Volume 291, number 2, 211–213 FEBS 10265 © 1991 Federation of European Biochemical Societies 00145793/91/\$3 50 ADONIS 0014579391009744 October 1991

Cloning of segment polarity gene homologues from the unsegmented brachiopod *Terebratulina retusa* (Linnaeus)

Pcter W.H. Holland, Nicola A. Williams and Jeremy Lanfear*

Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford OXI 3PS, UK

Received 8 August 1991

We have used the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) to amplify, clone and sequence homologues of the *Drosophila* segment polarity genes engrailed (en), cubitus interruptus Dominant (a^{D}) and wingless (wg) from the genome of the brachiopod, *Telebratulina retusa* (Linnaeus) The deduced translation products of brachiopod en and a^{D} share high levels of sequence identity with their *Drosophila* homologues. The brachiopod wg-related clone is divergent from *Drosophila* wg, although clearly a member of the wg/Wnt gene family. These results indicate that structural diversity of *Drosophila* segment polarity genes has been evolutionarily conserved in a divergent, ancient and unsegmented animal phylum.

Engrailed, Homeobox, Zinc finger gene, Wingless, Brachiopod, Molecular evolution

1 INTRODUCTION

The establishment of the segmental body pattern during embryogenesis in *Drosophila melanogaster* involves the sequential activation of several groups of genes, each group leading to the division of the embryo into progressively smaller units [1,2] The 'segment polarity' genes represent the final tier of this genetic cascade, being responsible for establishing and maintaining the spatial limits and polarity of the metameric units. The *Drosophila* segment polarity gene group may be subdivided both functionally, on the basis of mutant phenotypes, and structurally, since the genes encode a wide diversity of protein products [2].

Putative homologues of several segment polarity genes have been reported from other organisms, including vertebrates, but in most cases the phylogenetic distribution of the genes is poorly known [2] In particular, it is not known whether the structural diversity of segment polarity genes seen in *Drosophula* has been evolutionary conserved in a diversity of animals, including in the many groups of unsegmented animals which may be employing these genes for distinct roles

In an attempt to address this question, we have investigated whether the genome of a representative species of the Brachiopoda, a phylogenetically ancient and divergent phylum of unsegmented animals, contains ho-

*Present address Beatson Institute for Cancel Research, Garscube Estate, Switchback Road, Bearsden, Glasgow G61 1BD, UK

Correspondence address PWH Holland, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PS, UK Tax (44) (865) 310 447 mologues of three *Drosophila* segment polarity genes The strategy we adopted is based on the use of degenerate oligonucleotide primers in the Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) to amplify related sequences, prior to recombinant DNA cloning We report the isolation and sequence determination of brachiopod genomic DNA clones derived from genes homologous to three functionally and structurally divergent *Drosophila* segment polarity genes, a homeobox gene, *engrailed (en)*, a zincfinger gene, *cubitus interruptus Dominant (ci^D)*; and a gene coding for a secreted protein, *wingless (wg)*.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

Genomic DNA extraction, purification, PCR, cloning and sequencing were as previously described [3 4] The PCR primer sequences used were en, primers A and C of Holland and Williams [5], wg primers of Gavin et al [6], ci^{D} , 5'-GAGAGGATCCNITYAARGCN-CARTAYATG-3' and 5'-GAGAAGCTTRTGNACNGTYTIN-ACRTGYTT-3', designed by Drs PW Ingham and G Paterno (ICRF DBU Oxford UK) to complement conserved regions between the *Dissophila* ci^{D} and human *GLI* genes.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

31. Cloning of a brachiopod en gene homologue

PCR-mediated amplification of brachiopod DNA was performed using primers complementary to conserved regions within, and downstream of, the *en* homeobox. Following isolation and cloning of the major band. 11 recombinants were sequenced, and found to derive from the same homeobox gene (Fig. 1A). The deduced translation product of the cloned region shares 77% sequence identity with *Drosophila en* (Fig. 1B), and comparable identity with vertebrate *en* related genes [5]. Brachiopod engrailed homologue

| 8 | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| | 1 20 | 40 | 60 |
| Brachiopod | NEQLARLKKEFEINRYLTEORROE | LSRELMLNESQIKIWFONKRAKLKKS1 | GrKSGLALH |
| Drosophila | SRNCRQ | SGAII | -S-NPQ |

Fig 1 (A) Consensus nucleotide sequence (internal to primers) from brachiopod en homologue (B) Deduced amino acid sequence from (A), aligned with Drosophila en Dashes indicate identity with en

32. Cloning of a brachiopod ci^D gene homologue

Following amplification of brachiopod DNA with primers within the zinc-finger region of ci^D , a single band was produced, found to hybridize to a putative ci^{D} homologue from Xenopus laevis (not shown), and cloned The DNA sequence of a single recombinant is shown in Fig 2A Alignment with Drosophila ci^{D} [7] and 3 putative human homologues (GLI, GLI2, and GLI3 [8]), suggests that the brachtopod clone derives from a true ci^{D} homologue and contains 2 introns Interestingly, both intron positions have been highly conserved. being identical in brachiopod, beetle, human and nemertean ([8] and J.L, unpublished data).

The deduced translation product of the cloned region shares 91% sequence identity with Diosophila ci^{D} , revealing exceptional evolutionary conservation of ci^{D} compared to other zinc-finger gene families (9] and JL, unpublished data)

3.3. Cloning of a brachiopod wg gene homologue

PCR-mediated amplification of brachiopod DNA was performed using primers complementary to a conserved region shared by *Diosophila wg* and two vertebrate Wnt genes (putative wg homologues [6,10]) The major product was cloned, the DNA sequence of a single recombinant is shown in Fig 3A Alignment of the deduced translation product of this clone with Drosophila wg (Fig. 3B) revcals identity of only 46% (excluding an additional stretch of 85 amino acids in wg) We

A

Brachiopod cubitus-interruptus Dominant homologum

CTG GTT GTA CAT AFT MATATIKATUTE GTALLENG MAAN CAT CAC AAA TGC ACG GTE STGDTCT GTA CAT AFT MATATIKATUTE GTALLENG MAAN CAT CAC AAA TGC ACG GTE STGDTCTTT GTA CAT AFT MATATIKATUTE GTALLENG AAA AAA CCT CAC AAA TGC ACG GTE STGDTCTTT GTA GTALLENG AGT GTALLENG AGA AAA CCT CAC AT GTALLENG GTALLENG AGT CGA CTG GAG AAA CC CTA AAA ACC CAC CTG AGG CTA CAT ACT GGG GAL AAA CTA TAT AFG TUT GAA TTC CCA 900 TGT GCG AAA GCC TTC AGC AAT GGT TCA GAC GAL GCC AAA GAC CGA AAA CAC ACT CTA AAT GCT GTGGTSTETTETEGEGTSTGTETETETEGES STGTTGGTGTGTAGTAGTGTGTTTTGGC AAA GCA GCC GGC TGT ACC AAG AGA TAC ACT ATG TGT GGG GAG GAC TGT GGC AAA GCA GCC GGC TGT ACC AAG AGA TAC ACT GCC CCC AGC TCA CTG TGC GAAA GCA GCC GGC TGT ACC AAG AGA TAC ACT GCC CCC AGC TCA CTG AGG

В

Construction of the second sec

61 E0 Srechlopod RAKHQMRTHSHAKPYVCKAAGCTKRYTDP65LR Drosophile

Fig. 2 (A) Nucleotide sequence (internal to primers) from clone of brachiopod ciⁿ homologue. Lower case letters are putative intron sequence (B) Deduced amino acid sequence from exon regions of (A), aligned with Drorophila clⁿ Dashes indicate identity with ciⁿ.

Δ

| Brachiopod wingless homologue |
|--|
| GOT GTG AGT GGG TCG TGT ACA ATG AAG ACA TGC TGG TCT AAA CTG TCG CCT TTC AGA GTG GTT GGA ACT CAC CTG ATG AAG CGC TAC CTG AAG GCC AAA CAC GTG GCC ALTA TA TAG GGC CGC AGG AGG CCC GTC TTC CTA AAA CTC AAA CGT TCC CGG AGG CCA AAT AAA AAA CCC AGA AAA AGA GAC TTG GTT TAC TTA CAA AAA TCC CGC AGG CAC AAT AAA AAA CCC AGA AAA AGA GAC TTG GTT TAC TTA CAA AAA TCC CCC AAC TAC TGT GAC AGG GAC UTT AAG AAG GGC TCA CTG GGC ACC CAC GGA CTA TGC AAT AAG ACG TOT CCA GGC ACA CAT GGC TGT AAC CTG CTG TGT GGC AGG GGA TAC AAC ACA CAC CTC AAA CCA AAG ACG TGG CAA T^C TAC TGC AAG |
| B Brachlopod CVSGSCTMKTCWSKLSPFRVVGTHLHKRYLKAKHV ATI DrosophilaVNR-ANI-DN-KA-FDG-TR-QV-NSLRATNALAPVSPNAAGSNSV 1 60 |
| Brachiopod Drosophila GSNGLIIPQSGLVYGEEEERNLNDHMPDILLENSHPISKIHHPNMPSPNSLPQAGQRGGR 61 120 |
| 39 Drachiopod KGRRRFVF LKLKRSRRPNKKPRKRDLVVLQKSPNVCDRDVKKGSLGTMGRLCNKT Drosophila MGRRQKHNRVHFQ-NPHNPEH-P-GSKEP-SF-EKNLRQ-IQC- 121 180 |
| 94 Brachiopod CPGTDGCNLLCCCRGYNTHLKPKTWQCYCK Drosophila SL-VG-HRRDEVVVVCR-A-T 101 210 |

Fig 3 (A) Nucleotide sequence (internal to primers) from clone of brachiopod ug homologue (B) Deduced amino acid sequence from (A), aligned with Drosophila wg Dashes indicate identity with en, blanks indicate gaps introduced to maximize alignment

believe that this clone does derive from a true brachiopod wg/Wnt homologue, since the deduced translation product shares all of the 33 amino acid residues which are invariant between wg and 9 mouse Wnt genes in this region [6,10]

34. Diversity of brachiopod segment polarity gene homologues

Homologues of the Drosophila segment polarity gene en have been cloned from representatives of several taxa, including arthropods, annelids, nematodes, echinoderms and vertebrates [5,11–14] However, homologues of the structurally divergent segment polarity genes ci^{D} and wg have been reported from fewer organisms [2,6,8,12].

The Terebratulina en, ci^D and wg homologues described here represent the first protein-coding genes to be cloned from a member of the Phylum Brachlopoda Their identification demonstrates that divergent segment polarity genes are conserved in at least insects, vertebrates and brachiopods, suggesting that functional interaction between these genes, as seen in Drosophila, may be evolutionarily ancient However, since the Brachiopoda are unsegmented metazoa, any developmental roles of these genes are likely to be fundamentally different from those in *Drosophula*.

Acknowledgements We thank Gary Paterno, Phil Ingham and Uwe Strähle for and wg primers. This work was supported by SERC Grant GR/F15076 to P W H H and N A W and an NERC studentship to J L

REFERENCES

- [1] Akam, M. (1987) Development 101, 1-22
- (2) Ingham, P.W. and Nakano, Y. (1990) Dev. Growth Differ. 32, \$63 574

- [3] Holland, PWH and Hogan, BLM (1986) Nature 321, 251-253
- [4] Holland, P W H (1991) Gene 98, 253-257
- [5] Holland, PWH and Williams, NA (1990) FEBS Lett 277. 250-252
- [6] Gavin, B J, McMahon, J A and McMahon, A P (1990) Genes Dev 4, 2319-2332
- [7] Orenic, T V, Slusarski, D C, Kroll, K L and Holmgren, R A (1990) Genes Dev 4, 1053-1067
- [8] Ruppert, J M, Kinzler, K W, Wong, A J, Bignor, S H, Kao, F -T, Law, M L, Seuanez, H N, O'Brien, S J and Vogelstein, B (1988) Mol Cell Biol 8, 3104-3113
- [9] Lanfear, J and Holland, PWH (1991) J Mol Evol 32, 310-315
- [10] Rusewijk, F., Schuermann, M., Wagenaar, E., Parren, P., Weigel, D and Nusse, R (1987) Cell 50, 649-657
- [11] Dolecki, G J and Humphreys, T (1988) Gene 64, 21-31 [12] Kamb, A, Weir, M, Rudy, B, Varmus, H and Kenyon, C (1989) Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 86, 4372-4376
- [13] Patel, N H , Martin-Blanco, E , Coleman, K G , Poole, S J , Ellis, MC, Kornberg, TB and Goodman, CS (1988) Cell 58, 955-968
- [14] Wedeen, C J, Price, D J and Weisblat, D A (1991) FEBS Lett 279, 300-302