2018-01-24

Skeletal muscle dedifferentiation during salamander limb regeneration

Wang, Heng; Simon, András

Curr Opin Genet Dev. 2016 Oct;40:108-112.
http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gde.2016.06.013
http://hdl.handle.net/10616/46200

Skeletal muscle dedifferentiation during salamander limb regeneration

by

Heng Wang and András Simon

Karolinska Institute, Department of Cell and Molecular Biology, Berzelius väg 35, 17177 Stockholm, Sweden

Correspondence to Andras.Simon@ki.se

Abstract

Salamanders can regenerate entire limbs throughout their life. A critical step during limb regeneration is formation of a blastema, which gives rise to the new extremity. Salamander limb regeneration has historically been tightly linked to the term dedifferentiation, however, with refined research tools it is important to revisit the definition of dedifferentiation in the context. To what extent do differentiated cells revert their differentiated phenotypes? To what extent do progeny from differentiated cells cross lineage boundaries during regeneration? How do cell cycle plasticity and lineage plasticity relate to each other? What is the relationship between dedifferentiation of specialized cells and tissue resident stem cells in terms of their contribution to the new limb? Here we highlight these problems through the case of skeletal muscle.

Tracking muscle cells in the salamander limb

Limb skeletal muscle fibers are formed by the fusion of somite-derived precursors. These multinucleate, elongated cells have a specialized cytoarchitecture built up by proteins, which make the fibers easily distinguishable from their precursor cells at the molecular level. A key feature of the myofibers in the context of the present review is the quiescent state of the myonuclei within the multinucleated syncytium, which is often referred to as the stable post-mitotic state [1,2].

Skeletal muscle has considerable regenerative capacity in all vertebrates, including mammals. However the myonuclei in mammals do not resume proliferation after an injury. Instead, a population of muscle stem cells, the so-called satellite cells, starts to proliferate and subsequently differentiates into muscle to replenish lost fibers [3–5]. Although satellite cells were first described in amphibians [6] *, their presence in adult salamanders [7–9] was unequivocally confirmed more than 40 years later by the isolation of single newt myofibers along with an attached population of cells expressing the canonical satellite cell marker, Pax7 [10]. This finding challenged the traditional view that solely the myofiber itself, rather than a quiescent stem cell population are the progenitor cells during salamander limb regeneration [11], and also highlighted the need to carry out cell type specific tracking experiments during limb regeneration.

Limb regeneration starts with a rapid wound healing followed by formation of a blastema from which the new limb develops [12,13]. Pioneering histological analyses

suggested more than half century ago that myofibers undergo fragmentation, and indicated the migration of mononucleate myofiber fragments into the salamander limb blastema [14*,15]. Furthermore, myofiber fragmentation temporally coincides with disorganization and histolysis of the stump tissues in general, and concomitant production of blastema cells [16]. Cell cycle reentry by myonuclei was also suggested but it is important to remember that the available tools at the time did not allow discrimination among myonuclei, satellite cell nuclei and the nuclei of other interstitial cells within muscle tissue [17]. The model of myofiber-dedifferentiation gained further support from several studies on myotubes, which are the *in vitro* model cell type for resident myofibers. Although myotubes lack striation, they do express a range of terminal differentiation markers, and their nuclei are stably quiescent. However, myotubes from the aquatic salamander, the newt, reenter the cell cycle and replicate their DNA upon appropriate stimulation, which is a distinctive feature of these cells compared to their mammalian counterparts [18*,19]. Furthermore, upon implantation of myotubes into the blastema, could give rise to mononucleate progeny in the blastema [20,21].

Although these studies collectively suggested a distinctive plasticity of differentiated salamander muscle cells, genetically integrated, heritable labeling of myonuclei was required to address whether and to what extent myofibers dedifferentiate during limb regeneration. These experiments were performed in the red spotted newt (*Notophthalmus Viridescens*) and the Mexican axolotl (*Ambystoma Mexicanum*), and revealed unexpected differences between these two salamander species [22] **. First, myofibers in newts gave rise to proliferating blastema progeny, but no such cells were found in the axolotl limb blastema. Second, in sharp contrast to the axolotl, the fraction of myofibers carrying the tracer was similar in pre-existing and regenerated muscle in the new limb in newt. Third, the newt blastema was largely devoid of $PAX7^+$ cells, except for a few cells appearing during the first few days of limb regeneration [10,23]. The axolotl limb blastema on the other hand contained a large number of $PAX7^+$ cells. To what extent these differences at the molecular level reflect differences in the cellular contribution of satellite cell progeny to the regenerating limb will be discussed further down. Importantly, the dissimilarities between the two species were independent of the developmental stages of the animals, since myofiber-progeny did not contribute to the new limb in axolotls that were experimentally induced to undergo metamorphosis, and $PAX7^+$ cells were also

lacking in the blastemas of larval newts. On the other hand, a recent analysis in the Japanase fire-bellied newt (*Cynops pyrrhogaster*) indicated that skeletal muscle dedifferentiation only occurs in metamorphosed animals [24]. Remarkably, that work also suggested that in larval stage the vast majority of blastema cells turn from being $PAX7^-$ into $PAX7^+$ between day12 to day15 after amputation. The possibility that proliferating $PAX7^+$ cells in the axolotl blastema are derived from myofibers, whose nuclei upregulate *Pax7* after amputation was raised [25], but the cell tracking experiments do not provide support for such a process.

Satellite cell progeny vs dedifferentiated cells in the blastema

Does the lack of $PAX7^+$ cells in the newt blastema mean that satellite cells do not significantly contribute to muscle (or to other tissues for that matter) in the regenerating limb? At a first glance this appears as a logical conclusion, especially in light of the contrasting observations in the axolotl [26]. However, it is important to keep in mind that the tracing experiments in newts specifically targeted myofibers, but not the satellite cells. Currently, it is perfectly possible that satellite cell progeny contribute to the limb blastema also in newts but these progeny downregulate expression of the *Pax7* gene within the blastema. If this were the case, a major difference between the newt and axolotl in terms of satellite cell contribution to the blastema would be at the level of gene regulation rather than in the cell source *per se* (Figure 1). In order to unequivocally determine the fate of satellite cells and to relate the contribution from satellite cells to myofiber dedifferentiation, one would need to trace satellite cell progeny during newt limb regeneration. So far this has not been feasible due to lack of suitable cell type specific promoter constructs.

As a surrogate approach to *bona fide in vivo* tracing, satellite cells were previously isolated and, following *in vitro* expansion, re-injected into to regenerating newt limb [10,23]. Although *in vitro* expansion could lead to such epigenetic changes in the cultured cells that naturally are not occurring, these experiments suggested that satellite cell progeny have the capacity to contribute to the regenerate. In addition, the experiments indicated that satellite cell progeny could not only give rise to muscle but also to other cell types in newts – a plasticity, which might be reflected by downregulation of *Pax7* in the satellite cell progeny [23]. This scenario would represent yet another difference between axolotls and newts. While axolotl muscle tissue, and presumably the satellite cells within, were shown only to form muscle

during limb regeneration [27] **, satellite cells may cross lineage boundaries in the newt. Again, the distinctive difference in the newt compared to the axolotl in that case would be the plasticity rather than the lack of contribution by satellite cells and their progeny.

Cell cycle plasticity and lineage plasticity

The results of the myofiber tracing studies in newts refined our understanding of myofiber plasticity from at least two aspects.

First, they showed that cell cycle reentry is a post-fragmentation event occurring in mononucleate myofiber progeny rather than in the myonuclei within the syncytium before breaking up of the myofiber. This is in line with earlier experiments showing that myotubes that were blocked to re-enter the cell cycle still could give rise to mononucleate (obviously non proliferating) progeny upon implantation into the blastema [21]. However they contrast other conclusions that some myonuclei did enter S-phase in the syncytium during limb regeneration [28]. Further experiments are required to resolve the discrepancy between the two studies. The mechanistic separation of cell fragmentation from cell cycle reentry is also consistent with the observations showing that, although without detectable proliferation, also axolotl limb and tail blastemas harbored mononucleate myofiber-derived progeny [22,29]. This indicates that fragmentation of myofibers may represent an alternative fate direction of the muscle fiber - a question that we will discuss further.

Second, they provided no evidence for the myofiber progeny to cross lineage boundaries, as the label introduced to intact muscle prior to limb removal was only found in muscle fibers and not elsewhere in the new limb. How the muscle identity of the myofiber progeny is maintained is not clear but myofiber derived mononucleate progeny that had lost expression of terminal muscle differentiation marker myosin heavy chain, still expressed the early myogenic factor Myf5 in the blastema [22]. It will be important to determine whether Myf5 expression is a prerequisite for retaining the myogenic commitment of myofiber progeny. Yet another open question is whether myofiber progeny acquire muscle stem cell properties, which also requires further investigations. So far we can conclude that dedifferentiated myofiber-derived cells neither do acquire Pax7-expression nor are they found in satellite cell position in the regenerated muscle within the new limb, suggesting that they act as lineage committed progenitors during regeneration.

171

172 **Mechanisms of myogenic dedifferentiation**

173 Three key features thus define dedifferentiation of skeletal muscle fibers during limb
174 regeneration: (1) Fragmentation of the syncytium into mononucleate cells, (2) loss of
175 terminally differentiated markers, but retention of at least one early myogenic
176 determinant and (3) proliferation of the fiber-derived mononucleate cells. As outlined
177 above, myofiber fragmentation does not depend on cycle reentry by the myonuclei,
178 and conversely, fragmentation of the muscle syncytium does not predestine the
179 derived mononucleate cells to proliferate. The underlying mechanisms of these two
180 processes should thus be possible to disentangle from each other.

181 Means to force myotubes of both salamander and mammalian origin to reenter the
182 cell cycle has been extensively explored. Key gate-keepers that prevent myonuclei
183 reentering the cell cycle or initiate myogenic dedifferentiation have been identified,
184 such as the retinoblastoma (Rb) protein [18], MSX1 [30], p21 [31], p19ARF [32], and
185 thoroughly discussed in an excellent recent review [26]. Here we focus myogenic
186 dedifferentiation cues specifically studied in the context of salamander limb
187 regeneration.

188 A series of experiments involving both culture based assays and cell tracking
189 approaches during limb regeneration showed that fragmenting muscle cells displayed
190 hallmarks of a programmed cell death (PCD) process, such as activation of caspase-3,
191 and that inhibition of caspase activity counteracted the derivation of mononucleate
192 cells from both cultured myotubes as well as myofibers in the limb [33] *.
193 Importantly, inducing a programmed cell death response by myotubes was sufficient
194 to cause cellularization of cultured myotubes but only a fraction of the derived
195 mononucleate cells could be rescued from dying by apoptosis inhibitors and induced
196 to proliferate. Although still not proven, the emerging model suggests that limb
197 amputation evokes myofibers to embark on a programmed cell death program, which
198 is manifested by fragmentation of the syncytium. However, the derived mononucleate
199 cells must be rescued from the full execution of the cell death program in order to
200 gain ability for resuming proliferation within the blastema. This idea is consistent
201 with the observations that axolotl myofibers also fragment into mononucleate cells
202 during appendage regeneration [22,29], but these cells cannot be traced further during
203 axolotl regeneration and presumably die.

At present it is unclear how the molecular components of the programmed cell death program cause myofiber disassembly. An experimentally approachable hypothesis is that caspases are involved in the disintegration of structural elements, which are required for maintaining the integrity of syncytium. Noteworthy in the context are the experiments showing that caspase activity is required for spermatid individualization during sperm maturation in drosophila – a process during which each spermatid becomes encapsulated by an independent plasma membrane [34]. Caspases might also expel obstacles of subsequent proliferation that reside in the chromatin structure.

What could be the reasons why, in contrast to the newt, myofiber derived mononucleate cells do not contribute to the regenerate in the axolotl (formally only proven in the limb)? Differences both in intrinsic cell properties as well as in extrinsic cues that cells encounter in the limb might provide explanations but no such differences have yet been identified. Assays on cultured newt myotubes indicated that inhibition of p53 activity is necessary for cell cycle reentry [35*,36] and p53 knockdown was also required to render mammalian myotube-derived mononucleate cells ability to resume proliferation [33]. However, p53 activity decreases also during axolotl blastema formation, and p53 stabilization led to impairment of limb regeneration [35]. Similarly, with a creative screening strategy using newt myotubes the Tanaka lab recently identified a MARCKS (Myristoylated alanine-rich C-kinase substrate)-like protein (MLP), which on one hand promotes proliferation of myofiber derived mononucleate cells in newts, and on the other hand initiates regeneration of both limbs and tails in the axolotl [37] **.

Future perspectives

Our understanding of how and to what extent skeletal muscle contributes to limb regeneration has significantly increased during the past years. In this review we also highlighted outstanding questions that still have not been addressed experimentally. One such issue is to determine the relative contribution from dedifferentiating myofibers and from satellite cells to the regenerating newt limb. Even if we have gained more insight to myofiber dedifferentiation at the cellular level, we are still short of insights into the underlying molecular mechanisms. One way forward is to combine cell tracking approaches with genome wide expression analyses and molecular manipulations using contemporary methods such as single cell sequencing

238 and genome editing technologies.

239 **Figure legends**

240 Figure 1. *Contribution of skeletal muscle cells to the blastema formation during newt*
241 *limb regeneration.* Myofiber dedifferentiation results in proliferating, Myf5^{+}/PAX7^{-}
242 mononuclear cells (black) in the blastema that give rise to the skeletal muscle in the
243 new limb. Lack of PAX7^{+} cells in the newt blastema indicates either a minimal
244 contribution of satellite cells (green) to the blastema formation or a down-regulation
245 of *pax7* gene expression in the progeny of satellite cells.

246

247 Figure 2. *Model of myofiber dedifferentiation during newt limb regeneration.* Injury
248 evokes myofibers to activate caspases, which are involved in the disassembly of the
249 syncytium. The resulting fragments apoptotic fragments will either die or survive and
250 proliferate. The identity of the pro-survival and proliferation cues is largely unknown.
251 Although not proven in newts, downregulation of p53 activity is likely to play a role
252 in cell survival. The MLP promotes proliferation of myofiber progeny during newt
253 limb regeneration.

254

255 1. Buckingham M, Bajard L, Chang T, Daubas P, Hadchouel J, Meilhac S,
256 Montarras D, Rocancourt D, Relaix F: **The formation of skeletal muscle:**
257 **from somite to limb [Internet]**. *J. Anat.* 2003, **202**:59–68.
258 2. Dumont NA, Bentzinger CF, Sincennes M-C, Rudnicki MA: **Satellite Cells**
259 **and Skeletal Muscle Regeneration. [Internet]**. *Compr. Physiol.* 2015,
260 **5**:1027–59.
261 3. Buckingham M: **Tissue Differentiation: A Personal Account of Research on**
262 **Myogenesis and Cardiogenesis. [Internet]**. *Curr. Top. Dev. Biol.* 2016,
263 **116**:135–51.
264 4. Tabebordbar M, Wang ET, Wagers AJ: **Skeletal muscle degenerative**
265 **diseases and strategies for therapeutic muscle repair. [Internet]**. *Annu. Rev.*
266 *Pathol.* 2013, **8**:441–75.
267 5. Braun T, Gautel M: **Transcriptional mechanisms regulating skeletal muscle**
268 **differentiation, growth and homeostasis. [Internet]**. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell*
269 *Biol.* 2011, **12**:349–61.
270 6. MAURO A: **Satellite cell of skeletal muscle fibers. [Internet]**. *J. Biophys.*
271 *Biochem. Cytol.* 1961, **9**:493–5.
272 * Satellite cells in skeletal muscle were first identified in this paper.
273 7. Popiela H: **Muscle satellite cells in urodele amphibians: faciliatated**
274 **identification of satellite cells using ruthenium red staining. [Internet]**. *J.*
275 *Exp. Zool.* 1976, **198**:57–64.
276 8. Cameron J, Hilgers A, Hinterberger T: **Evidence that reserve cells are a**
277 **source of regenerated adult newt muscle in vitro**. *Nature* 1986, **321**:607–
278 610.
279 9. Cherkasova L V: **[Cell satellites and postsatellites in the muscle tissue of the**
280 **adult Ambystoma mexicanum]. [Internet]**. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 1983,
281 **273**:991–3.
282 10. Morrison JI, Lööf S, He P, Simon A: **Salamander limb regeneration involves**
283 **the activation of a multipotent skeletal muscle satellite cell population.**
284 **[Internet]**. *J. Cell Biol.* 2006, **172**:433–40.
285 11. Brockes JP, Kumar A: **Plasticity and reprogramming of differentiated cells**
286 **in amphibian regeneration. [Internet]**. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 2002,
287 **3**:566–74.
288 12. Wallace H: **Vertebrate Limb Regeneration**. John Wiley and Sons Inc.;

1981:288.

13. Stocum DL: **New Tissues from Old [Internet]**. *Science (80-.).* 1997, **276**:15.

14. Hay ED: **Electron microscopic observations of muscle dedifferentiation in regenerating Amblystoma limbs [Internet]**. *Dev. Biol.* 1959, **1**:555–585.

* Pioneering study indicating the derivation of mononucleate blastema cells from skeletal muscle fibers.

15. Lentz TL: **Cytological studies of muscle dedifferentiation and differentiation during limb regeneration of the newt Triturus. [Internet]**. *Am. J. Anat.* 1969, **124**:447–79.

16. Iten LE, Bryant S V.: **Forelimb regeneration from different levels of amputation in the newt,Notophthalmus viridescens: Length, rate, and stages [Internet]**. *Wilhelm Roux' Arch. f*[illegible]*r Entwicklungsmechanik der Org.* 1973, **173**:263–282.

17. HAY ED, FISCHMAN DA: **Origin of the blastema in regenerating limbs of the newt Triturus viridescens. An autoradiographic study using tritiated thymidine to follow cell proliferation and migration. [Internet]**. *Dev. Biol.* 1961, **3**:26–59.

18. Tanaka EM, Gann AA, Gates PB, Brockes JP: **Newt myotubes reenter the cell cycle by phosphorylation of the retinoblastoma protein. [Internet]**. *J. Cell Biol.* 1997, **136**:155–65.

* This work shows that newt myonuclei are more susceptible to cell cycle reentry than their mammalian counteparts.

19. Tanaka EM, Drechsel DN, Brockes JP: **Thrombin regulates S-phase re-entry by cultured newt myotubes. [Internet]**. *Curr. Biol.* **9**:792–9.

20. Kumar A, Velloso CP, Imokawa Y, Brockes JP: **Plasticity of retrovirus-labelled myotubes in the newt limb regeneration blastema. [Internet]**. *Dev. Biol.* 2000, **218**:125–36.

21. Velloso CP, Kumar a., Tanaka EM, Brockes JP: **Generation of mononucleate cells from post-mitotic myotubes proceeds in the absence of cell cycle progression [Internet]**. *Differentiation* 2000, **66**:239–246.

22. Sandoval-Guzmán T, Wang H, Khattak S, Schuez M, Roensch K, Nacu E, Tazaki A, Joven A, Tanaka EM, Simon A: **Fundamental Differences in Dedifferentiation and Stem Cell Recruitment during Skeletal Muscle Regeneration in Two Salamander Species [Internet]**. *Cell Stem Cell* 2014,

323 **14**:174–187.
324 ** First study to demonstrate skeletal muscle dedifferentiation during newt limb
325 regeneration by genetic cell tracing.
326 23. Morrison JI, Borg P, Simon A: **Plasticity and recovery of skeletal muscle**
327 **satellite cells during limb regeneration. [Internet]**. *FASEB J.* 2010, **24**:750–
328 6.
329 24. Tanaka HV, Ng NCY, Yang Yu Z, Casco-Robles MM, Maruo F, Tsonis PA,
330 Chiba C: **A developmentally regulated switch from stem cells to**
331 **dedifferentiation for limb muscle regeneration in newts. [Internet]**. *Nat.*
332 *Commun.* 2016, **7**:11069.
333 25. Wu C-H, Huang T-Y, Chen B-S, Chiou L-L, Lee H-S: **Long-duration muscle**
334 **dedifferentiation during limb regeneration in axolotls. [Internet]**. *PLoS*
335 *One* 2015, **10**:e0116068.
336 26. Frasch M: **Dedifferentiation, Redifferentiation, and Transdifferentiation of**
337 **Striated Muscles During Regeneration and Development. [Internet]**. *Curr.*
338 *Top. Dev. Biol.* 2016, **116**:331–55.
339 27. Kragl M, Knapp D, Nacu E, Khattak S, Maden M, Epperlein HH, Tanaka EM:
340 **Cells keep a memory of their tissue origin during axolotl limb**
341 **regeneration. [Internet]**. *Nature* 2009, **460**:60–5.
342 ** This work shows that skeletal muscle tissue cells do not shift lineage during
343 axolotl limb regeneration.
344 28. Calve S, Simon H-G: **High resolution three-dimensional imaging: Evidence**
345 **for cell cycle reentry in regenerating skeletal muscle. [Internet]**. *Dev. Dyn.*
346 2011, **240**:1233–9.
347 29. Echeverri K, Clarke JD, Tanaka EM: **In vivo imaging indicates muscle fiber**
348 **dedifferentiation is a major contributor to the regenerating tail blastema.**
349 **[Internet]**. *Dev. Biol.* 2001, **236**:151–64.
350 30. Odelberg SJ, Kollhoff A, Keating MT: **Dedifferentiation of Mammalian**
351 **Myotubes Induced by msx1 [Internet]**. *Cell* 2000, **103**:1099–1109.
352 31. Pajalunga D, Mazzola A, Salzano AM, Biferi MG, De Luca G, Crescenzi M:
353 **Critical requirement for cell cycle inhibitors in sustaining nonproliferative**
354 **states. [Internet]**. *J. Cell Biol.* 2007, **176**:807–18.
355 32. Pajcini K V, Corbel SY, Sage J, Pomerantz JH, Blau HM: **Transient**
356 **inactivation of Rb and ARF yields regenerative cells from postmitotic**

357 **mammalian muscle. [Internet]**. *Cell Stem Cell* 2010, **7**:198–213.
358 33. Wang H, Lööf S, Borg P, Nader GA, Blau HM, Simon A: **Turning terminally**
359 **differentiated skeletal muscle cells into regenerative progenitors.**
360 **[Internet]**. *Nat. Commun.* 2015, **6**:7916.
361 * This work shows that skeletal muscle dedifferentiation and programmed cell death
362 share common molecular features.
363 34. Huh JR, Vernooy SY, Yu H, Yan N, Shi Y, Guo M, Hay BA: **Multiple**
364 **apoptotic caspase cascades are required in nonapoptotic roles for**
365 **Drosophila spermatid individualization. [Internet]**. *PLoS Biol.* 2004, **2**:E15.
366 35. Yun MH, Gates PB, Brockes JP: **Regulation of p53 is critical for vertebrate**
367 **limb regeneration. [Internet]**. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2013,
368 **110**:17392–7.
369 * This study links p53 activity to cell cycle reentry in differentiated newt muscle.
370 36. Yun MH, Gates PB, Brockes JP: **Sustained ERK activation underlies**
371 **reprogramming in regeneration-competent salamander cells and**
372 **distinguishes them from their mammalian counterparts. [Internet]**. *Stem*
373 *cell reports* 2014, **3**:15–23.
374 37. Sugiura T, Wang H, Barsacchi R, Simon A, Tanaka EM: **MARCKS-like**
375 **protein is an initiating molecule in axolotl appendage regeneration**
376 **[Internet]**. *Nature* 2016, **531**:237–40.
377 ** Identification of a regeneration inititiating factor that induces and stimulates
378 proliferation of stem and progenitor cells during appendage regeneration in
379 salamanders.


?
pax7+
pax7-
myf5+
pax7-
myf5+
pax7-


Injury
cell death
MLP
thrombin
serum factor
MLP receptor
PCD
Ⓟ Rb
p19arf
p53
X
E2F