

Mol Manuscript 18044

AHR ACTIVATION INHIBITS REGENERATIVE GROWTH

Lijoy K Mathew, Eric A Andreasen, and Robert L Tanguay

Department of Environmental and Molecular Toxicology,
Marine and Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Center,
Environmental Health Sciences Center
Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, 97331

Mol Manuscript 18044

RUNNING TITLE: AHR ACTIVATION INHIBITS REGENERATION

Address correspondence and reprint requests to:

Robert L. Tanguay
Oregon State University
Department of Environmental and Molecular Toxicology
1007 ALS
Corvallis, Oregon 97331-7301

541-737-6514 (voice)

541-737-7966 (fax)

robert.tanguay@oregonstate.edu

Document statistics:

Number of Text Pages:	29
Number of tables:	1
Number of Figures	9
Number of References:	40
Number of words in Abstract	249
Number of Words in Introduction:	700
Number of Words in Discussion:	1483

Mol Manuscript 18044

Abstract

There is considerable literature supporting the conclusion that inappropriate activation of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AHR) alters cellular signaling. We have previously established that fin regeneration is specifically inhibited by TCDD in adult zebrafish and have used this *in vivo* end point to evaluate interactions between AHR and growth controlling pathways. Because there are experimental limitations in studying regeneration in adult animals, we have developed a larval model to evaluate the effect of AHR activation on tissue regeneration. Two day old zebrafish regenerate their amputated caudal fins within 3 days. Here we demonstrate that TCDD specifically blocks regenerative growth in larvae. The AHR pathway in zebrafish is considerably more complex than in mammals, with at least three zebrafish AHR genes (zfAHR1a, zfAHR1b and zfAHR2), and two ARNT genes (zfARNT1 and zfARNT2). Although it was presumed that the block in regeneration was mediated by AHR activation, it had not been experimentally demonstrated. Using antisense morpholinos and mutant fish lines, we report that zfAHR2 and zfARNT1 are the *in vivo* dimerization partners that are required for inhibition of regeneration by TCDD. Several pathways including FGF signaling are essential for fin regeneration. Even though impaired FGF signaling and TCDD exposure both inhibit fin regeneration, their morphometric response are distinct suggesting that the mechanisms of impairment are different. With the plethora of molecular and genetic techniques that can be applied to larval stage embryos, this *in vivo* regeneration system can be further exploited to understand cross talk between AHR and other signaling pathways.

Mol Manuscript 18044

Introduction

2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD), an ubiquitous environmental contaminant causes a wide variety of toxicities including reproductive and developmental toxicity, immunotoxicity, cardiotoxicity, teratogenicity and neurotoxicity at low exposure levels. TCDD elicits toxicity by acting as a ligand for the aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AHR), [reviewed in (Schmidt and Bradfield, 1996)]. The AHR pathway has been studied in various disparate vertebrates including several species of fish. The AHR signal transduction pathway in fish species is akin to that of mammals except fish possess at least two AHR genes while the mammals have only one. AHR isoforms are designated as AHR1, and AHR2 (Hahn et al., 1997). zfAHR1a, zfAHR1b and zfAHR2 have been identified in zebrafish (Andreasen et al., 2002a; Karchner et al., 2005; Tanguay et al., 1999). *In vivo* antisense knockdown studies in zebrafish embryos have established that zfAHR2, and not zfAHR1, mediates the multiple end points of TCDD developmental toxicity in zebrafish (Prasch et al., 2003). Four splice variants of zfARNT2 denoted as zfARNT2a, b, c, x have been cloned and characterized (Tanguay et al., 2000; Wang, 2000). *In vitro* molecular and biochemical studies suggest that zfARNT2b functionally heterodimerizes with zfAHR2 to enhance the dioxin response element (DRE) driven transcription in the presence of TCDD (Tanguay et al., 1999; Tanguay et al., 2000). However, neither morpholino knockdown of zfARNT2 in zebrafish embryo, nor zebrafish ARNT2 mutants (*zfarnt2^{-/-}*) prevented TCDD mediated developmental toxicity (Prasch et al., 2004). This contradiction led to further investigation and identification of zebrafish ARNT1. Functional characterization by morpholino approach delineated that zfARNT1 is the functional heterodimer of zfAHR2 in zebrafish (Prasch et al., In Press).

Mol Manuscript 18044

Although AHR-driven transcriptional regulation has been extensively studied, the mechanism by which TCDD causes toxicity is not fully understood. The development of *in vivo* models to explore the complexity of AHR signal transduction is essential. Adult zebrafish have the remarkable capacity to regenerate their caudal fins completely within fourteen days after amputation (Geraudie et al., 1995) and it was previously demonstrated that TCDD inhibits this complex process (Zodrow and Tanguay, 2003). Recently it was reported that the caudal fin primordia of zebrafish larvae are also capable of tissue regeneration in a process remarkably similar to that observed in adults (Kawakami et al., 2004). In the larval fin, within 10 min of amputation, epithelial cells surrounding the amputation plane begin migrate over the wound site. These epithelial cells accumulate to form a compact wound epithelium by 24 hours post amputation (hpa). Actively proliferating mesenchymal cells denoted as blastema cells are evident in the area adjacent to the amputation plane by 24-48 hpa. After blastema formation, both the adult and larval regenerating fins exhibit a common cell proliferation profile with the proliferation starting at the distal area (posterior to the amputation plane). The distal-most cells do not proliferate during the late phase of repair; instead, drastic cell proliferation occurs in the proximal (anterior to the amputation plane) region. In addition to the similar regenerative events between adults and larvae, fibroblast growth factor (FGF) signaling is necessary during fin regeneration suggesting a common regenerative molecular mechanism (Kawakami et al., 2004; Poss et al., 2000b).

Studies in adult fin regeneration were limited by barriers in molecular and genetic techniques which motivated us to develop a larval model to evaluate the consequence of AHR activation on early life stage regeneration. The objectives of this study were to first determine whether TCDD impairs larval fin regeneration, and then to determine which AHR pathway

Mol Manuscript 18044

members mediate the response. Our observations demonstrate that TCDD specifically impedes larval fin regeneration. Activation of the AHR pathway was confirmed by immunohistochemical localization of induced cytochrome P4501A (zfCYP1A), a well studied AHR responsive gene. Antisense knockdown and mutant zebrafish lines demonstrate that zfAHR2 and zARNT1 are both required for the TCDD dependent block in regenerative growth. We also demonstrate that the inhibitory effects of TCDD exposure and FGF receptor antagonism on regeneration are distinct. In addition to the inherent advantages of zebrafish (i.e. rapid development and fecundity) the larval zebrafish model allows the use of many additional molecular and genetic techniques, such as transient and stable transgenics, mutant screens and antisense gene repression. Thus the larval zebrafish is an outstanding model to unravel tissue regeneration mechanisms.

Materials and Methods

Zebrafish lines and embryos.

Fertilized AB strain embryos (University of Oregon, Eugene, OR) were used for all the experiments. *zfarnt2*^{-/-} mutants (ARNT2^{hi1715}) in the TAB-14 background (Tubingen/AB cross no.14) was a gift of Nancy Hopkins (Center for Cancer Research and Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA). All embryos were raised in our laboratory according to standard procedures. Each experimental group consisted of 12 larvae.

Amputation of zebrafish larval fin primordia and chemical exposure.

Embryos were dechorionated and anesthetized with 0.008% 3-amino benzoic acid ethylester (tricaine) in fish water. At 48 hours post fertilization (hpf), larvae were placed on an agar plate

Mol Manuscript 18044

and the caudal fin primordia was amputated with a surgical razor blade just posterior to the notochord and transferred to a 24 well plate containing chemical free fish water. 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD)($>99\%$ pure) was purchased from Chemsyn (Lenexa, KS); β -naphthoflavone (BNF, $>99\%$ pure) was obtained from Acros Organics (Morris Plains, NJ) and α -naphthoflavone (ANF) from Sigma, (St.Louis, MO). The amputated larvae (48 hpf) were exposed to vehicle (0.3% DMSO) or TCDD in vehicle (0.5 ng/mL of fish water) in a 24 well plate for 1 hr. After incubation, the embryos were rinsed multiple times and allowed to develop for 3 days in vehicle/TCDD-free water at 27⁰C. Since BNF and ANF (both 0.3 μ g/mL) were not soluble in DMSO, these ligands were dissolved in dimethyl formamide (DMF). ANF and BNF exposures were conducted in 24 well plates for 24 hours, followed by multiple rinses in water. After exposure to ANF and BNF, the larvae were reared for 3 days at 27⁰C in ANF and BNF free water. The FGFR1 inhibitor (SU5402)) was purchased from Calbiohem (SanDiego, CA). The amputated larvae were exposed to SU5402 at a final concentration of 5 μ M for 1 day, followed by multiple rinses with fish water.

Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR).

The caudal fin primordia of 48 hpf larvae were amputated and the animals were exposed to vehicle or TCDD in vehicle (0.5 ng/mL of fish water) for 1 h. After multiple rinses in TCDD free water, the embryos were reared at 27⁰C. Regenerating fins were surgically amputated again at 3 dpa just posterior to the notochord. The amputated regenerating fins were directly immersed into TRI reagent (Molecular Research Laboratories, Cincinnati, OH) and RNA was isolated as previously described (Tanguay et al., 1999). Reverse transcription (RT) reactions were carried out using 100 ng of total RNA, 500 ng Oligo dT₁₂₋₁₈ primer, 1mM dNTPs. The mixture was

Mol Manuscript 18044

heated up to 65°C for 5 min and quick chilled on ice. The 20 µl reaction contained 1X First Strand Buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 8.3), 75 mM KCl, 3 mM MgCl₂), 0.01 M DTT, 40 units of RNaseOUT, and 200 units of SuperScript™ II Reverse Transcriptase (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, California). This reaction was incubated at 42°C for 50 min, followed by inactivation at 70°C for 15 min. Each 50 µl PCR reaction contained a 2 µl aliquot of cDNA as the template, 0.2 mM each dNTPs, 10X PCR Buffer, 1 mM MgSO₄, 0.2 µM forward and reverse primers for either AHR1, AHR2, ARNT1, ARNT2b/c, CYP1A, or β-actin (Table 1) and 1.0 unit of KOD Hot Start DNA polymerase (Novagen, San Diego, CA). The reactions were run in a PTC-100 Peltier thermal cycler (MJ Research, South San Francisco, CA) at the following conditions: 94°C for 20 s; 58°C for 30 s, 72°C for 80 s, for a total of 35 cycles. The PCR products were resolved by electrophoresis through a 2% agarose gel and visualized by ethidium bromide staining.

Morpholinos.

Zebrafish aryl hydrocarbon receptor 2 morpholino (*zfahr2*-MO) (Gene Tools, Corvallis, OR) targeted the translation start site beginning 4 bp upstream of the AUG codon to 18 bp downstream of the sequence. The sequence of the *zfahr2*-MO was 5'TGTACCGATAACCCGCCGACATGGTT3' and the 3' end was fluorescein tagged to assess microinjection success. Morpholinos were diluted to 2.8 mM in 1X Danieau's solution (58 mM NaCl, 0.7 mM KCl, 0.4 mM MgSO₄, 0.6 mM Ca(NO₃)₂, 5 mM HEPES, pH 7.6) as described (Nasevicius and Ekker, 2000). Zebrafish aryl hydrocarbon receptor nuclear translocator 1 morpholino (*zfarnt1*-MO) (5'CTCTTACCTCAGTTACAATTTATA3') overlapped the translation start site of *zfarnt1* mRNA, starting 4 bp upstream of the AUG start codon to 17 bp downstream of the sequence. The morpholinos were diluted to 1.5 mM in 1x Danieau's solution

Mol Manuscript 18044

prior to microinjection. A standard control morpholino (Gene Tools, Corvallis, OR) (5'CTCTTACCTCAGTTACAATTTATA 3') was used as a control morpholino (Control-MO). The embryos were injected at the 1–2 cell stage with approximately 1-3 nl of the appropriate morpholino solution. Embryos were screened for fluorescence at 24 hpf to reveal successful injection. The caudal fin of selected embryos were amputated and exposed to TCDD or vehicle for 1 hour at 48 hpf. The morpholino injected embryos (morphants) were raised for 3 days following amputation and the regeneration of fin tissue was observed.

Genotyping of *zfarnt2* mutants.

Embryonic DNA was extracted from individual embryos in extraction buffer (0.01 M Tris, 2 mM EDTA, 0.2% Triton-X, 0.2 mg/ml Proteinase-K) incubated at 55°C for 2.5 h. The extract was heated at 100°C for 10 min before centrifugation and the supernatant was used as the DNA template for PCR. The primers used were *zfarnt2*F1, *zfarnt2*R1 and TranspoR. *zfarnt2*F1 and *zfarnt2*R1 flank the knockout viral insertion and TranspoR lies within the transposon insert. *zfarnt2*F1 and *zfarnt2*R1 were designed to distinguish *zfarnt2*^{-/-} mutants from wild type (WT) and from heterozygous (HET) larvae, while *zfarnt2*F1 and TranspoR were used to distinguish WT from HET larvae. PCR was performed to amplify the appropriate sequence using KOD Hot Start DNA polymerase and the PCR products were examined by gel electrophoresis and ethidium bromide staining.

Whole mount immunolocalization of *zfcyp1a* and α -acetylated tubulin.

The distribution of *zfcyp1a* protein in zebrafish larval fin tissue was assessed using the monoclonal antibody, C107 (mouse anti-CYP1A, 1:500; Biosense Laboratories, Bergen,

Mol Manuscript 18044

Norway). Monoclonal antibodies generated against acetylated tubulin (mouse anti-AT, 1:1000; Sigma, St. Louis) label most axons and major peripheral processes in the developing embryo. On 3 dpa, TCDD exposed and control larvae were fixed overnight in 4% paraformaldehyde in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and washed in PBS + 0.1% Tween-20 (PBST). The larvae were permeabilized with 0.005% trypsin (4°C) in PBS on ice for 5 minutes, rinsed in PBST and postfixed in 4% paraformaldehyde. Permeabilized larvae were blocked in 10% normal goat serum (NGS) in PBS + 0.5% Triton X-100 (PBSTx) for an hour at 22°C and incubated with the primary antibody overnight at 4°C in 1% NGS- PBSTx. Following 4x 30 min washes in PBST, the larvae were incubated with a secondary antibody (1:1000)(Alexa-546 conjugated goat anti mouse; Molecular Probes, Eugene, OR) for 5 h at 22°C. The larvae were then washed 4x for 30 min in PBST and visualized by epifluorescence microscopy.

Statistical Analysis.

Each experiment comprised of 12 larvae per group. The larvae were exposed to vehicle or chemical with 2 larvae in each well. Significant difference in the area and length between the control and TCDD exposed animals was assessed by Students t-test ($p < 0.05$) using SigmaStat 2.03 software.

Results

TCDD Inhibits Larval Zebrafish Caudal Fin Regeneration.

Larval zebrafish caudal fin primordia have the remarkable ability to regenerate by a mechanism similar to that observed in adult fin regeneration (Kawakami et al., 2004). These studies were designed to determine if AHR activation would impact larval fin regeneration similar to adult

Mol Manuscript 18044

zebrafish (Zodrow and Tanguay, 2003). The caudal fin primordia of the 48 hpf larvae were partially amputated just posterior to the notochord (Fig. 1). A range of TCDD concentrations was used (0.01 ng to 1 ng/mL) to determine the sublethal concentration that inhibits fin regeneration (data not shown). From these initial dose response studies, 0.5 ng/mL of TCDD was determined as the most effective concentration that impairs fin regeneration without causing mortality prior to 120 hpf, and was used for all of the described studies. The amputated larvae were exposed to DMSO or TCDD and allowed to develop for 3 days. Zebrafish exposed to vehicle, regenerated their fin tissue in 3 days, while the process of regeneration was impaired in animals exposed to TCDD (Fig. 1). Although not the focus of these studies, exposed larvae also developed the typical TCDD toxicological signs including pericardial edema, yolk sac edema, reduced blood flow, impairment of the swim bladder (Henry et al., 1997; Prasch et al., 2004) at 3 dpa. This study suggests that larval and adult fin regeneration may be impaired by TCDD potentially through a common molecular mechanism. Importantly, these results allow full exploitation of the larval zebrafish model to elucidate the role of AHR activation and tissue regeneration.

Inhibition of Fin Growth by TCDD is Specific to the Regenerated Tissue.

To determine if the effects of TCDD are specific to the regenerating fin, we performed partial fin amputations. The ventral halves of the caudal fins were amputated leaving the dorsal half of the developing fin intact to serve as a control and the larvae were exposed to vehicle or TCDD (Fig. 2). Images were taken immediately after partial amputation (0 dpa) and three days later (3 dpa). In the presence of vehicle, embryos completely regenerate their fins in 3 days. However, fin regeneration was significantly inhibited by TCDD (Fig. 2). Even though TCDD exposed larvae displayed classic signs of toxicity and regeneration of the ventral portion of the fin was inhibited,

Mol Manuscript 18044

growth of the nonamputated dorsal half of fin was not affected (Fig.2). This suggests that AHR activation specifically interferes with the regenerative process and not just growth.

In order to quantify the growth response, the length of maximum outgrowth, the area of regenerated fin tissue (%) and the area of nonamputated fin tissue (%) were measured as depicted in the schematic diagram (Fig. 3A). The length of maximum outgrowth is defined as the distance from the plane of amputation to the tip of the regenerating fin. The area of regenerated fin tissue represents the newly grown ventral fin tissue after partial amputation. The area of the intact dorsal half of the fin was used to determine whether TCDD impacts non-regenerative fin development. The length of maximum outgrowth and the area of regenerated fin tissue (%) in TCDD exposed larvae were significantly lower when compared to the control larvae (Fig. 3B, C). Surprisingly, the increase in the area of nonamputated fin tissue (%) from 0-3 dpa in TCDD exposed larvae was significantly greater than the control larvae (Fig. 3D). Together, these results establish that TCDD specifically inhibits the growth of the regenerating tissue. It is also important to emphasize that normal fin development and growth are not impeded by TCDD unless the fin is amputated.

Detection of AHR Pathway Members in the Regenerating Fin Tissue.

To determine the expression profile of AHR members and regulated genes in the larval regenerating fin tissue, RNA was isolated from the regenerating fin tissue of DMSO or TCDD exposed larvae at 3 dpa. RT-PCR was performed using gene-specific primers for *zfAHR1*, *zfAHR2*, *zfARNT1*, *zfARNT2b/c*, *zfCYP1A* and β -actin as a control. The transcripts of *zfahr1*, *zfahr2*, *zfarnt1* and *zfcyp1a* were expressed in both DMSO and TCDD exposed larval regenerating fin tissue, but the expression of *zfarnt2b/c* was faint (Fig. 4). Even though this

Mol Manuscript 18044

method is non quantitative, *zfcyp1a* transcript level observed in the TCDD exposed fin tissue was apparently increased over DMSO levels suggesting that AHR pathway is active in regenerating fin tissue.

Whole Mount Immunolocalization of zfCYP1A.

A common biomarker to evaluate the activation of AHR pathway by TCDD is to observe CYP1A expression. The temporal and spatial pattern is often associated with the toxicity (Andreasen et al., 2002b; Henry et al., 1997; Tanguay et al., 1999). Immunohistochemical staining of zfCYP1A protein was conducted with larvae exposed to vehicle or TCDD at 48 hpf. Specific immunolocalization of zfCYP1A was detected in the fin tissue of the TCDD exposed larvae, but was not observed in the control larvae (Fig. 5). zfCYP1A was consistently abundant at the distal tip of the caudal fin. TCDD induced expression of CYP1A in the intersegmental vessels (SE) was used to ensure the positive detection of zfCYP1A between the TCDD and vehicle exposed larvae (Fig.5). Elevated expression of zfCYP1A protein in the fin tissue of TCDD exposed larvae confirms that AHR pathway is activated

BNF, another AHR2 Ligand Inhibits Regeneration.

To further test the hypothesis that TCDD blocks regeneration by inappropriately activating the AHR pathway, BNF was used as an alternative AHR ligand. BNF has been shown to bind and activate the zebrafish AHR2 (Wentworth et al., 2004). When amputated larvae were exposed to BNF (0.3µg/mL), regeneration was completely blocked as we observed in larvae exposed to TCDD. However, when zebrafish were exposed to the AHR2 antagonist, ANF (0.3 µg/mL) or

Mol Manuscript 18044

vehicle, regeneration progressed and was completed in three days (Fig. 6). These results strongly suggest that ligand activation of AHR2 is necessary to block the regenerative process.

AHR2 is Necessary for TCDD to Impede Fin Regeneration.

With the availability of the nearly complete zebrafish genomic sequence and the ability to use antisense modified oligonucleotides (morpholinos), the role of any protein in a biological process can be rapidly evaluated *in vivo* using zebrafish embryos or larvae (Nasevicius and Ekker, 2000). Morpholinos have been shown to be most effective between 0 and 96 hpf. Higher concentrations of morpholino (2.8 mM) can be used to prolong the repression of target genes up to 120 hpf (data not shown). The zfAHR2 and control morphants were amputated and exposed to vehicle or TCDD at 48 hpf and raised for 3 days. The control and zfAHR2 morphants exposed to vehicle regenerated completely indicating that the endogenous functions of zfAHR2 are not required for regeneration. As expected, the control morphants exposed to TCDD failed to regenerate (Fig. 7A). The caudal fins in zfAHR2 morphant animals exposed to TCDD were capable of complete regeneration indicating that inhibition of fin regeneration by TCDD is mediated through zfAHR2 (Fig. 7A). In other words, in the absence of zfAHR2, TCDD has no effect on tissue regeneration. Importantly, the zfAHR2 morphants also failed to develop other signs of TCDD toxicity including pericardia edema, yolk sac edema, reduced blood flow as previously detailed (Prasch et al., 2003). Immunohistochemical analysis was performed on the control and zfAHR2 morphants exposed to vehicle and TCDD to monitor *in situ* zfCYP1A protein expression. zfCYP1A was not detected in either control or zfAHR2 morphants exposed to vehicle (data not shown). Control morphants had significant vascular and extravascular zfCYP1A expression, and in zfAHR2 morphants, zfCYP1A protein was not detected indicating complete and persistent

Mol Manuscript 18044

knockdown of AHR2 (Fig. 7B). These results confirm that AHR pathway cannot be activated by TCDD in the absence of AHR2.

ARNT1, Not ARNT2 is Required for Inhibition of Fin Regeneration by TCDD.

Since there are at least two ARNT genes expressed in the early embryo, zfARNT1 and zfARNT2, it was important to determine which ARNT is the *in vivo* partner for zfAHR2 that is necessary to block tissue regeneration. A genetic approach was used to specifically evaluate the role of zfARNT2. Insertional mutagenesis screens had previously identified zebrafish mutants that lacked ARNT2 expression (Amsterdam et al., 1999). These mutants were generously provided by Dr. Nancy Hopkins (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA). Embryos collected from *zfarnt2*^{+/-} (HET) parents were raised to 48 hpf and 40 larvae were amputated and exposed to TCDD. In this pool of larvae, 25% should be *zfarnt2*^{+/+} (WT), 50% should be *zfarnt2*^{+/-} (HET) and 25% should be *zfarnt2*^{-/-} mutants. TCDD completely inhibited the fin regeneration in all the larvae, irrespective of the ARNT2 genetic status (Fig. 8A). Genotyping of individual larvae were conducted with PCR to determine the larval genetic makeup (Fig. 8A).

To determine the role of zfARNT1 in fin regeneration, morpholinos were used to knockdown early life stage zfARNT1 protein expression. Control and zfARNT1 morphants were amputated at 48 hpf, followed by a waterborne exposure to vehicle or TCDD. The amputated larvae were allowed to regenerate their fins for 3 days. The control morphants exposed to TCDD displayed impaired fin regeneration, while the zfARNT1 morphants were able to completely regenerate their fins in the presence of TCDD (Fig. 8C). *In situ* immunolocalization of zfCYP1A protein confirms that zfCYP1A is highly induced in control morphants exposed to TCDD, while

Mol Manuscript 18044

the zfARNT1 morphants had a significant decrease in the CYP1A expression (Fig. 8D). Together these results indicate that ARNT1 is a necessary *in vivo* dimerization partner for AHR2, which together, initiate a process that inhibits tissue regeneration.

Morphometrically, TCDD and FGFR1-mediated inhibition of fin regeneration are different.

It is clear that AHR activation impairs or interferes with signaling pathways required for tissue regeneration, but these downstream targets remain unknown. To begin to understand the underlying cellular responses, the effects of TCDD were compared to the effects of another chemical known to impact regeneration. Inhibition of fibroblast growth factor receptor 1 (FGFR1) by a lipophilic drug (SU5402) has been shown to inhibit both adult and larval fin regeneration (Kawakami et al., 2004; Poss et al., 2000b). At the gross level, SU5402 inhibited fin regeneration, but to a lesser extent than TCDD (Fig. 9A, B). Importantly, over the course of the regeneration period (3 days), SU5402 had a significant reduction in the overall embryonic and larval growth, whereas TCDD had no measurable effect on overall growth during this developmental window (data not shown). During regeneration, neuronal axons and their peripheral processes grow and extend into the newly formed tissue (Tanguay, unpublished observation). The growth and pathfinding of these structures can be used to assess tissue reorganization. *In situ* immunolocalization using an α -acetylated tubulin antibody is a convenient way to label the axons and their peripheral processes. In the control larvae, the peripheral processes branch off the axonal trunks and fan out into the regenerate. After 3 days, a complex, but ordered network of branches is formed in the new tissue (Fig. 9C). In the TCDD exposed animals, the peripheral processes consistently extended toward the amputation plane, and then

Mol Manuscript 18044

made lateral turns, nearly perpendicular to the plane of amputation. Importantly, the branches continued to extend in the presence of TCDD, but the pathfinding is altered. These observations are consistent with the concept that that TCDD impairs the ability of the neuronal processes to migrate directly into the tissue (Fig. 9C, D). Further illustration of this point is revealed when only the ventral half of the fin is amputated (Fig. 9E). TCDD consistently lead to an altered neuronal growth pattern where the new processes in the partially amputated fin continued to grow, but made lateral turns in the absence of sufficient new tissue to accommodate their length. These results suggest that, in TCDD exposed larvae, the peripheral processes in the regenerating fin maybe incapable of growing straight due to a physical barrier or improper growth factor signaling. The neuronal response in SU5402 exposed larvae was noticeably different. The pathfinding of the neuronal branches was not affected. The processes reached the end of the new tissue and had a branching pattern indistinguishable from that in control animals (Fig.9E). Taken together, these results suggest that the inhibition of regeneration mediated by TCDD and FGFR1 inhibitor is different.

Discussion

Regeneration of tissue is a well orchestrated process where the injured or lost structure is completely replaced. In both adult and larval zebrafish, an epithelial wound covering is formed within 12hpa and this response does not involve cell proliferation (Nechiporuk and Keating, 2002; Santamaria et al., 1996). Wound closure is followed by the development of blastema and the wound epidermis is hypothesized to be a source of growth factors that stimulate and regulate the formation of the blastema. In adult zebrafish, fibroblast growth factors (FGFs) present in the wound epidermis interacts with the mesenchymal FGFR1. FFGR1 inhibitor studies suggest that

Mol Manuscript 18044

active FGF signaling is required for the formation of blastema and regenerative outgrowth (Poss et al., 2000b). The differential expression of *mps1*, *shh*, *lef1*, *wnt3a*, *wnt5*, *RAR- γ* and *msx* homeobox genes illustrates the complexity of signaling pathways during the regeneration process (Akimenko et al., 1995; Poss et al., 2000a; Poss et al., 2000b; White et al., 1994). During regenerative outgrowth, cell proliferation propagates from distal zone to the proximal zone of fin primordia with intense proliferation occurring in the proximal region during the late phase of repair (Kawakami et al., 2004; Nechiporuk and Keating, 2002). In larvae, fin regeneration is completed in 3-5 days by controlled cellular proliferation and migration. It has been established that TCDD impairs the outgrowth phase of regeneration (Zodrow and Tanguay, 2003). Although it had been presumed that the block in regeneration is mediated by TCDD binding and activation of AHR signaling pathway, it had not been experimentally demonstrated.

In mammals, studies have demonstrated that *Ahr* null mice develop hepatic defects and have reduced liver size implicating a role of AHR in normal liver growth and development (Lahvis et al., 2000 ; Schmidt and Bradfield, 1996). The underlying deficit appears to be a congenital vascular defect, failure of ductus venosus closure (Walisser et al., 2004). In addition to this endogenous developmental role, functional AHR is required to mediate TCDD toxicity (Gonzalez and Fernandez-Salguero, 1998; Mimura et al., 1999). Both zfAHR1 and zfAHR2 were present in the regenerating fin of vehicle and TCDD exposed larvae (Fig. 4). Previous studies have reported that zfAHR1 does not mediate TCDD toxicity as it does not bind to AHR ligands and has a very limited tissue distribution (Andreasen et al., 2002a). Knockdown of zfAHR2 by antisense morpholinos revealed that zfAHR2 mediates the endpoints of TCDD dependent developmental toxicity (Prasch et al., 2003). zfAHR2 morphants regenerated the fin tissue completely in the presence of TCDD confirming that AHR2 is necessary for TCDD to block fin

Mol Manuscript 18044

regeneration. Recently, a third AHR gene was identified in zebrafish which is located adjacent to the AHR2 gene in the zebrafish genome. This duplicated gene was designated as AHR1b. *In vitro* studies indicate that AHR1b has AHR-like properties (Karchner et al., 2005). The AHR2 morpholino studies demonstrate that AHR1b cannot play a role in mediating the well-studied *in vivo* responses to TCDD. The endogenous role for AHR1b remains to be identified.

In mammals, ARNT1 is the functional dimerization partner for AHR mediating many endpoints of TCDD toxicity (Schmidt and Bradfield, 1996). *arnt2* knockout mice die within 24h of birth and have impaired hypothalamic development, confirming its function during normal development (Hosoya et al., 2001). In zebrafish, four splice variants of zfARNT2 have been characterized and zfARNT2b has been demonstrated to be transcriptionally active with zfAHR2 *in vitro* (Tanguay et al., 2000). Unexpectedly, antisense repression of ARNT2 did not impact embryonic responses to TCDD. Similar results were obtained in zebrafish *arnt2* mutants. Collectively, these results confirm that zfARNT2 is not the *in vivo* partner of zfAHR2 mediating the developmental toxicity by TCDD (Prasch et al., 2004). zfARNT1 was recently characterized in zebrafish (Prasch et al., In Press). In regenerating larval fin, zfARNT1 was highly abundant in both vehicle and TCDD exposed larvae, while the expression of zfARNT2 was low. Fin regeneration in *zfARNT2*^{-/-} was impaired when exposed to TCDD, while the *zfARNT1* morphants completely regenerated, confirming that *zfANRT1* is the heterodimer of *zfAHR2*.

Since TCDD inhibits adult zebrafish fin regeneration when dosed on either 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 dpa, this suggests that TCDD interferes with multiple stages of regeneration (Zodrow and Tanguay, 2003). Similar results were found in larvae. When larvae were exposed to TCDD at 1 dpa, fin regeneration was also impaired (data not shown). Importantly, since wound healing and blastema formation occur in the first day, regenerative outgrowth may be the TCDD target.

Mol Manuscript 18044

Pharmacologic inhibition of FGFR1 inhibits blastema formation as well as outgrowth indicating that FGF signaling is required during fin regeneration (Kawakami et al., 2004; Poss et al., 2000b). Although FGFR1 inhibitor effectively reduced regenerative outgrowth, overall embryonic growth was also affected. Both FGFR1 inhibitor and TCDD impaired fin regeneration, but the tissue response to these chemicals was different. Using neuronal outgrowth as a marker, TCDD led to a significant disorganization of peripheral processes. Since matrix degradation and turnover are important in wound healing, tissue remodeling, tissue repair and inflammation, one possibility is that the extracellular matrix (ECM) metabolism is affected by TCDD. Matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs) are considered to be primarily responsible for the turnover of ECM. These proteolytic enzymes play a major role during development and morphogenesis. Improper regulation of these proteinases may result in pathologies such as arthritis, cancer, atherosclerosis, aneurysms, tissue ulcers and fibrosis (Visse and Nagase, 2003). It has also been reported that, after CNS injury, the optic nerve astrocytes are stimulated by regenerating axons by secreting active MMP and down regulating tissue inhibitors of metalloproteinases (TIMPs), resulting in the degradation of scar tissue creating a permissive growth environment (Ahmed et al., 2005). Tenascin-R, a glycoprotein deposited into the ECM acts as a repellent guidance molecule in boundaries during normal growth and regeneration of optical axons (Becker et al., 2004), clearly demonstrating that ECM components play critical roles in axonal guidance. We therefore propose that if matrix remodeling is impaired by TCDD, the neuronal growth cone may be unable to traverse through the matrix, resulting in abnormal pathfinding.

ECM is a dynamic environment that plays a crucial role in regulating cellular functions during normal and pathological remodeling processes such as embryonic development, tissue

Mol Manuscript 18044

repair, inflammation, tumor invasion, and metastasis. ECM macromolecules are critical for creating a conducive cellular milieu for proper proliferation and migration of different cell types. The MMPs are specifically controlled at the transcriptional level, activation of precursor zymogens, cell-ECM interactions and inhibition by endogenous TIMPs (Nagase and Woessner, 1999). The expression and functional role of MMPs has been studied in adult zebrafish regenerating fin, and have demonstrated that *membrane type mmp*, *mmp-2* and *timp-2* mRNA transcripts were expressed in the regenerating fin tissue. Fin outgrowth was significantly reduced by GM6001, a MMP inhibitor, emphasizing the magnitude of these proteinases during fin regeneration (Bai et al., 2005). Similarly, MMP inhibitor studies demonstrate that these enzymes are required for normal newt limb regeneration and *mmp3/10a*, *mmp3/10b* and *mmp-9* are upregulated within hours of limb amputation. The temporal expression of MMPs in the regenerating newt limb suggests that these enzymes are involved in blastema formation, maintenance and growth (Vinarsky et al., 2005). Interestingly, aryl hydrocarbons such as TCDD and Benzo (a) pyrene induced the expression of MMP-9 in PC-3 and DU145 human prostate cancer cells (Haque et al., 2005). TCDD increased the expression and activity of MMP-1, MMP-2 and MMP-9 in transformed melanoma cell (A2058), as well as increased invasion (Villano et al., 2005). Gene expression in the fetal murine heart after TCDD exposure *in utero* suggest possible alterations in cell cycle control and ECM production and remodeling (Thackaberry et al., 2005). Furthermore, TCCD enhanced expression of MMP-1, 9 and TIMP-3 in lung airway epithelial cells by microarray analysis, implying that MMP expression maybe a common endpoint for AHR pathway activation (Martinez et al., 2002). In normal human keratinocytes, TCDD induces MMP-1 expression and co-treatment with all trans retinoic acid enhanced the MMP-1 expression additively (Murphy et al., 2004), suggesting the cross talk of AHR pathway

Mol Manuscript 18044

with other signaling pathways. These studies correlate with the finding that ECM remodeling is impaired in the regenerating fins of TCDD exposed adult zebrafish (E. Andreasen, personal communication).

In summary, our data provide evidence that activation of AHR pathway inhibits larval zebrafish fin regeneration. The inhibition of fin regeneration is mediated by TCDD activation of zfAHR2 and its *in vivo* dimerization with zfARNT1. Preliminary data and the supporting literature point to an association between AHR pathway activation and impaired extracellular tissue remodeling. The interactions between cells and ECM are tightly controlled by membrane proteins, proteolytic enzymes, cytokines and growth factors during numerous physiological processes as well as during regeneration. Inappropriate expression or activity of any of the factors can mediate a variety of pathologies such as tumor metastasis, cardiovascular disease or toxicity. The larval fin regeneration model presented herein can be exploited to unravel the cross talk between AHR activated and other critical signaling pathways.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Nancy Hopkins for the *arnt2* mutants and Fred Tilton, Dr. Stacey Harper and Dr. Mark Reimers for helpful discussions on the manuscript.

Mol Manuscript 18044

References

- Ahmed Z, Dent RG, Leadbeater WE, Smith C, Berry M and Logan A (2005) Matrix metalloproteases: degradation of the inhibitory environment of the transected optic nerve and the scar by regenerating axons. *Mol Cell Neurosci* **28**:64-78.
- Akimenko MA, Johnson SL, Westerfield M and Ekker M (1995) Differential induction of four msx homeobox genes during fin development and regeneration in zebrafish. *Development* **121**:347-57.
- Amsterdam A, Burgess S, Golling G, Chen W, Sun Z, Townsend K, Farrington S, Haldi M and Hopkins N (1999) A large-scale insertional mutagenesis screen in zebrafish. *Genes Dev* **13**:2713-2724.
- Andreasen EA, Hahn ME, Heideman W, Peterson RE and Tanguay RL (2002a) The zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) aryl hydrocarbon receptor type 1 (zfAHR1) is a novel vertebrate receptor. *Mol Pharmacol* **62**:234-249.
- Andreasen EA, Spitsbergen JM, Tanguay RL, Stegeman JJ, Heideman W and Peterson RE (2002b) Tissue-specific expression of AHR2, ARNT2, and CYP1A in zebrafish embryos and larvae: effects of developmental stage and 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin exposure. *Tox Sci* **68**:403-419.
- Bai S, Thummel R, Godwin AR, Nagase H, Itoh Y, Li L, Evans R, McDermott J, Seiki M and Sarras MP, Jr. (2005) Matrix metalloproteinase expression and function during fin regeneration in zebrafish: analysis of MT1-MMP, MMP2 and TIMP2. *Matrix Biol* **24**:247-60.
- Becker CG, Schweitzer J, Feldner J, Schachner M and Becker T (2004) Tenascin-R as a repellent guidance molecule for newly growing and regenerating optic axons in adult zebrafish. *Mol Cell Neurosci* **26**:376-89.
- Geraudie J, Monnot MJ, Brulfert A and Ferretti P (1995) Caudal fin regeneration in wild type and long-fin mutant zebrafish is affected by retinoic acid. *Int J Dev Biol* **39**:373-81.
- Gonzalez FJ and Fernandez-Salguero P (1998) The aryl hydrocarbon receptor: studies using the AHR-null mice. *Drug Metab Dispos* **26**:1194-8.
- Hahn ME, Karchner SI, Shapiro MA and Perera SA (1997) Molecular evolution of two vertebrate aryl hydrocarbon (dioxin) receptors (AHR1 and AHR2) and the PAS family. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **94**:13743-8.
- Haque M, Francis J and Sehgal I (2005) Aryl hydrocarbon exposure induces expression of MMP-9 in human prostate cancer cell lines. *Cancer Lett* **225**:159-66.
- Henry EC, Kent TA and Gasiewicz TA (1997) DNA binding and transcriptional enhancement by purified TCDD.Ah receptor complex. *Arch Biochem Biophys* **339**:305-14.
- Hosoya T, Oda Y, Takahashi S, Morita M, Kawachi S, Ema M, Yamamoto M and Fujii-Kuriyama Y (2001) Defective development of secretory neurones in the hypothalamus of Arnt2-knockout mice. *Genes Cells* **6**:361-74.
- Karchner SI, Franks DG and Hahn ME (2005) AHR1B, a new functional aryl hydrocarbon receptor in zebrafish: tandem arrangement of *ahr1b* and *ahr2* genes. *Biochem. J.*
- Kawakami A, Fukazawa T and Takeda H (2004) Early fin primordia of zebrafish larvae regenerate by a similar growth control mechanism with adult regeneration. *Dev Dyn* **231**:693-9.

Mol Manuscript 18044

- Lahvis GP, Lindell SL, Thomas RS, McCuskey RS, Murphy C, Glover E, Bentz M, Southard J and Bradfield CA (2000) Portosystemic shunting and persistent fetal vascular structures in aryl hydrocarbon receptor-deficient mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **97**:10442-7.
- Martinez JM, Afshari CA, Bushel PR, Masuda A, Takahashi T and Walker NJ (2002) Differential toxicogenomic responses to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin in malignant and nonmalignant human airway epithelial cells. *Toxicol Sci* **69**:409-23.
- Mimura J, Ema M, Sogawa K and Fujii-Kuriyama Y (1999) Identification of a novel mechanism of regulation of Ah (dioxin) receptor function. *Genes Dev* **13**:20-5.
- Murphy KA, Villano CM, Dorn R and White LA (2004) Interaction between the aryl hydrocarbon receptor and retinoic acid pathways increases matrix metalloproteinase-1 expression in keratinocytes. *J Biol Chem* **279**:25284-93.
- Nagase H and Woessner JF, Jr. (1999) Matrix metalloproteinases. *J Biol Chem* **274**:21491-4.
- Nasevicius A and Ekker SC (2000) Effective targeted gene 'knockdown' in zebrafish. *Nat Genet* **26**:216-20.
- Nechiporuk A and Keating MT (2002) A proliferation gradient between proximal and msxb-expressing distal blastema directs zebrafish fin regeneration. *Development* **129**:2607-17.
- Poss KD, Shen J and Keating MT (2000a) Induction of *lef1* during zebrafish fin regeneration. *Dev Dyn* **219**:282-6.
- Poss KD, Shen J, Nechiporuk A, McMahon G, Thisse B, Thisse C and Keating MT (2000b) Roles for Fgf signaling during zebrafish fin regeneration. *Dev Biol* **222**:347-58.
- Prasch AL, Heideman W and Peterson RE (2004) ARNT2 is not required for TCDD developmental toxicity in zebrafish. *Toxicol Sci* **82**:250-8.
- Prasch AL, Tanguay RL, Mehta V, Heideman W and Peterson RE (In Press) Identification of zebrafish ARNT1 homologs: TCDD toxicity in the developing zebrafish requires ARNT1. *Mol Pharmacol*.
- Prasch AL, Teraoka H, Carney SA, Dong W, Hiraga T, Stegeman JJ, Heideman W and Peterson RE (2003) Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor 2 Mediates 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin Developmental Toxicity in Zebrafish. *Toxicol Sci* **76**:138-50.
- Santamaria JA, Mari-Beffa M, Santos-Ruiz L and Becerra J (1996) Incorporation of bromodeoxyuridine in regenerating fin tissue of the goldfish *Carassius auratus*. *J Exp Zool* **275**:300-7.
- Schmidt JV and Bradfield CA (1996) Ah receptor signaling pathways. *Ann Rev Cell Dev Biol* **12**:55-89.
- Tanguay RL, Abnet CC, Heideman W and Peterson RE (1999) Cloning and characterization of the zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) aryl hydrocarbon receptor. *Biochimica Biophys Acta* **1444**:35-48.
- Tanguay RL, Andreasen EA, Heideman W and Peterson RE (2000) Identification and expression of alternatively spliced aryl hydrocarbon nuclear translocator2 (ARNT2) cDNAs from zebrafish with distinct functions. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* **1494**:117-128.
- Thackaberry EA, Jiang Z, Johnson CD, Ramos KS and Walker MK (2005) Toxicogenomic Profile of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin in the Murine Fetal Heart: Modulation of Cell Cycle and Extracellular Matrix Genes. *Toxicol Sci*.
- Villano CM, Murphy KA, Akintobi A and White LA (2005) 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD) induces matrix metalloproteinase (MMP) expression and invasion in A2058 melanoma cells. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol*.

Mol Manuscript 18044

- Vinarsky V, Atkinson DL, Stevenson TJ, Keating MT and Odelberg SJ (2005) Normal newt limb regeneration requires matrix metalloproteinase function. *Dev Biol* **279**:86-98.
- Visse R and Nagase H (2003) Matrix metalloproteinases and tissue inhibitors of metalloproteinases: structure, function, and biochemistry. *Circ Res* **92**:827-39.
- Walisser JA, Bunger MK, Glover E and Bradfield CA (2004) Gestational exposure of Ahr and Arnt hypomorphs to dioxin rescues vascular development. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **101**:16677-82.
- Wang WW, J. Hsu, H. Kong, Z. Hu, C. (2000) Overexpression of a zebrafish ARNT2-like factor represses CYP1A transcription in ZLE cells. *Marine Biotechnology* **2**:376-386.
- Wentworth JN, Buzzeo R and Pollenz RS (2004) Functional characterization of aryl hydrocarbon receptor (zfAHR2) localization and degradation in zebrafish (*Danio rerio*). *Biochem Pharmacol* **67**:1363-72.
- White JA, Boffa MB, Jones B and Petkovich M (1994) A zebrafish retinoic acid receptor expressed in the regenerating caudal fin. *Development* **120**:1861-72.
- Zodrow JM and Tanguay RL (2003) 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin inhibits fin regeneration in zebrafish. *Toxicological Sciences* **76**:151-161.

Footnote:

This work was supported in part by NIEHS grants ES10820, ES00210, and ES03850.

Mol Manuscript 18044

Legends

Fig. 1 TCDD inhibits the regeneration of zebrafish fin primordia. The caudal fin primordia of zebrafish larvae (48 hpf) were surgically ablated just posterior to the notochord. Following amputation, larvae were exposed to TCDD (0.5 ng/mL) or vehicle control (DMSO). The fin regeneration images were captured immediately after amputation (0 dpa) on 3 dpa. The dotted line indicates the plane of amputation at 0 dpa.

Fig. 2 The suppression of fin regeneration by TCDD is specific to the regenerating tissue. The ventral half of the caudal fin was amputated followed by the waterborne exposure to TCDD (0.5 ng/mL) or control (DMSO). The embryos were allowed to develop further to analyze whether the TCDD preferentially inhibits the regenerating tissue. Fin regeneration images were acquired on 0 dpa and 3 dpa.

Fig. 3 TCDD preferentially affects the regenerating fin. (A) The length of maximum outgrowth, the area of regenerated fin tissue and the area of nonamputated fin tissue at 0 and 3 dpa were measured in vehicle and TCDD exposed embryos as described in the schematic diagram. (B) The length of maximum ventral caudal fin outgrowth (1 micron = 1.54 pixels) and (C) the area of regenerated fin tissue (%) in control larvae were significantly greater than the TCDD exposed embryos ($P < 0.001$). (D) The measurement of increase in the area of nonamputated tissue from 0-3 dpa will delineate whether TCDD affects the normal growth of fin tissue. The area of the dorsal half of the caudal fin in TCDD exposed larvae was greater than control larvae ($P < 0.004$). The dotted line indicates the plane of amputation. The respective

Mol Manuscript 18044

values represent the mean \pm SEM (t-test, n = 11). All three parameters were measured using the Image Pro-Plus software (Media Cybernetics, Silver Spring, MD).

Fig.4 Identification of AHR pathway members in the regenerating zebrafish fin tissue by RT-PCR. The 48 hpf larvae were exposed to DMSO (C) or TCDD (T) after amputation and the regenerating fin tissues were harvested for RNA isolation (n = 100). Reverse transcription was conducted followed by PCR using *zfAHR1*, *zfAHR2*, *zfARNT1*, *zfARNT2b/c*, *zfCYP1A* and β -actin specific primer pairs. The PCR products were resolved by agarose gel electrophoresis and visualized with ethidium bromide staining.

Fig. 5 Whole mount immunolocalization of *zfCYP1A*. The immunohistochemical localization of *zfCYP1A* in control and TCDD exposed larvae at 3 dpa using monoclonal antibody, C107. Depicted are the images of fin tissue and the trunk of the larvae with positive CYP1A localization in the intersegmental vessel (SE).

Fig. 6 Activation of AHR2 by BNF inhibits fin regeneration similarly to TCDD. The caudal fin of 48 hpf larvae were surgically amputated and exposed to control (DMSO), an AHR antagonist ANF, or AHR agonists BNF and TCDD. The images were taken at 3 dpa and the dotted line indicates the plane of ablation of fin tissue.

Fig. 7 Fin regeneration occurs in *zfahr2* morpholino injected embryos in the presence of TCDD. (A) The control morpholino (Control MO) and *zfahr2* morpholino (AHR2 MO) injected embryos were amputated at 48 hpf and exposed to vehicle or TCDD. The fin regeneration

Mol Manuscript 18044

images were taken at 3 dpa. Dotted line marks the plane of amputation. **(B)** Immunolocalization of zfCYP1A on Control and *zfahr2* morphants exposed to TCDD. (SE – intersegmental vessel).

Fig. 8 Role of zfARNT members in the inhibition of fin regeneration by TCDD. (A) Heterozygous (HET, *zfarnt2*^{+/-}) and homozygous *zfarnt2*^{-/-} mutants were exposed to vehicle or TCDD. The images are of *zfarnt2*^{+/-} and *zfarnt2*^{-/-} larvae characterized genotypically by PCR. The images of the mutants exposed to DMSO are not shown. **(B)** Genotyping the *zfarnt2* mutants by PCR. **(C)** The control (Control MO) and *zfarnt1* morphants (ARNT1 MO) were exposed to vehicle or TCDD at 0 dpa. The images were captured at 3 dpa. Images of the control and *zfarnt1* morphants exposed to DMSO are not shown. **(D)** Whole mount immunolocalization of zfCYP1A in control and *zfarnt1* morphants exposed to TCDD. (SE – intersegmental vessel).

Fig. 9 Inhibitory effect on the process of fin regeneration by TCDD and FGFR1 inhibitor is different. (A, B) The 48 hpf larvae were amputated and exposed to vehicle, TCDD or FGFR1 inhibitor (SU5402). Images of the TCDD and SU5402 exposed larvae were taken at 3 dpa. **(C, D, F)** Whole mount immunolocalization of acetylated tubulin that stains axons and the peripheral processes of larvae exposed to vehicle, TCDD or FGFR1 inhibitor (SU5402). The arrows indicate the path of diverging peripheral processes **(D, E)** Immunohistochemical staining was done on TCDD exposed larvae with ventral half cuts to delineate the peripheral processes that are diverging at the site of inhibition of fin regeneration. The arrow on the ventral half cut reveals the deviating path of peripheral processes **(D)**. The images are representative of 12 larvae and the images were inverted.

Mol Manuscript 18044

Table 1. Oligonucleotides used for PCR.

Name of Primer	Sequence of the primer (5'-3')
zfAHR1F	TAGACAGCGATATACAGCAG
zfAHR1R	TCTCTCCAACACCATTCATG
zfAHR2F2	ACGGTGAAGCTCTCCATA
zfAHR2R2	AGTAGGTTTCTCTGGCCAC
zfARNT1F	ATCCTGCGCATGGCCGTATC
zfARNT1R	GATGTAGCCTGTGCAGTGGAC
zfARNT2b/cF	GACTGAATTCCTTTCGCGCCAC
zfARNT2b/cR	CTGGAGCTGCTTGACGTTG
zfCYP1AF	ACAACATCAGAGACATCACC
zfCYP1AR	TCTCTTGCAGTCGCTCCTGG
zf β -actinF	AAGCAGGAGTACGATGAGTC
zf β -actinR	TGGAGTCCTCAGATGCATTG
zfARNT2F1	CGGAAATGTCGCTGTTGTTAGTTGTG
zfARNT2R1	GAAGTGAAGTTTGCAGTTTGGAGAC
TranspoR	TGCGATGCCGTCTACTTTGA

Fig.1




Fig.2




Fig.3A




Fig.3B




Fig.4




Fig.5




Fig.6




Fig.7




Fig.8




Fig.9

