

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

T-DNA promoter tagging in *Nicotiana tabacum*

A thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Philosophy in Genetics at Massey University,
Palmerston North, New Zealand

Donald Haldane Kerr

1997

Abstract

Plant development is primarily controlled at the level of gene expression. In order to analyse this regulation it is necessary to isolate genes which are involved in organ development through cellular and tissue determination or which respond to environmental signals. Promoter tagging was chosen in order to identify genes potentially associated with plant development by their spatial and temporal pattern of expression. The introduction of a promoterless reporter gene tag allows the expression patterns of plant genes to be readily characterised.

A new series of promoter tagging vectors were constructed from the plasmid pPCV604 (Koncz, 1989). The selectable kanamycin resistance marker gene from pBin6 (Bevan, 1984) was cloned into pPCV604 to create pGT. The hygromycin phosphotransferase gene in pGT was then replaced with a promoterless β -glucuronidase (*gus*) gene coupled with octopine synthase termination sequence subcloned from pKiwi101a (Janssen and Gardner, 1989) creating pGTG. This binary transformation vector required the helper pRK replication functions of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* strain GV3101. In order to bypass this restriction, the vector sequence of pBin19 was combined with the T-DNA of pGTG to create pBin19-GTG. The latter plasmid was found to have a higher *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*-mediated *Nicotiana tabacum* transformation efficiency in strain LBA4404 than pGTG in strain GV3101.

In both the pGTG and pBin19-GTG promoter tagging vectors the promoterless *gus* gene has an initiation codon 62 base pairs inside the T-DNA. This sequence includes translation termination codons in all three reading frames. Therefore, insertion of the T-DNA into a plant gene could lead to activation of the *gus* gene, under the control of the plant gene promoter, via transcriptional fusion.

Nicotiana tabacum leaf segments were transformed with pGTG or pBin19-GTG and transgenic plants selected on kanamycin. A population of 87 transgenic tobacco plants were fluorometrically screened for GUS activity in leaf and root material; 37% were found to contain GUS activity, indicating a high frequency of promoter tagging.

Two transgenic plants with root specific *gus* expression were analysed histochemically.

Progeny after self-fertilisation lacked GUS activity, though this was restored in progeny of one plant with 5-azacytidine treatment, suggesting involvement of methylation in the gene silencing. Southern hybridisation, inverse PCR cloning of T-DNA flanking sequences and segregation on kanamycin indicated the presence of multiple T-DNA copies within the primary transformants. Furthermore, inverse PCR sequence from one plant indicated multiple and truncated T-DNA insertions at one or more loci.

A further population of transformed plants was generated with pBin19-GTG and histochemically screened for GUS activity in roots (14 positive from 147 tested), shoots (27 positive from 147) and floral organs (14 positive from 56). Overall, combining results from all plant organs tested, an average of 33% of plants were found with GUS activity in one or more organs. A diverse range of patterns of *gus* expression were observed and described including patterns involving root branching.

Forty four plants from this population were analysed for T-DNA copy number via Southern hybridisation with a *gus* probe (right border junction T-DNA) and *nptII* probe (central T-DNA). Multiple copies were frequently found with an average of 3.3 T-DNA copies per transgenic plant. Overall, an average of 11% of T-DNA insertions were found to be involved in *gus* activation.

Comparison of the fluorometric (37% positive, 87 plants tested) and histochemical (22% positive, 147 plants tested) screens for GUS activity in root and shoot material was discussed and it is suggested that further care is needed in assigning promoter tagging hits from fluorometric screening.

Variable expression was observed with promoter tagged genes. It is suggested that further research is required to determine whether this variation was due to silencing, perhaps by methylation, or was a result of the tagged promoters' normal expression patterns.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr Derek White, Professor Barry Scott and latterly Professor Paula Jameson, for their patience and advice during this research study.

I am grateful to Dr Csaba Koncz for the plasmid pPCV604 which made this study possible and also for sharing unpublished results.

I acknowledge with thanks the receipt of essential personal funding from a Massey University Scholarship, a University Grants Committee Scholarship, the William Georgetti Trust, Grasslands DSIR and finally an Assistant Lectureship within the Plant Biology and Biotechnology Department.

I have been privileged to study within the Plant Molecular Genetics Laboratory at AgResearch Palmerston North (formerly Grasslands DSIR) and would like to thank the scientists, technicians and fellow students there for their support, both scientific and personal.

I am also grateful to the staff and students within Scott Base (Molecular Genetics Unit) and in the Plant Biology and Biotechnology Department for occasional assistance, advice and use of equipment, especially Lynnaire Oswald for assistance with tissue culture and glasshouse work in the last eighteen months.

Thanks also to my friends and family who have supported me, especially my parents Joan and Barry Kerr and friends from the congregation of All Saints' Church, Palmerston North.

I wish to credit Peter Spring, formerly of DSIR Science Centre Palmerston North, for the photographs in Figures 16, 17, 18 **A**, **B** and **G**, 19, 20 **A** and 22 and Lynnaire Oswald, Plant Biology and Biotechnology Department, for the majority of the photographs in Figure 31.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Figures	ix
List of Tables	xi
Abbreviations	xii
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Gene regulation	1
1.2 Gene cloning	2
1.3 Gene tagging	3
1.4 Transposon tagging	4
1.5 T-DNA gene tagging	6
1.6 Promoter tagging	7
1.7 Enhancements of gene tagging	9
1.8 <i>Agrobacterium</i> -mediated transformation	11
1.9 Aims	13
1.10 Promoter tagging vector	13
2.0 Methods and materials	17
2.1 Bacterial work	17
2.1.1 Bacterial media	17
2.1.2 Bacterial strains and DNA vectors	17
2.1.3 Bacterial strain maintenance	17
2.1.4 Antibiotics	20
2.1.5 Plasmid transfer into <i>Agrobacterium</i>	20
2.1.6 Preparation of CaCl ₂ competent cells	20
2.1.7 Preparation of electrocompetent cells	21
2.2 Laboratory precautions	21
2.2.1 Government regulations	21
2.2.2 Sterilisation	21

2.2.3 DNA precautions	22
2.2.4 Laminar flow hood use	22
2.2.5 Water quality	22
2.3 DNA manipulation	22
2.3.1 Preparation of DNase free RNase	22
2.3.2 Plasmid DNA extraction method one	22
2.3.3 Plasmid DNA extraction method two	23
2.3.4 Rapid plasmid size determination	23
2.3.5 DNA purification by phenol extraction	24
2.3.6 Ethanol precipitation	24
2.3.7 Restriction endonuclease digestion	24
2.3.8 Alkaline phosphatase treatment of DNA	25
2.3.9 DNA ligation	25
2.3.10 DNA transformation into CaCl ₂ competent bacterial cells	25
2.3.11 Electroporation	26
2.3.12 Agarose gel electrophoresis	26
2.3.13 Elution of DNA fragments from agarose	27
2.3.14 DNA quantification	28
2.3.15 DNA sequencing	28
2.4 Tobacco growth	29
2.4.1 Tissue culture growth room	29
2.4.2 Tissue culture media	29
2.4.3 Tobacco genotypes	30
2.4.4 Seed sterilisation	30
2.4.5 <i>Agrobacterium</i> -mediated tobacco transformation and regeneration	30
2.4.6 Glasshouse tobacco growth	31
2.4.7 Analysis of progeny	31
2.5 Analysis of β -glucuronidase activity	32
2.5.1 Standard histochemical assay	32
2.5.2 Floral histochemical assay	32
2.5.3 Enzyme extraction for fluorometric assay	33
2.5.4 Microtitre plate fluorometric assay	33
2.5.5 Standard fluorometric assay	33
2.6 Southern blotting and hybridisation	34
2.6.1 Tobacco DNA extraction	34
2.6.2 Southern blotting	34
2.6.3 Labelling probe	35
2.6.4 Hybridisation	35
2.6.5 Stripping	36
2.7 Rescue of flanking plant genomic sequence	36
2.7.1 Polymerase chain reaction	36
2.7.2 PCR primers	37
2.7.3 Inverse PCR	40
2.7.4 Plasmid rescue	40

2.7.5 Single sided ligation mediated PCR	41
2.7.6 Analysis of DNA sequence	42
3.0 Results I	43
3.1 Promoter tagging vector construction	43
3.1.1 Construction of pGT	43
3.1.2 Construction of pGTG	59
3.1.3 Construction of pBin19-GTG	66
3.2 Comparison of tobacco transformation with pGTG and pBin19-GTG	69
3.3 Fluorometric screening for GUS activity	71
3.4 GUS activity in plants E1 and 118	75
3.4.1 Fluorometric assay	75
3.4.2 Histochemical staining	76
3.5 Analysis of progeny	82
3.5.1 GUS expression	82
3.5.2 Azacytidine treatment	83
3.5.3 Kanamycin resistance	89
3.6 Southern hybridisation	93
3.7 Cloning of plant genomic sequence flanking the T-DNA	95
3.7.1 Inverse PCR	95
3.7.2 Analysis of flanking sequence	102
3.7.3 Plasmid rescue	105
3.7.4 Single sided ligation mediated PCR	109
3.8 Rationale for further experiments	113
4.0 Results II	114
4.1 Histochemical screening of tissue culture roots and shoots	114
4.2 Individual patterns of gene expression revealed by promoter tagging	114
4.3 Histochemical staining of floral material	128
4.4 Determination of T-DNA copy number by Southern hybridisation	140
4.5 Overview of promoter tagging information	149
5.0 Discussion	150
5.1 T-DNA promoter tagging vectors	150
5.2 Cloning of plant genomic sequence flanking T-DNA insertions	153

5.3 T-DNA copy number	157
5.4 Frequency of promoter tagging events	160
5.5 Patterns of tagged gene expression	162
5.6 Promoter tagging compared with T-DNA mutagenesis	164
5.7 Silencing and methylation	166
6.0 Summary and conclusions	169
7.0 References	172
8.0 Appendix	185
8.1 Plasmids	185
8.1.1 Physical map of pBin6	185
8.1.2 Physical map of pUC8	186
8.1.3 Physical map of pBin19	187
8.2 Southern hybridisations	188

List of Figures

Figure 1. Physical map of pPCV604.	15
Figure 2. Primer sites within the T-DNA region of pGTG and pBin19-GTG.	39
Figure 3. Overview of pBin19-GTG plasmid construction.	44
Figure 4. Restriction endonuclease digestion of pBin6.	46
Figure 5. Physical map of pNNPT.	49
Figure 6. Partial digestion of pPCV604 with <i>EcoRI</i>	50
Figure 7. Potential outcome of cloning during construction of pGT.	52
Figure 8. Ligation reactions and controls for construction of pGT.	55
Figure 9. Screening of putative pGT clones with <i>EcoRI</i>	57
Figure 10. Physical map of pGT.	58
Figure 11. Physical map of pUCK1.	60
Figure 12. Physical map of pUCK2.	61
Figure 13. Physical map of pGTG.	64
Figure 14. DNA sequence determined across the T-DNA right border of pGTG.	65
Figure 15. Physical map of pBin19-GTG.	67
Figure 16. Comparison of <i>Nicotiana</i> transformation by GV3101 with pGTG and LBA4404 with pBin19-GTG.	72
Figure 17. Microtitre plate screening for fluorometric GUS activity.	74
Figure 18. GUS activity in plants 118 and E1.	77
Figure 19. GUS activity in seedlings of plant E4.	84
Figure 20. Localisation of GUS activity in a seedling of plant E4.	85
Figure 21. GUS activity of 118 seedlings grown on 5-azacytidine.	87
Figure 22. Screening for kanamycin resistance.	90
Figure 23. Autoradiograph of Southern hybridisation of genomic DNA from plants E1 and 118.	94
Figure 24. Inverse PCR trial on pGTG.	96
Figure 25. Inverse PCR products following <i>HindIII</i> , <i>EcoRI</i> and <i>PstI</i> digestion of DNA from plants E1 and 118.	98
Figure 26. Inverse PCR products from plants E1 and 118 digested with <i>EcoRI</i> and <i>BamHI</i>	101

Figure 27. DNA sequence from inverse PCR cloning isolates.	103
Figure 28. Comparison of restriction maps of pGTG T-DNA left border region and plasmid rescue clone pDK6.	108
Figure 29. Single sided ligation mediated PCR trial on plasmid DNA.	110
Figure 30. Single sided ligation mediated PCR from plant genomic DNA. . .	112
Figure 31. Histochemical GUS detection in diverse organs of transgenic tobacco.	120
Figure 32. Trial of GUS histochemical detection within floral organs.	129
Figure 33. Effect of ferricyanide/ferrocyanide catalyst on GUS histochemical staining in floral organs.	132
Figure 34. Trial of XGluc staining of floral organs from untransformed plants.	135
Figure 35. GUS activity in floral organs.	138
Figure 36. Physical map of the T-DNA of pBin19-GTG.	141
Figure 37. Gel and Southern hybridisation of plant genomic DNA from T- DNA tagged plants.	142
Figure 38. Frequency of <i>gus</i> hybridising bands after Southern hybridisation of A and W series transgenic plants.	148

List of Tables

Table 1. Bacterial strains and DNA vectors.	18
Table 2. Oligonucleotide primers.	38
Table 3. Fragment sizes of pBin6 as determined from Figure 4.	47
Table 4. Transformation of S17-1 after DNA ligation to create pGT.	56
Table 5. Restriction mapping of pGTG.	63
Table 6. Restriction mapping of pBin19-GTG.	68
Table 7. Comparison of tobacco regeneration with different <i>A. tumefaciens</i> strain and binary vector combinations.	70
Table 8. Kanamycin sensitivity of transgenic progeny.	92
Table 9. Histochemical screening for GUS activity of transgenic <i>Nicotiana</i> <i>tabacum</i>	115
Table 10. Distribution of GUS staining in plant organs.	116
Table 11. Number of significant hybridising fragments from Southern hybridisation of plant genomic DNA from Figure 37.	145

Abbreviations

AB	<i>Agrobacterium</i> minimal media, Section 2.1.1
Ap	ampicillin
CTAB	hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide
EDTA	ethylene diamine tetra acetic acid, sodium salt unless specified
Gm	gentamycin
<i>gus</i>	β -glucuronidase gene
GUS	β -glucuronidase enzyme
<i>hpt</i>	hygromycin B phosphotransferase
kb	kilobase pairs
Km	kanamycin
LB	left border of T-DNA, a 25 base pair conserved sequence
LB	Luria Bertani bacterial media, Section 2.1.1
MS	Murashige and Skoog plant media, Section 2.4.2
MU	methyl umbelliferone
MUG	methyl umbelliferone glucuronide
Nic	<i>Nicotiana</i> media, Section 2.4.2
<i>nos</i>	nopaline synthase gene from <i>Agrobacterium tumefaciens</i> T-DNA
<i>npt</i>	neomycin phosphotransferase gene, conferring kanamycin resistance
<i>ocs</i>	octopine synthase gene from <i>Agrobacterium tumefaciens</i> T-DNA
P _{35S}	promoter region of the 35S cauliflower mosaic virus transcription unit
PCR	polymerase chain reaction
P _{mas}	promoter region of <i>mas</i> gene
P _{nos}	promoter region of <i>nos</i> gene
RB	right border of T-DNA, a 25 base pair conserved sequence
Rf	rifampicin
Ri	root inducing, referring to <i>Agrobacterium rhizogenes</i> plasmid
rpm	revolutions per minute
SOB	bacterial media, Section 2.1.1
SOC	bacterial media, Section 2.1.1
SDS	sodium dodecyl sulphate
SSC	saline sodium citrate (20xSSC: 3 M NaCl, 0.3 M trisodium citrate)

SUDS	an agarose gel loading buffer also containing detergent suitable for halting restriction endonuclease enzyme activity, Section 2.3.12
Tc	tetracycline
T-DNA	transferred DNA, essentially the section of DNA bounded by left and right border sequences that is inserted into the plant genome by <i>Agrobacterium</i>
TE	buffer, 10 mM Tris-HCl, 1 mM EDTA, pH 8.0
Ti	tumour inducing, referring to <i>Agrobacterium tumefaciens</i> plasmid
Tp	trimethoprim
TY	Tryptone and yeast extract bacterial media, Section 2.1.1
<i>vir</i>	virulence genes on <i>Agrobacterium</i> Ti plasmid
XGal	5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl β -D-galactoside
XGluc	5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl β -D-glucuronide (cyclohexylammonium salt)

Other standard abbreviations are as used by Biochemical Journal (1992)