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1. **Summary**

microRNAs (miRNAs) are a large family of small non-coding RNAs, which post-transcriptionally repress numerous genes; a type of regulation which is important for countless physiological processes of multicellular organisms in health and disease.

miRNAs are genomically encoded and transcribed as long precursors, which undergo a refined and tightly regulated maturation process giving rise to ~22 nucleotide-long RNAs. These small RNAs function as part of an RNA-protein complex termed miRNA induced silencing complex (miRISC). miRNAs, and by extension miRISCs, typically bind partially complementary elements in the 3' untranslated region (UTR) of target messenger RNAs (mRNAs), which become consequently repressed. A large set of studies clearly indicates that miRISC-mediated repression is achieved in metazoans by a variable combination of target mRNA degradation and translational repression. However, the phase of translation that is inhibited is a controversial subject. Various models have been proposed, based mostly on the study of artificial target reporters, which support either an initiation or a post-initiation block model. Argonaute proteins are core component of the miRISC and directly bind miRNAs. The GW182 protein, another miRISC component, has recently emerged as an essential mediator of miRNA-mediated repression action. However, its precise molecular function is still unclear.

The work presented here aimed at understanding the *in vivo* mechanistic aspects of miRNA-mediated repression in more details, using the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans* as a model organism and focusing on the well characterized *let-7* miRNA. Initial results from a large-scale genetic screen revealed a strong genetic interaction between *let-7* and various translation initiation factors, leading me to propose that *C. elegans* miRNAs inhibit the initiation of translation on their target mRNAs. Additional genetic experiments uncovered an unsuspected widespread genetic interaction between *let-7* and the translation machinery and suggested that *let-7* might function by inhibiting the eukaryotic translation initiation factor 3 (eIF3) activity. Biochemical experiments demonstrated that a large set of *C. elegans* miRNA targets are translationally repressed at the initiation step, sometimes in combination with mRNA degradation, and that the *C. elegans* GW182 homologs AIN-1 and AIN-2 are essential for these mechanisms. Additional unpublished data revealed that translational repression is
specifically mediated by AIN-1, whereas depletion of both AIN-1 and AIN-2 is necessary to prevent miRNA target degradation.

Collectively, these results show that *C. elegans* miRNAs employ at least two mechanisms *in vivo*, i.e. target degradation and inhibition of translation initiation, which are likely to be independent pathways.
2. Introduction

2.1. Regulatory noncoding RNAs

Molecular biology has been traditionally centered on the view that RNA molecules merely represent message transporters between the DNA encoded genetic information and functionally active proteins. In higher eukaryotes, this view has been challenged based on several observations (reviewed in (Mattick 2003)). First, in higher organisms the number of protein-coding genes is not only lower than expected, but also fails to reflect biological complexity: humans contain only about 30% more protein-coding genes than the simple nematode Caenorhabditis elegans (approximately 25'000 and 19'000, respectively). At the same time, the ratio between noncoding and coding sequences of the genome increases from 1.3 in C. elegans to 47 in humans (Frith et al. 2005). Second, although the human euchromatic genome is composed of only 1.2% percent of protein-coding genes (Consortium 2004), more than 90% of it is likely to be transcribed on one or both strands (Birney et al. 2007). Indeed, ~98% of the transcriptional output of mammalian genomes is composed of noncoding transcripts (Mattick 2003). Third, an increasing number of noncoding RNAs has been shown to be functionally active, regulating processes as diverse and important as chromosome structural organization and messenger RNAs (mRNAs) translation (reviewed in (Amaral et al. 2008)). Fourth, these noncoding RNAs appear to be developmentally regulated (Dinger et al. 2008) and in some cases, associated with diseases (reviewed in (Szymański and Barciszewski 2008)). Finally, promter regions of noncoding genes do not only contain binding sites for common transcription factors (Cawley et al. 2004) but are also generally more conserved than the ones of protein-coding genes (Carninci et al. 2005). These accumulating evidences point to a much broader role of RNA molecules than previously acknowledged in the function, and more importantly, the regulation of cellular processes. Although there is still some debate about how much noise this high level of noncoding transcription represents, it has been proposed to have allowed higher eukaryotes to integrate the network of information needed to develop highly complex biological processes (Mattick 2001). In parallel to the “RNA world” hypothesis, which proposes that DNA-based organisms originated from a cellular and pre-cellular RNA-based life, the idea of a “modern RNA world” has been proposed, postulating that RNA is a more optimal
material than protein for certain functions and is therefore also employed for recently evolved and sophisticated tasks (Eddy 2001).

Regulatory noncoding transcripts are generally referred to as long or small noncoding RNAs, i.e. longer and shorter than approximately 300 nucleotide (nt) long. Rather than an objective size threshold, this classification reflects the fact that the former are much less characterized than the latter, which have only their relative small size in common. The importance of long noncoding RNAs is just starting to be appreciated and few paradigms of regulation mediated by these are appearing (reviewed in (Wilusz et al. 2009)). In general, such RNAs can modulate the transcription of downstream genes, either in trans or in cis, influence the processing of transcripts by base-pairing mechanisms, modify the activity of protein-binding partners, or serve as precursors of small RNA molecules. One outstanding example, due to its physiological importance, is X-chromosome inactivation (XCI). XCI is initiated by the recruitment of the Polycomb complex by the RepA noncoding RNA expressed from the Xist gene, which in turn induces repressive chromatin modifications on the chromosome to be inactivated (Zhao et al. 2008). It is likely that more regulatory mechanisms relying on long noncoding RNAs are yet to be discovered.

Regarding small noncoding RNAs, much attention has been brought to the so-called small silencing RNAs. Since their discovery in the early 1990s, they were shown to play an important role in regulating gene expression. The best understood classes of small silencing RNAs are the small interfering RNAs (siRNAs), microRNAs (miRNAs), and the more recently identified Piwi-interacting RNAs (piRNAs) (reviewed in (Ghildiyal and Zamore 2009)). siRNAs, miRNAs, and piRNAs share some similarities: they range between 20 to 30 nucleotides in size, they associate with members of the Argonaute (Ago) protein family, and typically induce repression of target genes via a base-pairing mechanism. Beside these commonalities, these RNAs follow different biogenesis pathways, interact with distinct sets of factors, and are implicated in different regulation mechanisms.

The effects of small silencing RNAs were first documented in plants. The use of antisense transgenes of chalcone synthase (CHS), which encodes for an enzyme involved in flower pigmentation, resulted in a decrease, rather than an increase, of pigmentation intensity, due to a strong downregulation of endogenous CHS mRNA levels (van der Krol et al. 1988; Napoli et al.
1990). The exact mechanism involved remained elusive until further studies conducted in plants, *Drosophila melanogaster*, and *C. elegans* revealed that gene silencing can be triggered by long double stranded RNAs (dsRNAs), which are processed by Dicer, a type III endoribonuclease, into siRNAs (Fire et al. 1998; Hamilton and Baulcombe 1999; Hammond et al. 2000; Zamore et al. 2000; Bernstein et al. 2001). In brief, siRNAs function as part of the Ago-containing RNA induced silencing complex (RISC), which is recruited to target transcripts by perfect antisense base-pairing. Ago proteins direct the endonucleolytic cleavage (slicing) of targets and the resulting RNA fragments are rapidly degraded (reviewed in (Carthew and Sontheimer 2009)). This process, i.e. the conversion of long dsRNAs into siRNAs followed by post-transcriptional gene silencing (PTGS), has been termed RNA interference (RNAi). The discovery of RNAi had a deep impact on our understanding of molecular biology, both as tool and as a natural phenomenon (Novina and Sharp 2004). Exogenous long dsRNAs, from viruses or transgenes were originally thought to be the unique source of siRNAs, and therefore RNAi was essentially seen as a defense mechanism against foreign nucleic acids. It was later discovered that siRNAs can also be produced from endogenous triggers in plants and animals and control the expression of endogenous genes and transposons (reviewed in (Vazquez 2006; Okamura and Lai 2008)). In addition to playing a role in PTGS, siRNAs are also involved in heterochromatin formation in plants, fission yeasts, flies and nematodes (reviewed in (Buhler and Moazed 2007)), highlighting the broad action range of this type of small RNAs.

piRNAs differ significantly from siRNAs and miRNAs: they are produced by a poorly understood, but Dicer-independent, mechanism from single stranded precursors (reviewed in (Klattenhoff and Theurkauf 2008)). They interact with the Piwi clade of Ago proteins, whereas siRNAs and miRNAs do so with the Argonaute clade (see below). Their expression is restricted to the germline, where they seem to silence retrotransposons and thereby protect germline DNA integrity (Klattenhoff and Theurkauf 2008).

miRNAs represent the third well defined class of small silencing RNAs. miRNA biology is relatively well understood, due to extensive research efforts over the last 10 years. Yet, some aspects still remain unclear, especially about their precise mode-of-action. In the following sections, after a brief introduction about miRNA discovery, I present our current understanding of miRNA biogenesis, mode-of-action, and biological functions.
2.2. microRNA biology

2.2.1. The discovery of microRNAs

*C. elegans* develops to adulthood through four larval stages (L1 to L4), each separated by a molt. During this development, cell division patterns are essentially invariant among individuals, both in time and space, and have been extensively mapped (Sulston and Horvitz 1977; Kimble and Hirsh 1979). This makes it possible to study mutants in which these patterns are altered. The locus of the first known miRNA, *lineage-4* (*lin-4*), was initially described in 1981 for this reason (Chalfie et al. 1981). In *lin-4* animals, certain cells reiterate L1 parental division pattern during the L2 and L3 stages. Additionally, and probably consequently, *lin-4* mutants exhibit a delayed developmental timing and fail to form the adult cuticle, termed alae. (Chalfie et al. 1981). During the following years, numerous genetic and biochemical studies from the Ambros and Ruvkun laboratories helped understanding the role of *lin-4* (reviewed in (Neilson and Sharp 2008)). It appeared that *lin-14* loss-of-function (LOF) animals have a phenotype opposite to *lin-4*. Cells which adopt a retarded phenotype in *lin-4* animals show a precocious development in *lin-14* LOF, that is they adopt a L2 fate at the L1 stage already. Conversely, *lin-14* gain-of-function mutations induce a similar phenotype as *lin-4* mutations. Further analyses showed that *lin-4* is epistatic to *lin-14*. It also became clear that elements in 3’ untranslated region (UTR) of *lin-14* mRNA were necessary and sufficient to allow *lin-4* to repress *lin-14* expression from the L2 stage onward. Nevertheless it was not before 1993 that the molecular identity of *lin-4* was elucidated: a ~22 nucleotide-long RNA with partial antisense complementarity to elements of the *lin-14* 3’UTR (Lee et al. 1993). The *lin-4* - *lin-14* interaction established the paradigm of miRNA action: a small RNA represses the expression of a target mRNA by binding imperfect complementary elements in its 3’UTR. However, before becoming a classical example, this regulation was considered only as a curiosity: one small non-conserved RNA regulating one mRNA in *C. elegans*.

This all changed 7 years later with the discovery of a second *C. elegans* miRNA: *lethality-7* (*let-7*) (Reinhart et al. 2000). *let-7*, which, as its name implies, is required for worm viability, was identified by a genetic screen devised to find new heterochronic genes, i.e. genes which, like *lin-4* and *lin-14*, regulate developmental timing. Reinhart and co-workers showed that *let-7* expression starts at the L3 stage and represses *lin-41* expression, which in turn allows
the *lin-29* transcription factor to be expressed and worms to properly reach the adult stage. Because similarly to *lin-4*, *let-7* was shown to be a heterochronic gene itself and to regulate other members of this pathway, these RNAs were termed small temporal RNAs (stRNAs). However, this denomination was replaced by "microRNA" when it became clear later that not all members of this family regulate developmental timing.

Realizing that *let-7* was not restricted to *C. elegans*, but highly conserved among bilaterians, with 100% homology between *C. elegans* and *H. sapiens* (Pasquinelli et al. 2000), gave its momentum to the miRNA field. Three studies, simultaneously published in *Science* in 2001, reported the identification of numerous small RNA similar to *lin-4* and *let-7* in *D. melanogaster* and *C. elegans* and suggested to name this class of RNA "microRNA" (Lagos-Quintana et al. 2001; Lau et al. 2001; Lee and Ambros 2001). At the same time, few miRNAs were also identified in *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Reinhart et al. 2002).

Since 2001, the number of known miRNA did not stop to grow. The current miRBase release (13.0) refers almost 10’000 miRNAs among which 187 in *A. thaliana*, 152 in *D. melanogaster*, 155 in *C. elegans*, and 706 in *H. Sapiens* (Griffiths-Jones et al. 2008). Beside plants and metazoans, miRNAs have also been detected in some viruses (reviewed in (Cullen 2009)) and in the unicellular algae *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* (Molnár et al. 2007; Zhao et al. 2007), suggesting that this type of RNA is evolutionary ancient.

Altogether, miRNAs represent today a large family of molecules regulating many genes relevant to important cellular and physiological processes (see section 2.2.5.). They are defined by a few common features which set them apart from siRNAs or piRNAs. They do not derive from long dsRNA molecules like siRNAs, but from hairpin-folded single stranded precursors, which undergo a specific maturation process (see section 2.2.2. and 2.2.3.) and, unlike piRNAs, require Dicer for their biogenesis. Additionally, at least in animals, they normally do not induce target endonucleolytic cleavage like siRNAs, but rather mediate target repression via a combination of translation inhibition and mRNA destabilization (see section 2.2.4.). This difference is thought to result mainly from the nature of the binding between miRNAs and their targets. Animal miRNAs, except for a few counterexamples (Yekta et al. 2004; Davis et al. 2005) and contrary to plants miRNAs, bind target RNAs with limited complementarity, mostly restricted to the 5' region of the microRNA, the so-called "seed" region (reviewed in (Bartel
Another striking feature of miRNAs is that, although artificial binding sites placed in mRNA 5'UTRs or open reading frames (ORFs) seem functional (Saxena et al. 2003; Kloosterman et al. 2004; Lytle et al. 2007), endogenous binding sites are almost exclusively located in the 3'UTR of target mRNAs. One notable exception is the human miR-10a, which binds to mRNA 5'UTRs. However these interactions do not silence, but rather seem to stimulate target expression (Orom et al. 2008).

Similarly to siRNAs and piRNAs, miRNAs function in a complex with Ago proteins (reviewed in (Hutvagner and Simard 2008)). Ago proteins are essential for the function of small silencing RNAs and define the core of RISCs. They contain two RNA-binding domains: PAZ (PIWI/Argonaute/Zwille) and Piwi, which interact with the 3' and 5' ends of small silencing RNAs. Agos are present in bacteria, archea and eukaryotes and have undergone a high degree of gene duplication, especially in plants and metazoans. There are 8 Ago genes in humans, 5 in D. melanogaster, 10 in A. thaliana and 27 in C. elegans. Based on phylogenetic analysis, these genes can be classified in three groups: the Argonaute-like proteins (similar to A. thaliana AGO1), the Piwi-like proteins (similar to D. melanogaster PIWI), and the C. elegans specific group 3 Argonautes (Hutvagner and Simard 2008). Some Agos are specialized for one type of small silencing RNA. For example, piRNAs interact exclusively with Piwi-like Agos. Similarly, two out of the 27 C. elegans Agos are specific for miRNAs: ALG-1 and ALG-2 (Grishok et al. 2001).
2.2.2. Biogenesis and post-transcriptional regulation of microRNAs

miRNA biogenesis is a multistep process. The production of ~22 nt-long miRNAs starts with the transcription of a primary-miRNA (pri-miRNA) of hundreds, sometimes thousands of nucleotides. Pri-miRNAs are first cleaved in the nucleus by the Drosha-Pasha complex to produce ~70 nt-long precursor miRNAs (pre-miRNAs). Pre-miRNAs are then exported in the cytoplasm where their cleavage by Dicer produces mature miRNAs able to associate with the RISC complex, termed miRISC in this case, and direct target transcript repression (this pathway is presented in more details in the review included in section 2.2.3.). Initially, miRNA biogenesis was thought to be a rather passive process. It was assumed that pri-miRNAs are directly and automatically converted into active miRNAs. However, an ever-increasing number of evidence shows that miRNA maturation is tightly regulated. This aspect of miRNA biology is reviewed in detail below (Ding et al. 2009). Since the publication of this review, two facets of miRNA life-cycle regulation have seen significant developments. These are the regulation of let-7 processing by the pluripotency factor LIN28 and the discovery of an active miRNA turnover mechanism in C. elegans.

The Lin28 gene, in addition to being a let-7 target itself, encodes an RNA-binding protein which regulates the processing of let-7 family members, i.e. let-7 and other miRNAs with identical 5’ sequence. It has been proposed that Lin28 directly competes with Drosha and Dicer for the binding of the pri-miRNA and pre-miRNA intermediates, respectively (Newman et al. 2008; Rybak et al. 2008; Viswanathan et al. 2008). A subsequent study suggested that LIN28 induces pre-let-7 3’ uridylation, which blocks its processing and directs it for degradation (Heo et al. 2008). Two recent studies in human cell lines and mouse embryonic stem cells substantiated this model by identifying the terminal uridyl transferase 4 (TUT4) as the enzyme involved in this process (Hagan et al. 2009; Heo et al. 2009). Moreover, a similar mechanism has been found to occur in C. elegans via the poly(U) polymerase PUP-2 (Lehrbach et al. 2009). Uridylation of miRNA intermediates is therefore a conserved mechanism and a potentially important way of regulating miRNA maturation. Interestingly, the addition of a 3’-terminal adenine to the mature miR-122 by the poly(A) polymerase GLD2 was recently shown to stabilize this miRNA in human hepatocytes (Katoh et al. 2009). These studies indicate that
sequence modification of miRNAs or miRNA precursors might be a widely employed mechanism to selectively regulate their processing and stability.

It is conceivable that mature miRNA level, and thereby activity, might also be regulated by an active degradation mechanism. However, besides the identification in plants of SDN1, a "small RNA degrading nuclease" able to degrade miRNAs in vitro (Ramachandran and Chen 2008), there was so far no evidence for such a mechanism. Recently, Chatterjee and Grosshans showed that C. elegans mature miRNA levels are modulated by the 5’ to 3’ exonuclease XRN-2 (Chatterjee and Grosshans 2009). XRN-2 depletion was shown to elevate the levels of several miRNAs and to reinforce let-7 target repression in vivo. Additionally, in vitro experiments using larval lysates suggested that miRNAs are first released from Ago proteins before being degraded by XRN-2. Interestingly, this release step can be blocked by the addition of target RNA molecules to the lysates. This suggests that the presence of miRNA targets might indirectly regulate the level of their cognate miRNAs and implies that miRNA clearance might be triggered by the disappearance of their targets.

Considering the broad effects of miRNAs on many biological processes (see section 2.2.5.), it is not surprising that their activity has to be precisely controlled. Recent data now show that this control can take place at every step of the miRNA life-cycle, from pri-miRNA transcription to mature miRNA clearance.
2.2.3. Publication: “Regulating the regulators: mechanisms controlling the maturation of microRNAs”
Regulating the regulators: mechanisms controlling the maturation of microRNAs
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MicroRNAs (miRNAs) are small noncoding RNAs that control diverse cellular and developmental events through repressing target mRNA expression. Regulated transcription of the genes encoding miRNAs by RNA polymerase II promotes specific expression patterns of individual miRNAs. However, recent studies have established that substantial regulation of mature miRNA accumulation also occurs after transcription. Here, we review the mechanisms of such post-transcriptional regulation, with a particular focus on examples where molecular mechanisms or physiological principles are beginning to emerge. Elucidating these mechanisms will increase our understanding of gene regulation and provide new insights into causes of miRNA misexpression in diseases such as cancer.

Introduction
MicroRNAs (miRNAs) are a large class of genomically encoded 22 nucleotide (nt)-long RNAs that regulate target mRNAs in plants and animals through an antisense mechanism [1,2]. The first miRNA, lin-4, was identified in a genetic screen for mutations causing abnormal temporal regulation of cell differentiation in the nematode Caenorhabditis elegans [3], and it was initially considered to be unique to this organism. However, in the 15 years since, small RNA cloning and computational sequence analysis have tremendously expanded the number of known miRNAs and of organisms in which they occur; currently, there are 695 miRNAs known in humans, 488 in mouse, 152 in Caenorhabditis elegans, and it was initially considered to be unique to this organism. However, in the 15 years since, small RNA cloning and computational sequence analysis have tremendously expanded the number of known miRNAs and of organisms in which they occur; currently, there are 695 miRNAs known in humans, 488 in mouse, 152 in C. elegans [4]), miRNAs thus outnumber even large classes of regulatory proteins such as kinases, providing a first indication of the pervasiveness of gene regulation by miRNAs. Indeed, each miRNA has several, possibly dozens or even hundreds of targets (e.g. Refs [1,5,6], which it recognizes by binding to partially complementary sequences in the 3’ untranslated regions (3’UTRs) of the target mRNA [2]. Binding of the target results in repression of the target mRNA through mechanisms that have not been fully elucidated but seem to involve translational repression, deadenylation and degradation of the target mRNAs [2].

Consistent with their abundance, miRNAs are involved in various developmental and cellular processes, regulating, for instance, stem cell fates, apoptosis and metabolism, and miRNA dysregulation has been implicated in various diseases, particularly cancers [7,8]. Accordingly, much effort has been put into developing robust profiling methods for miRNA expression patterns (Box 1) as experimental tools for the biologist and potential diagnostic tools for the clinician.

Although mature miRNAs are only ~22 nt long, their biogenesis is a complex affair; transcription of a primary miRNA (pri-miRNA) of several hundred or thousands of nucleotides in length is followed by two processing steps mediated by the two nucleases Drosha and Dicer, respectively, and then loading of the mature miRNA into a functional protein complex containing an argonaute (AGO) protein at its core (Figure 1; [7,8]). We are now beginning to learn that the miRNA maturation events are highly regulated, subjecting these small post-transcriptional regulators of gene expression themselves to extensive post-transcriptional control. We will discuss here recent work that has begun to elucidate some of the regulatory mechanisms, which can be specific for individual or a few miRNAs or can affect miRNA expression more globally. We will point out examples where physiological consequences of such regulation are beginning to emerge. Given the numerous examples where aberrant miRNA expression contributes to pathologies, we predict that these regulatory principles will provide important insights into molecular mechanisms of disease and might ultimately yield novel targets for therapeutic intervention.

miRNA biogenesis: the main players
Transcription of the pri-miRNA is the first step along a complex pathway that generates an active RNA-induced silencing complex (RISC) loaded with a mature miRNA – the so-called miRISC (Figure 1). Although a few miRNAs seem to be transcribed by RNA polymerase III [9], the bulk of pri-miRNAs is transcribed by RNA polymerase II, the same enzyme that produces protein-coding mRNAs and is accordingly subject to similar intricate means of transcriptional regulation [7,10]. Indeed, a large fraction of vertebrate miRNAs is encoded in the introns of protein-coding host genes, with whom they are thus co-transcribed. However, the promoters of ‘intergenic’ pri-miRNAs – that is, those that are encoded outside protein-coding host genes – are also subject to input from numerous transcriptional
Box 1. MicroRNA expression analysis: opportunities and challenges

To understand the function of miRNAs in biology and exploit their utility as disease markers, robust and sensitive miRNA profiling technologies are required. Recent years have indeed seen a move from research-driven to application-oriented platforms comprising oligonucleotide microarrays, PCR or high-throughput cloning and sequencing approaches [78]. Nonetheless, considerable disagreement frequently exists with respect to miRNA expression patterns for a specific tissue or cell-type, which at least in part could be due to technical differences among platforms [79].

As for mRNA expression profiling, variations at any stage in the process, from sample collection and storage to RNA isolation, detection and data analysis, can influence the quality and accuracy of the final results. Additional challenges are imposed by the low abundance of miRNAs (~0.01% of the total RNA mass) and their small size, which leaves little flexibility for label attachment and probe design. Accordingly, achieving comparable melting temperatures for all miRNA-probe hybrids, which is essential to avoid significant numbers of false negatives and false positives, requires substantial effort [78]. Furthermore, although miRNA microarrays might preferentially detect mature miRNAs [80], this specificity might be insufficient when precursors accumulate to significant levels. The stem-loop TaqMan reverse transcription (RT)-PCR reagents [78] are one example of alternative tools with increased specificity for mature miRNAs, but global expression profiling using this system is cost-intensive and does not permit detection of the precursor forms.

Apart from technical problems associated with measuring miRNA expression, the subsequent analysis of miRNA expression data is nontrivial, mainly due to the lack of standardized normalization and scaling methods [81]. Consequently, efforts to standardize miRNA profiling protocols and establish thoroughly characterized reference sets that can serve as important standards for the validation of putative expression differences established by microarray-based approaches by quantitative (q)RT-PCR or northern blotting remains advisable.

The total number of miRNAs keeps increasing, which makes it difficult to compare miRNA expression datasets that have been generated by different platforms based on different miRBase releases [4]. Finally, recent reports using deep-sequencing technologies support the hypothesis that current microarray-based expression levels as a proxy for mature miRNA accumulation and activity could also be highly variable [21]. Sequences differ primarily at the 3'-end but also at the 5'-end of the molecule. Although the biological significance of these observations is unclear, robust, high-throughput discrimination is unlikely to be feasible with available hybridization-based technology and might require deep-sequencing instead. Regardless of the technical strength or weakness of individual profiling technologies, in situ hybridization approaches [83] are crucial for establishing the specificity and cellular resolution of miRNA expression patterns in vivo.

regulators [7]. Aberrant miRNA expression, which is frequently associated with cancer [1], could thus be a consequence of deregulated pri-miRNA transcription. Indeed, many genes encoding miRNAs are located at fragile chromosomal sites or chromosomal regions exhibiting altered copy numbers or genetic rearrangements in cancer [11]. The identification of common putative regulatory motifs upstream of human or C. elegans miRNAs [12] further suggests that certain transcription factors, which might be mutated or otherwise misexpressed in cancer, could act as master regulators of miRNA transcription. One example is MYC, which transcriptionally represses a large number of mouse and human miRNA genes [13] and induces others [14]. Epigenetic mechanisms might also contribute to silencing of certain miRNAs through histone deacetylation and DNA methylation [10].

After transcription, the nuclear pri-miRNA is cleaved endonucleolytically (‘cropped’; Figure 1) by the ‘microprocessor’ complex consisting of the RNase Drosha and its cofactor, the double-stranded RNA (dsRNA)-binding protein DGCR8 (DiGeorge syndrome critical region gene 8); named Pasha in flies and worms). Cropping seems to be tightly coupled to transcription [15,16] and, for intronic miRNAs, occurs before host intron splicing [16,17]. Cropping releases the precursor miRNA (pre-miRNA), which is 60–70 nt in length and characterized by its stem-loop structure [7,8]. The pre-miRNA is exported by the nuclear export receptor exportin-5 (Ran-binding protein 21) into the cytoplasm, where Dicer excises a ~22 nt duplex RNA, from which one strand will subsequently be selected as the mature miRNA and incorporated into RISC.

Although Dicer alone is sufficient to cleave pre-miRNAs in vitro, it associates with various proteins in the cell, including TRBP2 (transactivation response element RNA-binding protein 2), PACT (PRKRA; interferon-inducible dsRNA-dependent protein kinase activator A) and AGO proteins (also known as EIF2C proteins) to perform pre-miRNA cleavage, mature strand selection and loading onto an AGO protein to form an active RISC [18]. At the core of RISC is a member of the AGO family, which binds the mature miRNA. In humans, there are four AGO proteins, AGO1–AGO4, among which only AGO2 has the ‘slicer’ activity required to cleave endonucleolytically target miRNAs that are perfectly complementary to miRNAs [19]. However, perfect complementarity between miRNAs and their targets is rare in animals, and all four AGO proteins can mediate repression of partially complementary target miRNAs through slicer-independent mechanisms that are not well understood but seem to involve translational repression, deadenyllation and degradation of the target miRNAs [2].

Conceivably, transcription of a pri-miRNA could inevitably result in the expression of an active, mature miRNA, and early miRNA profiling experiments used pri-miRNA levels as a proxy for mature miRNA accumulation [20,21]. However, given the complexity of miRNA biogenesis, mature miRNA accumulation and activity could also be highly regulated. Indeed, discrepancies between the levels of the different processing intermediates and mature miRNAs [22,23] soon hinted at a regulated maturation process. Recent studies have begun to uncover various factors and mechanisms at work, suggesting that such regulation is widespread and physiologically relevant.

Regulation of pri-miRNA processing by Drosha

Although aberrant transcription can cause abnormal miRNA expression patterns, transcriptional regulation is not the only and possibly not even the most important layer of regulation. Initial evidence for this was twofold: first, in addition to deregulation of individual miRNAs, a global decrease in miRNA levels was shown to occur in diverse cancers [24]. Short of a master miRNA transcription factor that would affect transcription of many or all miRNAs, a post-transcriptional regulation at one or several steps of miRNA maturation seemed to be a more viable explanation for this observation. Second, although normal and tumor tissues were clearly distinguishable by their different levels of
mature miRNA expression, pri-miRNA expression patterns indicated little difference, again pointing to differences in miRNA biogenesis activities, possibly at the level of pri-miRNA cropping by Drosha [25]. Such an effect could plausibly be a consequence of gene copy number variations or other mutagenic events that affect the expression of Drosha or its cofactors, and altered Drosha expression has indeed been observed in some tumors; for example, see Refs [26,27]. However, the fact that differentiation of embryonic stem cells also induced divergent expression levels of mature miRNAs despite comparable pri-miRNA levels provided strong evidence for a regulatory mechanism [25].

Indeed, although the Drosha–DGCR8 ‘microprocessor’ complex is sufficient for processing of pri-miRNAs in vitro [28,29], cropping seems to be exquisitely modulated through accessory factors. A truncated, but functional, recombinant version of DGCR8 binds to heme, and the heme-bound, dimeric DGCR8 enhances Drosha activity towards pri-miRNA in in vitro processing reactions [30]. Some of this stimulation can be recapitulated when mutating the heme binding cysteine Cys352, which is conserved across animals, suggesting that heme binding stimulates Drosha–DGCR8 activity by masking a residue that normally interferes with cropping activity. It is currently unclear whether stimulation of microprocessor activity occurs also in the context of the full-length DGCR8 protein, within eukaryotic cells, and whether it is physiologically important.

In addition to its presence in the canonical Drosha–DGCR8 microprocessor complex, human Drosha has also been found in a larger complex that includes the DEAD box RNA helicases DDX5 (also known as P68) and DDX17 (also known as P72) but lacks DGCR8 [28]. Although Drosha in
the larger complex is substantially (approximately eightfold) less active [28], this might depend on the pri-miRNA substrate. Consistent with this possibility, deletion of the genes encoding mouse DDX5 or DDX17 induces downregulation of a large, yet restricted, subset of miRNAs (94 out of 266 surveyed) [31]. Among the unaffected miRNAs is miR-19a, which was also used as the substrate when comparing Drosha activity in the small versus large Drosha complex [28]. However, reduction of mature miRNA in cells lacking DDX17 and additionally depleted for DDX5 was not only limited to a subset of miRNAs but also substantially less complete than that seen upon Drosha depletion by RNA interference (RNAi), suggesting that the helicases might stabilize miRNA activity rather than being absolutely required for it.

Further support for the idea that different Drosha complexes might have different substrate preferences comes from the finding that only a subset of pri-miRNAs accumulates in DGC8R8-hemizygous mice [32]. However, even among those miRNAs whose primary transcripts accumulated, only a single mature miRNA showed appreciable, but moderate, depletion, making the interpretation of these findings difficult. Indeed, distinct large (DDX5-, DDX17-containing) and small (DGCR8-containing) Drosha complexes have so far only been observed in human embryonic kidney 293 (HEK293) cells but not in mouse [31] or Drosophila cells [33]. Functional specialization of distinct Drosha complexes thus remains speculative, and confirmation will require testing of the large human Drosha complex on a wider array of substrates, including pri-miRNAs such as miR-21 whose efficient processing depends on DDX5 and DDX17 [31,34].

Understanding how DDX5 and DDX17 activate Drosha might also reveal why such stimulation is only seen for some miRNAs. Human DDX5 can unwind a synthetic hairpin substrate. Consistent with this possibility, deletion of the P68-Drosha.

Although the mechanistic details of Drosha activation by SMAD proteins thus await clarification, Davis and colleagues [34] make a strong case for its physiological relevance in promoting smooth muscle cell differentiation. This process depends on BMPs and TGF-β, and inhibition of miR-21 can partially block this effect, at least in part through causing upregulation of the miR-21 target programmed cell death protein 4 (PDCD4).

A particularly well-studied example of regulated miRNA maturation involves repression of let-7 miRNA biogenesis by LIN28 and its paralog LIN28B. miRNAs of the let-7 family are important regulators of stem cell self-renewal and differentiation that are absent from embryonic and other stem cells but accumulate during differentiation [38]. By contrast, LIN28 promotes pluripotency and LIN28B are abundantly expressed in embryonic stem cells and hepatocellular carcinoma cells, respectively. This reciprocal expression is the result of an intricate feedback loop where LIN28 or LIN28B repress let-7 maturation, whereas mature let-7 represses LIN28 and LIN28B accumulation [38] (Figure 2).

Unexpectedly, the ability of LIN28 and LIN28B to block accumulation of mature let-7 involves repression of both Dicer [39] and Drosha activities [40–42], and LIN28 and LIN28B each contain two types of RNA-binding domains, a cold-shock domain (CSD) and two retroviral-type zinc-finger domains, through which they can bind pre-let-7 (and, by inference, pri-let-7) [39–42]. Although it is not yet established how LIN28-binding impairs let-7 maturation in the cell, an attractive model suggests that LIN28 competes with Drosophila and Dicer for let-7 precursor binding and prevents their access through steric hindrance. This notion is consistent with the observations that LIN28 or LIN28B are abundantly expressed in stem cells and exhibit in vitro binding affinities to pre-let-7 in the high submicromolar range [40,42], and in vitro binding experiments have indeed confirmed that LIN28 can compete with Dicer for pre-let-7 binding [39]. However, recent data also suggest that LIN28B might prevent pri-miRNA processing by inducing its degradation through 3’ terminal oligouridylation (see ‘Note added in proof’ below).
Specificity for LIN28 binding to let-7 miRNAs is provided by the pre-miRNA loop sequence, which contains certain nucleotides that are invariant among pre-let-7 miRNAs, although there is some disagreement on the precise identity of the nucleotides involved [41,42]. Interestingly, the substrate specificity of LIN28 in inhibiting dicing seems wider than for cropping, as dicing of pre-miR-let-7 family member and without obviously conserved regions in its loop sequence, is also affected [39]. Nonetheless, LIN28 does not cause a general block of Dicer activity because additional miRNAs, such as miR-125, are insensitive to increased LIN28 levels.

As discussed elsewhere [38], let-7 accumulation is not only regulated by LIN28 and LIN28B but also itself regulates the expression of LIN28 and LIN28B through let-7 binding sites in their 3'UTRs. Moreover, the mature let-7 RNA can compete with pre-let-7 for LIN28 binding in vitro and thus further regulate LIN28 protein activity in vivo [39]. These findings suggest that an exquisite regulatory loop exists to promote a fast and stable switch from situations of low to high let-7 levels, consistent with the reciprocal expression patterns of let-7 and LIN28 and their opposing roles in regulating stem cell self-renewal and differentiation [38].

The heterogeneous nuclear ribonucleoprotein A1 (hnRNP A1) exhibits an even narrower substrate specificity than that of LIN28. This single-strand RNA-binding protein seems to exclusively mature miR-18a, although miR-18a is contained in pri-miR-17–92, which harbors five additional miRNAs [43]. Moreover, hnRNP A1 seems to be dispensable for cropping of miR-18b, which is encoded in a distinct pri-miRNA cluster, although the pre-miRNA sequences of miR-18a and miR-18b are highly similar. Experiments on chimeric pri-miRNAs indicate that the specificity for miR-18a involves sequences outside the pre-miRNA cropping product, but how these sequences function and how hnRNP A1 stimulates pri-miR-18a cropping remains to be determined.

These results demonstrate that regulation of pri-miRNA processing can extend down to the level of individual miRNAs transcribed as part of a larger cluster. Because miR-17–92 is an oncogene [1], it will be interesting to determine in future experiments whether hnRNP A1 can modulate the tumorigenic activity of the cluster.

In the past two years, there have thus emerged several examples of modulated cropping as a means of regulating miRNA accumulation, and we can expect more in the future. For instance, processing of pri-miR-155 (B-cell integration cluster [BIC] RNA) occurs efficiently in HEK293 cells but much less efficiently in Burkitt lymphoma-derived Ramos cells [44], although this might depend on the specific experimental settings [45]. Moreover, a new class of intronic miRNAs (called ‘mirtrons’) has recently been discovered that does not require Drosha for biogenesis because splicing releases the corresponding pre-miRNA stem–loop structures (Figure 1) [46–48]. Their expression, in which the need for Drosha is bypassed, could thus be regulated in a very distinct manner from that of canonical miRNAs.

**Pre-miRNA processing**

After cropping of the pri-miRNA by Drosha in the nucleus, the resulting pre-miRNA is exported into the cytoplasm (Figure 1), where Dicer mediates its conversion into the mature miRNA. Dicing typically seems to function quite efficiently, as indicated by low levels of pre-miRNAs relative to mature miRNAs [49,50]. Nonetheless, early experiments already identified individual pre-miRNAs that were more abundant than their corresponding mature forms [51], although it was unknown whether this reflected regulation or simply inefficient processing of particular substrates under all conditions.

The first evidence that ‘dicing’ of specific pre-miRNAs can be regulated was obtained for mouse miR-138 [52]. Pre-miR-138 was easily detectable in many tissues, whereas the mature miR-138 derived from this precursor accumu-
lateral only in mouse brain and mouse fetal liver. Processing reactions with recombinant Dicer ruled out that pre-miR-138 \textit{per se} was refractory to processing, advocating the presence of a specific inhibitor of pre-miR-138 processing in non-neuronal tissues and cells. This activity has now been found enriched in the cytoplasm, where pre-miR-138 is also preferentially localized, ruling out that dicing is prevented by nuclear retention of pre-miR-138 (P. Leuscher and J. Martinez, personal communication). The molecular identity of the repressor has yet to be established.

As discussed in the previous chapter, dicing of \textit{let-7} family pre-miRNAs is also regulated, and the inhibitor has been identified as LIN28 (Ref. [39]) – the same protein that regulates translation in the brain. However, pro-miR-128a reduces siRNA generation from a long dsRNA substrate, are not cleaved might further regulate Dicer activity. For instance, overexpression of the RNA substrate for access to this nuclease but that, unlike true let-7, expression might also permit modulation of pre-miRNA processing, an intriguing possibility given that Dicer can be proteolytically activated by nuclear retention of pre-miR-138 (P. Leuscher and J. Martinez, personal communication). The molecular identity of the repressor has yet to be established.

A more general regulation of Dicer activity than in the examples discussed above is conceivable. For instance, Dicer can be proteolytically activated [53], possibly by releasing the autoinhibitory function exerted by its helicase domain [53,54]. Although this activation seemed to be more substantial for dsRNA substrates than for pre-miRNAs [49], such a mechanism might affect miRNA accumulation in the brain [55]. If Dicer activity is limiting, or close to limiting, for pre-miRNA processing, regulation of Dicer expression or gene copy number is altered in diverse cancers [56]. 'Decoy substrates' that compete with Dicer substrates for access to this nuclease but that, unlike true substrates, are not cleaved might further regulate Dicer activity. For instance, overexpression of the RNA \textit{rnscs-1} (RNA noncoding, starvation upregulated) in \textit{C. elegans} reduces Dicer-dependent endogenous small interfering RNA (endo-siRNA) accumulation [57]. When added to embryo extract, this 500-nt-long dsRNA substrate, when transfected, reduces siRNA generation from a long dsRNA substrate without itself being cleaved. However, because processing of pre-\textit{lin-4} miRNA was not affected, it remains to be established whether such mechanisms also operate to regulate pre-miRNA dicing.

Finally, efficient pre-miRNA processing involves additional proteins, such as AGO proteins, TRBP2 and PACT [18,58–60], so regulation of these proteins might further modulate Dicer activity. Interestingly, stability of human AGO2 has recently been shown to be affected by proline hydroxylation through the type I collagen prolyl-4-hydroxylase (C-P4H(I)) [61]. However, although C-P4H(I) deletion reduced RISC activity, as determined by decreased cleavage of a perfectly complementary \textit{let-7} target reporter, it is not known whether AGO2 destabilization coincided with a depletion of mature miRNAs. More importantly, because RISC activity is not limited, for pre-miRNA processing, regulation of dicing might be quite common: in a large-scale profiling effort, expression or gene copy number is altered in diverse human tissues and cell lines [54]. For instance, mature miR-128a accumulates almost exclusively in brain and skeletal muscle but not in spleen or B cells. However, pre- and pri-miR-128a levels (which were not distinguished in this PCR-based experiment) were considerably higher in spleen and B cells than in skeletal muscle, albeit lower than in the brain. In situ hybridization in cancer cell lines that did not accumulate mature miR-128a, miR-105 or miR-31 detected exclusively nuclear and/or nucleolar signals, with probes detecting both pri- and pre-miRNAs [49]. In a cell line that accumulated mature miR-31, such a probe revealed additionally some cytoplasmic, but no nucleolar, signal. The authors suggest that the nucleolar and/or nucleolar signal reflects pre-miRNA retention, preventing access by cytoplasmic Dicer. How the nuclear export of this pre-miRNA is regulated is not known. Moreover, because northern blot analysis demonstrated that long transcripts, presumably pri-miRNAs, were abundant in cells lacking the mature miRNA, these species might contribute a significant nuclear hybridization signal.

miRNA turnover

Surprisingly, several of the events affecting processing of intermediates along the miRNA biogenesis pathway do not alter accumulation of the respective processing substrates. For instance, LIN28 blocks processing, and thus consumption, of pri-\textit{let-7} in stem cells, yet pri-\textit{let-7} levels are equal in cells with and without LIN28 [55]. Similarly, increased pri-miR-21 processing upon stimulation by TFG-β or BMP4 does not alter pri-miR-21 levels [34] and nor does loss of DDX5 and DDX17 [31]. One possible explanation is that, in each of these cases, sufficient transcriptional stimulation might balance out increased consumption and, conversely, decreased consumption might be paralleled by decreased transcription. Alternatively, turnover of unprocessed, 'naked' transcripts might be very fast so that binding by the respective processing factors is required to sufficiently stabilize the substrate. The experimental investigation of pri-miRNA transcription rates could help to distinguish between these – not mutually exclusive – possibilities. Whether such putative turnover of miRNA processing intermediates is a regulated or constitutive process remains an open question for the time being.

In addition to miRNA processing intermediates, degradation of mature miRNAs might also affect the net accumulation of mature miRNAs. Possible examples include stabilization of pri-miR-122a by the DNA and RNA-binding translin (TSN) protein [62] or general destabilization of mature miRNA levels by the Trim-NHL (tripartite motif, NCL-1, HT2A and LIN-41 domain) protein and Ago1 binding partner Mei-P26 (meiotic gene recovered in a P-element screen) in \textit{Drosophila} stem cells [63]. Moreover, cell-cycle status affects the stability of miR-29b, which is rapidly degraded in proliferating cells but stabilized in mitotically arrested \textit{C. elegans} [64]. However, mechanisms have not been established for any of these events, and there is only limited evidence that these proteins do indeed affect miRNA turnover as opposed to a late biogenesis step.
Adenosine deaminases acting on RNA (ADARs) can convert adenosine to inosine (A-to-I editing) in various double-stranded RNA substrates, and several studies have demonstrated that both pri-miRNAs and pre-miRNAs can be substrates of ADARs [84,85] (Figure 3). For instance, selective editing of human pri-miR-142 blocks its processing by Drosha [86]. The unprocessed pri-miR-142 is rapidly degraded in vitro by Tudor staphylococcal nuclease homolog (Tudor-SN). As discussed elsewhere [87], this suggests that editing of specific pri-miRNA might be common but fails to be detected owing to efficient degradation, an idea that is also supported by a recent study identifying 47 pri-miRNAs that are edited without usually giving rise to edited mature miRNAs [85]. Editing also prevents the dicing of both mouse and human miR-151 [88], which therefore accumulate as pre-miRNAs. How editing blocks processing and to what extent this mechanism is used and possibly regulated remains to be elucidated.

In addition to affecting miRNA maturation, editing can also affect the specificity of the edited miRNAs if the edited site is included in the mature miRNA, because inosine base-pairs with cytosine instead of uracil. A survey of 99 miRNAs in human tissues revealed that six of these were edited in at least one tissue, and a substantial number of these editing events were predicted to modify target recognitions [89]. Experimental confirmation of this hypothesis was provided for miR-376, which is edited by both ADAR1 and ADAR2, at different positions of the precursor [90]. ADAR2-mediated editing of a nucleotide corresponding to position +4 in the mature miR-376p5p in particular creates a miRNA that, unlike its unmodified counterpart, represses phosphoribosylpyrophosphate synthetase 1 (PRPS1) expression and its resulting enzymatic activity in vivo.

Intriguingly, a different type of editing enzyme, the cytidine deaminase APOBEC3G (ABC3G), was found to counteract the activity of several miRNAs [91]. However, this function does not depend on the deaminase activity of ABC3G, leaving it unclear how miRNA inactivation is achieved.

Although a recent deep-sequencing effort provided little evidence for widespread A-to-I editing of miRNAs [82], editing can play a crucial part in modifying the activity of a subset of miRNAs and thus needs to be considered when evaluating the potential relevance of miRNA-mediated gene regulation in vivo.

Although there is thus little known about any mechanisms of either constitutive or regulated degradation of mature miRNAs in animals, recent work in plants has identified the small RNA degrading nuclease SDN1, a homolog of the yeast 3′-to-5′ exonucleases Rex1p (RNA exonuclease 1) to Rex4p, as a nuclease that can degrade ‘naked’ small RNAs such as miRNAs in vitro [65]. Combined knockdown of three nucleases of the SDN1 family in Arabidopsis causes a two- to threefold increase in the levels of several mature miRNAs, suggesting that these miRNAs are also substrates of this family of RNases in vivo. However, it is currently not known whether the activity of these RNases is regulated and whether enzymes of this family affect miRNA stability in animals.

Concluding remarks

Although regulation of miRNA transcription is clearly important for setting miRNA expression patterns, the work that we have discussed here demonstrates that additional, post-transcriptional mechanisms further define miRNA activity, at least for a subset of miRNAs and tissues. Other mechanisms, such as RNA editing (Box 2 and Figure 3), can affect miRNA maturation and function, as will mechanisms that have not yet been discovered. However, one conclusion that we can already draw is that the levels of miRNA pathway intermediates will frequently not be good proxies for the expression patterns of mature miRNAs, which therefore need to be examined directly (Box 1).

In addition, if we want to understand the roles of miRNAs in specific cells or organisms and harness the regulatory power of miRNAs at a diagnostic or even a therapeutic level (Box 3), we need to consider additional factors that determine miRNA activity. These include ‘static’ factors such as single nucleotide polymorphisms and mutations, either in the miRNA or its targets, that might generate or abolish miRNA binding sites or affect their effectiveness (e.g. [66,67]). More importantly, ‘dynamic’ factors modulate miRNA activity without altering mature miRNA concentrations, for instance in
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Indeed, a first step towards exploiting this opportunity has just been reported: enoxacin, a low-molecular-mass antibacterial agent, promotes accumulation of a small subset of mature miRNAs, apparently through stimulating pre-miRNA processing by TRBP2-Dicer and subsequent RISC loading [76].

**Note added in proof**

LIN28B has recently also been observed to block dicing of pre-let-7 in hepatocellular carcinoma cell lines [77]. Direct competition between Dicer and LIN28 or LIN28B seemed to contribute relatively little to repression of processing; instead, binding by LIN28 or LIN28B promoted 3′ terminal oligouridylation of pre-let-7 by an unidentified terminal uridytransferase. The oligouridylated pre-let-7 was resistant to Dicer processing in vitro and underwent degradation, providing a novel mechanism for inhibition of let-7 maturation.
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**Box 3. MicroRNA-based therapeutic approaches**

Recent findings that antisense oligonucleotides can specifically block a given miRNA in vitro and in vivo have triggered efforts to explore miRNAs as a potential new class of therapeutics [92]. A recent study demonstrated that intravenous injection of a short locked nucleic-acid-modified oligonucleotide (‘LNA-anti-miR’) could block miR-122 activity in African green monkey, accompanied by a dose-dependent and long-lasting lowering of plasma cholesterol.

Importantly, there was no evidence for LNA-anti-miR-associated toxicity or histopathological changes in the studied animals [93], and a phase I safety study in humans has been initiated.

Conversely, restoring miRNA function by the exogenous delivery of a synthetic miRNA mimic might have therapeutic benefit, in particular in certain cancers where tumor-suppressor miRNAs are under-represented. Two recent studies demonstrated that viral delivery of miR-21 into myeloma cells prevented cell proliferation while deficiency of miR-21 in a mouse model led to an accelerated tumor growth [94,95]. However, this work also suggested that tumors might gain resistance to let-7 g expression [95].

Many miRNAs are believed to act in a highly tissue- or even cell-type-specific manner, where they contribute to the establishment and maintenance of cellular identity [7]. Furthermore, a significant number of miRNAs are coexpressed as transcription units and might act in a combinatorial manner. Thus, targeting a subset of miRNAs might be necessary to significantly modulate one given miRNA target, and potential adverse effects caused by potential off-targeting events remain to be carefully assessed. By contrast, a miRNA inhibitor that modulates a whole disease-relevant pathway by reducing several functionally related genes at once could in theory be more effective than the more conventional agents tailored to target one single protein. Finally, as for related antisense and siRNA-based approaches, developers of miRNA therapeutics face the crucial obstacle of ensuring both the stability of the inhibitors in the body and, most importantly, delivery to, and uptake by, the organ or cells of interest [96]. Although initial experiments in these directions look encouraging [97], much more work needs to be done to demonstrate that the concept of tuning miRNA levels is clinically viable.
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2.2.4. microRNA modes-of-action

The nature of the mechanism by which animal miRNAs repress their targets is certainly the most debated aspect of miRNA biology. A plethora of models, sometimes mutually exclusive, has been proposed over the last years and have been the subject of an intense discussion in various reviews (Jackson and Standart 2007; Nilsen 2007; Pillai et al. 2007; Standart and Jackson 2007; Eulalio et al. 2008a; Filipowicz et al. 2008; Richter 2008; Wu and Belasco 2008; Carthew and Sontheimer 2009; Chekulaeva and Filipowicz 2009). Moreover, some studies suggest that, under specific conditions, miRNAs act as translational activators rather than repressors (Vasudevan et al. 2007; Henke et al. 2008; Orom et al. 2008). Admittedly, miRNAs might function via different mechanisms depending on the organism, cell type, miRNA, miRNA target, or conditions investigated. However, even studies reporting very similar experiments sometimes reached opposite conclusions (e.g. (Petersen et al. 2006) and (Humphreys et al. 2005)). Therefore, one can hope that a deeper understanding of the mechanisms at play might help, at least partially, to unify the large body of apparently conflicting data, which exists today.

In plants, miRNAs, defined as such based on their biogenesis, were thought to act essentially like siRNAs, that is to base-pair perfectly or almost perfectly to target transcripts, and to induce endonucleolytic cleavage (Llave et al. 2002; Rhoades et al. 2002). This simple picture was recently challenged by Brodersen and colleagues, who uncovered mutations in Arabidopsis, which induce accumulation of miRNA targets at the protein level without changes at the mRNA level, and proposed that plant miRNAs function partially also as translational repressor (Brodersen et al. 2008). However, this study and previous ones, which documented similar examples (Aukerman and Sakai 2003; Chen 2004; Gandikota et al. 2007), did not investigate directly the translational status of miRNA targets. Therefore, alternative mechanisms, such as nascent polypeptide degradation, cannot be excluded yet.

Coming back to animal miRNAs, initial studies aimed at understanding their mode-of-action were performed in C. elegans, focusing on the first identified miRNA, lin-4 and two validated targets: lin-14 and lin-28 (Olsen and Ambros 1999; Seggerson et al. 2002). This studies established that, if LIN-14 and LIN-28 protein levels are downregulated by lin-4, lin-14 and lin-28 mRNAs are not significantly degraded and their polyadenylation status and
polyribosome association not substantially modified. Based on these observations, it was initially assumed that miRNAs function solely by inhibiting target translation at a step downstream on initiation without affecting the amount or structure of target mRNAs themselves.

Surprisingly, subsequent studies showed that miRNA targets often undergo a significant amount of degradation, most likely triggered by deadenylation. These include studies conducted in animal models (Bagga et al. 2005; Krutzfeldt et al. 2005; Giraldez et al. 2006; Mishima et al. 2006), cell lines (Lim et al. 2005; Behm-Ansmant et al. 2006; Rehwinkel et al. 2006; Schmitter et al. 2006; Wu et al. 2006; Eulalio et al. 2007b; Eulalio et al. 2009b) or cell-free system (Wakiyama et al. 2007). Based on these results, it is today generally accepted that miRNAs can, to a certain extent, induce target degradation. miRISC components, such as Ago proteins and by extension miRNAs, together with miRNA targets were shown to colocalize with processing-bodies (P-bodies), which are cellular foci enriched for the RNA degradation machinery (reviewed in (Parker and Sheth 2007)). Although P-bodies integrity is not required for miRNA mediated repression (Eulalio et al. 2007a), it was shown in Drosophila cells that the P-body components CAF1:CCR4:NOT1 (deadenylase complex), DCP1:DCP2 (decapping complex), and Xrn1 (exonuclease) mediate miRNA targets degradation (Behm-Ansmant et al. 2006; Eulalio et al. 2007b; Eulalio et al. 2009b).

It is also generally acknowledged that miRNA can repress the translation of their targets in parallel with, or prior to, mRNA degradation. However no agreement could be reached so far about the step of translation that is inhibited (Chekulaeva and Filipowicz 2009). Early experiments support a post-initiation mechanism (Olsen and Ambros 1999; Seggerson et al. 2002). This is essentially based on the observation that target mRNA distributions in sucrose density polysome gradients is unchanged whether or not the cognate miRNA is expressed, indicating that the repressed and non-repressed mRNAs are in average loaded with the same number of ribosomes. It was also shown that some miRNAs and miRISC components co-sediment with polysomes in human neuronal cells, suggesting that repressed targets are still loaded with ribosomes (Nelson et al. 2004). A following study by Pillai and colleagues fired up the controversy (Pillai et al. 2005). The authors showed that in HeLa cells let-7 binding to reporters mRNA shifts them to lighter fractions of density polysome gradient, indicating that
less ribosomes are present on the repressed mRNAs, a hallmark of reduced translation initiation rates. Moreover, this study and another one agreed on the observation that reporters driven by internal ribosome entry sites (IRESs), i.e. reporters, which do not rely on a cap structure for their translation, are refractory to miRNA-mediated repression, suggesting that miRNAs prevent interaction between the mRNA cap and translation initiation factors (Humphreys et al. 2005; Pillai et al. 2005). However, the same two studies disagreed about whether a poly(A) tail is required for repression.

Adding to the confusion, a set of subsequent studies using human cell lines argued in favor of a post-initiation phenomenon, although suggesting different models (Maroney et al. 2006; Nottrott et al. 2006; Petersen et al. 2006; Lytle et al. 2007). In these studies, arguments for a post-initiation mechanism are essentially based on observations that repressed mRNAs together with miRNAs sediment in deep (polysomal) fractions of polysome gradients and that reporters driven by certain types of IRES can still be repressed by miRNAs. Data from Maroney et al. suggest that repressed targets are actively translated and implicitly point toward a mechanism affecting the nascent polypeptide (Maroney et al. 2006). Such a model is also explicitly supported by Nottrott and colleagues, however direct experimental evidences are lacking (Nottrott et al. 2006). Peterson and co-workers proposed that translational repression is achieved by premature ribosome drop-off (Petersen et al. 2006). However, they do not see repressed targets shifting to lighter polysome fractions, something that, based on this model, would be expected as pointed out by Chekulaeva and Filipowicz (Chekulaeva and Filipowicz 2009). Simultaneously, other studies substantiated the initiation model, using globally the same experimental strategies as the studies mentioned above but finding opposite results (Bhattacharyya et al. 2006; Huang et al. 2007). Importantly, Bhattacharyya and colleagues reported the first observation of an endogenous target, CAT-1, being repressed at the initiation level in human cells (Bhattacharyya et al. 2006).

Several laboratories recapitulated, at least to some extent, miRNA repression in cell-free systems (Wang et al. 2006; Mathonnet et al. 2007; Thermann and Hentze 2007; Wakiyama et al. 2007). All these studies point to an initiation mechanism, based on the fact that reporters containing either a non-functional cap or an IRES cannot be repressed by miRNAs. The
initiation model was also further supported by two additional studies, while each implying a different mode-of-action (Chendrimada et al. 2007; Kiriakidou et al. 2007).

By immunoprecipitation, Chendrimada et al. identified an interaction between miRISC and the eukaryotic translation initiation factor 6 (eIF6), a factor involved in preventing the premature association between the 60S and 40S ribosomal subunits. Depletion of eIF6 prevented miRNA-mediated repression of reporter mRNAs in human cells and of the lin-4 targets lin-14 and lin-28 in C. elegans, suggesting that miRNAs inhibit translation initiation by preventing the 60S ribosomal subunit joining (Chendrimada et al. 2007). This model was supported by experiments in reticulocyte lysate which showed that miRNA targets are enriched for 40S, but not 60S, ribosome components (Wang et al. 2008). However, as noted earlier (Filipowicz et al. 2008), the fact that eIF6 is involved in ribosome biogenesis renders these data difficult to interpret, as translation could be generally affected by eIF6 depletion. Chendrimada et al. argue that eIF6 depletion does not affect global translation, as determined by polysome profiling, however the quality of these experiments is questionable: polysomes are almost completely absent in every conditions tested, making it difficult to assess any change in polysome magnitude. Finally, if eIF6 really plays a role in miRNA-mediated repression, it does not seem to be conserved in D. melanogaster, where no effect on miRNA target reporters could be observed upon eIF6 depletion (Eulalio et al. 2008b).

Kiriakidou and colleagues uncovered two residues highly conserved among Ago proteins, which were proposed to allow Ago to bind the mRNA cap structure. It was therefore suggested that Ago proteins directly compete with eIF4E, the cap-binding translation initiation factor, to inhibit translation initiation on miRNA targets (Kiriakidou et al. 2007). However, a recent bioinformatic study suggests that the conserved residues cannot fold in a structure able to bind the cap (Kinch and Grishin 2009). Alternatively, Eulalio et al. showed that these residues are important for the interaction between Ago1 and GW182, a miRISC component, in Drosophila cells. This result might explain why these residues are conserved and suggests that Ago-GW182 interaction is important for miRNA function (Eulalio et al. 2008b).

GW182 (a 182 kiloDaltons protein enriched in glycine and tryptophan repeats) was identified in 2002 using sera from a patient suffering from motor and sensory polyneuropathy and found to localize in discrete cytoplasmic foci named GW-bodies (Eystathioy et al. 2002).
Subsequent studies showed that GW-bodies correspond to P-bodies, indicating that GW182 might be involved in the control of mRNA stability. In parallel, co-localization and co-immunoprecipitation experiments in human cells showed that Ago proteins localize to P-bodies and interact with components of the mRNA degradation pathway and that miRNA targets are localized to P-bodies in a miRNA-dependent fashion (Liu et al. 2005b; Sen and Blau 2005). This suggested a link between GW182 and the miRNA pathway, which was confirmed by the observation that human and Drosophila GW182 physically interact with Ago proteins and that depletion of GW182 prevent efficient repression of miRNA target reporters (Liu et al. 2005a; Meister et al. 2005; Rehwinkel et al. 2005; Behm-Ansmant et al. 2006; Eulalio et al. 2008b).

Three GW182 paralogs have been identified in vertebrates (TNRC6A/HW182, TNRC6B, TNRC6C) and one in insects (GW182 or Gwaky). C. elegans has also been found to encode two distant homologs of this protein family: ain-1 and ain-2 (alg-1 interacting protein) (Ding et al. 2005; Ding and Han 2007; Zhang et al. 2007). Similarly to other GW182 proteins, AIN-1 and AIN-2 interact with ALG-1 and ALG-2, the C. elegans miRNA specific Ago proteins, and are essential for miRNA-mediated repression (Ding et al. 2005; Zhang et al. 2007). Recent efforts have been made to understand the architecture of GW182 proteins in flies and humans (Baillat and Shiekhattar 2009; Chekulaeva et al. 2009; Eulalio et al. 2009a; Eulalio et al. 2009c; Lazzaretti et al. 2009; Lian et al. 2009; Takimoto et al. 2009; Zipprich et al. 2009). These studies identified several domains required for Ago interaction and for miRNA target silencing (reviewed in (Eulalio et al. 2009d)), but did not address the mechanistic aspect of silencing itself. Therefore, although it is now manifest that GW182 proteins play a crucial role for miRNA-mediated silencing, it is unclear whether they are involved in an initiation or post-initiation inhibition mechanism. It is also surprising that AIN-1 and AIN-2 function, at least superficially, similarly to human and flies GW182 proteins, since they are only distantly related to these and lack for example the silencing domains identified in the aforementioned studies (Eulalio et al. 2009d). This suggests that either C. elegans AIN-1 and AIN-2 might function in a different way than other GW182 proteins or that a feature common to all of them as not yet been identified.

In summary, among the very large body of literature related to miRNA mode-of-action common themes, as well as discrepancies are apparent. Essentially, miRNA targets can be either repressed translationally or degraded or undergo a combination of both, however it is not known
if degradation requires prior translational repression. Moreover, there is no consensus about how translation of miRNA targets is impaired and, although GW182 proteins are recognized to be central to this and the degradation processes, there is little to no information about their precise molecular functions. An interesting postulate is that core miRISCs function as platforms, which could recruit different sets of effector proteins in a time-, tissue-, or environment-dependent manner, allowing miRNAs to function differently in distinct contexts (discussed in Hammell 2008). Such a scenario could explain that different experimental settings exhibit different type of miRNA-mediated repression, or even activation, mechanisms. In nematodes, food deprivation was shown for example to prevent lin-4 dependent lin-14 mRNA degradation, but not protein downregulation (Holtz and Pasquinelli 2009). Additionally, modulation activities could also be brought about by factors recruited to the 3'UTR of specific targets, such as, for instance, the RNA-binding protein Dnd1, which can mask certain miR-430 binding sites in zebrafish germ cells (Mishima et al. 2006; Kedde et al. 2007), or HuR, which can relieve CAT-1 repression by miR-122 in liver cells under stress conditions (Bhattacharyya et al. 2006). Consequently, a better understanding of potential miRISC modulators might help to reconcile apparently conflicting data.

Finally, it has to be noted that most of the studies discussed here have been conducted using artificial reporter systems and also sometimes artificial miRNAs, leaving it unclear how faithfully these systems recapitulate the endogenous miRNA-mediated regulation process. In my opinion, observations made with non natural molecules should be inferred only very cautiously to the endogenous situation. Cellular processes are robust machineries which can accommodate varying situations (Stelling et al. 2004). It is not granted that such machineries will automatically function canonically when confronted with artificial substrates. Therefore, experiments employing non-endogenous substrates can only inform us about the functional possibilities of a cellular machinery but not directly about its endogenous mode-of-action. For example, the fact that an artificial reporter mRNA containing a histone stem loop instead of a poly(A) tail can be repressed by miRNAs (Wu et al. 2006) cannot be directly used to demonstrate that poly(A) tails of endogenous targets do not play a role in miRNA-mediated repression. Unfortunately, this distinction is very often not made when discussing such results. This concern is also further underlined by the observations that the mode of reporter transfection or the type of viral promoter used to express reporters have been shown to influence
the apparent mode of miRNA-mediated repression (Lytle et al. 2007; Kong et al. 2008) and calls for studies focusing on the physiologically relevant aspects of miRNA-mediated repression.
2.2.5. Biological functions of microRNAs

Regardless of how exactly miRNAs silence their target genes, this type of regulation has been shown to be relevant to an overwhelming large number of cellular and physiological processes in health and disease. These include developmental timing, stem cell maintenance, cellular proliferation and differentiation, apoptosis, viral infection, immune response, hematopoiesis, and angiogenesis, to name just a few (reviewed in (Bushati and Cohen 2007)). Importantly certain microRNAs have also been shown to function as tumor-suppressor or oncogene genes (reviewed in (Esquela-Kerscher and Slack 2006)). It is maybe not so surprising that the breadth of processes regulated by miRNAs is so large, considering that an average miRNA has been predicted to regulate more than hundred targets and that 20% to 30% of animal 3'UTRs contain at least one conserved miRNA predicted binding site (Krek et al. 2005; Lewis et al. 2005). These predictions are difficult to establish, due to the imperfect nature of miRNA - miRNA target binding in animals. Nevertheless, they have seen some experimental support from recent large-scale proteomics studies, which indicated that miRNAs typically repress hundreds of targets, albeit in average to a moderate extent (Baek et al. 2008; Selbach et al. 2008).

In general, miRNA interaction with their targets can be characterized according to how much a given target is repressed, how much the target repression physiologically matters, and how many targets a given miRNA represses to achieve its function. The consideration of these characteristics allows to classify miRNA activities as either "genetic switch" or "fine-tuning" (Flynt and Lai 2008). Genetic switches generally concern cases one or a few targets. This is for example the C. elegans L1 to L2 developmental switch controlled by lin-4 repression of lin-14 (see section 2.2.1.). lin-4 expression allows worm development to proceed from the L1 to the L2 stage by almost completely abolishing lin-14 expression. Another example of a clear developmental switch in nematodes comes from let-7. This miRNA, which regulates multiple targets, including various transcription factors (Grosshans et al. 2005), controls the L4 to adult transition by repressing the NHL protein LIN-41 (Reinhart et al. 2000). let-7 mutations, depending on their penetrance, lead to various phenotypic defects ranging from cuticular defects to death by vulva bursting (Reinhart et al. 2000). Interestingly, individual depletion of let-7 targets is often sufficient to rescue let-7 mutant animals (Abrahante et al. 2003; Grosshans et al. 2005).
2005; Lall et al. 2006), suggesting that a complex network of genetic interactions might exist between the targets regulated by a given miRNA.

In instances of fine-tuning regulation, the role of miRNAs is to set a precise level of target activity, therefore, in this case and contrary to the lin-4 - lin-14 paradigm, targets are often co-expressed together with their cognate miRNAs. Importantly, fine-tuning regulation is not synonymous with trivial regulation, as exemplified by the D. melanogaster miR-8 regulation of atrophin (Karres et al. 2007). miR-8 mutant phenotypes - elevated apoptosis in the brain and behavioral defects - are caused by upregulated levels of Atrophin and can be rescued by deleting one copy of the atrophin gene. Interestingly, knocking-down atrophin specifically in miR-8 expressing cells below the level achieved by miR-8 repression also results in phenotypic defects. This shows that miR-8 functions by achieving a precise, physiologically optimal level of Atrophin. Another example comes from the study of B-cell differentiation. miR-150 regulates B-cell lineage development essentially by tuning precisely, among several predicted targets, the level of the c-Myb transcription factor (Xiao et al. 2007; Zhou et al. 2007). Here as well, too low and to high c-Myb levels are equally detrimental.

Some miRNA functions have also been shown to depend on the regulation of a large set of targets. An impressive example comes from the ectopic expression of tissue specific miRNAs in HeLa cells (Lim et al. 2005). Cells transfected with the brain specific miR-124 or the muscle specific miR-1 specifically shift their expression profile toward that of brain or muscle cells, respectively, as determined by level modulation of about hundred transcript in each cases. This and additional studies (Farh et al. 2005; Sood et al. 2006) show that miRNAs can enforce cellular identities by modulating a large number of targets, which are often co-expressed with tissue specific miRNAs, but kept to a low level. In an other study, it appears that certain Drosophila miRNAs and their cognate targets are reciprocally expressed in adjacent but not overlapping tissues (Stark et al. 2005). This suggests that miRNAs, by targeting genes that are already transcriptionally inactive, might also function as a backup system repressing transcriptional leaks. Such a model might explain why a large-scale study of individual miRNA mutants in C. elegans reported most of them to be superficially wild-type (Miska et al. 2007). Alternatively, this could indicate that a large degree of redundancy between certain miRNAs exist. Indeed, a large number of C. elegans and D. melanogaster miRNAs have homologues
predicted to regulate identical sets of targets (Ibanez-Ventoso et al. 2008). This could also suggest that, besides a few cases of life-or-death regulation, most miRNAs regulate subtle or environment-dependent phenotypes.

Altogether, miRNA-mediated repression, by being able to quickly block the expression of mRNAs, which might have otherwise long half-lives, seems particularly well adapted to situations requiring a rapid and clear change in gene expression. miRNAs are also well suited for local regulation of translation, like in neurons for instance (Ashraf et al. 2006). Additionally the fact that, in certain cases, miRNA-mediated repression is reversible (Bhattacharyya et al. 2006), suggests that miRNAs can be particularly useful not only for a fast repression but also reactivation of their targets. Moreover, miRNAs probably represent a rather evolutionary plastic mode of gene regulation as the modification of only a few nucleotides in a transcript is sufficient to introduce or delete miRNA binding sites. This idea is supported by the observation that, although animal miRNAs are in general well conserved, only a few miRNA - miRNA target interactions are evolutionary preserved (Chen and Rajewsky 2006). These cumulative advantages of miRNAs might explain why they seem to play a role in virtually every biological process investigated so far.
2.3. Aim of this work

Considering the existing controversy about the mode-of-action of miRNAs (see section 2.2.4.) and the relative lack of in vivo studies on this topic, the aim of this work was to understand in more details the mechanistic aspects of miRNA-mediated repression in physiologically relevant context. This study was performed using C. elegans and focusing mostly on let-7, as a model miRNA (reviewed in (Bussing et al. 2008)). The premises of this work were laid by the results of a large-scale RNAi screen performed by H. Grosshans and aimed at identifying new interaction partners of let-7 in a unbiased manner (Ding et al. 2008). This initial experiment identified a potent genetic interaction between certain translation initiation factors, including subunits of eIF3, and let-7, which led me to propose the following thesis:

C. elegans miRNAs function in vivo, and at least partially, by inhibiting the initiation of translation on target mRNAs.

I explored this thesis by pursuing in parallel genetic as well as biochemical research approaches, which have been the objects of two independent publications included below (see sections 3.1. and 3.2.) (Ding et al. 2008; Ding and Grosshans 2009). The genetic experiments aimed at delineating the extent of the genetic interaction between let-7 and the translation machinery in general, and translation initiation factors in particular. These experiments uncovered an unexpected widespread genetic interaction between let-7 and the C. elegans translation machinery, suggesting that let-7 activity and let-7 targets are especially sensitive to alteration of the translation process. Additionally, these genetic data suggest, but do not demonstrate, that let-7 activity may directly oppose that of eIF3 (Ding et al. 2008). The biochemical experiments aimed at directly assessing the translational status and mRNA level of endogenous target mRNAs in response to repression by miRNAs. The results demonstrated that miRNA-mediated repression is achieved in C. elegans by a combination of target mRNA degradation and inhibition of translation initiation and that the GW182 homologs AIN-1 and AIN-2 are essential mediators of these mechanisms (Ding and Grosshans 2009). Importantly, these observations bring early C. elegans studies, which argued for a post-initiation model (Olsen and Ambros 1999; Seggerson et al. 2002) into a new perspective. Additional experiments
aimed at deciphering the role of individual miRISC components in the repression mechanisms are also presented and discussed (see section 3.3.).
3. Results and discussion

3.1. Publication: “The let-7 microRNA interfaces extensively with the translation machinery to regulate cell differentiation”
The let-7 microRNA interfaces extensively with the translation machinery to regulate cell differentiation

Xavier C. Ding,† Frank J. Slack,* and Helge Großhans†,*

†Friedrich Miescher Institute for Biomedical Research (FMI); Basel, Switzerland; ‡Department of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology, Yale University; New Haven, Connecticut USA
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MicroRNAs (miRNAs) are noncoding RNAs that regulate numerous target genes through a posttranscriptional mechanism and thus control major developmental pathways. The phylogenetically conserved let-7 miRNA regulates cell proliferation and differentiation, thus functioning as a key regulator of developmental timing in C. elegans and a tumor suppressor gene in humans. Using a reverse genetic screen, we have identified genetic interaction partners of C. elegans let-7, including known and novel potential target genes. Initial identification of several translation initiation factors as suppressors of a let-7 mutation led us to systematically examine genetic interaction between let-7 and the translational machinery, which we found to be widespread. In the presence of wild-type let-7, depletion of the translation initiation factor eIF3 resulted in precocious cell differentiation, suggesting that developmental timing is translationally regulated, possibly by let-7. As overexpression of eIF3 in humans promotes translation of mRNAs that are also targets of let-7-mediated repression, we suggest that eIF3 may directly or indirectly oppose let-7 activity. This might provide an explanation for the opposite functions of let-7 and eIF3 in regulating tumorigenesis.

Introduction

MicroRNAs (miRNAs) are small, untranslated RNAs involved in numerous developmental pathways (reviewed in ref. 1). They function through an antisense mechanism where binding of an miRNA to complementary sequences in its target mRNAs (cognate mRNAs) causes cognate mRNA repression, but the mechanisms of target mRNA repression are less clear. Many different, and sometimes contradictory, miRNA modes of action have been proposed (reviewed in refs. 2 and 3). These include inhibition of target mRNA translation either at the initiation or elongation step, target mRNA degradation in a non-endonucleolytic fashion, which may or may not result from deadenylation, and co-translational protein degradation. MiRNAs may thus act through multiple mechanisms. These mechanisms may either function redundantly or as alternate pathways that affect only individual subsets of miRNAs and/or cognate mRNAs.2,3

The C. elegans let-7 miRNA was originally identified as a component of the heterochronic pathway,4 which controls the temporal fate of cells during postembryonic development (reviewed in ref. 5). Postembryonic development proceeds through the four larval stages, L1 through L4, followed by the sexually mature, adult stage. During normal development, cells adopt fates that are characteristic of the developmental stage of the animal, e.g., certain cells divide while others may exit the cell cycle and differentiate. Mutations in heterochronic genes may cause cells to prematurely adopt fates that are normally observed at a later developmental stage, i.e., cause precocious phenotypes. Alternatively, the mutant cells may display retarded phenotypes, i.e., characteristics typical of cells in earlier developmental stages. Partial loss of let-7 activity causes retarded phenotypes, i.e., repetition of fourth larval stage (L4) cell fates, while more complete loss of activity causes animals to die by bursting through the vulva at the larval-to-adult transition.4 These phenotypes are due to overexpression of let-7 target genes and can be partially suppressed by knock-down of individual let-7 target genes.6,10

let-7 is conserved in higher eukaryotes, with a striking 100% sequence identity in the case of the mature let-7 of C. elegans and humans.11,12 This, and the observation that let-7 expression is temporally regulated in invertebrates as well as vertebrates,11 suggests that let-7 function may also be conserved. This view is supported by our recent finding that C. elegans let-7 regulates let-60 ras expression, while human let-7 regulates the let-60 orthologue RAS.7,13 Human let-7 also regulates the chromatin-binding factor HMGA2, and failure of let-7-mediated HMGA2 repression promotes oncogenic transformation.14-18 Consistent with overproliferation of cells with reduced let-7 expression, let-7 also represses the expression of the cell cycle regulator CDC25A (refs. 19 and 20). Reduced let-7 expression in lung cancer21,22 may contribute to tumorigenic transformation through upregulation of these oncogenes,22,23 and reduced let-7 expression levels are prognostic for poor patient survival.21,24 Let-7 has also been shown to function as a tumor suppressor in breast cancer, where it controls proliferation and differentiation of tumor initiating cells.25 The converging results from these different experimental systems have supported a model of let-7 functioning as an important
regulator of stem cell fates in both normal and tumor cells. To achieve this function, let-7 expression is highly regulated not only at the transcriptional level, but, as recent data suggest, also posttranscriptionally (reviewed in ref. 26).

To identify interaction partners of the let-7 miRNA, which might include novel let-7 targets, regulators of let-7 expression, mediators of let-7 activity, or heterochronic genes, we devised a high-throughput, functional genomics screen based on RNA interference (RNAi). Through this screen, we identified 41 known and novel interaction partners of let-7. As several genes directly or indirectly involved in translation were found among the novel let-7 suppressors, we systematically examined genetic interactions between let-7 and the core translational machinery and found them to be widespread. Consistent with translational control of the heterochronic pathway, we found that depletion of several of these genes, in particular subunits of the tumor promoting translation initiation factor eIF3, caused abnormal timing of cell differentiation in the presence of wild-type let-7.

Results

A reverse genetics screen reveals translation factors as suppressors of let-7. The temperature sensitive let-7(n2853) allele contains a point mutation in the mature let-7 sequence that impairs target binding. In addition, reduced accumulation of the mutant let-7(n2853) sequence suggests that these genes may be targets of the let-7 miRNA whose depletion had previously been shown to suppress let-7(n2853) [refs. 4 and 10]. As several genes directly or indirectly involved in translation were found among the novel let-7 suppressors, we systematically examined genetic interactions between let-7 and the core translational machinery and found them to be widespread. Consistent with translational control of the heterochronic pathway, we found that depletion of several of these genes, in particular subunits of the tumor promoting translation initiation factor eIF3, caused abnormal timing of cell differentiation in the presence of wild-type let-7.

To identify interaction partners of the let-7(n2853) allele, we carried out a feeding RNAi screen to uncover additional suppressors of the let-7(n2853) bursting phenotype. We performed this screen by RNAi on synchronized L1 stage larvae to avoid missing factors whose efficient depletion would cause sterility and/or embryonic lethality. Using a previously described feeding library of bacteria producing double-strand RNA, we individually tested the suppressing effect of RNAi on almost 90% of the genes on chromosome I, i.e., ca. 2,400 genes (Fig. 1). We found that 41 genes could efficiently suppress the conditional lethality of the let-7 mutation when knocked down through RNAi by feeding (Table 1). Some but not all of the suppressor genes contained let-7 complementary sites, as defined previously, in their 3′ untranslated regions (UTR) suggesting that these genes may be targets of the let-7 RNA (Table 1).

Our screening procedure was validated by two observations. First, we blindly identified lin-41, the only known heterochronic gene in the chromosome I library, as a potent suppressor of let-7(n2853) when depleted. lin-41 is a known downstream target of the let-7 miRNA whose depletion had previously been shown to suppress let-7(n2853) (refs. 4 and 10). No RNAi construct targeting lin-28, another heterochronic gene and known suppressor of let-7 encoded on chromosome I, was included in the RNAi library. A second gene, lin-4 was identified independently by us through a computational approach and also subsequently validated as a let-7 target. Second, seven genes in the library are targeted by two independent RNAi constructs, and we identified both clones for four of these genes, rpl-24.2, Y65B4BR.5, insb-5 spo-2 and spg-7. In the remaining three cases differences in the RNAi phenotypes elicited by each pair of constructs were already previously noted.

The largest class of suppressors identified in our screen is comprised of genes with a predicted function in the metabolism of RNA or protein, which account for nearly half (20/41) of the suppressors (Fig. 2). Genes from this category showed a 50% increase over the frequency found by Fraser et al., who queried the library for genes eliciting any phenotype when depleted in wild-type animals (Fig. 2). This observation may suggest that genes of this functional class are particularly important as targets and/or mediators of let-7 function or are heterochronic genes. Given the tight posttranscriptional regulation of let-7 expression, it will also be of considerable interest to test in future work whether any of these novel let-7 interactors control let-7 maturation.

Our list of suppressors contained several translation initiation factors: two putative subunits of the eukaryotic translation initiation factor (eIF) 3, eif-3.4 and eif-3.5 (D41D11.2 and B0511.10, respectively) and the delta subunit of eIF2B (F11A3.2). We also

---

Figure 1. A high-throughput reverse genetics screen to identify suppressors of let-7(n2853) lethality. See main text and Materials and Methods for details.
### Table 1
Suppressors of let-7(n2853) lethality identified in a screen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORF†</th>
<th>Locus†</th>
<th>Function/Homologies‡,§</th>
<th>LCS‡</th>
<th>Suppression‡</th>
<th>DNA synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W02D9.1</td>
<td>pri-2</td>
<td>DNA primase</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y54E10A.15</td>
<td>cdh-1</td>
<td>Hs CDT1, Dm dup</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RNA metabolism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B051J.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17E4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C36B1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C53H9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14B4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein metabolism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B051.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03D6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C39D3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C41D11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C47B2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y47G6A.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y113A2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy/metabolism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T09B4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W09C5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chromosome dynamics

| C45G3.1 | aspm-1 | Dm Asp | - | + |
| T03F1.9 | hcp-4 | CENP-C homologue | - | ++ |

### Cell structure

| F56A3.3 | rpp-6 | Nuclear pore protein | - | +++ |
| T19B4.2 | rpp-7 | Nuclear pore protein | 2 | +++ |
| T21E12.4 | dmc-1 | Dynemin heavy chain | - | ++ |
| Y48G1A.5 | imb-5 | Sc Cse1p, Hs CAS/CSE1 | 1 | ++ |
| Y71F9AM.5 | mlf-1 | NTF2-family | - | + |
| Y105EB.9 | qpp-1 | y-adapter AP-1 | 1 | ++ |
| H15N14.2 | nsf-1 | Vesicle fusion | - | + |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C01G8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F57810.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Signalling

| K12C11.2 | smo-1 | Hs SUMO-1 | - | + |
| ZCS81.1 | nek2 | NEK kinase family | - | ++ |

### Unknown

| F20C4.1 | smgl-1 | Hs Neuroblastoma amplified gene protein | - | ++ |
| F56A3.4 | spg-5 | Coiled coils | - | ++ |
| T23D8.3 | spg-5 | Hs IV1; in operon with elf28 | - | ++ |
| Y63D3A.5 | tfg-1 | Hs TG1 (TrkA-fused gene) | - | ++ |

*Some ORFs were targeted by more than one dsRNA construct and/or construct names might differ from those of the target ORF indicated here. †Gene loci names according to Wormbase, Release 188. Gene names were not considered when assigning functional classes in cases where no published information or sequence homologies were available to support the gene designation. ‡Sc: Saccharomyces cerevisiae, Dm: Drosophila melanogaster, Hs: Homo sapiens. In most cases functions are predicted from homologies. §LCS: let-7 complementary site as identified in ref. 7. UTR was not included in dataset used for LCS prediction. ++, >30%, +++ >50%, ++++, >80% survival. ‡Sequencing revealed plasmid contained other than predicted insert, targeting the indicated ORF (chromosome V).
Novel let-7 microRNA interactors

Figure 2. let-7 suppressors are enriched for factors involved in RNA and protein metabolism. Genes involved in RNA and protein metabolism are enriched among the suppressors of the let-7(n2853) mutation. Indicated are the distributions across functional classes of genes causing suppression of the let-7(n2853) associated lethality (left chart) or visible phenotypes in otherwise wild-type animals (right chart; assembled from data in ref. 29). Assignments to functional classes are from Wormbase Release WS188. Where gene assignments had changed from those used by Fraser et al., their data were adjusted accordingly. Note that both studies used an identical RNAi library.

identified eif-6 (C47B2.5) as a let-7 suppressor, an unexpected result given previous data showing that depletion of eIF6 abrogated miRNA target repression. However, recent data from Drosophila S2 cells suggest that eIF6 may not be widely required for miRNA activity.

As our initial screen did not cover the whole genome, we tested additional translation factors for a genetic interaction with let-7. Many translation factors have identifiable homologues in C. elegans and we performed a systematic RNAi screen of these factors for suppression of the let-7(n2853) phenotype (Table 2). In most cases, knock-down of translation factors induced a slow growth or developmental arrest phenotype. We could frequently avoid developmental arrest by mixing bacteria that carried the dsRNA producing plasmid with those carrying a plasmid without insert. We found that additional translation factors could suppress the let-7 mutation, in fact, most of the translation factors tested, including initiation, elongation, as well as termination factors, showed partial suppression. Many, but not all suppressors caused slow growth (Table 2), ruling out for at least a subset of translation factors that delayed development as the cause for let-7 suppression. Moreover, an approximately wild-type rate of development also suggests that at least this subset of suppressors affects general translation only weakly. As a corollary, let-7 function and/or the heterochronic pathway appear to be highly sensitive to altered translation levels.

Depletion of translation factors affects the heterochronic pathway. To ascertain that the suppression of the let-7 vulval bursting phenotype through impaired translation was specific, i.e., mediated through a modulation of the heterochronic pathway rather than an indirect consequence of, for instance, aberrant vulval development, we investigated whether depletion of individual translation factors caused heterochronic phenotypes in the seam cells. Seam cells are a subset of hypodermal cells that display a stem-cell-like division pattern during larval stages. At the larval to adult transition, seam cells exit the cell cycle and fuse to form a syncytium, which subsequently secretes collagenous structures termed alae. let-7 is expressed in the seam cells and in its absence, seam cells fail to terminally differentiate at this time and instead divide again. By contrast, overexpression of let-7 causes the opposite, precocious phenotype and seam cells fuse after the L3-to-L4 molt. We examined the effect of RNAi against eif-3.B, eif-3.C, eif-3.E, eif-3.H and eif-6 in animals carrying a wild-type allele of let-7. We selected these factors because they were amongst the first suppressors we had identified. While seam cell fusion is not observed in mock-treated animals at early L4 stage, significant numbers of eif-3(RNAi) and eif-6(RNAi) animals displayed precocious seam cell fusion, as did the lin-41(RNAi) positive control animals (Fig. 3). In the case of eif-3.B(RNAi) and eif-3.C(RNAi) we again had to dilute the RNAi-inducing bacteria with inert bacteria to avoid developmental arrest of the affected animals. These findings directly demonstrate that knock-down of this subset of the suppressing translation factors causes heterochronic defects.

To obtain further evidence for a role of translation factors in the heterochronic pathway we analyzed the genetic interaction between eif-3.E or eif-3.H and lin-41. lin-41 codes for a protein that prevents premature execution of adult fates by repressing production of the transcription factor LIN-29 until the L4 stage. LIN-41 protein levels themselves are regulated through the interaction of let-7 miRNA with the let-7 complementary sites in the 3' UTR of lin-41 mRNA. lin-41 loss-of-function mutations lead to partially penetrant precocious phenotypes in the seam cells and we previously showed that the penetrance of this phenotype can be enhanced when a second let-7 interactor, the let-7 target daf-12, is also knocked down. Similarly, while only 53.1% of the lin-41(ma104) animals display precocious alae (±2.4% SEM), the penetrance of this phenotype was significantly (p < 0.05, student's t-test) increased to 65.0% ± 1.2% for lin-41(ma104); eif-3.E(RNAi) animals and 80.1% ± 0.4% for lin-41(ma104); eif-3.H(RNAi) animals.

Analysis of seam cell fusion and alae formation thus indicate that the translation factors investigated modulate the heterochronic...
pathway. This shows that depletion of these factors does not simply superflicially rescue the let-7(n2853) mutant phenotype but impacts on a pathway known to be regulated by let-7. These data would suggest that translation of one or several heterochronic genes, possibly let-7 target genes, is inefficient and therefore particularly susceptible to further decreases in translation activity. Interestingly, overexpression of eIF3 subunits has been linked to various cancers (reviewed in ref. 35), and our findings indicate that the opposing effects of eIF3 and let-7 on cell differentiation might be a contributing factor (see Discussion).

**Discussion**

We have identified several novel genetic interaction partners of the let-7 miRNA. Some of these contain predicted let-7 binding sites, and future work may establish them as bona fide let-7 targets. Here, we have focused on the observation that our screen identified several translation initiation factors whose depletion allowed survival of let-7(n2853) worms (Table 1). Systematic depletion of individual translation factors subsequently allowed us to identify suppressors at each step of translation.33**3** Initiation, elongation and termination (Table 2). These suppressors include a subunit of eIF2, which is part of the eIF2GTP/Met-tRNA<sub>Met</sub> ternary complex and all but one subunit of the eIF2B factor, which catalyzes guanine nucleotide exchange on eIF2 bound to GDP. Among the factors required to recruit the 40S ribosomal subunit to the ternary complex to form the 43S pre-initiation complex (PIC), we observed that eIF1A and all but one of the eIF3 subunits permitted larval growth results are suppressors. The eIF4F complex, which comprises the cap-binding eIF4E, the scaffolding eIF4G, and the ATP-dependent RNA helicase eIF4A, recruits the 43S PIC to mRNA via an interaction between eIF3 and eIF4G. Among these factors, none of the eIF4E homologues (ife-1 to ife-5) individually tested showed suppression, eIF4G and one homologue of eIF4A (F57B9.3) showed developmental arrest, whereas the eIF4A homologue encoded by the F57B9.6 ORF showed potent suppression. Additionally eIF5F and eIF5B were also identified as suppressors. Finally, all translation elongation and termination factors tested showed either a developmental block or suppression of the bursting phenotype.

Based on this result, it seems that suppression of the let-7(n2853) bursting phenotype can be rescued by decreasing the activity of virtually any step of the translation initiation process as well as the elongation and termination steps. Indeed, some of the other suppressors found in our screen are predicted, by homology, to be part of the ribosome (rpl-24.2) or function in its biogenesis (the putative snoRNP proteins W01B11.3 and Y48GA1.4 and the putative nucleolar GTPases homologous to Lsg1p and Nog2p) and we also found two poly(A)-tail binding proteins, pat-1 and patp-2. However, not all translation factors could suppress let-7 lethality. This may be due to redundancy (e.g., ife-1 to ife-5), inefficient depletion by RNAi or a genuine lack of interaction between these two genes.

Unexpectedly, we also observed that depleting eIF6 rescues let-7(n2853) animals and causes precocious heterochronic phenotypes in the presence of wild-type let-7, although this factor was reported to be required for miRNA mediated repression.30 If eIF6 were similarly required for let-7 function, we would have expected to see the opposite phenotypes, i.e., enhancement of weak let-7 alleles and or retarded heterochronic phenotypes. Our data would

---

**Table 2 Genetic interactions between let-7 and the translation machinery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation factor</th>
<th>locus</th>
<th>ORF</th>
<th>let-7(n2853) suppression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eIF1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF1A&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ili-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2&lt;sup&gt;c,d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2Bt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2Bv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2Bj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2B&lt;sup&gt;y&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ppp-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2B&lt;sup&gt;y&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF2B&lt;sup&gt;y&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup,c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup,d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF3&lt;sup&gt;,f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF3&lt;sup&gt;,g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF3&lt;sup&gt;,h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF3&lt;sup&gt;,i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF3&lt;sup&gt;,j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF3&lt;sup&gt;,k&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF4&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF4&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF4&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF4&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF4&lt;sup&gt;D&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF4&lt;sup&gt;E&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF4&lt;sup&gt;F&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF5&lt;sup&gt;,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF5&lt;sup&gt;,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF5&lt;sup&gt;,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF5&lt;sup&gt;,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF6&lt;sup&gt;,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF6&lt;sup&gt;,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF6&lt;sup&gt;,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eIF6&lt;sup&gt;,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elongation factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eEF1&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ili-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eEF1&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ili-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eEF1&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ili-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eRF1&lt;sup&gt;,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ili-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eRF1&lt;sup&gt;,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ili-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, RNAi treatment was performed to overcome developmental block by mixing bacteria that carried the dsRNA producing plasmid with those carrying a plasmid without insert. *H.1 dilution; *H.5 dilution; *H.10 dilution; *slow growth; * multiple RNAi targets. Suppression: -, <20%; +, >20%; +++, >40%; +++++, >80%, x, developmental block, n = 60 worms for each. Control animals fed with bacteria carrying empty L4440 vector showed never more than 10% survival, whereas dsRNA treatment, showed never less than 90% survival.
thus argue against an involvement of eIF6 in let-7 function, consistent with earlier reports from D. melanogaster cells that eIF6 does not seem to be generally involved in promoting miRNA function.34,35

It is also surprising to see that eif-3.D, along with almost all other eIF3 subunits, is found as an efficient suppressor. This observation is in contrast with a recent report indicating that eif-3.D(RNAi) in an RNAi sensitized strain enhanced the weak let-7(mg279) loss-of-function allele, as determined by increased vulval bursting.36 However, we found that eif-3.D(RNAi) can induce vulval bursting even in wild-type animals where ca. 20% of animals die by bursting despite having functional let-7. It is possible that this bursting phenotype may dominate over a weak let-7 allele, particularly when RNAi is performed in an RNAi sensitized strain, as done in the earlier report.36

We are particularly intrigued to see that depletion of eIF3 subunits causes precocious seam cell differentiation in the presence of wild-type let-7. This is because several of the thirteen subunits of human eIF3 have altered expression levels in cancers including lung, breast, cervical, esophageal, prostate and testicular cancers, and this aberrant expression is likely to contribute to oncogenesis.33 For instance, INT6/eIF3e was originally identified as a common integration site of mouse mammary tumor virus,37 and expression of the truncated INT6/eIF3e gene product, but not of the wild-type eIF3e gene, is sufficient to transform a number of cell lines.38,39 Conversely, INT6/eIF3e loss-of-heterozygosity and decreased expression appear to be associated with breast and non-small cell lung cancers, suggesting that INT6/eIF3e activity is particularly dosage dependent. Recently, eIF3h overexpression was shown to increase tumorigenic phenotypes in various cell lines,40 and eIF3h was also found in a genome-wide association screen for loci conferring increased risk for colorectal cancer.41 Finally, eIF3a, the largest eIF3 subunit, is overexpressed in human lung, breast, cervical and esophageal cancers,42-45 and reduction of eIF3a levels in two human lung and breast cancer cell lines, respectively, is sufficient to suppress the malignant phenotypes in vitro.46 eIF3a expression is also higher in fetal than in more differentiated tissues,47 and thus reciprocal to let-7 expression.48

As expression of eIF3 subunits in human cells appears to be highly coordinated such that forced overexpression of individual subunits leads to increased accumulation of other subunits and incorporation into functional eIF3 complexes, it appears likely that additional eIF3 subunits are deregulated in tumors. When viewed together with the fact that let-7 functions as a tumor suppressor gene,49 these findings suggest that the opposing roles of eIF3 and let-7 on cell differentiation might be conserved beyond C. elegans. Indeed, increased amounts of eIF3 specifically stimulate translation of mRNAs involved in cell proliferation, in particular MYC and cyclin D1 (reviewed in ref. 48)—mRNAs that are repressed by let-7.50 We might thus speculate that the opposing activities of eIF3 and let-7 on a subset of cellular mRNAs contribute to the oncogenic functions of eIF3.

Taken together, we find widespread suppression of let-7 loss-of-function through decreased cellular translation activity, suggesting that let-7 targets or other heterochronic genes may be translationally regulated to allow proper timing of cell differentiation.

Figure 3. Reduced levels of eIF3 subunits cause precocious seam cell fusion. Synchronized N2; wls79 L1-stage larvae were grown on bacteria producing the indicated dsRNA and examined for presence of precocious seam cell fusion upon reaching early-L4 stage. (A–D) Photomicrographs of animals grown on bacteria producing the indicated dsRNA and examined for presence of precocious seam cell fusion upon reaching early-L4 stage. (A–D) Photomicrographs of animals grown on bacteria producing the indicated dsRNA and examined for presence of precocious seam cell fusion upon reaching early-L4 stage. (A–D) Photomicrographs of animals grown on bacteria producing the indicated dsRNA and examined for presence of precocious seam cell fusion upon reaching early-L4 stage.
Materials and Methods

let-7(n2853) suppressor screen and RNAi. Wild-type (N2) and let-7(n2853) (MT7626) strains used in this work were provided by the Caenorhabditis Genetics Center (CGC), which is founded by the NIH National Center for Research Resources. The screen was performed using RNAi by feeding with a published RNAi library covering 90% of the genes on C. elegans chromosome I. Additional RNAi clones were obtained from RNAi libraries or were created in the laboratory as follows by PCR on genomic DNA using the primers listed below. PCR fragments were digested with XhoI and KpnI (pXD10, pXD11 and pXD12), NdeI/XhoI (pHG8) or BamHI/XhoI (pHG9) and ligated into L4440 (reviewed in ref. 51). The resulting constructs were transformed in E. coli HT115 for feeding RNAi experiments.

The screen was performed as illustrated in Figure 1, with every step done in duplicate. Supplements were used at the following concentrations: ampicillin: 100 µg/ml, tetracycline: 12.5 µg/ml, IPTG: 1 mM. Retesting and testing of additional translation factors was done at 20°C and 25°C on 6-cm diameter plates as described. In some experiments, carbicillin was instead used instead of ampicillin. Suppressor identity was confirmed through plasmid DNA recovery followed by sequencing. In some cases we were unable to stage worms reliably because RNAi caused gonad migration defects in the absence of oocytes. These candidates were discarded.

Enhancement of lin-41 (ma104) precocious phenotypes was scored in at least two independent experiments with at least 100 animals scored per strain.

Oligonucleotide sequences.

Synthetic sequences are in lowercase, restriction sites underlined.

Name 5’ to 3’ sequence Plasmid

eif-3_C_F1 gctctagagcTGAATTGTCCTGATCACTTCC pXD10

eif-3_B_R1 gcaagtaccccATTCTCAGGACACGCTCA pXD11

cif-1_R1 gcaagtaccccATTCTCAGGACACGCTCA pXD11

cif-1_F1 gcaagtaccccATTCTCAGGACACGCTCA pXD11

eIF5B_F1 gcaagtaccccATTCTCAGGACACGCTCA pXD11

eIF5B_R1 gcaagtaccccATTCTCAGGACACGCTCA pXD11

cro-1_F1 ccatATGCTGCAAGATAGTCCATTA plasmid

cro-1_R1 ccatATGCTGCAAGATAGTCCATTA plasmid

eIF1_F1 ggagtcacctTGTCATGCTCACCCTGTTTG plasmid

eIF1_R1 ggagtcacctTGTCATGCTCACCCTGTTTG plasmid

Precocious seam cells fusion. Precocious seam cell fusion was analyzed using strain wts37[ajm-1: gfp, scw: gfp] (ref. 9). Microscopy images were acquired using a Zeiss Axioskop microscope equipped with a Zeisscam CCD camera and Axiovision software. Images were cropped and levels adjusted using Adobe Photoshop software.
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Repression of *C. elegans* microRNA targets at the initiation level of translation requires GW182 proteins
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MicroRNAs (miRNAs) repress target genes through a poorly defined antisense mechanism. Cell-free and cell-based assays have supported the idea that miRNAs repress their target miRNAs by blocking initiation of translation, whereas studies in animal models argued against this possibility. We examined endogenous targets of the let-7 miRNA, an important regulator of stem cell fates. We report that let-7 represses translation initiation in *Caenorhabditis elegans*, demonstrating this mode of action for the first time in an organism. Unexpectedly, although the lin-4 miRNA was previously reported to repress its targets at a step downstream of translation initiation, we also observe repression of translation initiation for this miRNA. This repressive mechanism, which frequently but not always coincides with transcript degradation, requires the GW182 proteins AIN-1 and AIN-2, and acts on several miRNAs targeted by different miRNAs. Our analysis of an expanded set of endogenous miRNA targets therefore indicates widespread repression of translation initiation under physiological conditions and establishes *C. elegans* as a genetic system for dissection of the underlying mechanisms.
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Introduction

MicroRNAs (miRNAs) are small, untranslated RNAs involved in numerous developmental pathways in plants and animals (reviewed in Bushati and Cohen, 2007). They regulate a large fraction of cellular mRNAs by binding to complementary sequences in their target miRNAs (‘cognate mRNAs’), but the mechanisms involved in subsequent repression of the mRNA are less clear (reviewed in Eulalio et al., 2008a; Filipowicz et al., 2008). In the best understood example, prevalent in plants, miRNAs function as small interfering (si)RNAs and induce mRNA cleavage through the RNA-induced silencing complex (RISC) when binding to perfectly complementary sites in their target mRNAs (Jones-Rhoades et al., 2006). In animals, this appears to be the exception, as most animal miRNAs are only partially complementary to their targets (Bushati and Cohen, 2007), thus precluding RISC-mediated cleavage. Early work on the *Caenorhabditis elegans* lin-4 miRNA established, instead, the paradigm that miRNAs functioned by translationally repressing their targets at a step downstream of translation initiation, without substantially affecting transcript levels (Olsen and Ambros, 1999; Seggerson et al., 2002). By contrast, recent studies aimed at recapitulating miRNA function in cell-free systems concluded that miRNAs inhibit target mRNA translation at the initiation step (Wang et al., 2006; Mathonnet et al., 2007; Ther mann and Hentze, 2007; Wakiyama et al., 2007). Inhibition of translation initiation, as evidenced by the hallmark shift of target mRNAs from heavy to light polysomal or monosomal fractions of sucrose density gradients in response to the miRNA, has also been observed in a number of cell-based studies. However, such studies also identified additional and sometimes confounding miRNA modes of action (Eulalio et al., 2008a; Filipowicz et al., 2008). These mechanisms include inhibition of target mRNA translation after initiation, target mRNA degradation in a non-endonucleolytic manner, which may or may not result from deadenylation, and co-translational protein degradation. Target mRNA degradation has also been observed for some miRNA targets in vivo, in *C. elegans* and zebrafish (Bagga et al., 2005; Giráldez et al., 2006).

Only a single study has so far demonstrated regulation of an endogenous mRNA, CAT1, by its cognate miR-122 miRNA at the level of translation initiation (Bhattacharyya et al., 2006). The other studies that examined endogenous miRNA targets instead provided evidence against repression of translation initiation (Olsen and Ambros, 1999; Seggerson et al., 2002; Kong et al., 2008), and this includes the only two studies that have tested this mechanism in an animal model, under physiological conditions (Olsen and Ambros, 1999; Seggerson et al., 2002). It is currently unclear whether this divergence of results denotes specific mechanisms operating for individual miRNAs and/or targets. Alternatively, the transfected miRNA target reporters that were used in the bulk of studies showing repression of translation initiation by miRNAs might be particularly conducive to this mode of action, consistent with reports that transfection modalities (Lytte et al., 2007) and choice of the promoters that drive reporter gene expression (Kong et al., 2008) can affect the apparent mode of target repression.

Consistent with the elusive nature of miRNA mechanism(s), few molecular players have been identified. Mature miRNAs occur in a complex with Argonaute (AGO) family proteins, and it has been suggested that direct binding of AGO to the mRNA cap may be responsible for miRNA target repression (Kiriakidou et al., 2007), but this has been
controversial (Eulalio et al., 2008b). The translation initiation factor eIF6 has been identified as a component of a large AGO2-containing complex in human cells and eIF6 depletion was shown to impair miRNA target gene silencing in human cells and C. elegans (Chendrimada et al., 2007). However, it has been suggested that the involvement of eIF6 may be indirect (Filipowicz et al., 2008), and studies of Drosophila cells have indicated that eIF6 may not be generally required for miRNA function (Eulalio et al., 2007, 2008b). Consistent with the latter notion, depletion of C. elegans eIF6 appears to enhance rather than diminish let-7 miRNA activity by genetic criteria (Ding et al., 2008).

AGO proteins also bind to members of the GW182 protein family in various organisms and this interaction contributes to miRNA function (reviewed in Ding and Han, 2007). Tethering of GW182 to an mRNA leads to degradation of this mRNA, and, conversely, GW182 depletion impairs miRNA activity (Liu et al., 2005; Behm-Ansmant et al., 2006; Eulalio et al., 2008b). In C. elegans, combined loss of the two GW182-like proteins AIN-1/2 partially phenocopies loss of the AGO proteins ALG-1/2 and causes upregulation of reporter genes under miRNA control (Ding et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2007). The level and extent to which AIN-1/2 contribute to miRNA function have remained unknown, although it has been suggested that they might localize repressed miRNA targets to P-bodies to enable their degradation (Ding et al., 2005).

We have focused here on the C. elegans let-7 miRNA to examine the mechanism of action of miRNAs in vivo. let-7 was originally identified as a component of the C. elegans heterochronic pathway (Reinhart et al., 2000), which controls the temporal fate of cells during postembryonic development. Several let-7 target genes have been identified (Slack et al., 2000; Abrahante et al., 2003; Lin et al., 2003; Grosshans et al., 2005; Lall et al., 2006) and among these, lin-41 and daf-12 have been characterized most extensively and their let-7-binding sites partially mapped (Reinhart et al., 2000; Slack et al., 2000; Vella et al., 2004; Grosshans et al., 2005). This availability of in vivo validated targets combined with the fact that the sequence of let-7 is perfectly conserved in animals (Pasquinelli et al., 2000; Lagos-Quintana et al., 2002), and that it has been used to examine miRNA mechanisms of action in diverse experimental systems (Bagga et al., 2005; Pillai et al., 2005; Nottrott et al., 2006; Mathonnet et al., 2007; Wakiyama et al., 2007), makes let-7 particularly suitable for our analysis.

In addition, understanding the mode of action of this specific miRNA is of particular interest because of its important developmental and pathological functions as a potent regulator of stem cell fates and a tumour suppressor (reviewed in Büssing et al., 2008).

We report that let-7 causes repression of translation initiation as well as degradation of its endogenous lin-41 and daf-12 target mRNAs. Other miRNAs silence their targets by the same mechanisms, and this includes lin-4 miRNA, previously reported to repress translation at a level after initiation (Olsen and Ambros, 1999; Seggerson et al., 2002). Translational repression requires the GW182 proteins AIN-1/2, as does mRNA degradation. Our findings indicate that downregulation of translation initiation is widely used under physiological conditions in C. elegans and establish the nematode as a system for genetic dissection of this process.

Results

Translational blockade of endogenous let-7 target genes

We recently observed widespread genetic interaction between let-7 and the translational machinery in C. elegans (Ding et al., 2008). These findings prompted us to examine whether let-7 regulates its targets translationally in vivo. To this end, we fractionated whole animal lysates by sucrose density gradient ultracentrifugation to analyse the polyribosome association of endogenous let-7 targets in wild-type and let-7(n2853) mutant C. elegans at the L3 developmental stage, when let-7 activity is low, and at the late L4 stage, when let-7 activity is high (Reinhart et al., 2000) (Figure 1A; Supplementary Figure S1). As the two let-7 targets daf-12 and lin-41 (Slack et al., 2000; Grosshans et al., 2005) are expressed at very low levels in L4 stage larvae (Snow and Larsen, 2000; Bagga et al., 2005 and this study, below), we used reverse transcription–quantitative PCR (RT–qPCR) to quantify them. It is to be noted that all experiments were performed using random hexamer oligonucleotides to prime RT, to include even mRNA, the poly(A) tail of which might be short due to the action of the miRNA (Eulalio et al., 2008a; Filipowicz et al., 2008). Additional control experiments, described below, further confirmed that we are detecting full-length mRNAs rather than partially stable degradation fragments.

We found that both lin-41 and daf-12 mRNAs were moderately, but consistently depleted from the highly translated polysomal fractions in wild-type relative to let-7 mutant animals at the late L4 stage (Figure 1B and C; Supplementary Figure S1), in agreement with decreased translation initiation (Eulalio et al., 2008a). By contrast, ama-1 and act-1 mRNAs, which are not targeted by let-7, displayed similar translational profiles in both strains (Figure 1B and C; Supplementary Figure S1).

L3 stage animals express little or no let-7 (Reinhart et al., 2000); accordingly, we see no difference when comparing polysomal association of daf-12 and lin-41 mRNAs between let-7 mutant and wild-type animals at this stage (Figure 1B and C; Supplementary Figure S1). Moreover, in wild-type animals, polysome association of daf-12 and lin-41 is decreased at L4 compared with L3 stage, consistent with the establishment of an inhibitory mechanism affecting translation initiation as let-7 expression starts. A more moderate decrease of polysome association is also seen when performing this comparison for let-7 mutant animals, suggesting that the n2853 allele may provide residual let-7 activity or that alternative mechanisms, possibly the let-7 sister miRNAs mir-48, mir-84 and mir-241 (Abbott et al., 2005; Li et al., 2005), may contribute.

To exclude the possibility that the RNA that we analysed in our sucrose gradients was not representative for the total pool of cellular RNA, we performed the following control experiments. We used TRizol to extract total RNA directly from ground worms, from the cleared lysate used for sucrose gradient centrifugation and from the pellet left behind upon lysate clearing. We found, first, that ~90% of the RNA is in the lysate supernatant and will thus be loaded on the sucrose gradient. Second, composition of RNA in the supernatant and pellet is comparable, neither let-7 target nor control mRNAs are preferentially enriched in, or depleted from, the supernatant relative to RNA retained in the pellet (Supplementary Figure S2). Finally, although increasing sucrose concentration
in total lysates decreased the yield of extracted RNA, RNA composition was largely unaffected (Supplementary Figure S2). To ensure comparable recovery from each fraction and greatest possible reproducibility, we equalized sucrose concentration in all fractions to 30% (w/v) prior to RNA extractions in all our experiments. This set of control experiments confirms that any results that we obtained in our analysis can be considered representative of the total pool of cellular RNA.

To determine further whether the fast-sedimenting mRNA was indeed associated with polyribosomes, we treated lysates with EDTA and observed that all four mRNAs were shifted to the top of gradients. Distributions became indistinguishable with EDTA and observed that all four mRNAs were shifted to the greatest possible reproducibility, we equalized sucrose concentration in all fractions to 30% (w/v) prior to RNA extractions in all our experiments. This set of control experiments confirms that any results that we obtained in our analysis can be considered representative of the total pool of cellular RNA.

The coincident loss of polysomes and shift of mRNAs demonstrates that our assay examines mRNAs associated with translation-competent ribosomes.

We conclude from these data that let-7 depletes its targets lin-41 and daf-12 from bona fide polysomes, consistent with blocking translation initiation on these mRNAs.

**Translational repression requires let-7 complementary sites in the lin-41 3' UTR**

The lin-41 3' untranslated region (3'UTR) is necessary and sufficient to confer let-7-mediated regulation on an unrelated reporter gene (Slack et al., 2000). To verify that let-7 impaired lin-41 translation by binding to the lin-41 3'UTR or a mutant variant thereof lacking the let-7-binding sites (Figure 2A). We expressed the transgene from the col-10 promoter to accumulate it specifically in the seam cells, where let-7 mediates lin-41 repression (Slack et al., 2000; Johnson et al., 2003).

Consistent with inhibition of translation initiation, we observed that only 40% of the reporter mRNA was associated with polysomes in wild-type animals, whereas this level reached almost 70% in let-7 mutant animals. Deletion of the endogenous microRNA targets
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Animals. Statistically significant (\(\text{cellular full-length mRNAs}\)). It is to be noted that the levels of RNA extracted from the gradients is representative of total fractions of the sucrose gradients, further confirming that when summing up the amounts of these mRNAs across all relative to wild-type animals. Similar ratios were obtained et al. action between details on the calculation). This result shows that the inter-
stayed constant (Figure 2D; see Materials and methods for where the average number of ribosomes per \(\text{polysome profiles}\). At the \(\text{L3 stage}\), the same whole animal lysates that were used for the poly-
transported \(\text{mRNA levels in the presence of their cognate miRNAs in \(\text{C. elegans}\). By RT–qPCR, we determined mRNA levels of the \(\text{C. elegans}\). For \(\text{lin-41}\), our results are in agreement with those seen by Bagga et al. (2005), and northern blot analysis of total RNA using a probe against \(\text{lin-41}\) identified a single band, the intensity of which mirrored the signal obtained by RT–qPCR in the same background (Figure 3B). Although \(\text{lin-41}\) mRNA levels in individual sucrose gradient fractions were below the limit of detection by northern blot analysis, these results essentially exclude the possibility that accumulation of \(\text{lin-41}\) mRNA degradation products could bias our RT–qPCR results and confirm that we reliably quantify full-length mRNAs. For \(\text{daf-12}\) mRNA, its low abundance prevents detection by northern blotting even in unfractined, total RNA without prior selection of polyadenylated mRNA (Snow and Larsen, 2000). Therefore, to confirm that our RT–qPCR assay similarly measures the levels of full-length \(\text{daf-12}\) mRNA, we tested a second set of primers, and obtained comparable results as expected (Supplementary Figure S5A). Finally, we examined the expression levels of both \(\text{daf-12}\) and \(\text{lin-41}\) using cDNA obtained through oligo-dT-primed RT. Again, we obtained comparable results (Supplementary Figure S5B and C), arguing against the detection of a stable degradation product and suggesting that any residual poly(A) tail on these mRNAs is sufficient to support priming through oligo-dT oligonucleotides. In summary, we confirm by several independent methods that our assays quantify full-length mRNAs, and we find that the \(\text{daf-12}\) and \(\text{lin-41}\) mRNAs are not only translationally repressed by \(\text{let-7}\) but also subject to degradation.

Translational repression of \(\text{daf-12}\) is at least equal to that of \(\text{lin-41}\) but the decrease of \(\text{daf-12}\) mRNA levels is more modest, suggesting that translational repression and transcript degradation may not be directly linked. Indeed, although the \(\text{lacZ::lin-41 reporter mRNA}\) is very efficiently
repressed translationally, mRNA levels differed by less than two-fold in wild-type relative to let-7(n2853) animals (Figure 3C). Although these findings strongly argue against its access to the translational machinery, we wished to exclude the possibility further that the translational effects that we observed were due to altered mRNA levels. ugt-63 and vit-1 are differentially expressed in synchronized late L4 wild-type and let-7(n2853) animals but are not direct targets of let-7 (B Hurscher and HG, unpublished data). Although vit-1 was four-fold less abundant in let-7(n2853) than in wild-type animals, and ugt-63 was two-fold more abundant, the translational profiles of both genes were similar in wild-type and let-7(n2853) (Supplementary Figure S6). Thus, altered mRNA levels per se do not appear to influence the efficiency of translation initiation.

**Multiple miRNAs function by preventing translation initiation**

The finding that let-7 mediates repression of translation initiation on its targets in *C. elegans* was unexpected, as *C. elegans* lin-4 was previously reported to repress these miRNAs at a step downstream of translation initiation (Olsen and Ambros, 1999; Seggerson et al., 2002). To determine whether repression of translation initiation is specific for let-7 or a more general mechanism, we tested whether lin-4 repressed translation initiation of lin-14 and lin-28, two experimentally validated targets (Wightman et al., 1993; Moss et al., 1997). lin-4 is first expressed in the mid-L1 stage and represses lin-14 by late L1/early L2 and lin-28 one stage later (Olsen and Ambros, 1999; Seggerson et al., 2002). When we compared extracts from late L2 stage wild-type and lin-4(e912) mutant animals, we observed that both mRNAs were shifted into the polysomal fraction in the mutant (Figure 4A and B). This shift is particularly pronounced for lin-28, where the effect is highly statistically significant (Figure 4A). By contrast, polysome association of the control miRNAs act-1 and ama-1 and the let-7 target daf-12 is identical in lin-4(e912) and wild-type animals (Figure 4A and B). We conclude that lin-4, similar to let-7, can repress its target at the level of translation initiation.

lin-14 and lin-28 transcript levels are increased in lin-4 mutants compared with wild-type animals, whereas daf-12, act-1 and ama-1 mRNA levels remain unchanged (Figure 4C). The observation that lin-4 induces a stronger translational blockade of lin-28 than of lin-14 and conversely a more pronounced degradation of lin-14 than of lin-28 further suggests that translational repression and target mRNA degradation are not directly linked mechanisms.

**Translational repression and degradation of miRNA targets require the GW182 proteins AIN-1 and AIN-2**

Having established that miRNAs mediate both target mRNA degradation and translational repression in *vivo*, we sought to identify the factors mediating these mechanisms. Good candidates were the GW182 homologues AIN-1 and AIN-2 (Ding et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2007), as depletion of GW182 causes upregulation of miRNA target genes in various systems (Ding and Han, 2007). However, although mRNA degradation is readily prevented upon GW182 depletion, derepression of those miRNA targets that are not strongly regulated by degradation is typically well below that seen with AGO depletion (Behm-Ansmant et al., 2006; Eulalio et al., 2007), consistent with the proposal that GW182 proteins might...
enhance miRNA activity by targeting repressed mRNAs to P-bodies for degradation (Ding et al., 2005).

To determine whether depletion of the GW182 family members AIN-1 and AIN-2 permitted uncoupling of translational repression and degradation of miRNA targets, we performed polysome profile analyses on L4 stage wild-type and ain-2(RNAi); ain-1(ku322) animals and analysed various targets of multiple miRNAs: the let-7 targets daf-12 and lin-41, the lin-4 targets lin-14 and lin-28, the lsy-6 targets cog-1 (Johnston and Hobert, 2003) and hbl-1, which is targeted by mir-48, mir-84, mir-241, let-7 and lin-4 (Abrahante et al., 2003; Lin et al., 2003; Abbott et al., 2005). As predicted,
depletion of AIN-1/-2 increased lin-41 and daf-12 transcript levels (Figure 5A). However, to our surprise, translational repression of both let-7 targets was also efficiently relieved (Figure 5B and C). In fact, the relief of both modes of let-7 target repression was more extensive in ain-2; ain-1 than in let-7(n2853) mutant animals, possibly suggesting that remaining let-7 activity or distinct miRNAs, perhaps of the let-7 family, contribute to residual repression of lin-41 and daf-12 in let-7(n2853) animals. Consistent with this idea, mRNA levels of the two let-7 targets daf-12 and lin-41 are upregulated in miR-48 mir-241; mir-84 triple mutant animals (Supplementary Figure S7).

Translational repression was also alleviated for lin-14, lin-28, cog-1 and hbl-1, although the results for lin-28 and hbl-1 narrowly missed statistical significance (lin-28, P = 0.055; hbl-1, P = 0.056). We also analysed genes not known to be miRNA targets (act-1, thb-2, ama-1 and eft-2). We observed no effect on total mRNA levels and no consistent trend of translational upregulation in response to AIN-1/-2 depletion (Figure 5). Low abundance of the investigated miRNA target mRNAs in late L4 wild-type animals (see Figure 3B) prevented us from performing northern blot analysis on poly-some profile fractions. However, consistent results were obtained by RT-qPCR with multiple lin-14 primer pairs (Supplementary Figure S8) and by semiquantitative classical RT–PCR (Supplementary Figure S9) confirming our observation that translational repression of miRNA target is relieved in AIN-1/-2 depleted animals.

Taken together, these data reveal that translational control is a mechanism that is widely used by miRNAs in vivo. Equally significant, our results show that AIN-1/-2 have a general and important function in the process. Notably, although transcript levels of lin-14, lin-28 and hbl-1 increased in ain-2; ain-1 mutant relative to wild-type animals, cog-1 mRNA levels remained unchanged (Figure 5C), demonstrating that translational repression can occur independently of target mRNA degradation.

Discussion

We report here that endogenous daf-12 and lin-41 mRNAs are translationally controlled by let-7 in vivo. Polysomal shifts can even be seen in whole worm lysates, despite the fact that let-7 regulates these targets only in a subset of those tissues where they are expressed (Antebi et al, 2000; Slack et al, 2000; Johnson et al, 2003). Nonetheless, the degree of spatial and temporal co-expression of the miRNA and its targets limits the sensitivity of our assay, as demonstrated forpha-4, a third experimentally validated let-7 target (Grosshans et al, 2005). let-7 regulates pha-4 in the intestine (Grosshans et al, 2005), but not in the pharynx, where pha-4 expression is particularly strong, and where let-7 is not co-expressed (Azzaria et al, 1996; Johnson et al, 2003). Under these conditions, we can neither observe polysomal shifts (Supplementary Figure S1) nor pha-4 mRNA accumulation (data not shown) in let-7 mutant relative to wild-type animals. By contrast, the magnitude of repression of translation initiation can be well appreciated for the col-10::lacZ::lin-41 reporter mRNA, which is exclusively expressed in the seam cells where let-7 is also active.

We subsequently expanded our studies to mRNAs targeted by other miRNAs, including the lin-4 targets lin-14 and lin-28 and found that these, too, were repressed at the level of translation initiation. These findings resonate well with results from cell-free and a subset of cell culture-based assays (Eulaliaio et al, 2008a; Filipowicz et al, 2008), and extend these studies by demonstrating such function under physiological conditions. Equally important, most published evidence for translation initiation has been obtained through the use of transfected target reporter genes, the mode of repression of which appears to be susceptible to transfection conditions (Lytle et al, 2007) and promoter choice (Kong et al, 2008). To our knowledge, only a single endogenous target gene was demonstrated to be repressed by this mechanism (Bhattacharyya et al, 2006), whereas this has been ruled out for others (Olsen and Ambros, 1999; Seggerson et al, 2002; Kong et al, 2008). Our study now demonstrates that repression of translation initiation is nonetheless widespread for endogenous miRNA targets, and different miRNAs.

Our finding that lin-4 represses its targets, at least in part, at the level of translation initiation contrasts with earlier experiments that had revealed largely unchanged polysomal distributions of C. elegans lin-14 and lin-28 before (L1 stage) and after (L2 stage) the onset of expression of their cognate miRNA, lin-4 (Olsen and Ambros, 1999; Seggerson et al, 2002). The reason for this discrepancy is currently unclear, but as lin-4 mutant animals were not compared with wild-type animals in the earlier studies, it is possible that the resulting translational profiles might also have reflected developmental, lin-4-independent effects such as potential repression of lin-28 by LIN-66 (Morita and Han, 2006). We also note that at least one of the earlier publications (Olsen and Ambros, 1999) displayed a—statistically nonsignificant—trend of lin-14 shifting to the (sub-) monosomal fraction at the L2 stage, when lin-4 expression is high.

Other miRNAs, in addition to lin-4, possibly its ‘sister’ mir-237, or even let-7 (Reinhart et al, 2000; Slack et al, 2000; Esquela-Kerscher et al, 2005; Grosshans et al, 2005; Morita and Han, 2006), may also regulate lin-14 or lin-28, and contribute to the polysomal shift observed in ain-2; ain-1 mutant animals. However, although this remains to be tested for lin-28, we did not detect any change in lin-14 mRNA levels or translation in response to the let-7(n2853) mutation (data not shown). Irrespective of this possibility, our experiments using lin-4 mutant animals clearly demonstrate that this miRNA can mediate repression of translation initiation.

In most instances, we observed significant amounts of cognate mRNA degradation alongside translational repression, but the extent of degradation varied by target. Moreover, there was no clear correlation between the extent of translational repression and target mRNA degradation; for example, we observed more degradation for endogenous lin-41 than for the reporter mRNA, although less translational silencing is apparent for the endogenous transcript. Although we cannot formally rule out the possibility that this specific case reflects differences between endogenous targets and targets expressed from transgenes or that transcriptional effects mediated by the lin-41 promoter may contribute to these differences, we favour the idea that translational repression and target mRNA degradation may be independent mechanisms and that seam cells favour translational repression. This is consistent with an earlier study showing that different types of cultured cells evoke different responses to
identical target mRNA reporters, with degradation dominating in some cell lines and translational blockade in others (Schmitter et al., 2006). Indeed, the observation that cog-1 is regulated translationally, but not at the level of mRNA degradation, further supports our conclusion that mRNA degradation and translational repression are two distinct mechanisms in vivo that may, however, frequently act together on the same mRNA targets.

It is to be noted that our results cannot rule out that the two mechanisms might function sequentially in that translational repression precedes mRNA degradation (e.g. Selbach et al., 2008). Indeed, we note that repression of translation initiation by lin-4 appears more prominent for lin-28 than lin-14. As lin-14 is repressed at an earlier developmental stage than lin-28 (Olsen and Ambros, 1999; Seegerson et al., 2002), it is tempting to speculate that increased lin-14 mRNA degradation might deplete the monosomal pool of translationally repressed mRNA, effectively reducing the apparent polysomal shift. Analysis of polysome profiles at increased temporal resolution might help to address this possibility in the future.

Early reports on GW182 suggested a more auxiliary function in mRNA activity, with a greater importance in representing targets susceptible to mRNA degradation (Ding et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2005; Behm-Ansmant et al., 2006; Eulalio et al., 2007). However, as AIN-1/-2 appear rather distantly related to GW182 proteins (Behm-Ansmant et al., 2006), it was unknown whether their functions can be inferred from GW182 activity in other organisms. Moreover, recent work on Drosophila GW182 has shown that degradation-independent, possibly translational, repressive mechanisms may also crucially involve GW182 (Eulalio et al., 2008b), possibly in an mRNA- and/or target-specific manner. We find that depletion of the GW182 proteins AIN-1/-2 severely impairs both cognate mRNA degradation and translational control in vivo, for a number of different mRNA targets and miRNAs, supporting the notion that these proteins are widely used, essential effectors of miRNA activities. This conclusion is also consistent with the alg-1/2-like phenotypes observed in ain-2, ain-1 double mutant animals (Zhang et al., 2007). In view of the fact that both mRNA degradation and translational repression require AIN-1/-2, we speculate that GW182 proteins may coordinate these two activities, possibly through interaction with distinct mediators or effectors, the identities of which remain to be elucidated.

Taken together, our study provides insights into mRNA function in an animal model and establishes C. elegans let-7 as a model for the genetic dissection of miRNA-mediated repression of translation initiation, complementing available biochemical systems. The fact that translational repression in vivo may be substantial at least for a subset of targets, and possibly occur even without any degradation altogether, suggests that the identification of targets of this important miRNA will benefit greatly from recently established proteomics approaches (Baek et al., 2008; Selbach et al., 2008).

Materials and methods

C. elegans strains and RNAi

Wild-type N2, MT7662: let-7(n2853), MH2385: ain-1(ku322) and DR72: lin-4(e912) strains were provided by the CGC; CSGS: N2;ls3(goa-1::gfp), col-10;ls3)::lin-41 (Caudy et al., 2003) by R. Plasterk; VT1066: mir-48-mir-241(n751), mir-84(n4307) (Abbott et al., 2005) by V. Ambros. The HW211: let-7(n8253), gfp::lin-1::gfp, col-10;ls3)::lin-41 strain was obtained by crossing CSGS::N2;ls3 with YKMT7662. The HW390: N2;els31(nx6;tsu1006), col-10::ls3)];lin-41(ALSC-1-3) strain was generated by genomic integration of an extrachromosomal array made of pPS101 and rol-6(su1006) (Vella et al., 2004), followed by several rounds of backcrossing to N2. As ain-2(mil863); ain-1(ku322) (Zhang et al., 2007) double mutant animals grow very poorly, we exposed ain-1(ku322) animals to ain-2(RNAi), starting with L1 larvae and using a published RNAi feeding construct and protocol (Kamath et al., 2003; Grosshans et al., 2005). Enhancement of the alae defect phenotype from 21% penetrant in the ain-1(ku322) single mutant to 100% in the double mutant confirmed efficient ain-2 knockdown (n>17 each). To circumvent reduced brood size associated with the lin-4(e912) allele and obtain a sufficiently large synchronized population, lin-4(e912) animals were expanded at 20°C on lin-14(RNAi) following synchronization by hatching in M9 buffer, animals were shifted back to standard non-RNAi food (OP50) and grown to the desired stage for extract preparation. The reappearance of the lin-4(e912) phenotypes (long, egg-laying defective) on these animals excluded the possibility that lin-14(RNAi) had prolonged effects.

Polysome profile analysis

A detailed description can be found in the Supplementary data. Briefly, lysates of synchronized worms were layered on linear sucrose gradients (15–60% w/v) and centrifuged for 3 h at 39000 rpm, 4°C, using a SW-40 rotor and an Optimma L-80 XP Ultracentrifuge (Beckman Coulter). The fractions were fractionated in 12 fractions of equal volume while absorbance at 234 nm was recorded. The entire gradient was fractionated so that any pelleted material would be recovered with the last fraction. However, we typically found very little RNA in this fraction, suggesting that RNAs did not substantially occur in heavy particles or compartments under our experimental conditions. After adjusting sucrose concentration in each fraction to 30% (w/v), RNA was extracted using TRIZol (Invitrogen) and RNA integrity confirmed on ethidium bromide-stained agarose gels before proceeding to RT. RNA recovery was quantitative under these conditions reaching up to 89% of input RNA. See Results section for a discussion of control experiments confirming that RNA extracted from the lysate is representative of the composition of total cellular RNA.

RT-qPCR

RNA RT was performed using the ImProm-II™ Reverse Transcription System (Promega) with random hexamer primers, according to the manufacturer’s recommendations using equal amounts of RNA (400 or 800 ng) for each sample to avoid saturating the RT reactions in fractions with high concentrations of RNA. For polysome profile fractions, relative transcript levels quantified by qPCR (below) were subsequently corrected for the total amount of RNA extracted from each fraction and expressed as a percentage of the total amount recovered for the gradients. Identical results were obtained using oligo-(dT)15 primers and equal volumes of RNA without applying any correction, validating the method and establishing that qPCR following RT by random hexamer is unlikely to detect stable degradation fragments. This was also directly examined for lin-14 and daf-12 using distinct qPCR primer sets, which yielded comparable results to the original primers.

qPCR reactions were performed in technical duplicate using the ABIopticon™ QPCR SYBR® Green ROX Mix (Thermo Fisher Scientific), according to the manufacturer’s recommendations, on an ABI Prism 7000 Sequence Detection System coupled to ABI Prism 7000 SDS 1.0 Software (Applied Biosystems). Relative transcript levels were calculated using the 2ΔΔCT method (Livak and Schmittgen, 2000). For all primer pairs (Supplementary data), amplification efficiencies were determined to be equal or superior to 1.8. Control reactions lacking either the reverse transcriptase or template mRNA confirmed specificity of the amplification reaction.

Northern blot

RNA electrophoresis and transfer were performed as described earlier (Bagga et al., 2005). UV crosslinked membranes were hybridized using ULTRAhyb hybridization buffer (Ambion) according to the manufacturer’s recommendations with randomly radiolabelled probes generated from PCR-amplified DNA (see Supplementary data for oligonucleotide sequences). Radioactive
signals were detected and quantified using a Storage Phosphor Screen and a Typhoon 9400 with the Imagequant TL software (all GE Healthcare).

**Calculation of average number of ribosomes per mRNA**

To calculate the average number of ribosomes per mRNA, each gradient fraction was assigned an average number of ribosomes by counting the peaks of the polysome profile at 254 nm. This number was multiplied with relative amount of the mRNA detected in this specific fraction. The sum of this product over all the fractions yielded the average number of ribosomes per mRNA.

**Statistical methods**

All statistical significances were calculated using the paired one-tailed Student’s t-test. Note that the statistical significance in this stringent test not only depends on the average and standard deviation of the data sets but also on the variation of the difference between the paired values so that error bars will not fully reflect the statistical significance obtained through this test.

**Supplementary data**

Supplementary data are available at The EMBO Journal Online (http://www.embojournal.org).
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Supplementary information

Supplementary Material and Methods

Polysome profile analysis

Synchronized worms were grown at 25 °C (N2 L3 and late L4, let-7(n2853) and ain-2(tm1863);ain-1(RNAi)) or at 20 °C (N2 L2 and lin-4(e912)) and on NGM (2%) plates seeded with *E. coli* OP50. L2 (~200’000), L3 (~50’000), or late L4 (~30’000) worms, staged by vulval and gonad development, were harvested and washed three times with cold M9 supplemented with 1 mM cycloheximide and once with Lysis Buffer (see composition below) without RNasin and PTE/DOC. Worms were pelleted and frozen in liquid N$_2$. Worms resuspended in 450 μl of cold Lysis Buffer (20mM Tris pH 8.5, 140 mM KCl, 1.5 mM MgCl$_2$, 0.5 % Nonidet P40, 2% PTE (polyoxyethylene-10-tridecylether), 1% DOC (sodiumdeoxycholate monohydrate), 1mM DTT, 1mM cycloheximide, 0.4 U/μl RNasin) were crushed to a fine powder using mortar and pestle precooled with liquid N$_2$. As the powder thawed, lysates were collected and cleared by centrifugation (10 min. at 10’000 g, 4 °C).

Lysate absorbances at 260 nm were measured and equivalent amounts of material were loaded on sucrose gradients and centrifuged for 3 hours at 39’000 rpm, 4 °C, using a SW-40 rotor and an Optima™L-80 XP Ultracentrifuge (Beckman Coulter). Linear 15% to 60% (w/v) sucrose gradients were prepared from 15% (w/v) and 60% (w/v) sucrose solutions containing 20 mM Tris pH 8.5, 140 mM KCl, 1.5 mM MgCl$_2$, 1 mM DTT and 1 mM cycloheximide using a Gradient Master (Biocomp).
Gradient fractionation was performed using a Tris Pump (Teledyn ISCO), a Gradient Fractionator (BR-184-X, Brandel), and a fraction collector (FC-203B, Gilson). Absorbance profiles were recorded at 254 nm with an Econo UV monitor EM-1 (Biorad) coupled to a data acquisition device (DI-158U, DATAQ Instruments) using the WinDaq Serial Acquisition software (version 3.17). Gradients were fractionated in 12 fractions of equal volume. RNA from lysates and from each fraction was extracted with TRIzol (Invitrogen), according to the manufacturer’s recommendations. RNA aliquots were quality controlled on ethidium bromide stained agarose gels prior to RT-qPCR analysis. For EDTA treatment, cycloheximide was omitted in M9, lysis buffer and sucrose solution and 10 mM EDTA was added to the lysis buffer and sucrose solutions. Incubation of extracts with puromycin (5mM for 20 min. at 37 °C) led to collapse of the polysomes, confirming their translational competence. Unexpectedly, all mRNAs, including those not known to be regulated by miRNAs, shifted towards dense sucrose gradients under these conditions, suggesting that the ribosome-free RNAs aggregated.

**β-galactosidase assay**

CT5a, HW211 and HW390 animals were grown on DH5α bacteria that lack β-galactosidase activity. Two animals of the desired stage were transferred into 1.5 μl BGA buffer (50 mM potassium phosphate, pH 7.2, 1 mM MgCl₂) and fixed and permeabilized by addition of 15 μl ice-cold acetone. Animals were resuspended in 8 μl of CPRG staining solution (1.5 mM CPRG [chlorophenolred-β-D-galactopyranoside] in BGA buffer) and incubated for 1 h to 24 h at 37 °C. Aliquots of 2 μl were measured on a Nanodrop spectrophotometer at λ = 575 nm and corrected for absorption at λ = 700 nm. Enzyme activities remained stable over the whole period as determined by constant changes in extinction per hour and worm measured
for different time points. No difference in β-galactosidase activity was seen for transgenic animals grown at either 20 °C or 25 °C; animals lacking lacZ transgenes did not exhibit any β-galactosidase activity. Correct stages were confirmed by subsequent DAPI staining of the animals used for the assay and microscopic analysis of the gonad.

**Classical PCR and quantification**

Classical RT-PCRs were performed on cDNA prepared as mentioned in the experimental procedures section of the main text. PCRs were performed using Taq DNA polymerase (Qiagen) according to the manufacturer’s recommendations. *lin-14*, *lin-41*, and *tbb-2* mRNA level were determined using same set of primers as for RT-qPCR reactions (qPCR lin-14 F2/R2, qPCR lin-41 F/R, qPCR tbb-1 F1/R1, respectively). PCR products were resolved on SyberSafe (Invitrogen) stained agarose gels. Quantification of the PCR products was performed by densitometry analysis of agarose gel pictures using the ImageJ software (http://rsbweb.nih.gov/ij/index.html).
Oligonucleotide sequences

Oligonucleotides used in the present study. The qPCR CT5a F1 and R1 primers were used to detect the lacZ::lin-41 reporter mRNAs. The forward primer is complementary to the lacZ sequence and the reverse primer to the lin-41 3’UTR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>5’ to 3’ sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qPCR act-1 F1</td>
<td>GTTGCCCAGAGGCTATGTTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR act-1 R1</td>
<td>CAAGAGCGGTGATTTCTTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR ama-1 F1</td>
<td>GATCGAAGGGATCGAGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR ama-1 R1</td>
<td>TGGAGAAAGAATTCGATGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR daf-12 F2</td>
<td>GCATTCCCGATGAAAGAAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR daf-12 R2</td>
<td>CCTTCTGGCCCTACCAAGAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR daf-12 F3</td>
<td>TTATATCCCGGCACTCTCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR daf-12 R3</td>
<td>TGGAAACACAGGTAACGAGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR lin-41 F1</td>
<td>ACCATAGTGCTCAAACCTCTGTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR CT5a F1</td>
<td>CGGTCGCTACCCTTACCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR CT5a R1</td>
<td>CTGGGAATGTTGTGTGCTTTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR pha-4 F1</td>
<td>CATGCAAGGAGGAAGTTTTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR pha-4 R1</td>
<td>TGGAGATTTCTGCGCTTTTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR vit-1 F1</td>
<td>GAGGATCGTCTGCGCTTTTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR vit-1 R1</td>
<td>GGCTTCACATTCCTCGTCTCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR ugt-63 F1</td>
<td>AAGAGCCCTCCTGAGAGACTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR ugt-63 R1</td>
<td>TCCTTTATGAGAGGAAGCAGCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR tbb-2 F1</td>
<td>CAAATTCTGGGAGGCTACTCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR tbb-2 R1</td>
<td>CATACCTTCCGATGCTGCTTCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR eft-2 F1</td>
<td>TGTGTCTCCGAGTGCTGCTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR eft-2 R1</td>
<td>CACATGCCTGCTCCGTAAGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR hbl-1 F1</td>
<td>ACTGCCACATATGCCAAAGAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR hbl-1 R1</td>
<td>TGGATGAAACCGCTCAAGTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR cog-1 F1</td>
<td>TCCACGACTCAATGCAACTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR cog-1 R1</td>
<td>TTTGATACGGAGGGTTTCTGGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR lin-14 F1</td>
<td>TGCAAATCTTCCCTCAATCAAGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR lin-14 R1</td>
<td>TTCTGCTGGAGCCTCTTCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR lin-14 F2</td>
<td>GATCCATGCTGAGGAGATT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR lin-14 R2</td>
<td>CGATGCTGGTTTCCATGATG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR lin-28 F1</td>
<td>ATTCAGAAGCGATCGAATGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qPCR lin-28 R1</td>
<td>CACACTTTTTGCACTCGGTTTTT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Supplementary information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer Set</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NB lin-41 F1</td>
<td>CAAGACTCTTTTCGGTGCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB lin-41 R1</td>
<td>CTGCACGGCTCATCAAAGTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB act-1 F1</td>
<td>GTTGCCAAGGGCTATGTTGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB act-1 R1</td>
<td>CAAGAGCGGTGATTTCCCTTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure S1: Polysome profile distribution of endogenous let-7 target mRNAs.

(A) Typical polysome profiles from synchronized late L4 wild-type and let-7(n2853) animals in the presence of cycloheximide or EDTA, respectively. The solid line represents the separation between the (sub)monosomal and polysomal fractions. Lower panels are ethidium bromide stained agarose gels of RNA extracted from polysome profile fractions. The 26S, 18S, 5.8S and 5S rRNAs are visible. As indicated by absorbance profiles at 254 nm and rRNA distributions across fractions, cycloheximide treatment preserves polysome integrity, whereas EDTA treatment induces ribosome dissociation into 40S and 60S ribosomal subunits. Note that the absorbance profiles are those also shown in Fig. 1 (B) Distribution of the let-7 targets daf-12 and lin-41 and of the control genes ama-1 and act-1 across polysome profiles from synchronized wild-type and let-7(n2853) L3 animals treated with cycloheximide, late L4 animals treated with cycloheximide, and late L4 animals treated with EDTA. pha-4 distribution is shown for synchronized wild-type and let-7(n2853) late L4 animals only. The dotted line represents the separation between the (sub)monosomal and polysomal fractions. Panel B, except EDTA treatment, shows averages of at least three biological replicates. EDTA treatment was performed in duplicate, one representative experiment is shown. Error bars are SEM. daf-12 and act-1 data are as in Fig. 1 and included for comparison.
**Figure S2: Analysis of RNA recovery from *C. elegans* lysate and polysome profile sucrose fractions.**

(A) Synchronized L4 wild-type and *let-7(n2853)* animals were either resuspended in TRIzol or in polysome profile lysis buffer and crushed in mortar and pestle precooled with liquid nitrogen. RNA from worms resuspended in TRIzol was purified according to manufacturer’s instructions. Lysate of worms resuspended in lysis buffer was cleared by centrifugation (see material and methods). RNA from the supernatant and the pellet was extracted using TRIzol. Approximately 90% of the RNA that can be recovered from direct TRIzol extraction is found in the supernatant for both wild-type and *let-7(n2853)* animals as determined by spectrophotometric analysis. Equal amounts of each RNA samples were reverse transcribed using random hexamer and relative abundance of the two *let-7* targets *daf-12* and *lin-41* and of the two control genes *act-1* and *ama-1* was determined by qPCR. No enrichment of any mRNA can be detected in the supernatant or pellet samples as compared to total RNA.

(B) Aliquots from one whole worm lysate (corresponding to SN in (A)) were either used for direct RNA extraction or mixed with sucrose solutions to obtain the indicated volume and concentration before RNA extraction. Although the amount of RNA recovered form lysates decreases when mixed with higher volume or higher concentration of sucrose solution, the relative abundance of *let-7* targets (*daf-12* and *lin-41*) and of *act-1* is only modestly (less than two-fold) affected as determined by random hexamer-primed RT-qPCR. Nevertheless, the sucrose concentration of polysome profile fractions was adjusted to 30% (w/v) before RNA purification in order to avoid underestimating the amount of RNA present in the deep part of the gradients.
Figure S3: Puromycin treatment of C. elegans extract induces polysome dissociation.

(A) Typical polysome profiles from synchronized late L4 wild-type and let-7(n2853) animals in the presence of cycloheximide or puromycin. The solid line represents the separation between the (sub)monosomal and polysomal fractions. As indicated by absorbance profiles at 254 nm cycloheximide treatment preserves polysome integrity, whereas puromycin treatment induces polysome dissociation. Note that the absorbance profiles with cycloheximide are those also shown in Fig. 1 and S1.

(B) Distribution of the let-7 target daf-12 and of the control gene act-1 across polysome profiles from synchronized wild-type and let-7(n2853) late L4 animals treated with cycloheximide or puromycin. The dotted line represents the separation between the (sub)monosomal and polysomal fractions. Puromycin treatment collapses the elongation competent polysomes and no difference can be observed for daf-12 distribution between wild-type and let-7(n2853) animals, indicating that the differential distribution observed in cycloheximide treated samples is due to differences in ribosome load on daf-12 mRNAs. Surprisingly, all mRNAs, including mRNAs not targeted by miRNA, shift to denser fractions of the gradients under these conditions, suggesting that the ribosome-free mRNAs aggregate. For cycloheximide treatment, the averages of four biological replicates is shown and error bar are SEM, data are as in Fig. 1 and S1 and included for comparison.
Figure S4: *lin-41* 3'UTR confers *let-7* mediated regulation

Quantitative measurement of the β-galactosidase (β-gal) activity in the different col-10::lacZ::lin-41 reporter strains shows that protein production is increased for the transgene lacking the *lin-41* LCSs or in *let-7* mutant worms, resulting in a respective five- and fifteen-fold increase in young adult compared to the activity in WT worms expressing a construct containing a full length *lin-41* 3'UTR. The lower level of β-Gal activity seen with the ΔLCS construct may indicate that other regulatory sites are still present in this 3’UTR. Averages of three biological replicates are shown, error bars are SEM.
Figure S5 RT-qPCR validation

(A) *daf*-12 total mRNA levels of synchronized late L4 wild-type and *let*-7(n2853) worms were determined by RT-qPCR using two distant pairs of primers: “qPCR *daf*-12 F2/R2” which amplify a fragment in the coding region and “qPCR *daf*-12 F3/R3” which amplify a fragment in the 3’UTR. The similarity of the results obtained with both primer pairs indicates that full length mRNA only is quantified.

(B-C) Reverse transcription reactions were performed on aliquots of the same total RNA extracted from wild-type and *let*-7(n2853) late L4 synchronized worms. The relative abundance, as determined by qPCR, of two *let*-7 targets (*lin*-41 and *daf*-12) and of two control genes (*eft*-2 and *prp*-4) was found to be similar for reactions using random hexamer (B) and oligo dT primers (C). This indicates that mRNA levels determined using random hexamer represent full length mRNAs and that any effect miRNAs might have on polyA tail lengths of their targets does not prevent efficient oligo dT-primed reverse transcription.
Figure S6: Changes in total mRNA levels do not influence translation initiation.
Although vit-1 and ugt-63 are differentially expressed in wild-type and let-7(n2853) animals, these genes are equally efficiently translated in both strains. (A) Analysis of vit-1 and ugt-63 total mRNA levels in synchronized late L4 wild-type and let-7(n2853) animals by RT-qPCR. (B) Distribution of vit-1 and ugt-63 mRNAs across polysome profiles from synchronized late L4 wild-type and let-7(n2853) animals. (C) Polysomal vit-1 and ugt-63 mRNA in late L4 wild-type and let-7(n2853) animals as percentage of the total. Averages of two biological replicates are shown for each panel.
Fig. S7 Regulation of let-7 targets by let-7 sister miRNAs.
Analysis of the let-7 target daf-12 and lin-41 and of control genes act-1 and ama-1 total mRNA levels in synchronized late L4 wild-type, let-7(n2853) and miR-48 miR-241(nDf51); miR-84(n4037) animals by RT-qPCR. Both let-7 targets are also regulated by miR-48, miR-84, and miR-241 although to different extents, which may be due to different temporal and spatial co-expression pattern with daf-12 and lin-41 (n=3, error bars are SEM).
Figure S8 Comparison of two lin-14 primer pairs
lin-14 total mRNA level and distribution across polysome profile of synchronized L4 wild-type and ain-2(RNAi);ain-1(ku322) animals were tested by RT-qPCR using two different pairs of primers amplifying distant regions from the same cDNA preparation. The similarity between the results obtained with both primer pairs indicates that full length mRNAs and not stabilized degradation products are quantified. (A) Schematic representation of the region amplified by RT-qPCR. (B) Polysome profile distribution. (C) Total mRNA level. (D) Percentage of mRNA in the polysomal fractions.
Fig. S9 Comparison between RT-qPCR and RT-PCR analyses.
(A) cDNA of total RNA and of RNA from polysome profile of synchronized L4 wild-type and ain-2(RNAi);ain-1(ku322) animals was used for semi-quantitative classical PCR. Aliquots of PCR reactions were analyzed on SybrSafe stained agarose gel. Distribution of both miRNA targets lin-14 and lin-41, but not the tbb-2 control mRNA, is shifted toward the polysomal fractions in ain-2(RNAi);ain-1(ku322) animals as compared to wild-type. Note that for each mRNA, wild-type and ain-2(RNAi);ain-1(ku322) samples were loaded on the same gel and photographed under identical conditions but are represented as separate panels for better comparison. T, total RNA, -RT, negative control reaction lacking the reverse transcriptase using RNA from fraction 5. (B) Quantification of pictures shown in panel A was performed by densitometry analysis and is reported as percentage of the total. Results from RT-qPCR analysis are shown for comparison. (C) Polysomal fraction of lin-14, lin-41 and tbb-2 mRNAs in synchronized L4 wild-type and ain-2(RNAi);ain-1(ku322) animals as percentage of the total determined by RT-PCR and RT-qPCR. (D) Total levels of lin-14, lin-41 and tbb-2 mRNAs in synchronized L4 wild-type and ain-2(RNAi);ain-1(ku322) animals as fold increase in ain-2(RNAi);ain-1(ku322) animals compared to wild-type determined by RT-PCR and RT-qPCR. The overall results obtained by RT-PCR are similar to the ones obtained by RT-qPCR, confirming the validity of the latter method.
3.3. Additional results

3.3.1. Introduction

The results presented above show that *C. elegans* miRNAs repress target mRNAs by at least two mechanisms: mRNA degradation and inhibition of translation initiation, and that mutation of the GW182 homologs AIN-1 and AIN-2 is sufficient to prevent these two mechanisms. Moreover, the fact that *cog-1* repression by the *lys-6* miRNA seems to occur only at the level of translation suggests that mRNA degradation and translational control are two independent mechanisms, which often, but not always, occur concomitantly (Ding and Grosshans 2009).

Several questions remain to be addressed in order to understand in more detail how miRNAs function and what the exact interplay is between target translational repression and degradation. What are the exact molecular roles of AIN-1 and AIN-2? Do these factors physically repress target mRNAs or do they recruit additional effector proteins? What dictates the mechanism by which a target mRNA is repressed? The results presented in this section summarize preliminary experiments aimed at answering these points.
3.3.2. Results

AIN-1 specifically mediates miRNA target translational control

Because *C. elegans* miRNA targets are repressed by two different mechanisms, it is tempting to speculate that miRISC composition, which could differ in a tissue or time specific manner, might determine by which means a target is repressed. This idea is supported by the observation that, in *Drosophila* embryo lysates, Ago1- and Ago2-containing miRISCs employ different mechanisms to repress target reporters (Iwasaki et al. 2009). To test for a similar phenomenon in *C. elegans*, I analyzed the repression status of several miRNA targets in animals mutated for either *alg-1* or *alg-2*, the two *C. elegans* miRNA-specific Ago proteins, by polysome profile fractionation and RT-qPCR. Additionally, I also investigated the effects of individual *ain-1* or *ain-2* mutations on target repression. The results obtained were compared to the wild-type and *ain-2;ain-1* situations, in which full repression and, respectively, derepression occur.

In *alg-1*(gk214) or *alg-1*(RNAi) mutants, translational repression and mRNA degradation of *daf-12*, a *let-7* target, and *lin-14*, a *lin-4* target, are both prevented to a similar extent as in *ain-2*(RNAi);*ain-1*(ku322) animals. Conversely, in *alg-2*(ok304) animals, *daf-12* and *lin-14* repression is not detectably impaired (data not shown). These results suggest that ALG-1 plays a major role in mediating miRNA function, whereas ALG-2 on its own does not seem to be essential. This observation is in line with the respective phenotypes associated with these mutants: *alg-1*(gk214) display strongly penetrant phenotypes (alae defects, retarded development timing, and vulva bursting), while *alg-2*(ok304) are superficially wild-type (Grishok et al. 2001), and suggests that the Argonaute composition of the miRISC does not directly determine the nature of the repression mechanism.

In *ain-1*(ku322) single mutant, polysome profile analysis revealed that translational repression of various *let-7* and *lin-4* targets is lost to a similar extent as in *ain-2*(RNAi);*ain-1*(ku322) animals. On the other hand, translational repression of miRNA targets is as strong in *ain-2*(tm1863) as in wild-type animals (fig. 1A). Concerning target mRNA degradation, the total mRNA level of *daf-12* and *lin-14* in *ain-1*(ku322) is very close to the low level found in wild-type, while *lin-41* and *lin-28* levels are upregulated but not as much as in *ain-2;ain-1* double
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mutants. Total mRNA levels of all these targets are unchanged in *ain-2(tm1863)* (fig. 1B) as well as in the likely null *ain-2(tm2424)* mutants (data not shown) when compared to wild-type. These results indicate that miRNA target translational repression is specifically mediated by AIN-1 and that AIN-2 on its own, similarly to ALG-2, does not seem to play an essential role in any repression mechanism. Importantly this also shows that, in *ain-1* mutants and for at least a subset of targets like *daf-12* and *lin-14*, mRNA degradation still occurs even when translational repression is lost. See figure 4A for a summary of these results.

**Genetic interaction between AIN-1 and various RNA binding factors**

In order to identify factors which, like AIN-1, might be involved in one specific mode of miRNA-mediated repression, I performed a small scale genetic screen on putative candidates. I hypothesized that depletion of miRNA effector proteins should produce a detectable phenotype in the sensitized *ain-1(ku322)* background, similar to *ain-2* depletion, which induces a phenotypic response in *ain-1* mutants but not in wild-type animals. I expected to identify factors which might be specific to the target mRNA degradation mechanism, like AIN-1 is to translational repression. Various factors were screened for their phenotypic effects when depleted in *ain-1(ku322)* and wild-type animals. The factors tested include RNA binding proteins known to interact physically with AIN-2 (*pab-2, sqd-1, car-1, tsn-1, aco-1*) (Zhang et al. 2007), and factors reported to interact with the miRISC (*tsn-1, vig-1, cgh-1, nhl-2*) (Caudy et al. 2003; Hammell et al. 2009). Qualitatively, depletion of only *pab-2, cgh-1*, and *sqd-1* showed and aggravation of *ain-1(ku322)* phenotypes. This was confirmed by quantitative analysis of alae defects and vulva bursting of wild-type and *ain-1* animals subjected to the respective RNAi (fig. 2). *pab-2, cgh-1*, and *sqd-1* depletions substantially increase alae defects in *ain-1(ku322)* animals but not, or only moderately, in wild-type (fig. 2A). However depletion of none of this factor reaches the effect induced by *ain-2(RNAi)* in *ain-1* mutants. Concerning the vulva bursting phenotype, it was only slightly increased by *pab-2(RNAi)* compared to the empty vector control, while in the case of *cgh-1* and *sqd-1* it equaled the effect of *ain-2* depletion. None of these RNAi conditions induced any bursting phenotype in wild-type animals (fig. 2B). These results indicate that *pab-2, cgh-1*, and *sqd-1* might be involved in the execution of miRNA mediated repression. However, because the effects of the depletion of these factors did not equal that of *ain-2*, it seems unlikely that they play an essential role in this pathway. A view
further supported by the observation that depletion of none of these factors in ain-1 animals resulted in an upregulation of the lin-4 target lin-28, as determined by western blot (data not shown).

A more direct way to discover potential mediators of miRNA action in general, and of target translational repression in particular, is to identify factors which physically interact with AIN-1. An antiserum, which specifically recognizes AIN-1 (fig. 3A and (Zhang et al. 2007)), was used for immunoprecipitation experiments. A specific ALG-1/2 antibody (fig. 3B) was used to validate AIN-1 co-immunoprecipitation. ALG-1 and ALG-2 are both strongly enriched in the wild-type immunoprecipitate, but absent from the ain-1(ku322) sample (fig. 3C). Of the genetically identified factors mentioned above, an antibody is available only for CGH-1, which was not found to co-precipitate with AIN-1 (fig. 3C). This experiment confirms that AIN-1 strongly interacts with ALG-1 and ALG-2 and indicates that, even though CGH-1 might play a role in the miRNA pathway, it is not tightly associated with miRISCs.
3.3.3. Figures
Figure 1 miRNA target translational repression is lost in ain-1(ku322) animals

Analysis of the translational status by polysome profile fractionation (A) and of the total mRNA level by qPCR (B) of the let-7 targets daf-12 and lin-41, the lin-4 targets lin-14 and lin-28, and of the control gene act-1 in wild-type, ain-1(ku322), and ain-2(tm1863) synchronized L4 animals. Results of ain-2(RNAi);ain-1(ku322) analysis (Ding and Grosshans 2009) are included for comparison.
Figure 2 Genetic interaction between ain-1 and various RNA interacting factors
(A) Alae structure analysis in wild-type and ain-1(ku322) young adult animals in response to depletion of ain-2, pab-2, cgh-1, and sqd-1 by RNAi at 25 °C. (B) Quantification of the vulva bursting phenotype in wild-type and ain-1(ku322) animals at the L4 to adult transition in response to depletion of ain-2, pab-2, cgh-1, and sqd-1 by RNAi (n=50 for each, as the ain-1(ku322) bursting phenotype is silenced at 20 °C and above, this experiment was done at 15 °C).
Figure 3 AIN-1 immunoprecipitation
(A) Western blot analysis of AIN-1 in wild-type and ain-1(ku322) animals. (B) Western blot analysis of ALG-1 and ALG-2 in wild-type, alg-1(gk214), and alg-2(ok304) animals. (C) Immunoprecipitation of AIN-1 in wild-type and ain-1(ku322) animals. AIN-1 physically interacts with ALG-1 and ALG-2 but not with CGH-1.
Figure 4 miRISC components role in miRNA mediated repression

(A) Effects of miRISC core factor mutations on specific repression mechanisms.

(B) Model of AIN-1 and AIN-2 role. Translational repression of miRNA targets is mediated by AIN-1, either directly or indirectly. Both AIN-1 and AIN-2 can apparently mediate miRNA target degradation. For some miRNA targets (daf-12 and lin-14), mRNA degradation can still occur in the absence of translational repression suggesting that these two mechanisms might be independent pathways. Genetic data suggests that SQD-1, PAB-2, and CGH-1 might play an accessory role in the miRNA pathway. ALG-1, but apparently not ALG-2, is essential for both mechanisms.
3.3.4. Material and methods

C. elegans strains and RNAi

Wild-type N2, MH2385: ain-1(ku322), VC446: alg-1(gk214), and RB574: alg-2(ok304) were provided by the Caenorhabditis Genetics Center, which is funded by the NIH National Center for Research Resources, ain-2(tm1863) and ain-2(tm2424) by S. Mitani (National Bioresource Project, Japan), and let-7(mg279) (Reinhart et al. 2000) by F. Slack. RNAi was performed on synchronized population starting with L1 larvae and using a published RNAi feeding construct and protocol (Kamath et al. 2003; Grosshans et al. 2005).

Polysome profile analysis and RT-qPCR

Polysome profile and total mRNA level analysis by RT-qPCR were performed using synchronized late L4 animals grown at 25 ºC as described in (Ding and Grosshans 2009).

Western blot and immunoprecipitation

Protein lysates were prepared by crushing worm pellet resuspended in one volume of lysis buffer (20mM HEPES, 10% Glycerol, 0.1% Triton X-100, 0.42 M NaCl, 1.5mM MgCl₂, 1 mM DTT, 1mM PMSF, complemented with EDTA-free protease inhibitor cocktail tablet (Roche Applied Science)) in mortar pre-cooled with liquid nitrogen. Lysates were cleared by centrifugation at 4 ºC for 10 min. at 10’000 RCF. 30µg of protein samples were loaded on NuPAGE 4%–12% Bis-Tris gels (Invitrogen) and transferred to Immun-Blot PVDF Membranes (Bio-Rad). AIN-1, ALG-1/2, CGH-1, and ACT-1 immunodetections were performed according standard protocols using AIN-1 antiserum (dilution 1/10’000, a gift from M. Han), anti-ALG-1/2 antibody (1/1’000 dilution, a gift from C. Mello), anti-CGH-1 antibody (1/2’000 dilution, a gift from K. Blackwell), and anti-Actin antibody (1/1’000 dilution, MAB1501, Chemicon International).

Immunoprecipitation was done with the Immunoprecipitation Kit (Protein G) (11719386001, Roche Applied Science) according to the manufacturer’s recommendation. 700 µg of protein from ain-1(ku322) or wild-type lysates were used for immunoprecipitation with 2 µl of AIN-1 antiserum.
3.3.5. Discussion

Analysis of *alg-1* and *alg-2* mutants shows that these two factors do not have the same apparent importance in the execution of miRNA mediated repression. Both repression mechanisms are impaired in *alg-1* mutants, but none are in *alg-2* animals (fig. 4A). These two genes were thought to carry redundant functions because of their high homology (80% and 88% identical at the nucleotide and protein level, respectively (Grishok et al. 2001; Tops et al. 2006)) and the fact that they are synthetic lethal. However *in vivo* and *in vitro* data suggest that ALG-1 and ALG-2 perform non overlapping functions. For example there is no overlap in genes causing synthetic lethality in *alg-1* and *alg-2* respectively (Tops et al. 2006). ALG-1 and ALG-2 are ubiquitously expressed from early embryogenesis to adulthood and seem to associate with the same set of miRNAs, but to reside in complexes of different masses, as determined by size-fractionation (Tops et al. 2006). One possible explanation for ALG-1 and ALG-2 functional differences could therefore be that a mediator of miRNA function associate with ALG-1-, but not ALG-2-containing miRISCs. Indeed ALG-1 is found in a single complex larger than 650 kDa, whereas ALG-2 is present in two smaller complexes of about 250 and 500 kDa (Tops et al. 2006). Nevertheless, the identity of this hypothetical factor has yet to be determined. Although both ALG-1 and ALG-2 bind mature miRNAs and are core components of the miRISC, it was proposed that ALG-2 might function essentially by promoting pre-miRNA processing and facilitating the loading of mature miRNA on ALG-1, which would in turn mediate target repression (Tops et al. 2006). This model fits the data presented here. Target repression is lost in *alg-1* mutants, but, because pre-miRNA processing does not absolutely require ALG-2, miRNA mediated repression can still occur in *alg-2* mutants. Nevertheless, the fact that *alg-1*(gk214) is a null mutant (fig. 3B) and synthetic lethal with *alg-2* mutation indicates that these genes are likely to share additional partially overlapping functions.

Similarly to ALG-1 and ALG-2, AIN-1 and AIN-2 were postulated to have a redundant function (Zhang et al. 2007). This is based on partial homology between AIN-1 and AIN-2 and the observation that *ain-1* mutants display only weakly penetrant phenotypes, and that *ain-2* mutants look superficially wild-type, but that *ain-2;ain-1* double mutants show strong defects reminiscent of the phenotypes observed in worms deficient for miRNA function, such as delayed developmental timing, seam cells proliferation defects, and vulva bursting at the adult
transition (Zhang et al. 2007). For this reason, my initial experiments addressing the role of AIN proteins in the miRNA pathway were done using $ain-2(RNAi);ain-1(ku322)$ double mutant worms (Ding and Grosshans 2009). Here I show that individual loss of AIN-1 or AIN-2 does not have the same effect on miRNA target repression, indicating that these factors are not completely redundant. $ain-1$ mutation prevents target translational repression but not, or only moderately, target mRNA degradation. On the other hand, both repression mechanisms are fully functional in $ain-2$ animals. These observations correlate well with the phenotype of the respective mutants: $ain-2(tm1863)$ and $ain-2(tm2424)$ are superficially wild-type and $ain-1$ ($ku322$) animals show mild defects in terms of alae structure, developmental timing, and bursting through the vulva (Fig. 2 and (Ding et al. 2005; Zhang et al. 2007)), which most likely result from loss of miRNA target translational repression. These phenotypes are more penetrant in $ain-2;ain-1$ double mutants, possibly because both miRNA target repression mechanisms are prevented in this background (Ding and Grosshans 2009). The observation that the two mechanisms by which miRNA repress target genes can be uncoupled suggests that they represent distinct pathways (fig. 4B). If this conclusion could be further experimentally validated, it would answer a long standing question: miRNA target degradation does not require prior translational repression to occur. This possibility is supported by recent findings showing that, upon nutrient deprivation, $lin-14$ mRNA degradation, but not protein downregulation, by $lin-4$ is prevented, showing, here as well, that miRNA-mediated repression is enforced by pathways which can be uncoupled (Holtz and Pasquinelli 2009). Moreover, experiments in yeast showed that mRNA degradation can be initiated on actively translated mRNAs (Hu et al. 2009), further supporting the idea that target mRNA do not necessarily need to be translationally silent to be degraded.

Although, similarly to ALG-1 and ALG-2, AIN-1 and AIN-2 are core components of the miRNA pathway, it seems that these factors function exclusively downstream of the mature miRNA production, as no accumulation of pre-miRNA or decrease of mature miRNA can be observed in $ain-2;ain-1$ double mutants (Zhang et al. 2007). The fact that target degradation is prevented only in $ain-2;ain-1$ double mutants shows that expression of AIN-1 or AIN-2 is sufficient to mediate this function, or recruit a mediator thereof. On the other hand, AIN-1 is required miRNA target translational repression. It is possible that AIN-1 serves as a platform to recruit an inhibitor of translation initiation, which would not be able to bind AIN-2. It is also
possible that AIN-1 directly inhibits miRNA target translation. One way to test this possibility would be to attempt to rescue *ain-1(ku322)* animals using transgenes coding for various portions of AIN-1. If a minimal *ain-1* rescuing fragment can be identified, one could compare, by immunoprecipitation coupled to mass spectrometry, if the rescuing and non-rescuing fragments interact with the same set of factors. If this is the case, it would suggest that the concerned part of AIN-1 might be directly involved in translation repression, if not, this could reveal the identity of the factor mediating this activity.

There are several possible reasons to explain the functional differences between AIN-1 and AIN-2. First, as discussed above, they might recruit different downstream effectors, which, considering the relative low homology between AIN-1 and AIN-2 (Zhang et al. 2007), would not be so surprising. Second, they might be expressed in a different subset of tissues. Although a *gfp::ain-2* transgene was reported to be expressed ubiquitously (Zhang et al. 2007), the expression pattern of AIN-1 is not so clearly documented. L. Ding and colleagues, based on an *ain-1::gfp* translational reporter, reported that AIN-1 is expressed in “a variety of tissue types, including vulval precursor cells and multiple neurons” (Ding et al. 2005). Therefore it is not clear whether AIN-1 is ubiquitously expressed or not. Third, AIN-1 and AIN-2, as determined by *gfp* reporter transgenes, do not have the same subcellular localization: AIN-2 is diffuse in the cytoplasm (Zhang et al. 2007), whereas AIN-1 localizes in DCP-2-containing punctuate structures corresponding to P-bodies (Ding et al. 2005). However, it is not known if this difference in localization is a cause or a consequence of AIN-1 and AIN-2 functional differences. Additional experiments might help to tell apart these possibilities. For example, if a transgene expressing AIN-2 under the *ain-1* promoter can rescue *ain-1* mutants, this would indicate that AIN-1/2 functional differences are likely due to different expression patterns. Finally, it is also possible that the modality by which a miRNA target is repressed depends on its 3’UTR architecture, such as for example the presence of binding sites for additional regulatory factors. Therefore, additional miRNA targets should be analyzed to confirm that the observations made so far are specifically due to miRISC factor mutations and not the identity of the targets investigated.

Genetic data indicate that *pab-2, cgh-1, and sqd-1* might play a role in miRNA mediated repression. *pab-2* encodes the closest *C. elegans* homolog of the human cytoplasmic poly(A)-
binding protein (PABP) (Rhoads et al. 2006) and is likely to be involved in the general translation machinery. It is possible that the ain-1 phenotype enhancement upon pab-2 depletion results from general translation defects rather than a miRNA specific effect. The fact that pab-2 RNAi did not enhance the weak vulva bursting phenotype of let-7(mg279) animals (data not shown), contrary to other factors involved in miRNA function (Parry et al. 2007), supports this idea. On the other hand, although pab-2(RNAi) failed to upregulate LIN-28 protein level in ain-1, it did so in wild-type animals (data not shown). This could be indicative of a partial overlap between AIN-1 and PAB-2 functions. Moreover, it was recently reported that, in mouse cell extract, GW182 interacts with PABP to promote miRNA target deadenylation (Fabian et al. 2009). A similar interaction could occur between AIN-1/2 and PAB-2, but this has still to be demonstrated.

CGH-1 is a conserved putative RNA helicase found in various RNA-protein granules, including P-bodies, and has been implicated in mRNA stability control and translational repression (reviewed in (Rajyaguru and Parker 2009)). This factor has recently been proposed to function together with the TRIM-NHL protein NHL-2 to modulate miRISC activity (Hammell et al. 2009). Enhancement of ain-1 phenotypes upon depletion of cgh-1 is in line with this idea, but the absence of effect upon nhl-2 depletion is not. However this might be due to incomplete nhl-2 depletion, as nhl-2(ok818);ain-1(ku322) animals have been reported to show enhanced alae defects compared to ain-1(ku322) (Hammell et al. 2009). Immunoprecipitation of CGH-1 coprecipitates miRISC components such ALG-1, ALG-2, and AIN-1 (Hammell et al. 2009), however the AIN-1 immunoprecipitation experiment presented here failed to pull down CGH-1. This could be due to the fact that CGH-1 interaction with AIN-1 is mainly RNA dependent or that this interaction is weak by nature. In any cases, NHL-2 and CGH-1 seem to play only accessory roles in the miRNA pathway, as none is absolutely required for miRNA mediated repression.

The third factor identified, SQD-1, is homologous to the Drosophila RNA binding protein Squid. C. elegans SQD-1 is poorly defined, but Squid has been shown to directly mediate subcellular localization of several mRNAs in Drosophila oocytes (Lall et al. 1999). It is therefore possible that SQD-1 might play a role in the relocalization of repressed miRNA targets, but
additional experiments are needed to substantiate this idea. Again, as far as partial depletion by RNAi allows to tell, *sqd-1* does not seem to be essential for miRNA function.

A comprehensive identification of factors physically interacting with AIN-1 and AIN-2 would help to better understand their molecular functions. Immunoprecipitation of endogenous AIN-1 works efficiently, as determined by the co-immunoprecipitation of ALG-1 and ALG-2. Coupled to mass spectrometry analysis, this approach would allow to determine if AIN-1 binds additional proteins or if it interacts only with DCR-1, ALG-1, and ALG-2, as published earlier (Ding et al. 2005; Zhang et al. 2007). A similar approach could be applied to AIN-2, either by using a tagged *ain-2* transgene or by raising an AIN-2 specific antibody. However, for this factor, a list of 39 interacting proteins has already been published (Zhang et al. 2007). Therefore, it may be more fruitful to extend the small-scale genetic screen presented here to all these factors, by using *ain-1* or *alg-1* sensitized backgrounds and looking for specific enhancement of phenotypic defects. This would allow to determine if any of these factors is directly relevant to miRNA functions.

In summary, the additional data presented here show that *ain-1* and *ain-2* are not functionally redundant and that translational repression of miRNA targets is likely to be mechanistically independent of the degradation mechanism. As discussed above, further experiments are needed to firmly confirm these conclusions and understand in more details the functional role of AIN-1 and AIN-2. This is an important research aim, as it may offer us a more comprehensive view of miRNA biology, possibly relevant for new therapeutic approaches to miRNA related diseases (reviewed in (Brown and Naldini 2009)).
4. Conclusion

This study aimed at better understanding the \textit{in vivo} mechanisms of miRNA-mediated repression. The use of \textit{C. elegans} as a model organism allowed to circumvent the potential artifacts associated with \textit{in vitro} or \textit{ex vivo} systems and to study directly the action of endogenous miRNAs acting on endogenous targets in a physiologically relevant context. I postulated that that \textit{C. elegans} miRNAs function \textit{in vivo}, and at least partially, by inhibiting the initiation of translation on target mRNAs. The results presented here make this thesis the most plausible explanation for the biological phenomena observed, which is as close to the truth as one can be.

It is satisfying to achieve the validation of this thesis, as sanctioned by international peer-reviewed publications. It represents for me the successful management of a project on the long term and the resolution of numerous technical and intellectual challenges. It answers a few questions, but most importantly open new ones, concerning for example the modalities of the mechanism uncovered. I can only hope that this work will challenge or inspire others to attempt to answer them, which will hopefully in turn bring new interrogations, as questioning is the essence of scientific reasoning.
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