Signaling Pathways Crucial for Craniofacial Development Revealed by Endothelin-A Receptor-Deficient Mice
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Most of the bone and cartilage in the craniofacial region is derived from cephalic neural crest cells, which undergo three primary developmental events: migration from the rhombomeric neuroectoderm to the pharyngeal arches, proliferation as the ectomesenchyme within the arches, and differentiation into terminal structures. Interactions between the ectomesenchymal cells and surrounding cells are required in these processes, in which defects can lead to craniofacial malformation. We have previously shown that the G-protein-coupled endothelin-A receptor (ETA) is expressed in the neural crest-derived ectomesenchyme, whereas the cognate ligand for ETA, endothelin-1 (ET-1), is expressed in arch epithelium and the paraxial mesoderm-derived arch core; absence of either ETA or ET-1 results in numerous craniofacial defects. In this study we have attempted to define the point at which cephalic neural crest development is disrupted in ETA-deficient embryos. We find that, while neural crest cell migration in the head of ETA-/- embryos appears normal, expression of a number of transcription factors in the arch ectomesenchymal cells is either absent or significantly reduced. These ETA-dependent factors include the transcription factors goosecoid, Dlx-2, Dlx-3, dHAND, eHAND, and Barx1, but not MHox, Hoxa-2, CRABP1, or Ufd1. In addition, the size of the arches in E10.5 to E11.5 ETA-/- embryos is smaller and an increase in ectomesenchymal apoptosis is observed. Thus, ETA signaling in ectomesenchymal cells appears to coordinate specific aspects of arch development by inducing expression of transcription factors in the postmigratory ectomesenchyme. Absence of these signals results in retarded arch growth, defects in proper differentiation, and, in some mesenchymal cells, apoptosis. In particular, this developmental pathway appears distinct from the pathway that includes UFD1L, implicated as a causative gene in CATCH 22 patients, and suggests parallel complementary pathways mediating craniofacial development.
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INTRODUCTION

The pharyngeal arches are unique transient structures that give rise to much of the head and neck skeleton (Noden, 1988). They are populated early in development by cephalic neural crest cells originating from the posterior midbrain–hindbrain region in a precise rostral–caudal pattern. (Kontges and Lumsden, 1996; Lumsden et al., 1991; Serbedzija et al., 1992). During migration, these cells undergo an epithelial to mesenchymal transition (Le Douarin, 1982). These ectomesenchymal cells interact with epithelial and mesodermal cell populations within the arches, leading to the formation of craniofacial bones, cartilages, and connective tissues (Kontges and Lumsden, 1996; Le Douarin, 1982; Noden, 1988). Proper spatiotemporal expression of transcription factors plays a crucial role in these processes, both in guiding neural crest cells during their migration and in orchestrating their subsequent differentiation (Francis-West et al., 1998).
We have recently demonstrated that components of the endothelin (ET) pathway are also involved in cephalic neural crest cell development. One of the two known G-protein-coupled endothelin receptors, ET₂, is expressed in the cephalic neural crest-derived ectomesenchyme of the pharyngeal arches (Clouthier et al., 1998), while its primary ligand, endothelin-1 (ET-1), is expressed in the arch ectodermal epithelium, pharyngeal pouch endoderm, and arch core paraxial mesoderm (Clouthier et al., 1998; Maemura et al., 1996). Endothelin-converting enzyme-1 (ECE-1), which proteolytically converts the inactive precursor of ET-1 to the active form (Xu et al., 1994), is expressed at sites both where ET₂ is expressed and where ET-1 is expressed (Yanagisawa et al., 1996b). Targeted disruption of ET₂ (Clouthier et al., 1998), ET-1 (Kurihara et al., 1994), or ECE-1 (Yanagisawa et al., 1996b) in mice results in craniofacial defects that resemble the human condition termed CATCH 22 (Wilson, 1993), characterized by abnormal faces and cardiovascular defects. We have shown that craniofacial malformations observed in ET₂⁻/⁻ embryos is due in part to the absence of the transcription factor goosecoid, whose expression in the pharyngeal arches, but not in the limb buds, is disrupted in ET₂⁻/⁻ embryos (Clouthier et al., 1998). More recently, epithelial expression of both ET-1 and Fgf-8 were found to be crucial for proper patterning of the neural crest-derived ectomesenchyme in the caudal and rostral halves of the first arch, respectively (Tucker et al., 1999). Thus, the intercellular signaling pathway mediated by ET-1/ET₂ interactions appears to be important for either the migration of cephalic neural crest cells or their subsequent differentiation in the arches during epithelial-mesenchymal interactions, and this effect is mediated in part through specific transcription factors.

In an attempt to further elucidate the cellular basis of craniofacial defects in ET₂⁻/⁻ embryos, we have analyzed specific aspects of neural crest development. We find that while migration of neural crest cells into the arches of ET₂ mutant embryos appears unaffected, the subsequent expression of at least five transcription factors by postmigratory ectomesenchymal cells is disrupted. This indicates that disruption of ET₂ signaling likely affects the later events of proliferation or differentiation of neural crest derivatives, rather than crest migration. Further, expression of the factor Dlx-3 is disrupted in both the arch mesenchyme and surrounding epithelium, suggesting a feedback loop in which epithelium-derived ET-1 induces ET₂ signaling within ectomesenchymal cells, which in turn results in the maintenance of Dlx-3 expression in both the mesenchyme and the epithelium. In addition, ET₂⁻/⁻ embryos have an increased incidence of apoptosis in the developing first arch mesenchyme, indicating that in the absence of ET₂-dependent developmental patterning information, at least some ectomesenchymal cells undergo programmed cell death. These findings may help in understanding the molecular and cellular basis of certain classes of human craniofacial malformations.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Mice

Mice heterozygous for the targeted ET₂ allele (Clouthier et al., 1998) were intercrossed in an inbred 129Sv background to produce embryos, some of which were homozygous (ET₂⁻/⁻) for the mutation. Genotyping of embryos was also performed as previously described (Clouthier et al., 1998).

In Situ Hybridization

Embryos for in situ hybridizations were collected and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde overnight at 4°C. Whole-mount in situ hybridizations were performed as previously described (Clouthier et al., 1998) using digoxigenin-labeled riboprobes against dHAND (Srivastava et al., 1997), eHAND (Srivastava et al., 1997), Dlx-2 (Robinson and Mahon, 1994), Dlx-3 (Robinson and Mahon, 1994), Barx1 (Tissier-Seta et al., 1995), MHox (Cserjesi et al., 1992; Leussink et al., 1995), Hoxa-2 (Manley and Capecchi, 1995), CRABP-1 (Giguère et al., 1990), AP-2 (unpublished gift from T. Willimas), and Ufd1 (Yamagishi et al., 1999). Following whole-mount in situ hybridization, embryos were dehydrated through a graded series of ethanol, embedded in paraffin, and sectioned at 7 µm.

Apoptosis Analysis

E10.5 or E11.5 wild-type, ET₂⁻/⁺, and ET₂⁻/⁻ embryos were collected and fixed overnight in 4% paraformaldehyde. For each age, three ET₂⁻/⁻ and three wild-type or ET₂⁻/⁺ embryos were examined. After processing and embedding in paraffin, 4-µm serial transverse sections through the first pharyngeal arch were cut and collected on Plus-coated slides. Following examination of unstained slides, a span of nine slides was picked for subsequent analysis. Slides 1, 4, and 7 were stained with hematoxylin and eosin (Hosoda et al., 1994) using the Apoptosis Detection System (Promega) and carefully examined to ensure that each pair of embryos being compared matched in both embryonic age and axial level. Embryonic age was assessed by counting the number of somites as well as by overall appearance of the embryos. The axial level chosen was through the first pharyngeal arch. While arches of ET₂ mutant embryos are smaller and appear developmentally delayed, the presence of specific structures was used to verify axial level. These included the second pharyngeal pouch with the entrance to the future tubotympanic recess apparent, internal carotid arteries, and inferior ganglion of the vagus (X) nerve. No gross or histological differences were observed between wild-type and ET₂⁻/⁻ embryos. Slides 2, 5, and 8 were subjected to a TdT-mediated dUTP nick end labeling (TUNEL) assay (Gavrieli et al., 1992) using the Apoptosis Detection System (Promega) and following the instructions of the manufacturer. This kit uses fluorescein-12-dUTP to label the 3'-OH ends of DNA, causing apoptotic nuclei to appear bright green when examined using fluorescence microscopy. The counterstain used was propidium iodide (Sigma) as recommended in the DNA Fragmentation Kit. This stain results in nuclei that appear red when viewed under fluorescence microscopy. Consequently, apoptotic nuclei appear yellow when a double exposure of the same section is taken. An Olympus BX-50 fluorescence microscope was used for analysis and photography.

Copyright © 2000 by Academic Press. All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.
Quantitation of Apoptosis

To determine the apoptotic index observed in the first mandibular arch (lateral lingual swelling) of E11.5 embryos, the number of fluorescent nuclei within the first pharyngeal arch was counted, being careful to take into account fragmentation of some apoptotic nuclei. The total number of nuclei in the arch was then counted in slides 1, 4, and 7, which had been stained by hematoxylin and eosin. The apoptotic index is the total number of fluorescent nuclei as a percentage of the total number of nuclei. Statistical significance was determined using an unpaired Student's t test.

Bromodeoxyuridine (BrdU) Analysis

Pregnant ETα−/− female mice were injected (ip) with 200 mg of BrdU (Boehringer Mannheim) per kilogram body weight. One hour later, embryos were collected, fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde for 1 h at 4°C, and then processed for paraffin embedding. Five-micrometer paraffin sections through the first pharyngeal arch were collected on Plus-coated slides (Fisher Scientific), and every other slide was counterstained with hematoxylin and eosin to ensure that the sections examined matched those subjected to TUNEL analysis. The chosen sections were then deparaffinized and rehydrated, followed by DNA denaturation in 2 M HCl for 60 min at 37°C. The acid was neutralized by immersing slides in 0.1 M boric acid (pH 8.5), for 10 min. After being washed in PBS, sections were permeabilized in 0.3% Triton X-100 in PBS for 10 min, followed by three washes in PBS, each for 5 min. Sections were blocked in 1.5% normal horse serum (Vector) in PBS, followed by incubation with a monoclonal mouse anti-BrdU antibody (Boehringer Mannheim) at a dilution of 1:25 in 0.1% BSA in PBS overnight at 4°C. After being washed three times in PBS for 5 min each time, sections were incubated with a biotinylated horse anti-mouse antibody (Vector Laboratories) diluted to 1:2000 in 1% normal horse serum in PBS for 30 min at room temperature. The slides were washed three times in PBS for 5 min each time and then incubated with a FITC–streptavidin antibody diluted to 1:50 in PBS (pH 8.2) for 30 min in the dark. After being washed three times in PBS for 5 min each, slides were counterstained with propidium iodide (Sigma) and coverslipped using Vectabond mounting media (Vector). Under fluorescence microscopy, BrdU-positive cells have green nuclei, while all nuclei appear red from the propidium iodide. Thus, BrdU-positive nuclei appear yellow when a double exposure of the same section is taken. Negative controls included slides in which no primary or secondary antibody was used.

RESULTS

Normal Migration of Cephalic Neural Crest Cells in ETα−/− Mice

We have previously shown that the development of cephalic neural crest derivatives is disrupted in ETα mutant embryos (Clouthier et al., 1998), including the mandible, Meckel's cartilage, tympanic, gonial, jugal, alisphenoid, pterygoid, and palatine bones, as well as the malleus, incus, and hyoid. In situ hybridization studies showed that ETα mRNA is not observed within the neural tube, indicating that neural crest cells express ETα only after they begin migration (Clouthier et al., 1998). Diffuse ETα message is then found in streams extending away from the neural tube, presumably migrating neural crest cells, and in the head mesenchyme. Later, message is also observed in the ectomesenchyme of the pharyngeal arches. ET-1 message is observed in the arch epithelium and core paraxial mesoderm (Clouthier et al., 1998; Maemura et al., 1996). The observed defects in ETα−/− embryos could therefore arise as a result of aberrant migration of the crest cells or from a failure of subsequent epithelial–mesenchymal interactions of ectomesenchymal cells within the arches.

We first examined the expression of several factors known to be expressed by migrating neural crest cells. Dlx-2, a member of the Distal-less gene family, is involved in the development of proximal skeletal elements derived for arches 1 and 2 (Qiu et al., 1995, 1997). Using whole-mount in situ hybridization analysis, Dlx-2-positive cells were observed extending from the posterior midbrain/anterior hindbrain into arches 1 and 2 in both E9.0 wild-type and ETα−/− embryos (Fig. 1A). Similar results were obtained when we examined the expression of AP-2, a transcription factor crucial to the survival of migratory neural crest cells (Schorle et al., 1996; Zhang et al., 1996). AP-2 expression in E9.0 wild-type and ETα−/− embryos was observed in streams extending from the rhombomere (r)1/r2 region into arch 1 and r4 into arch 2 (arrows in Fig. 1B). CRABP-1, associated with early epithelial–mesenchymal interactions within the pharyngeal arches, was weakly expressed in the mesenchyme of arch 1 and strongly expressed in streams extending from the hindbrain into arches 2, 3, and 4 in both E9.0 wild-type and ETα−/− mutant embryos (Fig. 1C). Another marker of neural crest migration into arch 2 is Hoxa-2, the most anteriorly expressed member of the Hox gene family (Gendron-Maguire et al., 1993; Rijli et al., 1993). Hoxa-2 expression in migrating crest cells from r4 was also unaffected by the disruption of the ETα gene (Fig. 1D). Together, these results suggest that migration of neural crest cells from the posterior midbrain/hindbrain regions into arches 1 and 2 is not detectably affected by an absence of ETα-mediated signaling. However, we cannot rule out a migratory disturbance in a small subset of neural crest cells.

Ectomesenchymal Expression of Dlx-2 and Dlx-3 Is Abnormal in ETα Mutant Mice

Another possible effect of the absence of ETα signaling is a disruption in the molecular cues provided by transcription factors during the development of postmigratory neural crest cells within the pharyngeal arches. Thus, we examined the expression of several transcription factors in the developing arches at E9.5 and E10.5. We focused our analyses on "positional" rather than "cell type" specific markers, as we had previously shown that there were no detectable defects in the fundamental patterning of neurogenic neural crest derivatives in ETα−/− embryos (Clouthier et al., 1998).
Dlx-2−/− embryos exhibit multiple craniofacial abnormalities (Qiu et al., 1995, 1997), while both Dlx-2 and Dlx-3 are expressed in the mesenchyme and epithelium of the arches (Robinson and Mahon, 1994; Qiu et al., 1997). At E9.5, robust Dlx-2 expression in both wild-type (+/+ ) and mutant (−/− ) embryos was observed in the mesenchyme and epithelium of the maxillary and mandibular components of the first arch, as well as in arches 2, 3, and 4/6 (Figs. 2A and 2B). In contrast, Dlx-3 expression, observed in epithelial (arrows in Fig. 2D) and ectomesenchymal cells in the mandibular component of arch 1 and all of arch 2 (arrowheads), with weaker expression detected in the first mandibular arch mesenchyme. AP-2 expression is observed in r2-r4 (brackets) and in streams extending from r4 into arch 2 (arrowheads). Again, no differences were observed in the extent of hybridization between wild-type and ETα−/− embryos. h, heart; op, otic placode.

At E10.5, Dlx-2 expression was observed in several locations, including arches 1, 2, and 3 in a pattern similar to that observed in E9.5 embryos (Figs. 2E and 2F). However, in E10.5 ETα−/− embryos, expression of Dlx-2 in arch 2 was absent (Figs. 2E and 2F), indicating that ETα signaling is required either for maintenance of Dlx-2 expression in arch 2 mesenchyme or for the maintenance of the mesenchyme itself. Dlx-3 expression in E10.5 wild-type embryos was restricted to the posterior half of arch 1 and all of arch 2, as well as in the epithelium of the nasal process (Figs. 2G and 2H). In ETα−/− embryos, Dlx-3 expression was almost completely absent in the arch mesenchyme and epithelium, although nasal epithelial expression was unchanged (arrowheads in Fig. 2H). This suggests that ETα signaling not only is necessary for mesenchymal Dlx-3 expression but also acts in a reciprocal manner to maintain Dlx-3 expression in the arch epithelium. It is also important to note that the sizes of arches 1 and 2 were smaller in ETα mutant embryos at E10.5, a finding observed in all subsequent whole-mount analyses and one that is indicative of a developmental defect in overall arch growth.
FIG. 2. Developmental expression patterns of two Distal-less genes in ET<sub>a</sub><sup>−/−</sup> embryos. The pharyngeal arches in A, C, E, and G are again outlined to aid with visualization. (A–H) Whole-mount in situ hybridization analysis using probes for Dlx-2 and Dlx-3 in E9.5 (A–D) and E10.5 (E–H) wild-type (+/+ ) and mutant (−/− ) embryos. (A and B) The expression of Dlx-2 in both the first and the second pharyngeal arches is unchanged between wild-type and mutant embryos at E9.5. (C and D) Expression of Dlx-3 in both the mesenchyme (arrowheads in C and D) and the epithelium (arrows in D) of arches 1 and 2 is almost completely absent in E9.5 ET<sub>a</sub><sup>−/−</sup> embryos. (E and F). At E10.5, Dlx-2
Expression of the HAND Genes Is Disrupted in ETA Mutant Mice

The transcription factors dHAND (Srivastava et al., 1995) and eHAND (Cserjesi et al., 1995) are expressed in both the pharyngeal arches and the conotruncal/outflow region of the heart. dHAND mutant embryos die around E10.5, due in part to the failure of aortic arch artery development (Srivastava et al., 1997) and apoptosis of all pharyngeal arch mesenchyme (Thomas et al., 1998). Further, the expression of both genes is downregulated in ET$^-/-$ embryos (Thomas et al., 1998). To examine whether this was also the case in ETA$^-/-$ embryos, whole-mount in situ hybridization analysis of dHAND and eHAND expression was examined. In E9.5 wild-type embryos, dHAND was expressed on the distal two-thirds of the first and second pharyngeal arches (Figs. 3A and 3B), whereas eHAND expression was confined to the distal one-third of the first arch (Figs. 3C and 3D). In E9.5 ETA$^-/-$ embryos, the expression of both genes was nearly undetectable in the arches (Figs. 3A–3D).

At E10.5, expression of dHAND in wild-type embryos was observed in the mesenchyme of arches 1–6 (Figs. 3E and 3F). In ETA$^-/-$ embryos, expression was almost completely absent (Figs. 3E and 3F). However, histological analysis of sectioned embryos after whole-mount in situ hybridization revealed that dHAND expression in mutant embryos was still slightly detectable within the distal aspects of the first arch mesenchyme (data not shown). Similarly, expression of eHAND in E10.5 wild-type embryos was unchanged from the pattern observed at E9.5, but was significantly reduced in ETA$^-/-$ embryos (Figs. 3G and 3H). However, like dHAND expression, eHAND message was still detectable along the extreme distal edge of the first arch in mutant embryos (Figs. 3G and 3H). Interestingly, expression of dHAND in the bilateral dorsal aortas appeared unaffected by loss of ETA$^-/-$ signaling (yellow arrowheads in Fig. 3F), as was dHAND expression in the limb buds (yellow arrowheads in Fig. 3E).

Disruption of Arch 2 Development Involves Loss of Barx1 Expression

Like Dlx-2, another gene showing arch 2-specific changes in expression was Barx1, a BArH family homeodomain protein initially cloned in a screen of proteins capable of binding to the Ncam promoter (Tissier-Seta et al., 1995). In E10.5 wild-type mouse embryos, Barx1 was expressed in the proximal aspects of the maxillary and mandibular components of the first arch and in the second arch (Figs. 4A and 4B). In E10.5 ETA$^-/-$ embryos, Barx1 expression in the first arch was unaffected, but expression in the second arch was absent (arrows in Figs. 4A and 4B).

While we found that expression of a number of transcription factors was aberrant in ETA$^-/-$ embryos, that of others was not. One gene recently implicated in the development of cephalic neural crest cells is Ufd1, a gene that encodes a protein involved in degradation of ubiquitinated proteins (Yamagishi et al., 1999). Ufd1 was isolated in a PCR-based subtraction screen for genes whose expression was disrupted in dHAND mutant embryos (Srivastava et al., 1997; Thomas et al., 1998). The human homolog, UFD1L, was mapped to 22q11 and found to be deleted in all 182 patients examined suffering from a CATCH 22 phenotype (Yamagishi et al., 1999). Since Ufd1 is presumably downstream of dHAND, it was assumed that its expression would be disrupted in ETA$^-/-$ embryos as well. However, we found that Ufd1 expression was unchanged in ETA$^-/-$ embryos at both E9.5 (data not shown) and E10.5 (Figs. 4C and 4D), with expression observed in the frontonasal process, pharyngeal arches 1 and 2 (arrows and arrowheads in Figs. 4C and 4D), and limb buds. Though this is paradoxical, it does appear that Ufd1 acts on a craniofacial developmental pathway separate from that of the ETA receptor.

Another molecule whose expression was unchanged was MHOX, initially cloned in a screen of factors that bind the muscle creatine kinase enhancer (Cserjesi et al., 1995). MHOX mutant mice have defects in multiple cephalic neural crest-derived structures, indicating an involvement in the development of the ectomesenchyme (Cserjesi et al., 1995). In both E10.5 wild-type and ETA$^-/-$ embryos, MHOX expression was observed throughout the first and second arches (Figs. 4E and 4F), as well as in head and limb bud mesenchyme.

Increased Apoptosis in the First Pharyngeal Arch of ETA$^-/-$ Embryos

We have previously shown that numerous arch-derived elements are either malformed or missing in E18.5 ETA$^-/-$ embryos (Clouthier et al., 1998). While the results described above suggest that disruption of normal transcription factor expression leads to these defects, the cellular consequences of these changes remain unknown. The size of the first arch in E11.5 wild-type embryos is clearly larger than that in ETA$^-/-$ embryos (Figs. 5A and 5B). Further, the two first arch halves in E11.5 ETA mutant embryos are not yet completely fused, indicating a developmental defect. One possibility is that ETA$^-/-$ signaling results in altered proliferation of ectomesenchymal derivatives. Alternatively, absence of ETA-mediated developmental cues could lead to programmed
FIG. 3. Developmental expression patterns of the HAND genes in ETA \textsuperscript{−/−} embryos. (A–H) Whole-mount in situ hybridizations using probes for dHAND and eHAND in E9.5 (A–D) and E10.5 (E–H) wild-type (+/+) and mutant (−/−) embryos. (A and B) Expression of dHAND in E9.5 ETA \textsuperscript{−/−} embryos is absent in arches 1 and 2 (arrows in A). (C and D) eHAND expression in E9.5 ETA \textsuperscript{−/−} embryos is also significantly reduced (arrows in C). (E and F) At E10.5, dHAND expression is still greatly reduced in the arches of ETA \textsuperscript{−/−} embryos (arrows in E), though expression in the limb bud (arrowheads in E) and dorsal aorta (arrowheads in F) appears normal. (G and H) Arch expression of eHAND is still greatly reduced in ETA \textsuperscript{−/−} embryos (arrows in G and H).
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cell death of a subset of ectomesenchymal cells. To explore these two possibilities, we analyzed the extent of proliferation and apoptosis within the mandibular component of the first arch at E11.5.

We first looked for changes in the gross proliferation of the mandibular arch mesenchyme at E11.5. When BrdU incorporation was examined, an obvious decrease in the number of labeled cells within the arches of ETA2/2 embryos was observed (Fig. 5D). This was most notable in an area extending from the proximal arch into the distal arch in ETA2/2 embryos (arrows in B). (C) In contrast, Ufd1 expression is unchanged in ETA2/2 embryos, with expression observed in the pharyngeal arches (arrows in C; arrowheads and arrows in D), nasal epithelium, and limb buds. (E and F) MHox expression is also unchanged in ETA2/2 embryos; the difference in staining intensity for MHox is due only to slight variations in exposure time to chromogen.

We also examined the extent of apoptosis in the mandibular arch at E10.5 and E11.5 using the TUNEL assay (Gavrieli et al., 1992). At E10.5, apoptotic nuclei were observed in the first arch of both wild-type and ETA2/2 embryos, most of which was associated with the normal development of the mandibular branch of the trigeminal (V)
FIG. 5. Proliferative and apoptotic changes in E11.5 $\text{ETA}^{+/+}$ embryos. (A–F) Sections through the transverse plane of embryos at the level of the mandibular component of the first pharyngeal arch. (A and B) Hematoxylin- and eosin-stained sections illustrate that the mandibular arch (pa1) of $\text{ETA}^{-/-}$ embryos is significantly smaller and developmentally delayed compared with that of wild-type embryos. Landmarks used to define the axial level of the section are denoted, including the entrance of the future tubotympanic recess (asterisks) from pharyngeal pouch 2 (pp2). The areas shown in C–F are indicated with black boxes. (C and D) Bromodeoxyuridine incorporation appears less uniform in nuclei within the first arch of mutant embryos (D) than observed in wild-type embryos (C). This includes a band of nuclei in the mutant arch that extends distally across the arch (arrows). (E and F) TdT-mediated dUTP nick end labeling assay for apoptosis in $\text{ETA}^{+/+}$ and $\text{ETA}^{-/-}$ embryos. Yellow fluorescent nuclei indicate cells undergoing apoptosis. Significant apoptosis is observed in the arch mesenchyme of mutant embryos (arrows in F), whereas only scattered apoptotic cells are observed in the first arch of wild-type embryos (arrow in E). Due to the delayed development of the pharyngeal arches in $\text{ETA}^{-/-}$ embryos, normal apoptosis is still observed along the fusing midline arch epithelium. These apoptotic cells were not included when calculating the apoptotic index (Table 1). aa1, aortic arch artery 1; ca, carotid artery; opr, oropharyngeal region.
E11.5
+/- or +/− 17.9 ± 2.4
−/− 55.6 ± 3.8

**P = 0.0004
0.0013*
0.0005

Afferent migration of cephalic neural crest cells leads to craniofacial defects, as demonstrated in platelet-derived growth factor-α receptor-deficient embryos (Soriano, 1997), in which cephalic neural crest cells apparently undergo apoptosis during migration. However, our results indicate that cephalic neural crest cell migration is not significantly different between wild-type and ETA mutant embryos. These findings are also consistent with our finding that the migration of cardiac neural crest cells is also normal in ETA−/− embryos (Yamagishi et al., 1998a). Rather, absence of ETA signaling appears to affect the proliferation/differentiation of postmigratory crest cells. However, vital dye analysis of neural crest migration in ETα−/− embryos will be necessary to directly prove this point.

Hierarchical Transcription Factor Expression and Pharyngeal Arch Development

The inductive processes that modulate pharyngeal arch development are generally believed to be initiated by signals arising from the epithelium that act on ectomesenchymal cells (Hall, 1982; Tyler and Hall, 1977). Such epithelial-mesenchymal interactions within the pharyngeal arches have been documented, including CRBP-1 and CRABP-1 (Gustafson et al., 1993), Mxs-1 and Mxs-2 (Hill et al., 1989; MacKenzie et al., 1991), and BMP-2 and BMP-4 (Bennet et al., 1995). Our present results suggest that interaction of epithelial- and mesodermal-derived ET-1 with ETA-expressing ectomesenchymal cells results in signaling that then moderates the expression of at least six transcription factors involved in head development. Figure 6 summarizes our findings by illustrating the sites at which specific transcription factors are expressed within the pharyngeal arches and where this expression is dependent on ETA signaling. From this it is clear that absent or reduced gene expression is observed primarily in more distal areas of arches 1 and 2, suggesting that ETA signaling is important for subgroups of crest cell derivatives. This might be expected, considering that ET-1 expression is confined to the epithelium of the distal half of the pharyngeal arches as well as the paraxial mesodermal core (Clouthier et al., 1998; Maemura et al., 1996). However, the expression of Dlx-2 and Dlx-3, both observed in more proximal arch regions, is also affected. This may reflect the presence of paracrine mediators of ETA signaling, a possibility further strengthened by the finding that maintenance of epithelial Dlx-3 expression requires mesenchymal ETA signaling (see below). Reliance on epithelial-induced mesenchymal signals for continued epithelial development is not novel. Jernvall et al. demonstrated that during tooth development epithelial-derived BMP-4 expression is required for maintenance of epithelial function, but is transduced through mesenchymal signals (Mxs-1 and Mxs-2) (Jernvall et al., 1998). Whether the expression of other epithelial factors is...
affected in ETA-deficient mice or what the nature of a paracrine mediator might be is not yet known.

It is currently not clear how many signaling pathways govern craniofacial development. Since Dlx-1, Hoxa-2, and MHox are all properly expressed in ETA⁻¹⁻ embryos, these factors could either act upstream of ETA signaling or belong to different or parallel genetic pathways governing pharyngeal arch development. The spatiotemporal expression patterns of these molecules argues for the latter explanation. These additional pathways most likely work in concert with the ETA pathway in patterning the head, as mice mutant for Dlx-1 (Qiu et al., 1997), Hoxa-2 (Gendron-Maguire et al., 1993; Rijli et al., 1993), or MHox (Martin et al., 1995) all share at least a subset of missing or deformed

FIG. 6. Expression domains of various transcription factors involved in craniofacial development. Areas depicted in red depend on ETA signaling for initiation or maintenance of expression, whereas areas shown in blue are dependent on ETA signaling for maintenance of expression. Black areas depict domains where transcription factor expression is independent of ETA signaling. L, limb bud.
elements with \( E^{\alpha-} \) embryos. It will be important to examine the expression of other transcription factors as well as \( E^{\alpha} \) expression in Dlx-1, Hoxa-2, and MHox mutant mice to address these questions further.

**Proliferative and Apoptotic Changes in \( E^{\alpha-} \) Embryos**

One of the first observable morphological defects in \( E^{\alpha-} \) embryos is reduced mandibular and hyoid arch size, noticeable at E10.5. Our BrdU and TUNEL staining results suggest that this may be partly due to slowed proliferation of arch mesenchymal cells and their subsequent removal through apoptosis. Increased ectomesenchymal apoptosis likely reflects a loss of normal environmental cues in ectomesenchymal cells, rather than suggesting that ETA signaling normally has a direct antiapoptotic effect. This is based on the fact that significantly elevated apoptosis is not observed until E11.5 in \( E^{\alpha-} \) embryos, even though \( E^{\alpha} \) expression in these embryos is normal as early as E8.5 (our unpublished data). Yet, questions remain concerning how these changes are brought about. One hypothesis is that the absence of environmental cues (transcription factors) results in a stress response which then results in both slowed progression through S phase and later, apoptosis. p21, which inhibits cell proliferation at the G1/S transition point (Harper and Elledge, 1996), has been shown to be involved in early tooth remodeling during epithelial-mesenchymal interactions (Jernvall et al., 1998) and in mediating stress-induced proliferative and apoptotic changes in vitro (Gorospe et al., 1996), so it is an attractive molecule to consider. It is also possible that the aberrant expression of cell cycle factors themselves leads to reduced proliferation and apoptosis. Analysis of molecules associated with cell cycle control and apoptosis will have to be examined in \( E^{\alpha-} \) ectomesenchymal cells to determine if these possibilities are occurring.

It is somewhat surprising that ectomesenchymal apoptosis is not more striking, considering the complex and multifaceted craniofacial phenotype observed in \( E^{\alpha-} \) embryos (Clouthier et al., 1998). Further, absence of dHAND expression in dHAND-/- embryos resulted in disruption of Msx-1 expression and massive apoptosis of arch mesenchymal cells by E10.5 (Thomas et al., 1998). Why then is arch apoptosis not more widespread in \( E^{\alpha-} \) embryos? Thomas et al. show that Msx-1 expression is normal in ET-1-/- embryos and thus speculate that the apoptosis in dHAND mutant embryos results from absence of Msx-1 expression. In their model, absence of Msx-1 expression is sufficient to induce or maintain Msx-1 expression in ET-1-/- embryos and thus protect against ectomesenchymal apoptosis. However, functional inactivation of Msx-1 in mice does not result in widespread loss of arch-derived elements (Satokata and Maas, 1994), implying that loss of Msx-1 alone does not result in ectomesenchymal apoptosis. Also, the proposed action of Msx-1 during epithelial-mesenchymal interactions that occur during tooth development suggests that absence of Msx-1 might actually have an antiapoptotic affect (Jernvall et al., 1998). Thus, this evidence indicates that loss of Msx-1 expression alone does not directly correlate with ectomesenchymal apoptosis, though the mechanism for its differential regulation in ET-1-/- (and presumably \( E^{\alpha-} \)) and dHAND-/- embryos is not clear (see below).

Scattered apoptosis in the mesenchyme of \( E^{\alpha} \) mutant embryos may reflect a differential dependence on ETA signaling by subgroups of neural crest cells, possibly representing their rhombomeric origin (Kontges and Lumsden, 1996), and could explain the absence of Barx1, Dlx-2, and truncated ET-1 transcripts only in the second arch. This may also explain the fact that not all arch-derived elements are missing in term embryos; many structures are simply malformed. This may result from the action of other signaling pathways that can partially compensate for the loss of ETA signaling, preventing widespread apoptosis of ectomesenchymal cells but not entirely rescuing their abnormal development. Analysis of the developmental potential of \( E^{\alpha-} \) cells in \( E^{\alpha-} \) chimeric embryos may help clarify these points.

**Possible Functions of Dlx-2, Dlx-3, and dHAND Downstream of ETA Signaling**

The differential change in Dlx-2 expression between the first and the second arches of \( E^{\alpha-} \) embryos is intriguing and may provide insight into the role of Dlx-2 downstream of ETA signaling. Dlx-2-/- mice exhibit abnormal development of cranial bones derived from the proximal aspects of arches 1 and 2, including the alisphenoid and maxillary bones (arch 1) and the stapes and styloid (arch 2) (Qui et al., 1995). Dlx-2 is thus believed to be crucial for proper proximodistal patterning of the arches. While absence of ETA signaling affects most arch-derived elements (Clouthier et al., 1998), distal structures of the first arch are more severely affected, with most being completely absent (i.e., Meckel's cartilage, the mandible, and the malleus). This correlates with higher epithelial ET-1 expression in the medial-distal aspects of the arch (Maemura et al., 1996). This does not, however, explain the loss of Dlx-2 expression in the second arch, which suggests that ETA signaling is either directly or indirectly inducing a second arch-specific mediator of Dlx-2 expression. It is interesting that the major phenotypic overlap between Dlx-2-/- and ET-1-/- embryos is severe malformation or absence of the stapes and styloid. Thus, this may represent a signaling axis involved in patterning of these two craniofacial structures.

The effects of Dlx-3 absence in \( E^{\alpha-} \) embryos are more difficult to assess due to the early embryonic lethality of Dlx-3-/- embryos (Morasso et al., 1999). Like Dlx-2, Dlx-3 is expressed in the proximal aspects of arches 1 and 2, with first-arch expression becoming restricted to the caudal half by E10.0 (Robinson and Mahon, 1994). This caudal restric-
tion resembles a pattern observed for a subpopulation of cephalic crest cells derived from rhombomeres 1 and 2 (Lumsden et al., 1991). Long-term fate mapping analysis indicates that this subpopulation eventually forms the incus (Kontges and Lumsden, 1996). Thus, Dlx-3 may be involved in incus development, and downregulation of Dlx-3 expression as a direct or indirect consequence of loss of ET receptor signaling in ET-1 embryos may therefore contribute to the absence of the incus. The expression pattern of Dlx-3 in the second arch indicates that it may be involved with Dlx-2 in the development of the stapes and styloid.

Another interesting aspect of Dlx-3 expression is that it is not only absent in the mesenchyme, but is also greatly reduced in the arch epithelium of ET-1/2 embryos. During arch development, proliferation of the ectodermal epithelium occurs concomitantly with ectomesenchymal proliferation, ensuring proportional growth. Growth and maintenance of the epithelium also have a more direct impact on head development, as the ectoderm is believed to be involved in the development of the cephalic neural crest-derived dermal bones, including the jugal and squamosal bones (Tyler and Hall, 1977), two bones that are malformed in ET-1/2 embryos (Clouthier et al., 1998). Epithelial expression of Dlx-3 has been hypothesized to be involved in dermal bone development (Qiu et al., 1997), and its absence may thus be a major contributing factor to dermal bone deformities observed in ET-1/2 embryos. Interestingly, a mutation in DLX-3 has recently been found to be associated with trichodento-osseous syndrome in humans, an autosomal dominant disorder primarily affecting the teeth and cranial bones (Price et al., 1998). The sites of this disease occur in areas in which significant epithelial-mesenchymal interactions occur during development, illustrating the importance of Dlx-3 in epithelial-mesenchymal interactions during head development.

Another interesting relationship is that of ETα and dHAND. Although normal dHAND expression is dependent on ETα signaling, and expression of both Ufd1l and Msx-1 is dependent on dHAND, we and others (H. Kurihara, personal communication) have found that Ufd1l expression is intact in ET-1/2 and ETα/α embryos, as is Msx-1 expression in ET-1/2 embryos (and thus presumably in ETα/α embryos) (Thomas et al., 1998). This is despite the fact that UFD1L mutations in humans (CATCH 22) result in a phenotype that closely resembles that of ETα/α embryos (Clouthier et al., 1998; Yamagishi et al., 1999). We currently do not understand the basis of these discrepancies, though the cardiac insufficiency observed in dHAND mutant embryos that leads to death at E11.0 may contribute to changes throughout the embryo, including the heart and pharyngeal arches. These changes would likely include the loss of expression of numerous genes, many of which would not necessarily lie directly downstream of dHAND. In contrast, while loss of ETα signaling disrupts cephalic and cardiac neural crest cell development, embryonic lethality is not observed. Therefore, widespread changes in gene expression would not be expected. That Ufd1l expression is normal in ETα/α embryos also illustrates the complex combinatorial pathways that are required for correct craniofacial patterning and suggests that other 22q11 genes may act downstream of ETα signaling. Further analysis of Msx-1 and Ufd1l, as well as other downstream signaling molecules of ETα and dHAND, will be necessary to better understand these processes.
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