Dissecting the Unique Role of the Retinoblastoma Tumor Suppressor during Cellular Senescence

Agustin Chicas,[1] Xiaowo Wang,[3] Chaolin Zhang,[1] Mila McCurrach,[1] Zhen Zhao,[1] Ozlem Mert,[1] Ross A. Dickins,[1] Masashi Narita,[1] Michael Zhang,[1] and Scott W. Lowe[1,2,*]
[1]Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, NY 11724, USA
[2]Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Cold Spring Harbor, NY 11724, USA
[3]MOE Key Laboratory of Bioinformatics and Bioinformatics Div, TNLIST/Department of Automation, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China
*Correspondence: lowe@cshl.edu

SUMMARY

The RB protein family (RB, p107, and p130) has overlapping and compensatory functions in cell-cycle control. However, cancer-associated mutations are almost exclusively found in RB, implying that RB has a nonredundant role in tumor suppression. We demonstrate that RB preferentially associates with E2F target genes involved in DNA replication and is uniquely required to repress these genes during senescence but not other growth states. Consequently, RB loss leads to inappropriate DNA synthesis following a senescence trigger and, together with disruption of a p21-mediated cell-cycle checkpoint, enables extensive proliferation and rampant genomic instability. Our results identify a nonredundant RB effector function that may contribute to tumor suppression and reveal how loss of RB and p53 cooperate to bypass senescence.

INTRODUCTION

Loss-of-function mutations in the retinoblastoma gene product (RB) or its signaling network are considered requisite for cancer development; hence, the roles and regulation of RB have been intensively studied (reviewed in Burkhart and Sage, 2008; Rowland and Bernards, 2006). The best-characterized RB activity relates to its ability to control the G1-S transition, where it negatively regulates the E2F family of transcription factors. Cyclin-dependent kinases (CDKs) activated in response to mitogenic stimuli phosphorylate and inactivate RB, allowing the released E2F to transcriptionally activate genes required for cell-cycle progression. Certain viral oncoproteins bind RB and release E2F, leading to forced S phase entry. Because spontaneous mutations in *RB* may produce similar effects, the ability of RB to halt cell-cycle transitions is considered central to its tumor suppressor function. Nevertheless, RB binds other proteins besides E2F and can regulate processes such as apoptosis, quiescence, differentiation, and senescence. How these proteins and processes contribute to the tumor suppressor activities of RB is poorly understood.

RB is a member of a multigene family consisting also of *RBL1* (p107) and *RBL2* (p130) (Burkhart and Sage, 2008). Studies using both biochemical and genetic approaches have identified distinct and overlapping functions of each family member (Classon and Harlow, 2002). Like RB, both p107 and p130 bind E2F proteins and are substrates for phosphorylation by active cyclin/CDKs (Classon and Harlow, 2002). Furthermore, p107 and p130 also associate with DNA tumor virus oncoproteins and can induce cell-cycle arrest when overexpressed (Mulligan and Jacks, 1998). Yet, despite the similarities among the RB proteins in structure and function, somatic mutations affecting p107 or p130 are rare in human cancers (Burkhart and Sage, 2008).

In contrast to their action in cell-cycle control, less is known about how RB proteins influence cellular senescence. Senescent cells exit the cycle irreversibly, acquire a large and flat morphology, accumulate a senescence-associated β-galactosidase (SA-β-gal), and undergo changes in gene expression linked to cell-cycle inhibition and inflammation (Campisi and d'Adda di Fagagna, 2007). In cultured cells, senescence can be triggered by replicative exhaustion, or in response to activated oncogenes, DNA damage, or oxidative stress (Courtois-Cox et al., 2008)., Accordingly, the senescence program acts as a general antiproliferative stress response and is considered a potent tumor suppressive mechanism in vivo (reviewed in Narita and

---

Significance

The action of RB as a tumor suppressor has been difficult to define, partly because of the redundancy of the related proteins p107 and p130. By coupling RNAi technology with a genome-wide analysis of gene expression and RB chromatin binding, we identified a unique and specific activity of RB in repressing DNA replication as cells exit the cell cycle into senescence. We further show how failure of this activity, when coupled to loss of a fail-safe checkpoint, leads to both senescence bypass and genomic instability. Our study provides a comprehensive data set of the genes controlled by RB family members in distinct proliferative states and insights into the regulation of cellular senescence and RB action in tumor suppression.

Figure 1. RNAi-Mediated Knockdown of RB But Not p107 or p130 Impairs Ras-Induced Senescence

(A) Immunoblots of growing IMR90 cells infected with the indicated shRNAs probed for RB, p107, or p130. Actin was used as loading control.

(B) Immunoblots of ras-senescent IMR90 cells. Chromatin-bound fractions were used for the RB, p107, and p130 blots and Histone H3 was used as loading control. Whole cell lysates were used for the p16 and ras blots and actin was used as loading control.

(C) SA-β-galactosidase staining. The scale bar represents 100 μM.

(D) DAPI staining to visualize SAHF. Scale bar represents 10 μM.

(E) Quantification of SAHF (red bars), BrdU incorporation (blue bars). Values represent the mean and standard error (SE) of at least three independent experiments. (V) is empty vector, (S) is senescent, (G) is growing, and (Q) is quiescent.

the mir-30 design (Silva et al., 2005). These shRNAs were transduced into IMR90 human diploid fibroblasts (HDF), a well-characterized normal human cell strain that has an intact RB pathway, is widely used to study both replicative and oncogene-induced senescence (Narita et al., 2003; Shay et al., 1991), and can rapidly and completely transition between various growth states by simple cell culture manipulations. As shown in Figure 1A, each shRNA efficiently and specifically represses its target RB family protein. To elucidate the contribution of the individual RB family members to ras-induced senescence, we transduced IMR90 cells with shRNAs targeting each RB family protein together with a retrovirus expressing oncogenic ras and the populations were selected for cells harboring both constructs. Nine days postinfection, cell populations were examined for markers of senescence. For comparison, IMR90 cells expressing each shRNA were examined in normal growth conditions, or following induction of quiescence by serum withdrawal or contact inhibition (confluence).

Although each shRNA suppressed its corresponding family member (Figure 1B), only those targeting RB reduced SA-β-gal accumulation (Figure 1C) and SAHF formation (Figures 1D and 1E) in cells triggered to senesce. None of the shRNAs were able to completely bypass senescence; however, a small but reproducible percentage of shRB-expressing cells (but not shp107- or shp130-expressing cells) continued to incorporate BrdU at the 9 day time point (Figure 1E, see below). Identical results were obtained using two different shRNAs targeting each gene, suggesting no RNAi off-target effects. Therefore, most subsequent experiments were performed with the most potent shRNAs. Consistent with the overlapping functions of the RB family, none of the shRNAs had any notable impact on proliferation of growing or quiescent cells (Figures 1E and 5B; data not shown). Similar results were also observed in WI38 cells, another normal human fibroblast strain (data not shown). These observations confirm that, in normal human fibroblasts,

Lowe, 2005; Prieur and Peeper, 2008). Indeed, senescent cells accumulate in benign tumors in mice expressing activated oncogenes, and in these settings codisruption of genes controlling senescence regulators lead to malignant progression. Moreover, certain DNA-damaging chemotherapeutic agents can induce senescence in tumors, and the integrity of the senescence program contributes to the antitumor effect of these agents.

The regulation of cellular senescence involves interplay between the p53 and RB tumor suppressor networks (Courtois-Cox et al., 2008). For example, DNA tumor virus oncoproteins that target p53 and RB bypass senescence in cultured cells (Shay et al., 1991). Although these oncoproteins bind all three RB family members, acute inactivation of RB is sufficient to promote proliferation in senescent mouse embryo fibroblasts (MEFs) (Sage et al., 2003) and prevents SAHF accumulation and cooperates with p53 loss to bypass senescence in human diploid fibroblasts (Narita et al., 2003; Voorhoeve and Agami, 2003). Based on these observations, we hypothesized that RB must have targets in senescence that differ from those controlled by p107 and p130, and that these targets might highlight processes that mediate its tumor-suppressive effects.

RESULTS

RB Has a Nonredundant Role in Oncogene-Induced Senescence

To understand the relative contribution of individual RB family members to various proliferative states, we generated multiple short-hairpin RNAs (shRNAs) targeting each family member using

RB plays a crucial role in cellular senescence that is not shared with other family members.

Impact of Individual RB Family Members on Gene Expression in Different Growth Conditions

The RB family proteins function primarily as transcriptional corepressors by binding and redundantly modulating the activity of the E2F transcription factor family (Burkhart and Sage, 2008). We therefore reasoned that RB might have transcriptional targets not shared by p107 or p130 during senescence (but not during quiescence), and that these targets might contribute to the impaired program observed in cells lacking RB. Previous attempts to identify specific targets of individual RB family of proteins have examined growing or quiescent mouse embryo fibroblasts from the corresponding knockout mice that may have been susceptible to developmental compensation and were not comprehensive (Markey et al., 2007). Here, we examined the impact of acutely inhibiting different pocket proteins on genome-wide gene expression patterns in normal human cells.

Transcriptional profiling was performed on IMR90 cells in growing, low serum quiescent (0.1% FBS for 4 days), contact inhibited quiescent (5 days after confluency) or senescent conditions expressing shRNAs targeting RB, p107, p130, or control. RNA from two independent experiments was hybridized to the Affymetrix U133 Plus 2.0 microarray and the generated data were processed as described in Experimental Procedures. Average-linkage hierarchical clustering analysis was performed to aggregate arrays and genes based on similarities of gene expression (Eisen et al., 1998). This analysis clustered the different growth conditions over the effect of the different shRNAs, indicating that each shRNA has a smaller effect on global gene expression than the particular growth condition (see Figure S1A available online).

Senescent cells displayed a global upregulation of antiproliferative genes, downregulation of growth-promoting genes, and a pattern of gene expression known as the senescence-associated secretory phenotype (Coppe et al., 2008). Accordingly, we observed upregulation of cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitors (CDKis) and protein metalloproteinases (MMPs), as well as many cytokines and chemokines (CXCs) in senescent cells (Figure S1A).

A Nonredundant Role for RB in Repressing Some E2F Target Genes During Senescence

To understand how each RB family member influences gene expression in different growth conditions, we identified differentially expressed genes in the presence of each shRNA. Unique and reproducible shRNA-dependent changes in gene expression were observed under all conditions (Figure S1B). Interestingly, senescent cells expressing shRB underwent the most substantial changes in gene expression as evidenced by the number of probe sets that were up or downregulated (Figure S1B). Gene ontology (GO) analysis (Dennis et al., 2003) showed little overlap in the processes affected by repressing each of the RB proteins under different conditions (Table S1). However, we observed a differential but overlapping effect of RB on gene expression categories depending on the growth state. Whereas genes upregulated in cells undergoing senescence in the absence of RB were enriched with "DNA replication" factors

(Table S1, $p < 9.2 \times 10^{-14}$), those upregulated in growing cells lacking RB were enriched with "cell cycle" genes (Table S1, $p < 6.12 \times 10^{-8}$). Using a nonbiased bioinformatics analysis, we identified the E2F motif, with the consensus sequence TTTSSCGC (where S represents C or G), as the most enriched motif in genes upregulated in cells undergoing senescence in the absence of RB ($p < 2.1 \times 10^{-7}$ with Bonferroni correction) (Figure S1C). Surprisingly, the E2F motif was only moderately enriched in the set of genes upregulated in growing cells lacking RB ($p < 0.09$ with Bonferroni correction), and not enriched in gene sets impacted by other conditions or shRNAs (data not shown). These observations suggest that RB has a unique specificity in regulating a subset of E2F targets in senescent cells.

RB Represses Distinct Genes Depending on Cellular Context

To better characterize the genes and processes controlled by RB, we grouped genes that were significantly upregulated by RB loss in senescent, low serum, confluent, and growing conditions (741, 120, 784, and 291, respectively; Table S2) and subjected the corresponding probe sets to hierarchical clustering (Figure 2A). Consistent with our more global analyses, these genes often contained E2F binding sites and were highly expressed in growing but not in quiescent or senescent cells (Figure 2A; Table S2). Interestingly, most predicted E2F target genes were contained within two distinct adjacent clusters that were only divided by the influence of RB in senescent cells. Whereas the genes in clusters C3 (Figure 2D) were highly expressed in RB-deficient senescent cells, the genes in cluster C4 (Figure 2E) remained repressed. Gene ontology analysis revealed that genes in cluster C3 (Table S3; replication cluster) were enriched for DNA replication factors ($p < 3.0 \times 10^{-29}$ with Benjamini correction), particularly components of the prereplication complex, whereas genes in cluster C4 (Table S3; cell-cycle cluster) were enriched for mitotic cell-cycle factors ($p < 1.0 \times 10^{-21}$ with Benjamini correction). We have confirmed these results with additional biological replicates (Figure S1D). Thus RB is uniquely required to repress the transcription of replication genes during cellular senescence.

Clustering analysis also revealed two other distinct clusters. One cluster contains a group of genes that were highly expressed only in senescent cells lacking RB (Figure 2C). The genes in this cluster (Table S3; cyclin E cluster) are poorly characterized, except for cyclin E1, a bona fide E2F target gene known to activate several cyclin-dependent kinases. The other cluster is enriched in many cytokines and chemokines (CXCs) that are part of the senescence-associated secretory phenotype (Figure 2B). However, these genes, some of which contribute to senescence, were still induced in the absence of each RB family member and, in some cases, their expression further increased in the absence of RB (data not shown). Thus, whereas RB is required for some aspects of the senescence program, the vast majority of changes are RB independent.

Selective High-Affinity Binding of RB to the "Replication Factor" Set of E2F Targets

The expression analysis described above suggests that RB discriminates between different E2F target genes and growth states. Previous attempts to detect RB bound to specific E2F

Figure 2. RB Represses Components of the Replication Machinery during Cellular Senescence

(A) Heat map of expression patterns derived from hierarchical clustering of RB responsive genes (1826 probes) highlighting the E2F target genes. (B–E) Magnification of various gene clusters. (B) Immuno-surveillance cluster (C) Cyclin E cluster (D) DNA replication factors clusters. (E) Mitotic cell-cycle cluster. See also Figure S1 and Tables S1–S3.

of the antibody (Figure S2D). Thus ChIP-seq analysis allowed us to identify and validate thousands of RB binding sites under different growth conditions in a manner that has not been previously possible.

Gene ontology (GO) analysis revealed that genes targeted by RB were highly enriched in DNA replication factors (p < 7.1E-12), irrespective of growth condition (Table S5; common targets). Using the nonbiased de novo motif search algorithm DME (Smith et al., 2006), we found that the most highly enriched motif in all conditions is similar to the known E2F motif (TTTCCCGC). We also showed that the majority of RB ChIP-seq peaks were centered at the E2F motif and that RB binding intensity correlated with the quality of E2F motif (data not shown and Figure S2E). For example, we detected RB specifically bound to the promoter region of the MCM3 (Figure 3A), an E2F target gene derepressed in the absence of RB. Importantly, no significant peaks were observed outside the promoter region or in the control (beads only) precipitation (Figure 3A). Together, these global and nonbiased analyses indicate that the primary targets of RB-mediated repression are E2F target genes.

To identify those RB targets that required RB for repression, we integrated the RB ChIP-seq and transcriptional profiling data. We observed that 2.9%, 1%, and 4.5% of genes bound by RB in growing, quiescence, and senescence conditions, respectively, were significantly derepressed in the absence of RB (Figure S2F). This analysis revealed that the affinity of RB was greatest for those genes that required RB for repression (Figure 3C). Interestingly, gene ontology analysis revealed that this class of genes was highly enriched for DNA replication factors (p < 3.0 × 10^{-20}) (Figure 2D). To confirm the preference of RB for DNA replication genes, we also compared the average affinity of RB for genes in either cluster C3 (those that are depressed by RB suppression and are enriched in replication factors) or simply RB target genes defined by the GO term "DNA replication factor" with all other direct RB target genes. Remarkably, RB showed an average 3-fold (p < 1E-9) or 1.7-fold (p < 1E-6) higher affinity for the genes in cluster C3 or "DNA replication factor" genes, respectively, under all three conditions (Figure 3B; data not shown) and a higher affinity for these factors in senescence than in growing cells (Figures S2G and S2H). Together, these data indicate that, although RB can

target promoters in growing or quiescent cells have failed or yielded contrasting results (Cam et al., 2004; Rayman et al., 2002; Wells et al., 2000), perhaps because RB binds weakly if at all to these promoters under these conditions. To investigate whether the selectivity for DNA replication factors in senescent cells was due to preferential binding of RB to the promoters of these genes, we identified RB binding sites by combining chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) followed by deep sequencing (ChIP-seq) (Robertson et al., 2007). This procedure provides a completely nonbiased view of where proteins bind chromatin and can be more sensitive than conventional ChIP or ChIP-chip analysis (Park, 2009).

Libraries made after chromatin immunoprecipitation with an anti-RB antibody from growing, quiescent, or senescent cells produced a total of 14.4, 13.5, and 12 million reads, of which 40%, 37%, and 33% uniquely aligned to the human genome, respectively (Table S4). We used MACs (model-based analysis for ChIP-seq) (Zhang et al., 2008) to find ChIP-seq peak regions (RB binding sites) with a significance threshold (p value $\leq 10^{-5}$) and false discovery rate (FDR) threshold of 1%. We identified 4525, 4214 and 8336 RB binding sites in growing, quiescent and senescent cells, respectively, with an overlap of 1281 peaks (Table S4; Figure S2A). About 80% of the peaks can be mapped within 5 kb upstream of predicted transcriptional start sites of known refseq genes and about half are located near promoters (data not shown). Of note, the ChIP-seq experiments were reproducible (Pearson correlation coefficient 0.84) (Figure S2B), and about 89.7% and 76.5% of the top 1000 and top 2000 RB binding sites were identified in biological replicates, respectively (Table S4; senescence #2). Saturation analysis indicated that the most high-affinity RB binding sites should have been identified at the sequencing depth we achieved (Figure S2C). Importantly, the signal intensity from these sites was substantially reduced in cells expressing shRNAs targeting RB, confirming the specificity

Figure 3. Selective Binding of RB to the Promoters of DNA Replication Factors

(A) Binding patterns of RB to the MCM3 gene shown as custom tracks on the UCSC genome browser.

(B) Histogram comparing binding of RB-as measured by read counts-to DNA replication factors versus other RB targets. Error bars represent the standard deviation of the read counts.

(C) Correlation of RB binding to gene promoters and expression of those genes in RB-deficient cells under different growth conditions. See also Figure S2 and Tables S4 and S5.

to the situation in senescence, the RB family shares the capacity to suppress E2F target genes during quiescence.

We tested whether the ability of the other RB family proteins to compensate for loss of RB in quiescent HDFs reflected the ability of these proteins to replace RB at E2F target gene promoters. Because p130 is the most prominent RB family member bound to E2F target genes in quiescent cells (Balciunaite et al., 2005), we compared the binding of p130 in the presence and absence of RB in quiescent and senescent cells by ChIP-seq. We found that like RB, the main targets of p130 are genes containing E2F binding sites (Figure S3). Importantly, we found that whereas binding of p130 to many promoters increased in quiescent cells lacking RB, no effect was observed in senescent cells (Figure 4F). For example, p130 bound the MCM5 gene promoter with a 1.8-fold greater intensity in quies-

bind to genes involved in a variety of processes, DNA replication genes are uniquely dependent on RB in senescent cells.

Redundancy of the RB Family of Proteins in Quiescent Cells

We were surprised by the nominal impact of suppressing individual RB proteins on E2F target gene expression during quiescence (Figures 4A–4C and 2D and 2E), a cell-cycle state thought to be influenced by the RB family (Burkhart and Sage, 2008). There is ample evidence that the RB proteins have redundant and/or compensatory functions (Sage et al., 2000). To test whether the RB proteins had an overlapping ability to repress E2F targets in quiescent HDFs, we developed retroviral vectors that express combination of two or three shRNAs targeting RB, p107 and p130 in tandem (Figure 4D) and introduced these into IMR90 cells. Cells expressing each vector efficiently suppressed the targeted proteins, although two or more shRNAs slightly reduced the efficiency of each individual shRNA (Figure 4E). Despite this, only cells in which all three RB family proteins were suppressed showed upregulation of E2F target genes in quiescent cells (Figure 4E). Therefore, in stark contrast

cent cells lacking RB than those expressing RB, whereas the binding of p130 in senescent cells was not affected by RB suppression (Figure 4G). Thus, p130 can compensate for RB loss in quiescent cells by enhancing its binding to E2F target gene promoters. Together these data suggest that there is a binding equilibrium between RB and p130 such that at a given moment either one or the other is bound to particular E2F sites. Loss of RB shifts the equilibrium toward p130, perhaps explaining why loss of individual RB proteins does not effect expression of E2F targets in quiescent cells.

RB Represses the DNA Replication Machinery in Cells Undergoing Senescence

Among the genes derepressed in the absence of RB are key components of the pre-replication complex (pre-RC), pointing to a possible defect in the proper shut down of DNA synthesis in cells undergoing senescence. Assembly of the pre-RC on origins of replication is a crucial and limiting step in the synthesis of DNA occurring only once per cell cycle and during a short window of time prior to S phase (Stillman, 1996). We therefore tested whether RB-deficient cells inappropriately

Figure 4. Repression of E2F Target Genes Is Unique for RB in Senescence but Is Redundant in Quiescence

(A–C) Immunoblots and qPCR to measure expression of (A) MCM2, (B) cyclin A, and (C) cyclin E1 in growing, quiescent, or senescent cells expressing the indicated shRNA. qPCR values are averages of representative experiments done in triplicates.

(D) Schematic diagram of the polycistronic shRNAs used to knockdown the indicated members of the RB family.

(E) Immunoblots probed for the indicated protein from lysates of quiescent IMR90 cells infected with the indicated shRNA.

(F) Histograms comparing the binding intensity of p130 at gene promoters before (non-shRB) and after RNAi-mediated suppression of RB (shRB) in quiescent (top) and senescent (bottom) cells. The shift to the right of zero indicates that the p130-specific antibody coimmunoprecipitates more promoter DNA in the absence of RB during quiescence.

(G) Binding patterns of p130 and RB to the MCM5 gene shown as custom tracks on the UCSC genome browser. p130 binding to the MCM5 gene promoter increases 1.8-fold in RB-deficient quiescent cells while binding in senescent cells remain unchanged. See also Figure S3 and Table S6.

retained an assembled pre-RC by immunoblotting the chromatin-bound fraction of ras-transduced cells for specific replication factors (Mendez and Stillman, 2000). Although components of the pre-RC were bound to chromatin in growing cells under all conditions, they were not detected in quiescent cells or in senescent cells lacking p107 or p130 or expressing a vector control. In contrast, pre-RC components were bound tightly to chromatin in RB-suppressed cells triggered to senesce (Figure 5A).

Consistent with the above results, experiments examining BrdU incorporation and DNA content revealed that cells lacking RB show unscheduled DNA synthesis when entering senescence. Specifically, shRB-expressing cells continued to incorporate BrdU for at least 4 days longer than control, shp107-, and shp130-expressing cells upon ras transduction (Figure 5B). These cells also showed a higher percentage of cells with 4N and 8N DNA content compared with the other cell populations (>2-fold and >7-fold, respectively, Figure 5C). Despite

ongoing DNA replication, shRB-expressing cells triggered to senesce did not expand after postselection day 7 (PS7) (Figure 7B), indicating that they activated an additional barrier to proliferation (see Figure 7). Nevertheless, these results demonstrate that RB is required to halt DNA synthesis during cell-cycle exit into senescence, such that cells lacking RB undergo unscheduled DNA replication and, in some cases, endoreplication. Interestingly, quiescent cells lacking RB did not display these defects (Figures 5B and 5C), further supporting the unique role of RB in senescent cells.

RB Repression of Cyclin E1 Is Required to Prevent Replication of Senescent Cells

Our results argue for a unique role for RB in repressing the replication machinery, particularly during senescence. However, in addition to the pre-RC components, loss of RB also led to derepression of the cyclin E1 gene (Figures 2C, 4C, and 5A), a key regulator of the cell-cycle engine (Sherr and Roberts, 2004). Although less appreciated, cyclin E1 has also been directly linked to DNA replication and endoreplication (Zhang, 2007)—phenotypes observed in senescent cells lacking RB. We therefore hypothesized that the aberrant cyclin E expression could contribute to the unscheduled DNA replication leading to polyploid cells. To test this hypothesis, we introduced tandem shRNAs capable of repressing cyclin E1 and RB (Figure 6A) into IMR90 cells together with oncogenic ras. Remarkably,

Figure 5. RB Is Required to Prevent Inappropriate DNA Replication in Cells Undergoing Senescence

(A) Immunoblots of chromatin-bound proteins probed for MCM2, MCM3, ORC1, and cyclin E1. Blots were normalized by Coomassie blue staining for histones.

(B) Time course BrdU incorporation assays of cells undergoing senescence in the absence of RB, p107, or p130 compared with vector control. (S/PS3, S/PS5, S/PS7 stand for postselection day 3, 5, or 7, respectively). Values represent the mean ± SE of at least three independent experiments.

(C) Cell-cycle profiles of growing (top), quiescent (middle), or senescent (bottom) IMR90 cells expressing the indicated shRNA.

in RB-deficient cells (data not shown). Thus, in senescent cells, RB is required to repress both replication factors as well as cyclin E1, which would otherwise facilitate loading these factors into the pre-RC leading to aberrant replication and endoreplication.

RB Loss Triggers a p53/P21-Dependent Checkpoint that Prevents Escape from Senescence

Although loss of RB prevents the appropriate shut down of DNA replication in cells triggered to senesce, these cells eventually arrest, suggesting the activation of a second proliferation barrier that prevents unrestrained proliferation. In addition to the RB pathway, the p53 tumor suppressor also contributes to senescence (Courtois-Cox et al., 2008). Interestingly, p53 can respond to replicative stress and (Marusyk and DeGregori, 2007), accordingly, we noted an increase in p53 ser15 phosphorylation (Figure S5A) and a concomitant increase in the levels of its target gene p21 in RB-deficient cells triggered to senesce (Figure 7A).

To test whether p21 was required for this second proliferation barrier, we introduced shRNAs targeting both RB and p21 into IMR90 cells together with oncogenic ras. Strikingly, these cells efficiently bypassed senescence, as assessed by cell proliferation, BrdU incorporation, and colony formation relative to controls in both IMR90 and WI38 cells (Figures 7B and 7C, and data not shown). Furthermore, consistent with their ongoing proliferation, cells expressing the RB/p21 shRNA derepressed both the DNA replication E2F targets (MCM3, cyclin E1) and mitotic E2F targets (cdc2, cyclin A, cyclin B) (Figure 7E, Figure S5B). Similarly, cells coexpressing shRNAs targeting RB and p53, or p16 and p21, bypass senescence (data not shown), which is associated with sustained expression of cell-cycle/mitotic E2F targets (e.g., cyclin A, B, cdc2), albeit to varying degrees (Figure 7E). Interestingly, cells cosuppressing p16 and p21 did not hyperinduce cyclin E, perhaps owing to incomplete knockdown or a subtly different mechanism of senescence

despite a nominal impact on normal growing cells (data not shown, see also Geng et al., 2003), suppression of cyclin E1 was sufficient to prevent the aberrant DNA replication and endoreplication, otherwise observed in cells undergoing senescence in the absence of RB (Figure 6B). Furthermore, we rescued the phenotype by reintroducing a shRNA-resistant cDNAs encoding either wild-type or a kinase-deficient cyclin E1 (cyclin E1 KD-E) (Sheaff et al., 1997) (Figure S4).

Distinct from its cell-cycle activity, cyclin E1 can directly influence DNA replication by recruiting MCMs to the pre-RC in a kinase-independent manner (Geng et al., 2007). To investigate the requirement for cyclin E1 in promoting assembly of the pre-RC in cells lacking RB, we used the association between MCM2 and chromatin as a surrogate marker (Geng et al., 2007). Immunofluorescence on pre-extracted samples showed that suppression of cyclin E1 caused a significant reduction in MCM2-positive cells (Figure 6C), indicating inefficient loading of MCM2 onto chromatin. Similarly, immunoblotting of chromatin-bound proteins showed less chromatin-bound MCM2 in cells lacking cyclin E1 (Figure 6D). These results were not due to a reduction in MCM2 expression because total MCM2 protein levels were unchanged (Figure 6E). The levels of MCM2 and MCM3 RNA also remained unchanged in cells lacking cyclin E1, indicating that cyclin E is not required for the upregulation of these genes

Figure 6. RB Repression of Cyclin E1 Is Required to Prevent Replication of Senescent Cells

(A) Immunoblots of lysates from senescent cells expressing a polycistronic shRNA targeting RB and cyclin E1 (tan depicted on the top of the figure) probed for RB and cyclin E1. Growing (G), senescent (S), senescent cells expressing shRNA targeting only RB (shRB/S), or only cyclin E1 (shE1/S) are used as controls. Actin is used as loading control.

(B) Cell-cycle profiles of vector control senescent cells (V/S), senescent cells expressing shRB (shRB/S), or the tandem shRB/cE1 shRNA (Tan/S).

(C) Immunofluorescence of pre-extracted cells to measure association of MCM2 with chromatin. Percentage of MCM2-positive cells is indicated in the bottom right corner of the images. DAPI staining was used to visualize the nuclei. At least 200 cells were counted per experiment. Scale bar represents 100 μm.

(D) Immunoblots of chromatin-bound extracts from growing (G), quiescent (Q), vector control senescent cells (V/S), senescent cells expressing shRB (shRB/S), or the tandem shRB/cE1 shRNA (Tan/S): two independent samples are shown.

(E) Immunoblots of lysates from senescent cells expressing the tandem shRB/cE1 shRNA (Tan/S) and shRNA-resistant cyclin E1 cDNA encoding either wild-type (WtcE) or kinase-deficient (KDcE) cyclin E1. Lysates from growing (G), vector control senescent cells (V/S), senescent cells expressing shRB (shRB/S), or the tandem shRB/cE1 shRNA (Tan/S) alone are used as controls. See also Figure S4.

escape. Regardless, in the absence of this proliferation block, cells cosuppressing RB together with p21 accumulate more polyploid cells compared with those lacking RB alone (Figure 7D, Figures S5C–S5E). Therefore, in human fibroblasts, p21 mediates a checkpoint that is activated in response to RB loss and serves to limit the consequences of unrestrained DNA replication. In the absence of this checkpoint, proliferation continues unabated, thus providing an explanation for how RB and p53 loss cooperate to bypass senescence.

DISCUSSION

The *RB* gene family encodes important regulators of cell proliferation with overlapping and redundant functions, yet only *RB* is commonly mutated in human tumors. By performing a series of genome-wide analyses, we see that RB has a nonredundant role in binding and repressing E2F target genes that are directly involved in DNA replication, particularly in senescent cells. Consequently, in cells triggered to senesce, RB loss leads to sustained loading of pre-replication complexes, aberrant DNA replication, and—in the absence of a second cell-cycle checkpoint—proliferation and genomic instability. By contrast, RB is dispensable for proper cell-cycle exit during quiescence because other RB family members act redundantly to control key E2F targets. Consistent with our observations, cells harboring a transcriptionally compromised RB mutant fail to repress replication targets during oncogene-induced senescence but not cell-cycle exit, including those required for normal development (Talluri et al., 2010).

Implications for Senescence Control

A hallmark of senescence is its stable cell-cycle arrest coordinated by interplay between the RB and p53 tumor suppressor networks (Courtois-Cox et al., 2008). Whereas p53 promotes senescence by transactivating growth inhibitory genes, RB represses growth-promoting genes, which, in some cases, may involve heterochromatization of E2F target genes (Narita et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2005). Here we see that RB is dispensable for many of the gene expression changes that accompany senescence but, instead, uniquely and specifically represses a subset of E2F target genes required for DNA replication. Whether these effects involve the same processes that influence SAHF formation remains to be determined; nevertheless, they highlight the importance of repressing DNA replication for proper execution of the senescence program.

Consistent with a role for p53 in senescence, cells lacking RB eventually arrest because they engage a second proliferation barrier mediated by the p21 cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor. In response to certain mitogenic oncogenes, p53 activates p21 and triggers senescence in response to replication stress (Halazonetis et al., 2008), and thus it seems likely that the aberrant DNA synthesis produced by RB loss exacerbates this fail-safe mechanism. Regardless, p21 loss reveals the full capacity of RB-deficient cells to aberrantly replicate

Figure 7. RB Loss Triggers a p53/p21 Dependent Checkpoint that Prevents Escape from Senescence
(A) Immunoblots of lysates from IMR90 senescent cells expressing the indicated shRNA probed for p21 or actin.
(B) Growth curve of ras-infected cells expressing the indicated shRNAs. Counting was initiated at PS7 (postselection day 7), at which time the vector control cells are fully growth arrested as measured by BrdU incorporation. error bars represent the standard error of at least three independent experiments.
(C) Analysis of PS7 cells for different proliferation and senescence markers and for the ability to form colonies at low density. Unlike vector control, RB, or p21 suppression, suppression of both RB and p21 leads to an increase in cell proliferation as measured by BrdU incorporation (20% positive compared with 2% for either shRB or shp21 alone) and colony formation. Scale bars for the micrographs showing SA-β-gal staining and BrdU immunofluorescence represent 100 μM and for DAPI staining represent 10 μM.
(D) Cell-cycle profiles of ras-infected cells expressing the indicated shRNA.
(E) Immunoblots of lysates from ras-infected cells expressing the indicated shRNA probed for the indicated proteins. See also Figure S5.

keratinocytes) and spontaneous loss of p16 due to DNA methylation in HMECs does not completely bypass senescence but is associated with the accumulation of polyploid cells [Romanov et al., 2001]).

Insights into RB Action in Proliferation Control

By combining RNAi with genome-wide gene expression and chromatin binding analyses, we identified genes that are direct RB targets and whose regulation is strictly RB dependent. This comprehensive analysis revealed that the specific targets of RB can vary between growth states. For example, only a specific subset of E2F target genes, particularly those directly involved in DNA replication, were both bound by RB and derepressed in RB-deficient cells entering senescence. Thus our results reveal not only the unique specificity of RB for E2F replication targets, but also a strict concordance between the nature of genes regulated by RB and the specific phenotype associated with RB loss—i.e., unscheduled DNA replication during senescence but not quiescence. Although previous studies hinted that RB family proteins can regulate different E2F targets (Hurford et al., 1997) and that loss of RB can ultimately lead to increased loading of replications complexes on chromatin (Srinivasan et al., 2007), the selectivity of RB toward repressing replication genes was not appreciated.

DNA, thus explaining how RB and p53 cooperate to promote senescence.

It remains to be determined whether our observations in fibroblasts can be extended to other cells types, though it is interesting that, human vulvar intraepithelial neoplasias (VIN) that have bypassed senescence through inactivation of the RB family and p53 (Santegoets et al., 2007) also show hyperinduction of the replication factors studied here (Figure S1E). Furthermore, the same genetic principles that control senescence in fibroblasts also apply to at least some cultured epithelial cells (e.g., RB and p53 cooperate to bypass senescence in HMECs and

By identifying thousands of RB binding sites throughout the genome, our analyses decisively show that the primary targets of RB-mediated repression are genes harboring E2F binding sites and, moreover, reveal that RB preferentially associates with a subset of E2F targets. By integrating these data with transcriptional profiling, we further demonstrate that RB mediates repression through physical association with these promoters. Still, only a fraction of RB target genes are derepressed in the absence of RB and only in senescence. Such a situation has also been observed for similar studies on the androgen receptor and may suggest compensation or redundancy in transcriptional control (Massie et al., 2007). Nevertheless, to our satisfaction, the genes that are sensitive to RB loss are those genes that show the higher affinity for RB. The binding of RB to replication factor genes during senescence has not been examined, and this unique combination of genes and circumstances may explain why RB binding to chromatin has previously been difficult to detect (Rayman et al., 2002).

In human cells, we see that RB is dispensable for cell-cycle exit into quiescence—instead, any RB family member could repress E2F target genes in this setting (see also Rayman et al., 2002); here we show that this redundancy can be explained, in part, by an increase in p130 recruitment to replication genes in cells lacking RB. In contrast, studies using mouse embryo fibroblasts show that acute ablation of *Rb* in quiescent cells leads to S phase entry and proliferation (Sage et al., 2003). Likewise, cre-mediated deletion of *Rb* in small intestine enterocytes allows for cell-cycle reentry of quiescent villus cells (Guo et al., 2009). The apparent discrepancy in our results may relate to cell type or species differences or the status of the helix-loop-helix protein HES1, which may play a crucial role in determining the reversibility of the quiescent state (Sang et al., 2008). Nevertheless, why other RB family members cannot always compensate for RB loss remains to be determined, though we suspect that the stable silencing of RB-target genes during senescence may require recruitment of an RB-specific chromatin modifying activity to these promoter of these genes. Indeed, an RB mutant that is unable to associate with chromatin modifying enzymes fails to repress DNA replication during oncogene-induced senescence but not during quiescence or differentiation (Talluri et al., 2010)

One key RB target in senescence was cyclin E, which was expressed at low levels in growing cells but strongly upregulated in RB-suppressed cells triggered to senesce. Because cyclin E promotes cell-cycle progression by activating CDKs (Zhang, 2007), its selective control by RB stands out from other RB targets directly involved in DNA replication. However, cyclin E has additional activities and can directly stimulate DNA replication by facilitating recruitment of MCM proteins to the pre-RC (Geng et al., 2007). Similarly, we see that the inappropriate expression of cyclin E1 in RB-deficient cells leads to sustained loading of MCM proteins onto chromatin in a CDK-independent manner, unscheduled DNA replication, and endoreplication. These results establish connections among the kinase-independent function of cyclin E1, loading of MCM complexes onto chromatin, and endoreplication and highlight how RB acts in a coordinated way to shut down DNA synthesis as cells enter senescence.

RB Action in Tumor Suppression

The importance of RB as a tumor suppressor gene is evident by the frequency of inactivating mutations that target RB or its pathway in human cancer; indeed, the RB pathway is thought to be disabled in virtually all tumor cells (Burkhart and Sage, 2008). Although RB can modulate the G1-S transition, cellular differentiation, DNA replication, mitosis, apoptosis, chromosomal stability, and cellular senescence, it is not clear which of these functions are crucial for its tumor suppressor activity. Our results reveal a unique and nonredundant role for RB in preventing DNA replication in cells undergoing senescence. Hence, when RB is lost, cells undergo inappropriate DNA replication, aberrant proliferation, and display genomic instability—processes that are exacerbated by other checkpoint defects and contribute to the development of malignant tumors. In this regard, it is interesting that a key target of RB-mediated repression in senescence is cyclin E1—a bona fide oncogene whose overexpression occurs in many human tumor types and is often associated with poor prognosis (Butt et al., 2008). Because cellular senescence has been established as a general antiproliferative, stress-response program that acts as a potent barrier to tumorigenesis, our findings suggest that selective targeting of DNA replication genes during senescence represents one key activity of RB in tumor suppression.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

A more detailed description of the reagents and experimental procedures used in this study can be found in the Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

Vectors

The following retroviral vectors were used in this study: pWZL-Hygro (H-rasV12) (Serrano et al., 1997), pWZL-Blasticidin (H-rasV12) (Narita et al., 2006). MiR30 design shRNAs targeting, Rb, p107, p130, and cyclin E1 were subcloned from the pSM2 RNAi codex library vector into MSCV-derived LMP vector. The polycistronic shRNA vectors were cloned in two steps (see Supplemental Experimental Procedures). The cyclin E1 cDNA and cyclin E1 kinase-deficient mutant were obtained from Bruce Clurman (Geng et al., 2007). Cyclin E1 and cyclin E1 mutant cDNAs were made resistant to shRNA inactivation by modifying the targeted sequence to include seven mismatches that did not alter the amino acid sequence, using a QuikChange II Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (Stratagene).

Cell Culture and Gene Transfer

Human diploid IMR90 fibroblasts and WI38 (ATCC) were cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum and antibiotics. Retroviruses were packed using Phoenix cells (G. Nolan, Stanford University, CA) and infections were performed as described elsewhere (Narita et al., 2003). The infected population was selected using either 2 μg/ml puromycin (Sigma) for 2 days, 100 μg/ml hygromycin B (Roche) for 3 days, or Blasticidin (10 μg/ml for 4 days). For coinfection, cells were sequentially selected with Puromycin, Hygromycin, and then Blastacidin. Postselection day 7 refers to 7 days after the puromycin selection.

Senescence Assays

Ras-induced senescent IMR90 cells (post-selection day 7) were plated on coverslips coated with 0.1% gelatin and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde. For cell-cycle arrest, the cells were labeled with 5-Bromo-2′-deoxyuridine (BrdU, 100 μg/ml, Sigma) and 5-fluor-2′-deoxyuridine (FdU, 10 mg/ml, Sigma) for 4 hr. Nuclei incorporating BrdU were visualized by immunolabeling with an anti-BrdU antibody (PharMingen, 1:400) as described previously (Narita et al., 2003).

Immunoassays

Immunoblotting was carried out as described previously (Narita et al., 2003). See Supplemental Experimental Procedures for a list of antibodies used. For immunofluorescence of chromatin-bound MCM2, cells were plated as described above, preextracted in CSK buffer with 0.3 mg/ml digitonin (Sigma), and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde. The MCM2 polyclonal antibody was a gift from Bruce Stillman (CSHL) and was used at 1/1000 dilution. Alexa Fluor Conjugates (Molecular Probes) were used as the secondary antibodies, and DNA was visualized with 4′,6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI) (1 μg/ml). Isolation of chromatin-bound proteins was performed as described elsewhere (Mendez and Stillman, 2000) with minor modifications (see Supplemental Experimental Procedures). For flow cytometry, cells were collected, washed with phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), resuspended in 100 μl PBS plus 900ul cold methanol and stored at +4°C overnight. Cells were washed in PBS and resuspended in 500 μl PI/RNase Staining buffer (BD Pharmingen). Data was collected on LSRII flow cytometer (BD Bioscience) and analyzed with Flowjo software (TreeStar, Ashland, OR).

Gene Expression Analysis

Total RNA was isolated with the RNeasy Mini Kit (QIAGEN) and was converted to cDNA with the TaqMan Reverse Transcription Reagents (Applied Biosystems) and used for quantitative polymerase chain reactions (PCRs) or utilized for cRNA preparation [Message AmpII (Ambion)] and hybridized to U133 Plus 2.0 microarray (Affymetrix) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Gene-specific primer sets were designed using Primer Express 1.5 (sequences are available from the authors upon request). Real-time PCR was carried out in triplicate using SYBR Green PCR Master Mix (Applied Biosystems) on the Roche's IQ5 ICycler. GAPDH or β-actin served as an endogenous normalization control. The quantification was done using an external standard curve made with a serial dilution of one of the RT reactions. Details on the microarray data analysis are provided in Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

Chip-Seq Analysis

The chromatin immunoprecipitation experiments were done as previously described (Orlando et al., 1997) with some modifications (see Supplemental Experimental Procedures). Immunoprecipated DNA was prepared for 1G sequencing as described elsewhere (Robertson et al., 2007) with some modification (see Supplemental Experimental Procedures). Further details of the analysis are found in Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

ACCESSION NUMBERS

All the expression profiling data and genome binding data are available from the GEO repository (accession number GSE19899).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information includes five figures, six tables, and Supplemental Experimental Procedures and can be found with this article online at doi:10.1016/j.ccr.2010.01.023.

REFERENCES

Balciunaite, E., Spektor, A., Lents, N.H., Cam, H., Te Riele, H., Scime, A., Rudnicki, M.A., Young, R., and Dynlacht, B.D. (2005). Pocket protein complexes are recruited to distinct targets in quiescent and proliferating cells. Mol. Cell. Biol. 25, 8166–8178.

Burkhart, D.L., and Sage, J. (2008). Cellular mechanisms of tumour suppression by the retinoblastoma gene. Nat. Rev. Cancer 8, 671–682.

Butt, A.J., Caldon, C.E., McNeil, C.M., Swarbrick, A., Musgrove, E.A., and Sutherland, R.L. (2008). Cell cycle machinery: Links with genesis and treatment of breast cancer. Adv. Exp. Med. Biol. 630, 189–205.

Cam, H., Balciunaite, E., Blais, A., Spektor, A., Scarpulla, R.C., Young, R., Kluger, Y., and Dynlacht, B.D. (2004). A common set of gene regulatory networks links metabolism and growth inhibition. Mol. Cell 16, 399–411.

Campisi, J., and d'Adda di Fagagna, F. (2007). Cellular senescence: When bad things happen to good cells. Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol. 8, 729–740.

Classon, M., and Harlow, E. (2002). The retinoblastoma tumour suppressor in development and cancer. Nat. Rev. Cancer 2, 910–917.

Coppe, J.P., Patil, C.K., Rodier, F., Sun, Y., Munoz, D.P., Goldstein, J., Nelson, P.S., Desprez, P.Y., and Campisi, J. (2008). Senescence-associated secretory phenotypes reveal cell-nonautonomous functions of oncogenic RAS and the p53 tumor suppressor. PLoS Biol. 6, 2853–2868.

Courtois-Cox, S., Jones, S.L., and Cichowski, K. (2008). Many roads lead to oncogene-induced senescence. Oncogene 27, 2801–2809.

Dennis, G., Sherman, B., Hosack, D., Yang, J., Gao, W., Lane, H., and Lempicki, R. (2003). DAVID: Database for annotation, visualization, and integrated discovery. Genome Biol. 4, R60.

Eisen, M.B., Spellman, P.T., Brown, P.O., and Botstein, D. (1998). Cluster analysis and display of genome-wide expression patterns. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 95, 14863–14868.

Geng, Y., Lee, Y.M., Welcker, M., Swanger, J., Zagozdzon, A., Winer, J.D., Roberts, J.M., Kaldis, P., Clurman, B.E., and Sicinski, P. (2007). Kinase-independent function of cyclin E. Mol. Cell 25, 127–139.

Geng, Y., Yu, Q., Sicinska, E., Das, M., Schneider, J.E., Bhattacharya, S., Rideout, W.M., Bronson, R.T., Gardner, H., and Sicinski, P. (2003). Cyclin E ablation in the mouse. Cell 114, 431–443.

Guo, J., Longshore, S., Nair, R., and Warner, B.W. (2009). Retinoblastoma protein (pRb), but not p107 or p130, is required for maintenance of enterocyte quiescence and differentiation in small intestine. J. Biol. Chem. 284, 134–140.

Halazonetis, T.D., Gorgoulis, V.G., and Bartek, J. (2008). An oncogene-induced DNA damage model for cancer development. Science 319, 1352–1355.

Hurford, R.K., Jr., Cobrinik, D., Lee, M.H., and Dyson, N. (1997). pRB and p107/p130 are required for the regulated expression of different sets of E2F responsive genes. Genes Dev. 11, 1447–1463.

Markey, M.P., Bergseid, J., Bosco, E.E., Stengel, K., Xu, H., Mayhew, C.N., Schwemberger, S.J., Braden, W.A., Jiang, Y., Babcock, G.F., et al. (2007). Loss of the retinoblastoma tumor suppressor: differential action on transcriptional programs related to cell cycle control and immune function. Oncogene 26, 6307–6318.

Marusyk, A., and DeGregori, J. (2007). Replicational stress selects for p53 mutation. Cell Cycle 6, 2148–2151.

Massie, C.E., Adryan, B., Barbosa-Morais, N.L., Lynch, A.G., Tran, M.G., Neal, D.E., and Mills, I.G. (2007). New androgen receptor genomic targets show an interaction with the ETS1 transcription factor. EMBO Rep. 8, 871–878.

Mendez, J., and Stillman, B. (2000). Chromatin association of human origin recognition complex, cdc6, and minichromosome maintenance proteins during the cell cycle: Assembly of prereplication complexes in late mitosis. Mol. Cell. Biol. 20, 8602–8612.

Mulligan, G., and Jacks, T. (1998). The retinoblastoma gene family: Cousins with overlapping interests. Trends Genet. *14*, 223–229.

Narita, M., Narita, M., Krizhanovsky, V., Nuñez, S., Chicas, A., Hearn, S.A., Myers, M.P., and Lowe, S.W. (2006). A novel role for high-mobility group a proteins in cellular senescence and heterochromatin formation. Cell *126*, 503–514.

Narita, M., and Lowe, S.W. (2005). Senescence comes of age. Nat. Med. *11*, 920–922.

Narita, M., Nunez, S., Heard, E., Lin, A.W., Hearn, S.A., Spector, D.L., Hannon, G.J., and Lowe, S.W. (2003). Rb-mediated heterochromatin formation and silencing of E2F target genes during cellular senescence. Cell *113*, 703–716.

Orlando, V., Strutt, H., and Paro, R. (1997). Analysis of chromatin structure by in vivo formaldehyde cross-linking. Methods *11*, 205–214.

Park, P.J. (2009). ChIP-seq: Advantages and challenges of a maturing technology. Nat. Rev. Genet. *10*, 669–680.

Prieur, A., and Peeper, D.S. (2008). Cellular senescence in vivo: A barrier to tumorigenesis. Curr. Opin. Cell Biol. *20*, 150–155.

Rayman, J.B., Takahashi, Y., Indjeian, V.B., Dannenberg, J.H., Catchpole, S., Watson, R.J., te Riele, H., and Dynlacht, B.D. (2002). E2F mediates cell cycle-dependent transcriptional repression in vivo by recruitment of an HDAC1/mSin3B corepressor complex. Genes Dev. *16*, 933–947.

Robertson, G., Hirst, M., Bainbridge, M., Bilenky, M., Zhao, Y., Zeng, T., Euskirchen, G., Bernier, B., Varhol, R., Delaney, A., et al. (2007). Genome-wide profiles of STAT1 DNA association using chromatin immunoprecipitation and massively parallel sequencing. Nat. Methods *4*, 651–657.

Romanov, S.R., Kozakiewicz, B.K., Holst, C.R., Stampfer, M.R., Haupt, L.M., and Tlsty, T.D. (2001). Normal human mammary epithelial cells spontaneously escape senescence and acquire genomic changes. Nature *409*, 633–637.

Rowland, B.D., and Bernards, R. (2006). Re-evaluating cell-cycle regulation by E2Fs. Cell *127*, 871–874.

Sage, J., Miller, A.L., Perez-Mancera, P.A., Wysocki, J.M., and Jacks, T. (2003). Acute mutation of retinoblastoma gene function is sufficient for cell cycle re-entry. Nature *424*, 223–228.

Sage, J., Mulligan, G.J., Attardi, L.D., Miller, A., Chen, S., Williams, B., Theodorou, E., and Jacks, T. (2000). Targeted disruption of the three Rb-related genes leads to loss of G(1) control and immortalization. Genes Dev. *14*, 3037–3050.

Sang, L., Coller, H.A., and Roberts, J.M. (2008). Control of the reversibility of cellular quiescence by the transcriptional repressor HES1. Science *321*, 1095–1100.

Santegoets, L.A., Seters, M., Helmerhorst, T.J., Heijmans-Antonissen, C., Hanifi-Moghaddam, P., Ewing, P.C., van Ijcken, W.F., van der Spek, P.J., van der Meijden, W.I., and Blok, L.J. (2007). HPV related VIN: highly prolifera-tive and diminished responsiveness to extracellular signals. Int. J. Cancer *121*, 759–766.

Serrano, M., Lin, A.W., McCurrach, M.E., Beach, D., and Lowe, S.W. (1997). Oncogenic ras provokes premature cell senescence associated with accumulation of p53 and p16INK4a. Cell *88*, 593–602.

Shay, J.W., Pereira-Smith, O.M., and Wright, W.E. (1991). A role for both RB and p53 in the regulation of human cellular senescence. Exp. Cell Res. *196*, 33–39.

Sheaff, R.J., Groudine, M., Gordon, M., Roberts, J.M., and Clurman, B.E. (1997). Cyclin E-CDK2 is a regulator of p27Kip1. Genes Dev. *11*, 1464–1478.

Sherr, C.J., and Roberts, J.M. (2004). Living with or without cyclins and cyclin-dependent kinases. Genes Dev. *18*, 2699–2711.

Silva, J.M., Li, M.Z., Chang, K., Ge, W., Golding, M.C., Rickles, R.J., Siolas, D., Hu, G., Paddison, P.J., Schlabach, M.R., et al. (2005). Second-generation shRNA libraries covering the mouse and human genomes. Nat. Genet. *37*, 1281–1288.

Smith, A.D., Sumazin, P., Xuan, Z., and Zhang, M.Q. (2006). DNA motifs in human and mouse proximal promoters predict tissue-specific expression. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA *103*, 6275–6280.

Srinivasan, S.V., Mayhew, C.N., Schwemberger, S., Zagorski, W., and Knudsen, E.S. (2007). RB loss promotes aberrant ploidy by deregulating levels and activity of DNA replication factors. J. Biol. Chem. *282*, 23867–23877.

Stillman, B. (1996). Cell cycle control of DNA replication. Science *274*, 1659–1664.

Talluri, S., Isaac, C.E., Ahmad, M., Henley, S.A., Francis, S.M., Martens, A.L., Bremner, R., and Dick, F.A. (2010). A G1 checkpoint mediated by the retino-blastoma protein that is dispensable in terminal differentiation but essential for senescence. Mol. Cell. Biol. *30*, 948–960.

Voorhoeve, P.M., and Agami, R. (2003). The tumor-suppressive functions of the human INK4A locus. Cancer Cell *4*, 311–319.

Wells, J., Boyd, K.E., Fry, C.J., Bartley, S.M., and Farnham, P.J. (2000). Target gene specificity of E2F and pocket protein family members in living cells. Mol. Cell. Biol. *20*, 5797–5807.

Zhang, H. (2007). Life without kinase: cyclin E promotes DNA replication licensing and beyond. Mol. Cell *25*, 175–176.

Zhang, R., Poustovoitov, M.V., Ye, X., Santos, H.A., Chen, W., Daganzo, S.M., Erzberger, J.P., Serebriiskii, I.G., Canutescu, A.A., Dunbrack, R.L., et al. (2005). Formation of MacroH2A-containing senescence-associated heterochromatin foci and senescence driven by ASF1a and HIRA. Dev. Cell *8*, 19–30.

Zhang, Y., Liu, T., Meyer, C.A., Eeckhoute, J., Johnson, D.S., Bernstein, B.E., Nussbaum, C., Myers, R.M., Brown, M., Li, W., and Liu, X.S. (2008). Model-based analysis of ChIP-Seq (MACS). Genome Biol. *9*, R137.