology.

Of particular interest is a class of receptors—called receptor tyrosine kinases (RTKs)—that regulate cell proliferation, differentiation, and survival and play an important role in embryonic development and disease. Growth factor receptors are an important subset

of RTKs. The platelet-derived growth factor receptor (PDGFR) family activates downstream signaling enzymes that stimulate the growth and motility of connective tissue cells, such as vascular smooth muscle cells (VSMCs), oligodendrocytes (cells of the tissue encasing nerve fibers), and chondrocytes (cartilage cells). The PDGF beta receptor is essential for directing the differentiation of VSMCs. While studies of signal transduction of this growth factor have established a model of how receptor tyrosine kinases function, the role of individual downstream signaling components in a living organism is still unclear.

Using mouse molecular genetics, Michelle Tallquist and colleagues set out to determine the function of individual components in the PDGFR beta pathway. They discovered a quantitative correlation between the overall amount of signal produced by the receptor and the end product of the signal, formation of VSMCs. Receptor responses, they report, are controlled in two ways: signaling was influenced both by the amount of receptors expressed and by the number of specific pathways engaged downstream of the receptor.

Surface receptors have “tails” that project into a cell’s interior. When a surface receptor is activated, a number of potential binding sites—modified amino acid residues—are exposed on its intracellular tail. Ten of these sites can bind to proteins with a specific amino acid sequence, called an SH2 domain; proteins with these domains can then initiate a signal transduction pathway. By introducing mutations in the SH2 domain-binding sites in mice, the researchers could evaluate how the loss of a particular binding site—and therefore


pathway—affected the function of the receptor. They had previously investigated the functions of two other downstream signaling proteins in similar experiments.

Surprisingly, Tallquist et al. found that losing some of the individual components did not produce a significant negative physiological effect. Only when multiple downstream signaling pathways were disrupted did the researchers see a significant effect on the population of the cells. Reductions in the numbers of both activated receptors and activated signal transduction pathways produced reductions in the population of VSMCs. These results have not been seen in tissue culture before, suggesting that signal transduction is more complex in vivo and that future studies would benefit from incorporating a global approach, rather than targeting a single signaling component. The next step will be to investigate exactly how the individual pathways contribute to this result. It is also unclear whether these results apply only to these growth factor receptors or explain how RTKs operate in general.

Such questions have significant clinical relevance. Overexpression of the PDGFR beta pathway has been linked to a variety of serious diseases, including atherosclerosis and cancer. Understanding how cells control the

action of this growth factor is an important step in developing targeted therapies. Since many of these conditions result from a growth factor stuck in the “on” position, inhibiting overactive receptors promises to be an effective clinical intervention. ■

Tallquist MD, French WJ, Soriano P (2003) Additive effects of PDGF receptor β signaling pathways in vascular smooth muscle cell development. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.0000052



Model of growth factor receptor