



**HAL**  
open science

## Changes in Gene Expression and Estrogen Receptor Cistrome in Mouse Liver Upon Acute E2 Treatment

Gaëlle Palierne, Aurelie J Fabre, Romain Solinhac, Christine Le Peron, Stéphane Avner, Françoise Lenfant, Coralie Fontaine, Gilles Salbert, Gilles Flouriot, Jean-François Arnal, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Gaëlle Palierne, Aurelie J Fabre, Romain Solinhac, Christine Le Peron, Stéphane Avner, et al.. Changes in Gene Expression and Estrogen Receptor Cistrome in Mouse Liver Upon Acute E2 Treatment. *Molecular Endocrinology -Baltimore-*, 2016, 30 (7), pp.709-732. 10.1210/me.2015-1311 . hal-01357623

**HAL Id: hal-01357623**

**<https://univ-rennes.hal.science/hal-01357623>**

Submitted on 26 Sep 2016

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1           **RESEARCH RESOURCE: Changes in gene expression and Estrogen Receptor**  
2                           **cistrome in mouse liver upon acute E2 treatment**

3  
4 Gaëlle Palierne<sup>1,#</sup>, Aurélie Fabre<sup>2,#</sup>, Romain Solinhac<sup>2</sup>, Christine Le Péron<sup>1</sup>, Stéphane Avner<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Françoise Lenfant<sup>2</sup>, Coralie Fontaine<sup>2</sup>, Gilles Salbert<sup>1</sup>, Gilles Flouriot<sup>3</sup>, Jean-François Arnal<sup>2</sup>, Raphaël  
6 Métivier<sup>1</sup>.

7 <sup>1</sup> Equipe SP@RTE (Spatio-Temporal Regulation of Transcription in Eukaryotes), UMR 6290 CNRS  
8 (Institut de Génétique et Développement de Rennes), Université de Rennes 1. Campus de Beaulieu,  
9 Rennes, 35042 Cedex, France

10 <sup>2</sup> Equipe 9 « Estrogen receptor : *in vivo* dissection and modulation », INSERM U1048 (Institut des  
11 Maladies Métaboliques et Cardiovasculaires), Toulouse, 31432 Cedex 4, France

12 <sup>3</sup> Equipe TREC (Transcription, Environment and Cancer), INSERM U1085-IRSET (Institut de  
13 Recherche en Santé, Environnement et Travail), Rennes, 35042 Cedex, France

14 <sup>#</sup> Footnote. The first two authors should be regarded as joint First Authors.

15 **Abbreviated Title:** Estrogen-sensitive genome response of liver

16 **Key terms:** Estrogen, estrogen receptor, liver, mouse, transcriptome, cistrome, ChIP-seq

17 **Word count:** 9,503

18 **Number of figures and tables:** 11 Figures and 4 Tables.

19  
20 *Corresponding author and person to whom reprint request should be addressed:*

21 Raphaël Métivier, PhD

22 Equipe SP@RTE. UMR CNRS 6290. Université de Rennes 1. Rennes, 35042 Cedex, France.

23 Phone: 33 (0)2 2323 5142

24 Fax: +33 (0)2 2323 6794

25 Email: raphael.metivier@univ-rennes1.fr

26 **Disclosure Statement:** The authors have nothing to disclose.

27

28 **Abstract**

29       Transcriptional regulation by the Estrogen Receptor  $\alpha$  (ER) has been investigated mainly in breast  
30 cancer cell lines but estrogens such as 17 $\beta$ -Estradiol (E2) exert numerous extra-reproductive effects,  
31 particularly in the liver where E2 exhibits both protective metabolic and deleterious thrombotic  
32 actions. To analyze the direct and early transcriptional effects of estrogens in the liver, we determined  
33 the E2-sensitive transcriptome and ER cistrome in mice following acute administration of E2 or  
34 placebo. These analyses revealed the early induction of genes involved in lipid metabolism, which fits  
35 with the crucial role of ER in the prevention of liver steatosis. Characterization of the chromatin state  
36 of ER binding sites (BSs) in mice expressing or not ER demonstrated that ER is not required *per se*  
37 for the establishment and/or maintenance of chromatin modifications at the majority of its BSs. This  
38 is presumably a consequence of a strong overlap between ER and Hepatocyte nuclear factor 4  $\alpha$   
39 (Hnf4 $\alpha$ ) BSs. In contrast, 40% of the BSs of the pioneer factor Foxa2 were dependent upon ER  
40 expression, and ER expression also affected the distribution of nucleosomes harboring dimethylated  
41 H3K4 around Foxa2 BSs. We finally show that, in addition to a network of liver-specific transcription  
42 factors including Cebp $\alpha/\beta$  and Hnf4 $\alpha$ , ER might be required for proper Foxa2 function in this tissue.

43

44

45

46

47

## 48 **Introduction**

49 Estrogen receptors (Esr1: ER $\alpha$ , termed ER throughout the manuscript; and Esr2: ER $\beta$ ) are ligand-  
50 dependent transcription factors that mediate the effects of estrogens such as 17- $\beta$  estradiol (E2) (1,2).  
51 Estrogens control the development, differentiation and function of tissues involved in reproduction,  
52 but are also pleiotropic hormones controlling the metabolism and homeostasis of many other tissues.  
53 They can be harmful or beneficial according to the target tissue, with deleterious effects in the  
54 development of cancers of uterus and breast, but protective effects on the bones, arteries and  
55 metabolism since they reduce the incidence of osteoporosis, atheroma, and type 2 diabetes (3).

56 The molecular actions of ER have been extensively studied *in vitro* in human cell lines, using  
57 mostly the prototypical breast cancer cell line, MCF-7. Over the last decade, genome-wide analyses  
58 obtained from such *in vitro* models have greatly challenged the historical view of proximal ER-  
59 directed gene regulation (4-6) and it is now accepted that, in breast cancer cells, ER can dynamically  
60 engage between 15,000 and 30,000 binding sites (ER BSs) across the genome. Once tethered to  
61 chromatin at these sequences, ER regulates transcription of its target genes through the dynamic  
62 recruitment of multiple partners including cofactors of diverse families of proteins and components of  
63 the transcriptional machinery (7-10). Importantly, most of the ER BSs that have been determined so  
64 far are thought to be enhancers located away from the transcriptional start site (TSS) of annotated E2-  
65 sensitive genes (11,12), although transcription of so-called enhancer RNAs (eRNAs) could occur at  
66 these places (13,14). The actions of pioneer TFs have also been demonstrated genome-wide as  
67 essential for the accuracy and frequency of ER binding. FOXA1 is one of the most studied of these  
68 proteins (6,11,15). It can bind to condensed chromatin to prepare it for the subsequent recruitment of  
69 other TFs, presumably by acting as a recruitment platform for histone modification and/or  
70 nucleosome remodelling complexes (16-18).

71 Whether these mechanisms actually apply *in vivo* remains uncertain and requires careful attention.  
72 Genome-wide analysis of the ER cistrome in tissue explants from normal human mammary glands  
73 has demonstrated that ER binding events in these differentiated primary cells are much more  
74 restricted than those in cancer cell lines (19). In addition, although ERs and FOXA have been shown  
75 to cooperate in establishing the estrogen-dependent protection of the liver against hepatocellular

76 carcinoma (20,21), the nucleosome positions and chromatin structure around Foxa sites were also  
77 found to be independent of Foxa1 and Foxa2 expression in differentiated adult mouse liver (22). This  
78 leads one to wonder whether Foxa proteins do indeed exert a pioneering influence on ER activity and  
79 whether they use similar mechanisms in the liver as those in human mammary gland.

80 As well as establishing these mechanistic aspects of ER function *in vivo*, studying the actions of  
81 E2 in the liver *in vivo* is also of utmost physiological interest since estrogens play important protective  
82 and deleterious roles. For example, E2 directly contributes to liver protection from the deleterious  
83 consequences of metabolic stresses such as a High Fat Diet (HFD) since it prevents HFD-induced  
84 liver steatosis through the activation of hepatocyte ER (23,24). On the other hand, exogenous  
85 estrogens administered for oral contraception or hormone replacement therapy at menopause  
86 stimulate the production of angiotensinogen, sex hormone-binding globulin and circulating hepatic  
87 coagulation factors (25). These changes are greatly enhanced by the oral route due to hepatic first-  
88 pass and appear to contribute, at least in part, to an increased risk of venous thrombosis and its life-  
89 threatening complication, the pulmonary embolism (26). It is thus of major interest to describe and  
90 understand the mechanisms of action of estrogen in the liver, since this organ represents an important  
91 target for these hormones and can mediate both the desired (protection against liver steatosis) and  
92 deleterious (contribution to increased risk of venous thrombosis) actions of estrogens. However, so far  
93 the estrogen-sensitive liver transcriptome and the ER cisome have been characterized only under  
94 chronic hormonal treatment (20,27-29).

95 Given this, we aimed to decipher the early steps of the mechanisms engaged by ER at the  
96 chromatin level that control liver gene expression following acute administration of E2 *in vivo*. To  
97 differentiate between ER-dependent and ER-independent processes, and to understand chromatin  
98 events induced by an ER deficiency, we gathered data from wild-type or ER knock-out (ERKO)  
99 mouse livers. Here, we demonstrate that although the liver transcriptional response to E2 is fully  
100 dependent upon ER expression, an ER deficiency has no drastic consequences on enhancer chromatin  
101 signatures. However, we provide evidence that ER is required for Foxa2 binding at a subset of sites,  
102 and that a network of other TFs may protect Foxa2 sites from loss of chromatin functionality.

103

## 104 **Materials and Methods**

### 105 **Ethics statement**

106 All procedures involving experimental animals were performed in accordance with the principles  
107 and guidelines established by the “Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale”  
108 (INSERM) and were approved by the local Animal Care and Use Committee.

### 109 **Mice**

110 ER-null mice (ERKO) from a C57BL/6 genetic background were generated as previously  
111 described (30) and were kindly provided by Prof P Chambon (Strasbourg, France). Female wild-type  
112 (ERWT) and ERKO mice littermates were obtained from the same parents. Mice were housed in  
113 groups of 5 per cage and kept in a temperature-controlled facility on an artificial 12h light-dark cycle.  
114 Genotyping was systematically performed on DNA prepared from tail biopsies using a mix of specific  
115 primers P4 (intron 1): 5'-GCTTTCCTGAAGACCTTTCATATGGTG-3', P3 (antisense in intron 2):  
116 5'-GGCATTACCACTTCTCCTGGGAGTCT-3', and mESR1ex2: 5'-  
117 CAATCGACGCCAGAATGGCCGAG-3'. Mice were ovariectomized at 4 weeks of age and then  
118 treated by oral gavage with placebo (castor oil, 5% ethanol) or E2 (1 mg/kg) at 10 weeks of age.  
119 Following anesthesia by intraperitoneal injection of ketamine (100 mg/kg) and xylazine (10 mg/kg),  
120 mice were sacrificed 1 or 4 hours after gavage. Blood was collected by retroorbital puncture and livers  
121 were used immediately or snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C.

### 122 **RNA preparation**

123 Ovariectomized ERWT or ERKO mice were treated or not with E2 for 4 hours. Following the  
124 extraction of livers and tissue homogenization using a Precellys tissue homogenizer (Bertin  
125 Technology), total RNAs were prepared using GenElute Mammalian Total RNA Miniprep Kit  
126 (Sigma-Aldrich). For Rt-qPCR experiments, 1 µg total RNA was reverse transcribed using a High  
127 Capacity cDNA Reverse Transcription Kit (Applied Biosystems) and subjected to qPCR.

### 128 **Gene expression arrays**

129 We used the One-Color Quick Amp Labeling kit (Agilent) to synthesize and label cRNAs using  
130 200 µg RNA, according to the manufacturer's instructions. 600 ng Cy3-labelled cRNA were

131 hybridized to a SurePrint G3 Mouse GE microarray (8X60K) at the GeT-TRIX Genopole facility  
132 (Toulouse, France). Slides were scanned immediately and data were analyzed with Feature Extraction  
133 Software 10.10.1.1 (Agilent) using the default parameters. All subsequent analyses were done under R  
134 ([www.r-project.org](http://www.r-project.org)) using packages of Bioconductor ([www.bioconductor.org](http://www.bioconductor.org)). We used the limma  
135 package for data normalization, selecting spots with a weight of one in at least three arrays from at  
136 least one experimental group, and carried out normalization using the quantile method. Experimental  
137 groups were compared by analysis of variances (*t*-test) and *p*-values were adjusted by the Benjamini  
138 and Hochberg (BH) method. Genes were considered as differentially expressed between two  
139 experimental conditions when their adjusted *p*-value was lower than 0.05 and their fold change greater  
140 than 1.5. The lists of all significantly regulated genes are given in **Supplemental File 1**. Functional  
141 annotations were performed under the web-platform webgestalt  
142 (<http://bioinfo.vanderbilt.edu/webgestalt/>) (31). Enrichments were calculated over the genome  
143 reference, using a BH-corrected *p*-value<0.0001 and considering only categories including at least 3  
144 genes. Comparative analysis with publicly-available datasets at the NCBI's Gene Expression Omnibus  
145 website (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/>) (32) used the generated lists of genes from GSE57804  
146 (33), GSE13265 (27), GSE45346 (28), GSE36514 (29) and GSE23850 for human MCF-7 (34).

#### 147 **MeDIP and hMeDIP assays**

148 Immunoprecipitation of methylated or hydroxymethylated cytosines (MeDIP or hMeDIP,  
149 respectively) were performed as described previously (35) on liver genomic DNA prepared using the  
150 DNeasy Blood Tissue Kit (Qiagen). We used 5 µg genomic DNA and 2 µg anti-5mC antibody or 15  
151 µg DNA and 5 µg anti 5-hmC antibody for MeDIP or hMeDIP, respectively. Immunoprecipitated  
152 DNA was purified *via* standard phenol-chloroform and ethanol precipitation procedures, and  
153 resuspended in 100 µl TE. Two µl of these samples were used for qPCR reactions.

#### 154 **ChIP experiments**

155 Livers were extracted from animals 1 hour after oral administration of placebo or E2, then sliced  
156 into small pieces and disrupted in 5 ml PBS by pressure through a 21G syringe needle. Cells from one  
157 half of a liver were fixed in 10 ml PBS containing 1% formaldehyde for 10 min at room temperature.  
158 Cross-linking was then stopped by incubation with 0.125M glycine at room temperature. Cells were

159 washed twice with PBS and then lysed in 1 ml buffer [10 mM Tris-HCl (pH 8.0), 10 mM NaCl, 3 mM  
160 MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 0.5% Igepal] containing 1X protease inhibitors (Complete Inhibitors, Roche). Extraction of  
161 nuclei was then performed by applying 50 strokes of potter on the suspension in an ice-cold Dounce  
162 followed by further incubation for 5 min at 4°C. Nuclei suspensions were then centrifuged at 13,000  
163 rpm at 4°C. Following two washes in PBS, nuclei were lysed by incubation in 4 ml lysis buffer [10  
164 mM EDTA, 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 8.0), 1% SDS, 0.5% Empigen BB (Sigma)] on ice for 10 min and  
165 sonification using a Branson 250 apparatus (3 pulses of 20 sec at 50% power, with at least 1 min on  
166 ice between each pulse). SDS was then neutralized by addition of 400 µl 10% Triton X-100 and  
167 chromatin was further sonicated by two additional 14 min sonications of the lysed nuclei in a  
168 BioRuptor apparatus (Diagenode) operating at high intensity with 30 sec on/off duty cycles.  
169 Chromatin was then cleared by a 10 min centrifugation at 10,000 x g and the supernatants were  
170 pooled for further use. CHIP experiments were performed using 300 µl of these chromatin  
171 preparations and 2 µg antibodies (**Supplemental Table 1**), as previously described (34,35). DNA was  
172 purified on NucleoSpin™ columns (Macherey-Nagel) using NTB buffer. Subsequent qPCR analysis  
173 used 2 µl of 5-fold diluted input material and 2 µl of CHIP samples.

#### 174 **ChIP-seq**

175 All ChIP-seq were performed on livers from the same 5 individuals per genotype and treatment  
176 groups. We pooled DNA originating from 20 different ChIP experiments performed as described  
177 above, *i.e.* 4 ChIP experiments per mouse. Construction of libraries and sequencing using an Illumina  
178 HiSeq apparatus were conducted at the IGBMC sequencing facility (Strasbourg, France). Reads were  
179 aligned onto the indexed chromosomes of the mm9 genome using bowtie 0.12.7 (36) with parameters  
180 allowing at most two mismatches, and selected for unique mapping onto the genome. Sequencing  
181 statistics are given in **Supplemental Table 2**. Due to the small amounts of recovered DNA in the ER  
182 ChIP experiments performed on livers from placebo and E2-treated ovariectomized animals, we  
183 combined reads obtained in two runs of sequencing to reach a representative sequencing depth.  
184 Extracted reads were converted to .wig signal files using samtools 0.1.12a (37) and MACS 1.4.1 (38)  
185 with default parameters. To minimize the bias of diverging sequencing depths between different  
186 samples immunoprecipitated with the same antibody, the signal intensities of a given .wig were



187 normalized so as to be comparable to the .wig file with the highest sequencing depth. Peak callings  
188 were then performed as described in (35) with different  $p$ -values and peaks defined as being  
189 constituted of at least 4 adjacent signals within 65 bp above the threshold values. Peak callings for  
190 histone marks ChIP-seq were done with a stringent  $p$ -value=  $1e^{-12}$ . All repetitive sequences were  
191 eliminated from the identified genomic regions using lists obtained from the UCSC (blacklist;  
192 <http://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin>). Bed files corresponding to the genomic coordinates of identified ER  
193 BSs and Foxa2 BSs are given in **Supplemental File 2**. Motif analysis was performed using the  
194 CentDist algorithms (<http://biogpu.ddns.comp.nus.edu.sg/~chipseq/webseqtools2>) and SeqPos tool on  
195 the cistrome web-platform (<http://cistrome.org/ap/>) (39), and illustrated within Wordles pictures  
196 (<http://www.wordle.net/>). For SeqPos analyses, we restricted the analyses to the top 5,000 sites when  
197 required, as defined by their maximum mean intensity in a 1 kb window centered on each region.  
198 When required Sequences were declared enriched with a  $p$ -value<0.05 and Z-score>2.5. All  
199 integrative analyses of the ChIP-seq data were performed using home-made scripts and algorithms  
200 from the cistrome web-platform. Analysis of publicly-available fastq ER ChIP-seq data at the GEO  
201 (32) or Array Express (<http://www.ebi.ac.uk/arrayexpress/>) (40) websites were performed under the  
202 same conditions. ER datasets analyzed were the GSE52351 (33), GSE36455 (41), E-MTAB-805 (20)  
203 and GSE25021 (42) for MCF-7 cells. Genomic regions identified by ChIP-chip assays (43) were  
204 extracted from the supplemental material of the manuscript and converted from mm5 to mm9 genome  
205 annotation. The .bed files corresponding to the cistromes of other transcription factors were all  
206 obtained from the cistrome finder system (<http://cistrome.org/finder/>; 44,45): Foxa1 (GSM427090;  
207 46), Cebp $\alpha$  (GSM548908; 47), Cebp $\beta$  (GSM427088; 46), Ppara $\alpha$  (GSM864671; 48), Rxra  
208 (GSM864674; 48), GR (common peaks from replicates GSM1122512 and GSM1122515; 49), Esrr $\alpha$   
209 (GSM1067408; 50), NR1D1 (GSM647029; 51), NR1D2 (GSM840529; 52), HDAC3 (common peaks  
210 from replicates GSM647022, GSM647023 and GSM647024; 51), NCor1 (GSM647027; 51), CTCF  
211 (GSM722759; 53) excepting Hnf4 $\alpha$  (GSE57807; 54) and NKx3-1 (common peaks from duplicate  
212 GSM878195 and GSM878196; 55) data, which were re-analyzed with our scripts.

### 213 **Real-time PCR (qPCR) and statistics**

214 Sequences of all oligonucleotides used in this study are given in **Supplemental Table 3** (RNAs)  
215 and **Supplemental Table 4** (ChIPs). Oligonucleotides for RT-qPCR were designed using  
216 NCBI/Primer-Blast (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/tools/primer-blast/>). All other primers were  
217 designed using the Primer3 program (<http://frodo.wi.mit.edu/primer3/>) (56). All ChIP-qPCR  
218 experiments were carried out using a BioRad MyiQ apparatus with 1  $\mu$ M oligonucleotide and a  
219 BioRad iQ SYBR Green supermix with 50 rounds of amplification followed by determination of  
220 melting curves. RT-qPCRs were performed on 96.96 Dynamic Arrays for the microfluidic BioMark  
221 system (Fluidigm Corporation) or using an ABI ViiA 7 apparatus. All statistical analyses of qPCR  
222 data were performed using GraphPad™ Prism software. Mann-Whitney non-parametric *t*-tests were  
223 used to determine significant variations from controls. Heatmaps of expression values and qPCR data  
224 were all generated using MeV (57). To normalize the data obtained from microarray experiments into  
225 a similar dynamic range, expression values shown within the heatmaps were normalized per mRNA  
226 as Normalized value= [(Value) – Mean(Row)]/[Standard deviation(Row)].

## 227 **Data deposition**

228 The microarray and ChIP-seq data generated in this study have been submitted to the NCBI Gene  
229 Expression Omnibus website (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/>) (32) under accession No.  
230 GSE70350.

231

## 232 **Results**

### 233 **Establishment of E2- and ER-dependent transcriptomes in liver**

234 Estrous cycle-dependent (58) or estrogen-sensitive transcriptomes in harvested livers (33) or in  
235 native animals treated by chronic administration of hormones (27,28) have already been documented.  
236 Here, we aimed to characterize the ER-dependent mechanisms of transcription regulation in the liver  
237 *in vivo* and to correlate these data with data on ER binding to chromatin at shorter times of treatment.  
238 Therefore, we chose to treat ovariectomized female ER<sup>+/+</sup> (ERWT) and their ER<sup>-/-</sup> (ERKO)  
239 littermate mice through gavage with E2 or placebo (P) for 4 hours, in castor oil solution. These  
240 conditions were deliberately chosen in order to engage the hepatic first-pass which is likely to have a

241 role in E2-induced venous thrombosis (26), as opposed to transcutaneous hormone injections. Liver  
242 mRNAs from ERWT or ERKO mice treated or not with E2 in these experimental conditions were  
243 then isolated and microarray analysis was performed. Differentially expressed genes between two  
244 conditions were considered significant when their fold change in expression were >1.5 with an  
245 adjusted *p*-value of <0.05. The list of all significantly regulated genes is given within **Supplemental**  
246 **File 1**. Despite a relatively elevated inter-individual variation in gene expression levels (**Fig. 1A**),  
247 these analyses were able to identify 124 E2-regulated mRNAs in ERWT, which corresponded to 110  
248 unambiguously annotated unique genes (**Fig. 1B**). Importantly, in ERKO animals, the E2 treatment  
249 did not significantly affect the transcriptional regulation of any genes (**Supplemental Fig. 1**). This  
250 result confirms that ER is required for the response of all of the identified genes to an acute treatment  
251 with E2. Approximately 80 % of the identified genes in ERWT mice were up-regulated by E2 (**Fig.**  
252 **1A**) and were grouped into functional annotations relevant for lipid and alcohol metabolisms, growth  
253 factor signalling and other functional pathways specific of the liver (**Table 1**). Interestingly, although  
254 performed in different experimental settings, 48 (44%) of the identified E2-sensitive genes here were  
255 similar to those determined previously following 3 days of treatment with the ER agonist PPT  
256 {4,4',4''-(4-propyl-[1H]-pyrazole-1,3,5-triyl)trisphenol} (28) (**Supplemental Fig. 2**). Our data also  
257 identified 194 mRNAs (129 genes) whose expressions were significantly different in ERKO  
258 compared to ERWT mice in the absence of E2 treatment (**Fig. 1A and 1B**). The ER coding gene *Esr1*  
259 was included in these 129 genes, thereby validating our analyses. These ER-dependent genes were  
260 identified as involved in cell growth/differentiation but also in lipid metabolic processes and  
261 mammary gland development (**Table 1**). Independent RT-qPCR experiments confirmed the observed  
262 changes in regulation for 91% of the 45 tested E2-regulated genes and 41.7% of the 12 tested ER-  
263 dependent genes (**Supplemental Fig. 3**). As illustrated within the Venn diagram depicted in **Fig. 1B**,  
264 only 10 of the ER-dependent and E2- sensitive genes also exhibited an ER-dependent basal  
265 expression. This may indicate that the remaining 119 genes with an ER-dependent basal expression  
266 are regulated by E2 (or other endogenous estrogens/signals) under different conditions of time or diet  
267 than those used in our analyses. The differential expression of these 119 genes in livers from ERKO  
268 vs. ERWT mice could also be an indirect consequence of ER gene inactivation in liver, whereby

269 dysregulation of one or more of these genes may provoke the observed effects. However, only a small  
270 proportion of the ER-dependent genes found here are similar to those reported by another study  
271 performed in mice with liver-specific ablation of *Esr1* expression (29). So it is possible that the  
272 changes in gene expression that we observed here between ERWT and ERKO livers are due to  
273 alterations of the function of (an)other tissue(s).

#### 274 **Identification of ER binding sites in liver**

275 To determine whether ER is a direct transcriptional regulator of the E2- and/or ER-sensitive  
276 transcriptomes identified above, and to obtain mechanistic insights into these regulations, we next  
277 established the cistrome of ER in placebo and E2-treated livers. In particular, we aimed to determine  
278 whether ER is bound to chromatin in the absence of E2, as has been reported in cultured cancer cells  
279 (59-62). Indeed, ER cistromes have already been determined for mouse liver by ChIP-chip (43,58) or  
280 ChIP-seq methods in intact (20) or harvested liver cells (33), however these have not been carried out  
281 in the absence of E2. Hence, we conducted ChIP-seq experiments to establish the cistrome of ER in  
282 livers from ovariectomized E2- or placebo- (P) treated wild-type mice. We used chromatin prepared  
283 from livers of ovariectomized E2-treated ERKO individuals as a control. To reduce any cistrome  
284 variation due to individual animal specificities, we pooled and sequenced the DNA fragments purified  
285 from ChIP experiments performed on chromatin prepared from five different animals. Sequenced  
286 reads were aligned onto the genome and enriched regions were identified at different *p*-values (**Fig.**  
287 **2A**). To determine the appropriate threshold enabling a comparison between the different cistromes,  
288 we calculated their overlap with decreasing significance (**Fig. 2B**). As expected, the overlap between  
289 two sets of genomic regions paralleled the threshold stringency. For instance, at a *p*-value of  $10^{-15}$ , 80%  
290 of the 87 ER BSs identified in placebo-treated ERWT animals were common with the 948 identified  
291 in E2-treated ERWT mice. In all subsequent analyses, we used ER cistromes determined with a  $10^{-5}$   
292 *p*-value threshold, which constituted the inflexion point for all overlapping ER BSs determined under  
293 the different conditions. At this threshold value, 3,857 ER BSs were identified in livers from E2-  
294 treated ERWT animals, 857 under control conditions, and 54 in ERKO (**Fig. 2C**). Using a similar  
295 approach we also confirmed that the ER cistromes from the liver overlap poorly with those reported

296 for the aorta and uterus (**Supplemental Fig. 4**) (33,41). Interestingly, 476 ER BSs detected in  
297 placebo-treated ERWT mice were not identified in E2-treated samples. Surprisingly, 14 additional  
298 regions were declared as specific to ERKO livers (**Fig. 2C**). Heatmaps of ChIP-seq binding values  
299 (**Fig. 2D**) as well as mean binding values (**Fig. 2E**) confirmed the presence of an ERKO-specific  
300 signal at these genomic regions (sub-panel #2 in **Fig. 2D**), indicating that these 14 BSs were likely not  
301 generated by a peak-calling approximation. These graphs also confirmed the specific binding of ER in  
302 ERWT livers either treated with E2 or placebo on corresponding ER BSs. This demonstrates that the  
303 placebo-specific ER BSs are not indicative of a residual binding of ER on the strongest sites observed  
304 in E2-treated livers. Finally, we observed that ER binding to the 345 ER BSs identified in placebo and  
305 E2-treated livers from ERWT animals was enhanced in hormone-stimulated conditions (**Fig. 2E**).

#### 306 **Examination of ERKO and placebo-specific ER BSs**

307 To validate the conclusions that could be made from our ChIP-seq data, we used qPCR to analyse  
308 ER binding to genomic regions presumed to either (i) bind ER in ERWT animals in both presence or  
309 absence of E2 (series #1); (ii) specifically recruit ER placebo-treated ERWT mice (series #3); or (iii)  
310 bind an ER-like protein in ERKO mice (series #2). We also took five randomly chosen sequences that  
311 did not recruit ER (#0 regions). The heatmaps in **Fig. 3** summarize the results of these experiments  
312 (mean data and statistics are shown in **Supplemental Fig. 5**) which were performed on ChIP samples  
313 prepared from four mouse livers (numbers on the top of the panel) that differed from those processed  
314 for ChIP-seq to generate independent data. A fraction of the pool of DNA that was subjected to high-  
315 throughput sequencing (HTS) served as a control. The promoter of the *Rplp0* gene was used as a  
316 normalizing ER-negative region, and two genomic regions located at the vicinity of the E2-regulated  
317 *Gdf15* gene were used as controls: one mobilized ER (Gdf15.3) and one did not (Gdf15.2). The results  
318 of these experiments confirmed the expected binding of ER to ER BSs from the #1 series of genomic  
319 regions, and not to those from the #0 series (**Fig. 3A**, left side of the panel). Moreover, these data  
320 showed an elevated level of variation concerning the binding of ER to the #2 and #3 regions detected  
321 in the different samples. For instance, in only two of the samples (one being the HTS sample), a  
322 protein recognized by the antibody used in these assays was specifically recruited (enrichment>2) to

323 four of the five tested #2 regions supposedly specific for ERKO livers. These observations led us to  
324 hypothesize that the antibodies targeting the C-terminal region of ER used for the ChIP-seq may  
325 purify a small number of non-specific genomic targets. High variations in enrichment levels were also  
326 evidenced between the five samples in the case of the ERWT placebo-specific ER BSs. Hence, we  
327 performed ChIP-qPCR assays with a specific antibody directed against the N-terminal region of ER  
328 on the same preparations of chromatin. As shown within the heatmap on the right side of the **Fig. 3A**  
329 (mean data and statistics are provided in **Supplemental Fig. 5**), whilst we were able to validate the  
330 binding of ER to the #1 series of genomic regions using this different antibody, this was not the case  
331 on the ERKO-specific ER BSs (#2 sites). These data indicated that the ER binding sites detected in  
332 ERKO mice may have represented a false-positive background of the ChIP-seq experiments, due  
333 either to the antibody or the pipeline used for processing the sequencing tags. Furthermore, as shown  
334 in **Table 2**, no specific motif related to an ER binding could be detected in ERKO sites, contrasting  
335 with the classical sequences found in the ER BSs identified in ERWT mice, such as FOX, HNF4, SP1  
336 and AP1/AP2 motifs (full motif analysis is provided within the **Supplemental Fig. 6** and  
337 **Supplemental File 3**). ERKO sites were therefore excluded from the subsequent analyses described  
338 in this manuscript. Likewise, the results obtained from these ChIP-qPCR experiments performed with  
339 the N-terminal antibody did not validate any of the 5 tested ER BSs specific for placebo-treated  
340 ERWT livers (compare the results obtained for the #3 series of genomic regions on left and right sides  
341 of **Fig. 3A**). This indicated that either none of the ER BSs falling in this placebo-specific category  
342 constitute actual sites of ER binding or that these sites may be subjected to extreme inter-individual  
343 variation. Hence, we conducted ChIP-qPCR on 14 more genomic regions of this #3 category using  
344 liver chromatin prepared from additional animals (5 treated with placebo and 3 with E2). Results of  
345 these experiments, illustrated within **Fig. 3B**, showed that 2 of these 14 sites (#3.18 and #3.19) were  
346 not detected in these independent experiments using the anti C-terminal antibody and that 5 (#3.7,  
347 #3.11, #3.17, #3.20 and #3.21) of the remaining 12 ERBSs were enriched in the DNA fractions  
348 enriched with the anti-N-terminal antibody.

349 In conclusion, as in human cancer cells, a mobilization of ER on chromatin can be detected in the  
350 absence of ligand in livers from ovariectomized mice. The existence of genuine placebo-only sites

351 was also confirmed in our ChIP-qPCR experiments. However, their number, as determined from our  
352 ChIP-seq data, may be biased or even overestimated *i)* because of the use of a C-terminal antibody  
353 that can generate false-positive regions with low-level of enrichments (such as the 54 ERKO sites);  
354 and/or *ii)* because the N-terminal epitope targeted by the antibody used in our confirmation ChIP-  
355 qPCR experiments is not accessible for chromatin-bound ER in placebo conditions.

#### 356 **ER BSs are “enriched” in the proximity of liver-specific genes**

357 Interestingly, in E2- and placebo-treated animals, 14.5% and 12.9% of the identified ER BSs  
358 respectively were found at a short distance (<3kb) from the promoters of annotated genes (**Fig. 4A**).  
359 When compared to the ER cistromes determined for human breast cancer cells, such an enrichment  
360 was clearly different from those identified for ER in the liver, uterus and, albeit to a lower extent, the  
361 aorta (**Fig. 4B** and **Supplemental Fig. 7**). Indeed, in E2-treated MCF-7 breast cancer cells, only 2 to 4%  
362 of the ER BSs identified were located in the vicinity of gene promoters (<3kb) (**Fig. 4B**). Note that an  
363 additional hour of treatment of mouse with E2 (2 hours in total) did not affect the distribution of ER  
364 BSs across the genome (data not shown). Importantly, GREAT (63) functional annotation of the ER  
365 cistrome in the liver also indicated that genes located proximal to and/or in relation to the identified  
366 ER BSs were clearly associated with liver-specific expression, function and diseases, such as lipid  
367 homeostasis and responses to insulin (**Table 3**). These data showed that the E2-mediated regulation of  
368 the rate of gene transcription in mouse liver may involve more proximal mechanisms than in human  
369 cancer cell lines, *i.e.* through binding of ER and its coregulators in the vicinity of the TSS. This  
370 hypothesis was confirmed by the observation that 28% of liver E2-regulated genes exhibited at least  
371 one ER BS within a 0-5kb window around their TSS, compared to 13% in MCF-7 cells (**Fig. 4C**).  
372 Interestingly, 75% of the genes characterized by an ER-dependent basal expression were located at  
373 distances >25kb from any ER BS (**Fig. 4C**). Again, this may reflect either an indirect effect of ER loss  
374 on the transcriptional rate of these particular genes, or their preferential long-range regulation. Finally,  
375 apart from a slight increase for genes within a 1-5 kb window, the strength of gene regulation by E2  
376 could not be correlated with the distance between their TSS and the ER BSs neither in mouse liver nor  
377 MCF-7 cell lines (**Fig. 4D**).



### 378 **ER loss impacts the chromatin status of the promoters of its target genes**

379 A loss of ER binding at some genomic regions could be either the source or a consequence of  
380 drastic changes in chromatin structure at these sites, including post-translational modifications of  
381 histones and DNA modifications. The nucleosomes located in active regulatory elements like  
382 enhancers exhibit histone marks such as H3K4me1, H3K4me2 and H3K27ac (64-66), and their DNA  
383 is globally characterized by low levels of CpG methylation that is inversely correlated to their  
384 hydroxymethylation status (35,67,68). Thus, we performed ChIP-seq experiments that aimed to  
385 determine the genome-wide location of nucleosomes marked with the H3K27ac or H3K4me2  
386 modifications. As shown within **Fig. 5A**, the mean enrichment of these two marks around ER BSs (as  
387 defined by the sum of ER BSs detected in placebo- and E2-treated animals) exhibited biphasic curves  
388 around the center of the ER BSs, reflecting the existence of modified nucleosomes surrounding  
389 poised/activated genomic regions (69-72). Importantly, the relative enrichment of ER BSs in  
390 H3K4me2 and H3K27ac were relatively similar in ERWT and ERKO mice (**Fig. 5B**). Furthermore,  
391 less than 3% of the ERBSs were overlapping with either the 4,084 or 2,137 genomic regions losing  
392 their H3K4me2 or H3K27ac marks in ERKO livers (**Supplementary Fig. 8**). This suggested that the  
393 binding of ER to its sites is not required for the establishment and/or maintenance of these chromatin  
394 modifications. Note that the presence of the two chromatin marks H3K4me2/H3K27ac slightly but  
395 significantly decreased at the promoter regions of genes transcriptionally down-regulated in ERKO  
396 livers (**Fig. 5C**), and conversely increased in the promoters of up-regulated ones. Interestingly,  
397 variations in H3K4me2 and H3K27ac contents were more coordinated in the promoters of up-  
398 regulated genes than in those of down-regulated genes (**Fig. 5D**). This indicates that the promoter  
399 regions of genes undergoing a “gain of function” in ERKO livers may be subjected to stronger  
400 chromatin remodelling than genes with a reduced transcriptional activity in ERKO.

### 401 **Hnf4 $\alpha$ may protect ERBSs from losing their chromatin functional state in ERKO liver**

402 In order to examine the possibility that some variations of chromatin functionality could occur in a  
403 specific sub-population of ER BSs, we clustered the profiles of H3K4me2 and H3K27ac  
404 modifications around these genomic regions (heatmaps of ChIP-seq signals in **Fig. 6A**). With the  
405 exception of the ER BSs classified within clusters 7, 9 and possibly 4 (mean signals are shown in **Fig.**



406 **6B**), no variations in H3K4me2 signals were apparent in ERKO compared to ERWT mice.  
407 Interestingly, in these two/three cases the enrichment levels of ER BSs in H3K4me2 did not  
408 significantly differ but the shape of the curves shifted from biphasic to monophasic shapes (see  
409 enlarged view in the corresponding panels). A similar shift was also observed in the case of the cluster  
410 4, but to a slighter extent. This suggests that the ER BSs included within clusters 7, 9 and possibly 4  
411 were changing their functionality/poised state. However, we did not observe any variations in  
412 H3K27ac levels in these clusters (**Supplemental Fig. 9**), indicating that this loss in functionality may  
413 only affect the stability and/or the presence of an H3K4me2-marked nucleosome at the center of the  
414 ER BS.

415 To validate these genome-wide observations and give further details on the exact loss of  
416 functionality of ER BSs in ERKO mice, we next evaluated the enrichment of ten ER BSs with  
417 H3K4me1, H3K4me2 and H3K27ac by CHIP-qPCRs using chromatin prepared from the same E2-  
418 treated ERWT and ERKO animals as previously described. The results of these experiments (data and  
419 statistics in **Supplemental Fig. 10**) are illustrated as heatmaps of enrichment in **Fig. 7A**. These data  
420 indicate that the presence of mono- or di-methylated H3K4 around the 10 tested ER BSs was not  
421 drastically affected in ERKO livers when compared to ERWT ones. The same results were observed  
422 for their K27 acetylation status. However, interestingly, in ERKO mice a small but significant  
423 increase in both H3K4me1 and me2 content was observed at the #1.3 ER BS, and an increase in  
424 H3K4me2 was seen at the #3.1 ER BS. These small increases in H3 modifications may be in  
425 accordance with the fact that, on some ER BSs, the shift from biphasic to monophasic shapes of  
426 enrichment observed by CHIP-seq actually reflects a more stable central H3K4me2-marked  
427 nucleosome. Finally, we envisioned that increased amounts of 5-mC or a decreased presence of 5-  
428 hmC on enhancer DNA may have accounted for the observed loss of functionality of ER BSs in  
429 ERKO mice. To test this hypothesis, we performed (hydroxy-) methylated DNA immunoprecipitation  
430 experiments (abbreviated to MeDIP and hMeDIP) and evaluated the enrichment of sites of interest of  
431 these two modified bases using qPCR. The results of these assays (**Supplemental Fig. 10**,  
432 summarized in **Fig. 7B**) indicated that the 10 tested enhancers were poorly enriched in 5-mC, and that  
433 the loss of ER had no general impact on these levels, apart from a slight but not significant increase in

434 the #1.2 ER BS in ERKO mice. In most cases, the amount of the active 5-hmC mark was also similar  
435 between ERWT and ERKO mice, except for a slight decrease in the #1.2 and an increase in the #1.3  
436 ER BSs that paralleled their levels of H3K4me2. It could therefore be proposed that the #1.3 enhancer  
437 is in fact a counter-example gaining some chromatin functionality.

438 Interestingly, clusters 4, 8 and 9 include ER BSs located away from TSSs and could thus be  
439 defined as putative enhancers (**Fig. 6A**). However, we did not find evidence of any motif for a  
440 transcription factor specific to cluster 8 or 9 that could explain why changes in H3K4me2 enrichment  
441 occur in the latter and not the former (motif analysis provided within **Supplemental File 4**). We  
442 previously observed that ER BSs were highly enriched in HNF4 motifs (see **Table2** and  
443 **Supplemental Figure 6**), another nuclear receptor, crucial for liver functions (73). This led us to  
444 determine whether its presence may protect ER BSs from losing their chromatin functionality in  
445 ERKO livers. As previously performed for ER, we determined Hnf4 $\alpha$  cistrome with different *p*-values  
446 to allow comparison between the different conditions, using data from another study (54). As shown  
447 within **Fig. 8A** and illustrated within the heatmap in **Fig. 8B**, we found that up to almost 77% of ER  
448 BSs were actually overlapping with Hnf4  $\alpha$  BSs. Importantly, when this overlap was lower for ER  
449 BSs belonging to clusters 7 and 9 (**Fig. 8C**), which are changing their functionality/poised state in  
450 ERKO livers. Therefore, this tie in with our hypothesis of a protective role of Hnf4  $\alpha$  against the loss  
451 of H3K4me2 mark on lost ER BSs.

452 In summary, together these observations indicate that a loss of ER in the liver does not strongly  
453 impact the chromatin status of its BSs: only those with a reduced overlap with Hnf4 $\alpha$  binding seem to  
454 present a less stable H3K4me2-marked nucleosome at their center.

#### 455 **A proportion of the mouse liver Foxa2 cistrome is ER-dependent**

456 Our genomic data are in favor of ER acting on chromatin regions whose activation is independent  
457 of ER-binding. This could reflect the possible actions of an ortholog of a pioneering factor such as  
458 human FOXA1 (15,19). Foxa proteins are expressed in mouse liver, including the related Foxa1 and  
459 Foxa2 (74,75), and these proteins have been found to serve as a scaffold for ER to regulate gene  
460 transcription in the liver and prevent hepatocarcinogenesis (20,21). Hnf4 $\alpha$  binding in mouse liver is  
461 also conditioned (at least on part of its sites) during development by Foxa2 (76,77). We therefore

462 sought to investigate the role of these proteins in the creation of an ER cistrome and mapped their  
463 binding sites by ChIP-seq using liver chromatin preparations from the same animals as those used for  
464 the ER ChIP-seq experiments. We first observed that the Foxa1 and Foxa2 cistromes were very  
465 similar, due to a cross-reaction of Foxa1 antibodies against the Foxa2 protein (data not shown). The  
466 Foxa1 cistrome was therefore not analyzed in the subsequent step. As previously, we determined the  
467 Foxa2 cistromes with different  $p$ -values. Whatever the significance level used, we observed that the  
468 Foxa2 cistrome was reduced in ERKO mice compared to ERWT mice (**Fig. 9A**), with 5,991 Foxa2  
469 BSs determined at a  $10^{-4}$   $p$ -value for ERKO compared to 11,767 for ERWT mice. As depicted within  
470 **Fig. 9B**, depending upon the  $p$ -value, 12 to 30% of ER BSs were found to recruit Foxa2,  
471 corresponding to 6-12% of the entire Foxa2 cistrome. Up to almost 90% of the Foxa2 sites identified  
472 in ERKO mice were also determined as Foxa2-positive in wild-type animals. At a fixed  $p$ -value of  $10^{-4}$ ,  
473 we identified 7,746 lost Foxa2 BSs (**Fig. 9C**). Importantly, only a sixth of these lost sites  
474 (688+491=1,179) were ER-positive (**Fig. 9C**). These data indicate that the loss of Foxa2 binding  
475 could be, at least in part, an indirect effect of ER depletion. The Foxa2 ChIP-seq signal was  
476 apparently lower in ERKO mice than in ERWT mice at conserved sites (see heatmap in **Fig. 9D** and  
477 mean values in **Fig. 9E**), indicating that Foxa2 binding events might also be less frequent in livers not  
478 expressing ER. However, although independent ChIP-qPCR experiments mostly recapitulated the  
479 expected results on gained and lost Foxa2 sites (**Supplemental Fig. 11, Fig. 9F**), a significantly  
480 reduced mobilization of this factor was observed for only 1 (#4.7) out of 10 tested conserved Foxa2  
481 BSs (**Fig. 9F**). We hypothesize that the highly heterogeneous enrichments obtained for the different  
482 samples may have hindered the detection of possible differences. Importantly, although our  
483 microarray data indicated that Foxa2 mRNA expression was 10% lower in ERKO livers, this  
484 regulation was neither systematic nor significant as assessed by independent RT-qPCR and Western  
485 blot experiments (**Supplemental Fig. 3 and Supplemental Fig. 12**).

#### 486 **Variations in the H3K4me2 content of nucleosomes included in lost Foxa2 BSs**

487 To better comprehend the possible events occurring at Foxa2 BSs in ERKO vs. ERWT livers, we  
488 used our ERWT and ERKO H3K27ac and H3K4me2 ChIP-seq data to determine the relative genome-  
489 wide enrichment of Foxa2 BSs in these chromatin modifications that indicate active/poised enhancers.

490 As described previously for lost ER BSs, changes were observed only at Foxa2 BSs located within  
491 putative enhancers (data not shown). We therefore focused our analysis on BSs situated >5 kb from  
492 any annotated gene promoter and aligned the mean H3K4me2 and H3K27ac ChIP-seq signals to these  
493 sites (**Fig. 10A**). Data obtained indicate that there was a loss of the biphasic shape of enrichment in  
494 H3K4me2 in ERKO compared to ERWT mice at these lost Foxa2 BSs (seen enlarged view in **Fig.**  
495 **10A**). In contrast, both the shape and level of enrichment of these sites in H3K27ac were unaffected  
496 (**Fig. 10A**). To evaluate a possible direct link between ER expression and these changes in chromatin  
497 modifications at Foxa2 BSs, we subdivided lost Foxa2 BSs into those which concomitantly recruited  
498 ER or those which did not (**Fig. 10B**). In contrast to their unchanged H3K27ac levels, we observed  
499 that the enrichment of both categories of sites in H3K4me2 was lower in ERKO livers compared to  
500 ERWT. Importantly, this was also associated with the disappearance of the biphasic shape of  
501 H3K4me2 enrichment (**Fig. 10B**), a biphasic-to-monophasic change that was observed neither at  
502 conserved Foxa2 BSs nor at novel ones (**Fig. 10A**). This demonstrated that the observed changes were  
503 not generated due to a bias of the normalization of the ChIP-seq signals but rather reflected a  
504 significant change in the enrichment of nucleosomes surrounding or centered on lost Foxa2 BSs in  
505 H3K4me2. Furthermore, such a change in shape was not observed at the BSs determined in mouse  
506 liver for other transcription factors such as Ctf, Ppara, Rxra, GR and Esrra (not shown).

507 Independent ChIP-qPCR experiments (data and statistics provided in **Supplemental Fig. 10**)  
508 following the enrichment of some Foxa2 BSs in H3K4me1 and H3K4me2 mostly recapitulated the  
509 conclusions obtained from genome-wide studies, *i.e.* that there is a reduction in the amount of  
510 methylated H3K4 in nucleosomes surrounding lost Foxa2 BSs in livers from ERKO mice (**Fig. 10C**).  
511 These effects were small, which may reflect the slight reduction observed in the amplitude of the  
512 mean profiles of the whole-genome data. Furthermore, due to the limited resolution of ChIP-qPCR  
513 experiments, the transition from a biphasic to monophasic distribution over a 1.5-2 kb window may  
514 have little or even no impact on the qPCR-mediated amplification of a DNA fragment located within  
515 a Foxa2 BS. Interestingly, we also observed a reduction in the acetylation of H3K27 on four of these  
516 sites, which was not expected from the whole-genome ChIP-seq data. MeDIP evaluation of the 5-mC  
517 amounts present within lost Foxa2 BSs also showed no variations between ERWT and ERKO livers

518 **(Supplemental Fig. 10; Fig. 10D)**. Altogether, these data indicate that the Foxa2-positive enhancers  
 519 which were lost in ERKO livers did not undergo complete chromatin closure. This conclusion is  
 520 reinforced by the fact that only two of the 15 tested Foxa2 BSs (#4.6 and #1.2) had reduced amounts  
 521 of 5-hmC in ERKO livers (**Fig. 10D**).

#### 522 **Liver-specific transcription factor networks may secure FoxA2 cistrome**

523 In order to gain further insights into the mechanisms responsible for the loss of Foxa2 BSs in  
 524 ERKO liver, we next examined whether particular transcription factors could either protect the  
 525 conserved Foxa2 BSs from loss, or be responsible for the loss. Reassuringly, the most enriched motifs  
 526 in each group were those recognized by Foxa2 and other members of the Forkhead family of TFs  
 527 (**Table 4**, example Wordle picture is given in **Figure 11A** for lost FoxA2 BSs; full analysis is  
 528 provided within **Supplemental File 3**). Besides Forkhead motifs, the sequences of the three Foxa2  
 529 BSs' category included similar sets of motifs for TF binding. The most frequently identified  
 530 sequences were those recruiting CEBP, HNF4 $\alpha$  and other NRs such as RXR, RAR, NR1D1/D2, or the  
 531 tumor suppressor NKX3-1. Importantly, CEBPA/B and HNF4 $\alpha$  are known "liver-enriched"  
 532 transcription factors (78-80). When examined more precisely, 38 or 68 motifs were specifically  
 533 identified within lost or conserved Foxa2BSs respectively (**Supplemental Fig.13**). However, the  
 534 different sets of TFs binding to these specific motifs do not create networks that can be associated  
 535 with specific functions, as evaluated by their annotations through STRING (81; see **Supplemental**  
 536 **Fig.13**) Furthermore, the expression levels of the transcription factors associated with these DNA  
 537 sequences were not significantly affected by the inactivation of the *Esr1* gene (**Supplemental Fig. 13**).

538 Finally, we compared our different categories of Foxa2 BSs to the available cistromes of other TF  
 539 determined by others in mouse livers. Those included Cebp $\alpha$  and Cebp $\beta$ , Hnf4 $\alpha$ , other nuclear  
 540 receptors, repressive co-regulators (Hdac and Ncor1) and Ctf. We also included Nkx3-1 in our  
 541 analyses since its motif was the most enriched in all Foxa2 BSs categories following FKH motifs.  
 542 Furthermore, NKX3-1 was demonstrated to act as an inhibitor of ER activity in human cancer cells  
 543 (82). Note however that the only available cistrome of this factor in mouse was determined in prostate.  
 544 We also integrated a Foxa1 cistrome, although it may not be totally specific and include FoxA2 BSs.  
 545 Strikingly, we observed that the overlaps of the conserved Foxa2 BSs with the cistromes of Foxa1,

546 ER, Hnf4 $\alpha$ , Nkx3-1, Cebp $\alpha$ , Cebp $\beta$  and Rxr $\alpha$  were significantly higher as compared to what was  
547 observed for lost or gained Foxa2 BSs (**Fig. 11B**). This indicates that the binding of (at least) one of  
548 these other TFs -excluding ER of course- to genomic regions may help to preserve Foxa2 binding at  
549 these sequences. Interestingly, Hnf4 $\alpha$ , Cebp $\alpha$  and Cebp $\beta$  were also found to be more often recruited  
550 on sites conserving their H3K4me2 or H3K27ac levels rather than on genomic regions with reduced  
551 or gained enrichment in these chromatin marks in ERKO livers (**Supplemental Fig. 14**). This  
552 suggests that this combination of factors may generally prevent changes of chromatin functionality to  
553 occur on the sites they engage in ERKO livers.

554

## 555 **Discussion**

556 The objectives of this study were dual: *i*) to identify mechanisms of actions of hepatic ER *in vivo*  
557 and in particular to test whether it can exert some influence in the absence of its ligand, and *ii*) to  
558 characterize short-term changes in liver response to estrogens following acute E2 administration that  
559 could explain how E2 could have opposite influences in liver.

560 Indeed, a number of studies have demonstrated in rodents that E2 has protective roles against  
561 metabolic abnormalities: ovariectomy, whole body ER knock-out (ERKO) and aromatase KO, are all  
562 associated with increased body weight, impaired glucose tolerance, insulin resistance (IR) and liver  
563 steatosis (23,24,83). In contrast, the administration of estrogens by the oral route prescribed for  
564 contraception or for hormonal replacement therapy at menopause is associated with an increased risk  
565 of venous thrombosis and pulmonary embolism, presumably due to the impact of E2 on liver  
566 coagulation factor expression or activity. Here, we characterized in mouse liver sets of E2- and ER-  
567 dependent genes which were associated with lipogenesis, but none with coagulation. Accordingly, the  
568 genes predicted to be controlled by enhancer regions losing or gaining the active chromatin marks  
569 H3K4me2 and H3K27ac in ERKO livers were associated with liver-specific functions (**Supplemental**  
570 **Fig. 8**). These observations tied in with the crucial role of ER in E2-mediated prevention of liver  
571 steatosis in mice fed with high fat diet. They also highlight species differences in the regulation of  
572 coagulation factors by E2 between human and mouse (84). We observed that 48 of the 110 E2-

573 regulated genes identified here were also regulated following chronic estrogen treatment for three  
574 days (36). This number drastically decreased to only two common genes after a two week treatment  
575 (37) or even one when comparing our list with a dataset generated from isolated liver cells (33). This  
576 latter observation could be explained by the adaptation of the liver cell transcriptome following cell  
577 culture, a transcriptome that also depends on the culture conditions (85,86). These differences  
578 between the estrogen-sensitive transcriptomes following chronic or acute treatment of hormones  
579 indicate that each mode of administration or time of treatment has a differential physiological impact.

580 Using conditions of short-term E2 administration and freshly-dissected liver, we detected ER  
581 binding to less than 4,000 genomic regions by ChIP-seq. This contrasts with the much larger ER  
582 cistromes determined in cultured human mammary cell lines such as MCF-7 cells (11,12).  
583 Interestingly, although we used chromatin prepared from livers treated for different times, our data are  
584 in agreement with some other studies that have also found limited ER cistromes in liver (43,58).  
585 Furthermore, it is tempting to speculate that this limited number of ER BSs could be the cause of the  
586 lower number of E2-regulated genes identified here in liver as compared to classical *in vitro* model  
587 such as cultured MCF-7 cells (up to 1,500 regulated genes; see 34 and ref 87). A large set of ER BSs  
588 was also determined in isolated mouse liver cells (33), which presented 3-fold more E2-sensitive  
589 genes than determined here following acute E2 treatment of liver. Importantly, although ~2-fold less  
590 numerous, 60% of the E2-bound ER BSs determined here were in common with those determined in  
591 (33). As discussed above, the discrepancy in the number of ER BSs could also be a direct  
592 consequence of the conditions of E2-treatment or liver cell differentiation. These conditions might, for  
593 instance, influence the expression of chaperone proteins such as p23, whose over-expression in MCF-  
594 7 breast cancer cells is reported to enhance the number of ER BSs (88). However, we determined that  
595 72% of the 5,526 ER BSs identified by our pipeline using a ChIP-seq dataset generated from the liver  
596 of non-ovariectomized females (20) were in common with the different ER cistromes determined in  
597 E2-treated livers from ovariectomized females (**Supplemental Fig. 4**). This suggests that the ER  
598 cistrome may present some robustness in liver, contrasting with an intrinsically more versatile hepatic  
599 transcriptome generated by (i) a cellular heterogeneity; and (ii) a high number of individual-specific  
600 regulatory influences (metabolic/detoxification...). Importantly, as is the case for all other reported



601 ER cistromes in liver, a significant fraction of the ER BSs identified here were found to be located in  
602 relatively close proximity to E2 regulated genes (7 to 12%), compared to MCF-7 data (2%). A general  
603 consequence of the organization of the genome within the nucleus is the existence of chromatin loops  
604 (89) that link distant regulatory elements such as ER BSs to their target genes (90) within large (1 Mb)  
605 topologically associating chromatin domains (TADs) (91). Although long-range interactions between  
606 enhancers and gene promoters do of course exist in mouse liver (92,93), our data point to the  
607 hypothesis that their multiplicity and possible functional redundancy (34,94) might be curtailed *in*  
608 *vivo* for E2-transcriptional responses within this tissue. This could also be true in the uterus, in which  
609 almost 16% of the ER BSs were located <3 kb from gene TSSs (**Supplemental Fig. 7**) (41).  
610 Additionally, enhanced stability of the loops between enhancers and TSSs may also increase the  
611 number of detected binding events at promoters, which would have to be considered as phantom  
612 imprints of this stable chromatin organization. However, the observed enrichment of these proximal  
613 ER BSs in motifs that are able to directly recruit ER (EREs, AP1 or Sp1) partly excludes this  
614 hypothesis.

615 We have also determined that ER could be detected at approximately 850 ER BSs in untreated  
616 livers from ovariectomized female mice, 40% of them also being engaged by ER in the presence of  
617 E2. However, the existence and functionality of the remaining 476 placebo-specific ER BSs remains  
618 unclear. These placebo-specific sites were not found enriched at the proximity of genes whose  
619 expression was repressed by E2, and less than 2% of them were located closer than 10 kb from the  
620 TSS of any annotated gene (data not shown). Furthermore, independent ChIP assays performed with  
621 an antibody directed against the N-terminal region of ER were able to confirm an ER commitment at  
622 only 5 of the 19 randomly chosen regions falling into the placebo-specific condition. This could  
623 reflect a problem of specificity of the antibody directed against the C-terminal region of the protein,  
624 since it was able to purify 40 genomic regions supposedly binding to ER in ERKO livers.  
625 Alternatively, the epitopes targeted by the anti N-terminal antibody may be less accessible than those  
626 recognized by the C-terminal antibody, although the recent structure of a DNA-bound ER complexed  
627 with cofactors would suggest the opposite (95). Finally, we can also postulate that the placebo-  
628 specific ER BSs may specifically recruit the ER $\alpha$  46 or ER $\alpha$  36 isoforms of ER which are devoid of



629 its N-terminal region and are known to be expressed in mouse liver (96-98). Investigating this  
630 hypothesis will require the whole-genome cartography of the binding events of these isoforms to be  
631 established using specific antibodies combined with the generation of corresponding mouse models  
632 expressing only one of the three ER isoforms.

633 Comparing the transcriptomes and the distribution of H3K4me2 and H3K27ac chromatin marks  
634 within the genome of ERWT and ERKO livers raised several novel insights into the roles of ER in  
635 mouse liver. First, from a chromatin point of view, we observed that the enrichment of genes  
636 promoters in active marks globally paralleled their differential expression in ERKO as compared to  
637 ERWT livers. This correlation was slightly more important for up-regulated than down-regulated  
638 genes, suggesting that chromatin changes accompanying genes with higher transcriptional activity are  
639 more drastic than those observed for genes with reduced activity. Second, among the 129 genes  
640 differently expressed in the livers of ERKO vs. ERWT mice, only 10 were also regulated by E2 in  
641 ERWT. On the one hand, this observation could reflect the fact that the remaining 119 genes are  
642 indirectly regulated by ER, *i.e.* that one or more proteins or RNAs regulated by ER and/or E2 is  
643 required for the correct expression of these genes. Note that this faulty regulatory component could be  
644 expressed in the liver itself but since we used whole body ER knock-out (KO) mice it could also be  
645 expressed in other organs and indirectly influence the signalling cascades in the liver. This hypothesis  
646 is supported by the fact that these genes do not have any ER BSs in their vicinity. On the other hand,  
647 this observation also indicates that ER is not absolutely required for the basal expression of the  
648 majority of the E2-sensitive genes in the liver. This demonstrates *in vivo* that ER has to be considered  
649 as a regulator of transcription rather than a required factor for the transcription of these genes. Such a  
650 conclusion can also be drawn from our MeDIP-qPCR and H3K4me2/H3K27ac CHIP-seq data, which  
651 demonstrated that ER is not required *per se* for the establishment and/or maintenance of chromatin  
652 modifications at the majority of its binding sites. Moreover, we found that ER BSs with reduced  
653 chromatin functionality in ERKO are less frequently associated with the liver master regulator Hnf4 $\alpha$   
654 (76-80).

655 These observations pointing at a secondary role of ER for the functionality of liver chromatin are  
656 also perfectly compatible with the notion that ER and other TFs act subsequent to the required

657 preliminary actions of pioneering factors such as FOXA proteins, or other partners such as GATA,  
658 C/EBP, etc (15,99,100) which determine the functionalization and accessibility of chromatin.  
659 However, contrasting with this pioneering view, we found that Foxa2 mobilization was affected in  
660 ERKO livers, even at ER-negative Foxa2 BSs identified in ERWT mice. Importantly, independent  
661 RT-qPCR or Western blot experiments did not consistently reproduce the 10% drop in Foxa2  
662 expression in ERKO livers detected by our microarray data. It is possible that the heterogeneity of the  
663 liver transcriptome and its dependence on the mouse diet may have hindered the detection of  
664 variations in Foxa2 expression. To get further information on a putative ER-mediated regulation of  
665 Foxa2, we hypothesized that if ER was controlling the expression of Foxa2 there might be genes  
666 regulated in the same way in ERKO and Foxa2KO mice. Comparison of our dataset with those  
667 available for a liver-specific double Foxa1/Foxa2 KO (22) revealed that 21 of the 721 Foxa-dependent  
668 mRNAs also had reduced expression in ERKO mice (data not shown). These genes exhibited no  
669 annotation towards a specific pathway or biological process. Although we cannot formerly exclude  
670 the possibility that Foxa2 expression may be influenced by the loss of ER expression, so far there is  
671 no clear evidence of a particular functional consequence of this putative direct relationship.

672 Nevertheless, a 10% drop in Foxa2 expression may not be sufficient to explain a 50% loss in  
673 Foxa2 BSs. An in depth motif analysis associated with a comparison of Foxa2 BSs with the available  
674 cistromes of other TFs allowed us to provide an hypothetical model in which the binding of a network  
675 of other TFs on shared BSs may protect these sites from totally losing FoxA2 engagement and  
676 chromatin functionality. These factors are Hnf4 $\alpha$ , Nkx3-1, Cebp $\alpha$ , Cebp $\beta$  and Rxra and possibly  
677 Foxa1. Although we cannot ascertain the perfect specificity of our Foxa1 cistrome because of  
678 antibodies cross-reactivity with Foxa2, it may be interesting to note that 188 putative “ERKO-specific”  
679 Foxa1 sites were determined as lost Foxa2 BSs (data not shown). Interestingly, we also determined  
680 that regions that totally lost their central H3K4me2-enriched nucleosome were including DNA  
681 recognition motifs for Tead and Tcfap2 factors (**Supplementary Fig. 14**). AP2 is a pioneer factor,  
682 and may exert here a direct function in controlling chromatin opening. Tead factors, and in particular  
683 Tead 2 are involved in Foxa2/Hnf4 $\alpha$  enhancer selection during hepatocyte differentiation (76). These  
684 two factors may therefore be integrated into the network of TFs that protect against chromatin

685 changes in ERKO livers. However, whether these factors direct the mobilization of chromatin  
686 modifiers that specifically prevent FoxA2 disengagement remains to be directly evaluated. Candidate  
687 modifiers could be proposed from our H3K4me2 ChIP-seq data showing a shift from a biphasic to a  
688 perfectly centered monophasic shape on some ER BSs and lost FoxA2 BSs. Two mechanisms could  
689 explain these observations: either the central nucleosome is preferentially modified by an H3K4  
690 methylase in ERKO livers (or the adjacent ones are not modified at all), or the absence of ER or  
691 FoxA2 directly or indirectly affects nucleosome positioning. In MCF-7 cells, ER genomic activity  
692 was shown to depend on the H3K methylases SMYD3, SETD1A, MLL1 or MLL2 (10,101-104), and  
693 even on its direct methylation by SMYD2 (105,106). However, mRNA encoding the orthologs of  
694 these proteins did not exhibit significant changes in ERKO relative to ERWT livers (not shown). The  
695 same was also true concerning the expression of histone chaperones involved in nucleosome  
696 positioning and dynamics, such as Spt16h and Ssrp1, components of FACT (107), or Spt6h and  
697 nucleolin (108).

698 In conclusion, we have demonstrated here that the actions of ER and the acute administration of  
699 E2 in mouse liver *in vivo* have particular characteristics. Another important outcome of this study is  
700 the fact that ER is not absolutely required for the basal expression of the majority of the E2-sensitive  
701 genes in the liver and that it appears to be dispensable for the establishment and/or maintenance of  
702 chromatin modifications at the majority of its binding sites, where other TFs such as Hn4a may  
703 preserve functional competence. In contrast, ER was found required for the binding of the Foxa2  
704 factor. Taken together, together, our results indicate that the loss of ER expression in livers from  
705 ERKO mice affects the distribution of H3K4me2-enriched nucleosomes around both ER BSs and  
706 Foxa2 BSs. The underlying mechanisms still remain to be understood, although they are likely  
707 independent of the transcriptional regulation of chromatin actors. Importantly, besides its genomic  
708 influences, ER exerts membrane- and/or cytoplasmic-based actions on intracellular kinase  
709 transduction pathways (109). Hence, it would be interesting to test whether ER could regulate the  
710 activity of Foxa2 or H3K4 methylases at the post-translational level in liver using specific mouse  
711 models expressing ER forms devoid of either nuclear- (110,111) or membrane-based regulatory  
712 abilities (112,113).

713

714 **Acknowledgements**

715 The staff of the animal facilities of the “Plateforme d’experimentation fonctionnelle” (A.  
716 Desquesnes) in Toulouse, M. Buscato and F. Boudou, are acknowledged for skillful technical  
717 assistance. We greatly acknowledge S. Vicaire, S. Le Gras, M. Philipps and B. Jost for their  
718 indispensable help and work on generating the HTS data at the IGBMC Microarray and Sequencing  
719 platform at Illkirch. We also thank Y. Lippi and P. Martin for the excellent contribution to microarray  
720 analysis carried out at the GeT-TRIX Genopole Toulouse facility. Work performed at the UMR  
721 CNRS 6290 was supported by the “Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique” (CNRS), the  
722 University of Rennes I, and benefited from grants from the “Association pour la Recherche contre le  
723 Cancer” (ARC), the “Ligue Contre le Cancer” (Equipe Labellisée Ligue 2009), the “Région Bretagne”  
724 [CREATE #4793] and the “Agence Nationale pour la Recherche” [ANR-09-BLAN-0268-01].  
725 Support for the work carried out at INSERM U1085 was obtained from the “Institut national de la  
726 santé et de la recherche médicale” (INSERM), the University of Rennes I, and the “Ligue Contre le  
727 Cancer”. The work at the INSERM unit U1048 was supported by the INSERM, University of  
728 Toulouse III, Faculty of Medecine Toulouse-Rangueil, “Fondation de France”, “Conseil Régional  
729 Midi-Pyrénées” and “Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale” (FRM). Sequencing performed by the  
730 IGBMC Microarray and Sequencing platform was supported by the FG National Infrastructure,  
731 funded as part of the "Investissements d'Avenir" program managed by the “Agence Nationale pour la  
732 Recherche” [ANR-10-INBS-0009].

733

734 **References**

- 735 1. **Couse JF, Korach KS.** Estrogen receptor null mice: what have we learned and where will they  
736 lead us? *Endocr Rev.* 1999;20:358-417.
- 737 2. **McEwan IJ.** Nuclear receptors: one big family. *Methods Mol Biol.* 1999;505:3-18.
- 738 3. **Lenfant F, Trémollières F, Gourdy P, Arnal JF.** Timing of the vascular actions of estrogens in  
739 experimental and human studies: why protective early, and not when delayed? *Maturitas.*  
740 2011;68:165-173.
- 741 4. **Carroll JS, Brown M.** Estrogen receptor target gene: an evolving concept. *Mol Endocrinol.*  
742 2006;20:1707-1714.
- 743 5. **Eeckhoute J, Métivier R, Salbert G.** Defining specificity of transcription factor regulatory  
744 activities. *J Cell Sci.* 2009;122:4027-4034.
- 745 6. **Magnani L, Eeckhoute J, Lupien M.** Pioneer factors: directing transcriptional regulators within  
746 the chromatin environment. *Trends Genet.* 2011;27:465-474.
- 747 7. **Shang Y, Hu X, DiRenzo J, Lazar MA, Brown M.** Cofactor dynamics and sufficiency in  
748 estrogen receptor-regulated transcription. *Cell.* 2000;103:843-852.
- 749 8. **Métivier R, Penot G, Hübner MR, Reid G, Brand H, Kos M, Gannon F.** Estrogen receptor-  
750 alpha directs ordered, cyclical, and combinatorial recruitment of cofactors on a natural target  
751 promoter. *Cell.* 2003;115:751-763.
- 752 9. **Zwart W, Theodorou V, Kok M, Canisius S, Linn S, Carroll JS.** Oestrogen receptor-co-  
753 factor-chromatin specificity in the transcriptional regulation of breast cancer. *EMBO J.*  
754 2011;30:4764-4776.
- 755 10. **Wong Jeong K, Chodankar R, Purcell DJ, Bittencourt D, Stallcup MR.** Gene-specific  
756 patterns of coregulator requirements by estrogen receptor- $\alpha$  in breast cancer cells. *Mol*  
757 *Endocrinol.* 2012;26:955-966.
- 758 11. **Carroll JS, Meyer CA, Song J, Li W, Geistlinger TR, Eeckhoute J, Brodsky AS, Keeton EK,**  
759 **Fertuck KC, Hall GF, Wang Q, Bekiranov S, Sementchenko V, Fox EA, Silver PA,**

- 760 **Gingeras TR, Liu XS, Brown M.** Genome-wide analysis of estrogen receptor binding sites. *Nat*  
761 *Genet.* 2006;38:1289-1297.
- 762 12. **Welboren WJ, Sweep FC, Span PN, Stunnenberg HG.** Genomic actions of estrogen receptor  
763 alpha: what are the targets and how are they regulated? *Endocr Relat Cancer.* 2009;16:1073-  
764 1089.
- 765 13. **Hah N, Murakami S, Nagari A, Danko CG, Kraus WL.** Enhancer transcripts mark active  
766 estrogen receptor binding sites. *Genome Res.* 2013;23:1210-1223.
- 767 14. **Li W, Notani D, Ma Q, Tanasa B, Nunez E, Chen AY, Merkurjev D, Zhang J, Ohgi K, Song**  
768 **X, Oh S, Kim HS, Glass CK, Rosenfeld MG.** Functional roles of enhancer RNAs for  
769 oestrogen-dependent transcriptional activation. *Nature.* 2013;498:516-520.
- 770 15. **Zaret KS, Carroll JS.** Pioneer transcription factors: establishing competence for gene  
771 expression. *Genes Dev.* 2011;25:2227-2241.
- 772 16. **Cirillo LA, Zaret KS.** An early developmental transcription factor complex that is more stable  
773 on nucleosome core particles than on free DNA. *Mol Cell.* 1999;4:961-969.
- 774 17. **Cirillo LA, Lin FR, Cuesta I, Friedman D, Jarnik M, Zaret KS.** Opening of compacted  
775 chromatin by early developmental transcription factors HNF3 (FoxA) and GATA-4. *Mol Cell.*  
776 2002;9:279-289.
- 777 18. **Soufi A, Garcia MF, Jaroszewicz A, Osman N, Pellegrini M, Zaret KS.** Pioneer transcription  
778 factors target partial DNA motifs on nucleosomes to initiate reprogramming. *Cell.* 2015;161:555-  
779 568.
- 780 19. **Hurtado A, Holmes KA, Ross-Innes CS, Schmidt D, Carroll JS.** FOXA1 is a key determinant  
781 of estrogen receptor function and endocrine response. *Nat Genet.* 2011;43:27-33.
- 782 20. **Li Z, Tuteja G, Schug J, Kaestner KH.** Foxa1 and Foxa2 are essential for sexual dimorphism  
783 in liver cancer. *Cell.* 2012;148:72-83.
- 784 21. **Zhao Y, Li Z.** Interplay of estrogen receptors and FOXA factors in the liver cancer. *Mol Cell*  
785 *Endocrinol.* 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.mce.2015.01.043. [Epub ahead of print].
- 786 22. **Li Z, Schug J, Tuteja G, White P, Kaestner KH.** The nucleosome map of the mammalian liver.  
787 2011; *Nat Struct Mol Biol*;18:742-746.

- 788 23. **Zhu L, Brown WC, Cai Q, Krust A, Chambon P, McGuinness OP, Stafford JM.** Estrogen  
789 treatment after ovariectomy protects against fatty liver and may improve pathway-selective  
790 insulin resistance. *Diabetes*. 2013;62:424-434.
- 791 24. **Han SI, Komatsu Y, Murayama A, Steffensen KR, Nakagawa Y, Nakajima Y, Suzuki M,**  
792 **Oie S, Parini P, Vedin LL, Kishimoto H, Shimano H, Gustafsson JÅ, Yanagisawa J.**  
793 Estrogen receptor ligands ameliorate fatty liver through a nonclassical estrogen receptor/Liver X  
794 receptor pathway in mice. *Hepatology*. 2014;59:1791-1802.
- 795 25. **Tchaikovski SN, Rosing J.** Mechanisms of estrogen-induced venous thromboembolism. *Thromb*  
796 *Res*. 2010;126: 5-11.
- 797 26. **Canonico M, Oger E, Plu-Bureau G, Conard J, Meyer G, Lévesque H, Trillot N, Barrellier**  
798 **MT, Wahl D, Emmerich J, Scarabin PY, Estrogen and Thromboembolism Risk (ESTHER)**  
799 **Study Group.** Hormone therapy and venous thromboembolism among postmenopausal women:  
800 impact of the route of estrogen administration and progestogens: the ESTHER study. *Circulation*.  
801 2007;115:840-845.
- 802 27. **van Nas A, Guhathakurta D, Wang SS, Yehya N, Horvath S, Zhang B, Ingram-Drake L,**  
803 **Chaudhuri G, Schadt EE, Drake TA, Arnold AP, Lusk AJ.** Elucidating the role of gonadal  
804 hormones in sexually dimorphic gene coexpression networks. *Endocrinology*. 2009;150:1235-  
805 1249.
- 806 28. **Pedram A, Razandi M, O'Mahony F, Harvey H, Harvey BJ, Levin ER.** Estrogen reduces  
807 lipid content in the liver exclusively from membrane receptor signaling. *Sci Signal*. 2013;6:ra36.
- 808 29. **Matic M, Bryzgalova G, Gao H, Antonson P, Humire P, Omoto Y, Portwood N, Pramfalk**  
809 **C, Efendic S, Berggren PO, Gustafsson JÅ, Dahlman-Wright K.** Estrogen signalling and the  
810 metabolic syndrome: targeting the hepatic estrogen receptor alpha action. *PLoS One*.  
811 2013;8:e57458.
- 812 30. **Dupont S, Krust A, Gansmuller A, Dierich A, Chambon P, Mark M.** Effect of single and  
813 compound knockouts of estrogen receptors alpha (ERalpha) and beta (ERbeta) on mouse  
814 reproductive phenotypes. *Development*. 2000;127:4277-4291.



- 815 31. **Zhang B, Kirov S, Snoddy J.** WebGestalt: an integrated system for exploring gene sets in  
816 various biological contexts. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2005;33:W741-748.
- 817 32. **Barrett T, Troup DB, Wilhite SE, Ledoux P, Rudnev D, Evangelista C, Kim IF, Soboleva A,**  
818 **Tomashevsky M, Marshall KA, Phillippy KH, Sherman PM, Muetter RN, Edgar R.** NCBI  
819 GEO: archive for high-throughput functional genomic data. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2009;37:D885-  
820 890.
- 821 33. **Gordon FK, Vallaster CS, Westerling T, Iyer LK, Brown M, Schnitzler GR.** Research  
822 Resource: Aorta- and Liver-Specific ER $\alpha$ -Binding Patterns and Gene Regulation by Estrogen.  
823 *Mol Endocrinol.* 2014;28:1337-1351.
- 824 34. **Quintin J, Le Péron C, Palierne G, Bizot M, Cunha S, Sérandour AA, Avner S, Henry C,**  
825 **Percevault F, Belaud-Rotureau MA, Huet S, Watrin E, Eeckhoute J, Legagneux V, Salbert**  
826 **G, Métivier R.** Dynamic estrogen receptor interactomes control estrogen-responsive trefoil  
827 Factor (TFF) locus cell-specific activities. *Mol Cell Biol.* 2014;34:2418-2436.
- 828 35. **Sérandour AA, Avner S, Oger F, Bizot M, Percevault F, Lucchetti-Miganeh C, Palierne G,**  
829 **Gheeraert C, Barloy-Hubler F, Le Péron C, Madigou T, Durand E, Froguel P, Staels B,**  
830 **Lefebvre P, Métivier R, Eeckhoute J, Salbert G.** Dynamic hydroxymethylation of  
831 deoxyribonucleic acid marks differentiation-associated enhancers. *Nucleic Acids Res.*  
832 2012;40:8255-8265.
- 833 36. **Langmead B, Trapnell C, Pop M, Salzberg SL.** Ultrafast and memory-efficient alignment of  
834 short DNA sequences to the human genome. *Genome Biol.* 2009;10:R25.
- 835 37. **Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G,**  
836 **Durbin R, 1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup.** The Sequence Alignment/Map  
837 format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics.* 2009;25:2078-2079.
- 838 38. **Zhang Y, Liu T, Meyer CA, Eeckhoute J, Johnson DS, Bernstein BE, Nusbaum C, Myers**  
839 **RM, Brown M, Li W, Liu XS.** Model-based analysis of ChIP-Seq (MACS). *Genome Biol.*  
840 2008;9:R137.



- 841 39. **Liu T, Ortiz A, Taing L, Meyer CA, Lee B, Zhang Y, Shin H, Wong SS, Ma J, Lei Y, Pape**  
842 **UJ, Poidinger M, Chen Y, Yeung K, Brown M, Turpaz Y, Liu XS.** Cistrome: an integrative  
843 platform for transcriptional regulation studies. *Genome Biol.* 2011;12:R83.
- 844 40. **Kolesnikov N, Hastings E, Keays M, Melnichuk O, Tang YA, Williams E, Dylag M,**  
845 **Kurbatova N, Brandizi M, Burdett T, Megy K, Pilicheva E, Rustici G, Tikhonov A,**  
846 **Parkinson H, Petryszak R, Sarkans U, Brazma A.** ArrayExpress update--simplifying data  
847 submissions. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2015;43: D1113-1116.
- 848 41. **Hewitt SC, Li L, Grimm SA, Chen Y, Liu L, Li Y, Bushel PR, Fargo D, Korach KS.**  
849 Research resource: whole-genome estrogen receptor  $\alpha$  binding in mouse uterine tissue revealed  
850 by ChIP-seq. *Mol Endocrinol.* 2012;26:887-898.
- 851 42. **Schmidt D, Schwalie PC, Ross-Innes CS, Hurtado A, Brown GD, Carroll JS, Flicek P,**  
852 **Odom DT.** A CTCF-independent role for cohesin in tissue-specific transcription. *Genome Res.*  
853 2010;20:578-88.
- 854 43. **Gao H, Fält S, Sandelin A, Gustafsson JA, Dahlman-Wright K.** Genome-wide identification  
855 of estrogen receptor alpha-binding sites in mouse liver. *Mol Endocrinol.* 2008;22:10-22.
- 856 44. **Qin B, Zhou M, Ge Y, Taing L, Liu T, Wang Q, Wang S, Chen J, Shen L, Duan X, Hu S, Li**  
857 **W, Long H, Zhang Y, Liu XS.** CistromeMap: a knowledgebase and web server for ChIP-Seq  
858 and DNase-Seq studies in mouse and human. *Bioinformatics.* 2012;28:1411-1412.
- 859 45. **Sun H, Qin B, Liu T, Wang Q, Liu J, Wang J, Lin X, Yang Y, Taing L, Rao PK, Brown M,**  
860 **Zhang Y, Long HW, Liu XS.** CistromeFinder for ChIP-seq and DNase-seq data reuse.  
861 *Bioinformatics.* 2013;29:1352-1354.
- 862 46. **MacIsaac KD, Lo KA, Gordon W, Motola S, Mazor T, Fraenkel E.** A quantitative model of  
863 transcriptional regulation reveals the influence of binding location on expression. *PLoS Comput*  
864 *Biol.* 2010;6:e1000773.
- 865 47. **Schmidt D, Wilson MD, Ballester B, Schwalie PC, Brown GD, Marshall A, Kutter C, Watt**  
866 **S, Martinez-Jimenez CP, Mackay S, Talianidis I, Flicek P, Odom DT.** Five-vertebrate ChIP-  
867 seq reveals the evolutionary dynamics of transcription factor binding. *Science.* 2010;328:1036-40.

- 868 48. **Boergesen M, Pedersen TÅ, Gross B, van Heeringen SJ, Hagenbeek D, Bindsbøll C, Caron**  
869 **S, Lalloyer F, Steffensen KR, Nebb HI, Gustafsson JÅ, Stunnenberg HG, Staels B,**  
870 **Mandrup S.** Genome-wide profiling of liver X receptor, retinoid X receptor, and peroxisome  
871 proliferator-activated receptor  $\alpha$  in mouse liver reveals extensive sharing of binding sites. *Mol*  
872 *Cell Biol.* 2012;32:852-67.
- 873 49. **Grøntved L, John S, Baek S, Liu Y, Buckley JR, Vinson C, Aguilera G, Hager GL.** C/EBP  
874 maintains chromatin accessibility in liver and facilitates glucocorticoid receptor recruitment to  
875 steroid response elements. *EMBO J.* 2013;32:1568-83.
- 876 50. **Chaveroux C, Eichner LJ, Dufour CR, Shatnawi A, Khoutorsky A, Bourque G, Sonenberg**  
877 **N, Giguère V.** Molecular and genetic crosstalks between mTOR and ERR $\alpha$  are key determinants  
878 of rapamycin-induced nonalcoholic fatty liver. *Cell Metab.* 2013;17:586-98.
- 879 51. **Bugge A, Feng D, Everett LJ, Briggs ER, Mullican SE, Wang F, Jager J, Lazar MA.** Rev-  
880 erba and Rev-erb $\beta$  coordinately protect the circadian clock and normal metabolic function.  
881 *Genes Dev.* 2012;26:657-67.
- 882 52. **Cho H, Zhao X, Hatori M, Yu RT, Barish GD, Lam MT, Chong LW, DiTacchio L, Atkins**  
883 **AR, Glass CK, Liddle C, Auwerx J, Downes M, Panda S, Evans RM.** Regulation of circadian  
884 behaviour and metabolism by REV-ERB- $\alpha$  and REV-ERB- $\beta$ . *Nature.* 2012;485:123-7.
- 885 53. **Shen Y, Yue F, McCleary DF, Ye Z, Edsall L, Kuan S, Wagner U, Dixon J, Lee L,**  
886 **Lobanenkov VV, Ren B.** A map of the cis-regulatory sequences in the mouse genome. *Nature.*  
887 2012;488:116-20.
- 888 54. **Alpern D, Langer D, Ballester B, Le Gras S, Romier C, Mengus G, Davidson I.** TAF4, a  
889 subunit of transcription factor II D, directs promoter occupancy of nuclear receptor HNF4A  
890 during post-natal hepatocyte differentiation. *Elife.* 2014;3:e03613.
- 891 55. **Anderson PD, McKissic SA, Logan M, Roh M, Franco OE, Wang J, Doubinskaia I, van der**  
892 **Meer R, Hayward SW, Eischen CM, Eltoum IE, Abdulkadir SA.** Nkx3.1 and Myc  
893 crossregulate shared target genes in mouse and human prostate tumorigenesis. *J Clin Invest.*  
894 2012;122:1907-19.

- 895 56. **Untergasser A, Cutcutache I, Koressaar T, Ye J, Faircloth BC, Remm M, Rozen SG.**  
896 Primer3--new capabilities and interfaces. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2012;40:e115.
- 897 57. **Saeed AI, Bhagabati NK, Braisted JC, Liang W, Sharov V, Howe EA, Li J, Thiagarajan M,**  
898 **White JA, Quackenbush J.** TM4 microarray software suite. *Methods Enzymol.* 2006;411:134-  
899 193.
- 900 58. **Villa A, Della Torre S, Stell A, Cook J, Brown M, Maggi A.** Tetradian oscillation of estrogen  
901 receptor  $\alpha$  is necessary to prevent liver lipid deposition. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.*  
902 2012;109:11806-11811.
- 903 59. **Joseph R, Orlov YL, Huss M, Sun W, Kong SL, Ukil L, Pan YF, Li G, Lim M, Thomsen JS,**  
904 **Ruan Y, Clarke ND, Prabhakar S, Cheung E, Liu ET.** Integrative model of genomic factors  
905 for determining binding site selection by estrogen receptor- $\alpha$ . *Mol Syst Biol.* 2010;6,:456.
- 906 60. **Ross-Innes CS, Stark R, Teschendorff AE, Holmes KA, Ali HR, Dunning MJ, Brown GD,**  
907 **Gojis O, Ellis IO, Green AR, Ali S, Chin SF, Palmieri C, Caldas C, Carroll JS.** Differential  
908 oestrogen receptor binding is associated with clinical outcome in breast cancer. *Nature.*  
909 2012;481:389-393.
- 910 61. **Tang B, Hsu HK, Hsu PY, Bonneville R, Chen SS, Huang TH, Jin VX.** Hierarchical  
911 modularity in ER $\alpha$  transcriptional network is associated with distinct functions and implicates  
912 clinical outcomes. *Sci Rep.* 2012;2:875.
- 913 62. **Ovaska K, Matarese F, Grote K, Charapitsa I, Cervera A, Liu C, Reid G, Seifert M,**  
914 **Stunnenberg HG, Hautaniemi S.** Integrative analysis of deep sequencing data identifies  
915 estrogen receptor early response genes and links ATAD3B to poor survival in breast cancer.  
916 *PLoS Comput Biol.* 2013;9:e1003100.
- 917 63. **McLean CY, Bristol D, Hiller M, Clarke SL, Schaar BT, Lowe CB, Wenger AM, Bejerano**  
918 **G.** GREAT improves functional interpretation of cis-regulatory regions. *Nat Biotechnol.*  
919 2010;28:495-501.
- 920 64. **Creyghton MP, Cheng AW, Welstead GG, Kooistra T, Carey BW, Steine EJ, Hanna J,**  
921 **Lodato MA, Frampton GM, Sharp PA, Boyer LA, Young RA, Jaenisch R.** Histone H3K27ac

- 922 separates active from poised enhancers and predicts developmental state. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*  
923 *USA*. 2010;107:21931-21936.
- 924 65. **Calo E, Wysocka J.** Modification of enhancer chromatin: what, how, and why? *Mol Cell*.  
925 2013;49:825-837.
- 926 66. **Wang Y, Li X, Hu H.** H3K4me2 reliably defines transcription factor binding regions in different  
927 cells. *Genomics*. 2014;103:222-228.
- 928 67. **Lister R, Pelizzola M, Downen RH, Hawkins RD, Hon G, Tonti-Filippini J, Nery JR, Lee L,**  
929 **Ye Z, Ngo QM, Edsall L, Antosiewicz-Bourget J, Stewart R, Ruotti V, Millar AH, Thomson**  
930 **JA, Ren B, Ecker JR.** Human DNA methylomes at base resolution show widespread  
931 epigenomic differences. *Nature*. 2009;462:315-322.
- 932 68. **Song CX, Szulwach KE, Fu Y, Dai Q, Yi C, Li X, Li Y, Chen CH, Zhang W, Jian X, Wang**  
933 **J, Zhang L, Looney TJ, Zhang B, Godley LA, Hicks LM, Lahn BT, Jin P, He C.** Selective  
934 chemical labeling reveals the genome-wide distribution of 5-hydroxymethylcytosine. *Nat*  
935 *Biotechnol*. 2011;29:68-72.
- 936 69. **Hoffman BG, Robertson G, Zavaglia B, Beach M, Cullum R, Lee S, Soukhatcheva G, Li L,**  
937 **Wederell ED, Thiessen N, Bilenky M, Cezard T, Tam A, Kamoh B, Birol I, Dai D, Zhao Y,**  
938 **Hirst M, Verchere CB, Helgason CD, Marra MA, Jones SJ, Hoodless PA.** Locus co-  
939 occupancy, nucleosome positioning, and H3K4me1 regulate the functionality of FOXA2-,  
940 HNF4A-, and PDX1-bound loci in islets and liver. *Genome Res*. 2010;20:1037-1051.
- 941 70. **He HH, Meyer CA, Chen MW, Jordan VC, Brown M, Liu XS.** Differential DNase I  
942 hypersensitivity reveals factor-dependent chromatin dynamics. *Genome Res*. 2012;22:1015-1025.
- 943 71. **Spicuglia S, Vanhille L.** Chromatin signatures of active enhancers. *Nucleus*. 2012;3:126-131.
- 944 72. **Cheng J, Blum R, Bowman C, Hu D, Shilatifard A, Shen S, Dynlacht BD.** A role for H3K4  
945 monomethylation in gene repression and partitioning of chromatin readers. *Mol Cell*.  
946 2014;53:979-992.
- 947 73. **Chen WS, Manova K, Weinstein DC, Duncan SA, Plump AS, Prezioso VR, Bachvarova RF,**  
948 **Darnell JE Jr.** Disruption of the HNF-4 gene, expressed in visceral endoderm, leads to cell

- 949 death in embryonic ectoderm and impaired gastrulation of mouse embryos. *Genes Dev.*  
950 1994;8:2466-77.
- 951 74. **Lee CS, Friedman JR, Fulmer JT, Kaestner KH.** The initiation of liver development is  
952 dependent on Foxa transcription factors. *Nature.* 2005;435:944-947.
- 953 75. **Bochkis IM, Schug J, Ye DZ, Kurinna S, Stratton SA, Barton MC, Kaestner KH.** Genome-  
954 wide location analysis reveals distinct transcriptional circuitry by paralogous regulators Foxa1  
955 and Foxa2. *PLoS Genet.* 2012;8:e1002770.
- 956 76. **Alder O, Cullum R, Lee S, Kan AC, Wei W, Yi Y, Garside VC, Bilenky M, Griffith M,**  
957 **Morrissy AS, Robertson GA, Thiessen N, Zhao Y, Chen Q, Pan D, Jones SJ, Marra MA,**  
958 **Hoodless PA.** Hippo signaling influences HNF4A and FOXA2 enhancer switching during  
959 hepatocyte differentiation. *Cell Rep.* 2014;9:261-71
- 960 77. **Gordillo M, Evans T, Gouon-Evans V.** Orchestrating liver development. *Development.*  
961 2015;142:2094-108.
- 962 78. **Sladek FM, Darnell JE.** Mechanisms of liver-specific gene expression. *Curr Opin Genet Dev.*  
963 1992;2:256-9.
- 964 79. **Zaret KS.** Regulatory phases of early liver development: paradigms of organogenesis. *Nat Rev*  
965 *Genet.* 2002;3:499-512.
- 966 80. **Shin D, Monga SP.** Cellular and molecular basis of liver development. *Compr Physiol.*  
967 2013;3:799-815.
- 968 81. **Szklarczyk D, Franceschini A, Wyder S, Forslund K, Heller D, Huerta-Cepas J, Simonovic**  
969 **M, Roth A, Santos A, Tsafou KP, Kuhn M, Bork P, Jensen LJ, von Mering C.** STRING v10:  
970 protein-protein interaction networks, integrated over the tree of life. *Nucleic Acids Res.*  
971 2015;43:D447-52.
- 972 82. **Holmes KA, Song JS, Liu XS, Brown M, Carroll JS.** Nkx3-1 and LEF-1 function as  
973 transcriptional inhibitors of estrogen receptor activity. *Cancer Research* 2008;68:7380–85
- 974 83. **Jones ME, Boon WC, Proietto J, Simpson ER.** Of mice and men: the evolving phenotype of  
975 aromatase deficiency. *Trends Endocrinol Metab.* 2006;17:55-64.

- 976 84. **Valéra MC, Gratacap MP, Gourdy P, Lenfant F, Cabou C, Toutain CE, Marcellin M, Saint**  
977 **Laurent N, Sié P, Sixou M, Arnal JF, Payrastre B.** Chronic estradiol treatment reduces platelet  
978 responses and protects mice from thromboembolism through the hematopoietic estrogen receptor  
979  $\alpha$ . *Blood*. 2012;120:1703-1712.
- 980 85. **Mizuguchi T, Mitaka T, Hirata K, Oda H, Mochizuki Y.** Alteration of expression of liver-  
981 enriched transcription factors in the transition between growth and differentiation of primary  
982 cultured rat hepatocytes. *J Cell Physiol*. 1998;174:273-284.
- 983 86. **Chang TT, Hughes-Fulford M.** Molecular mechanisms underlying the enhanced functions of  
984 three-dimensional hepatocyte aggregates. *Biomaterials*. 2014;35:2162-2171.
- 985 87. **Jagannathan V, Robinson-Rechavi M.** Meta-analysis of estrogen response in MCF-7  
986 distinguishes early target genes involved in signaling and cell proliferation from later target  
987 genes involved in cell cycle and DNA repair. *BMC Syst Biol*. 2011;5:138.
- 988 88. **Simpson NE, Gertz J, Imberg K, Myers RM, Garabedian MJ.** Research resource: enhanced  
989 genome-wide occupancy of estrogen receptor  $\alpha$  by the cochaperone p23 in breast cancer cells.  
990 *Mol Endocrinol*. 2012;26:194-202.
- 991 89. **Cavalli G, Misteli T.** Functional implications of genome topology. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*.  
992 2013;20:290-299.
- 993 90. **Fullwood MJ, Liu MH, Pan YF, Liu J, Xu H, Mohamed YB, Orlov YL, Velkov S, Ho A,**  
994 **Mei PH, Chew EG, Huang PY, Welboren WJ, Han Y, Ooi HS, Ariyaratne PN, Vega VB,**  
995 **Luo Y, Tan PY, Choy PY, Wansa KD, Zhao B, Lim KS, Leow SC, Yow JS, Joseph R, Li H,**  
996 **Desai KV, Thomsen JS, Lee YK, Karuturi RK, Herve T, Bourque G, Stunnenberg HG,**  
997 **Ruan X, Cacheux-Rataboul V, Sung WK, Liu ET, Wei CL, Cheung E, Ruan Y.** An  
998 oestrogen-receptor-alpha-bound human chromatin interactome. *Nature*. 2009;462:58-64.
- 999 91. **Ciabrelli F, Cavalli G.** Chromatin-driven behavior of topologically associating domains. *J Mol*  
1000 *Biol*. 2015;427:608-625.
- 1001 92. **Zhang Y, Wong CH, Birnbaum RY, Li G, Favaro R, Ngan CY, Lim J, Tai E, Poh HM,**  
1002 **Wong E, Mulawadi FH, Sung WK, Nicolis S, Ahituv N, Ruan Y, Wei CL.** Chromatin

- 1003 connectivity maps reveal dynamic promoter-enhancer long-range associations. *Nature*.  
1004 2013;504:306-310.
- 1005 93. **Schoenfelder S, Furlan-Magaril M, Mifsud B, Tavares-Cadete F, Sugar R, Javierre BM,**  
1006 **Nagano T, Katsman Y, Sakthidevi M, Wingett SW, Dimitrova E, Dimond A, Edelman LB,**  
1007 **Elderkin S, Tabbada K, Darbo E, Andrews S, Herman B, Higgs A, LeProust E, Osborne**  
1008 **CS, Mitchell JA, Luscombe NM, Fraser P.** The pluripotent regulatory circuitry connecting  
1009 promoters to their long-range interacting elements. *Genome Res.* 2015;25:582-597.
- 1010 94. **de Laat W, Duboule D.** Topology of mammalian developmental enhancers and their regulatory  
1011 landscapes. *Nature.* 2013;502:499-506.
- 1012 95. **Yi P, Wang Z, Feng Q, Pintilie GD, Foulds CE, Lanz RB, Ludtke SJ, Schmid MF, Chiu W,**  
1013 **O'Malley BW.** Structure of a biologically active estrogen receptor-coactivator complex on DNA.  
1014 *Mol Cell.* 2015;57:1047-1058.
- 1015 96. **Flouriot G, Brand H, Denger S, Métivier R, Kos M, Reid G, Sonntag-Buck V, Gannon F.**  
1016 Identification of a new isoform of the human estrogen receptor-alpha (hER-alpha) that is encoded  
1017 by distinct transcripts and that is able to repress hER-alpha activation function 1. *EMBO J.*  
1018 2000;19:4688-4700.
- 1019 97. **Wang Z, Zhang X, Shen P, Loggie BW, Chang Y, Deuel TF.** Identification, cloning, and  
1020 expression of human estrogen receptor-alpha36, a novel variant of human estrogen receptor-  
1021 alpha66. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun.* 2005;336:1023-1027.
- 1022 98. **Irsik DL, Carmines PK, Lane PH.** Classical estrogen receptors and ER $\alpha$  splice variants in the  
1023 mouse. *PLoS One.* 2013;8:e70926.
- 1024 99. **John S, Sabo PJ, Thurman RE, Sung MH, Biddie SC, Johnson TA, Hager GL,**  
1025 **Stamatoyannopoulos JA.** Chromatin accessibility pre-determines glucocorticoid receptor  
1026 binding patterns. *Nat Genet.* 2011;43:264-268.
- 1027 100. **Theodorou V, Stark R, Menon S, Carroll JS.** GATA3 acts upstream of FOXA1 in mediating  
1028 ESR1 binding by shaping enhancer accessibility. *Genome Res.* 2013;23:12-22.
- 1029 101. **Mo R, Rao SM, Zhu YJ.** Identification of the MLL2 complex as a coactivator for estrogen  
1030 receptor alpha. *J Biol Chem.* 2006;281:15714-15720.



- 1031 102. **Kim H, Heo K, Kim JH, Kim K, Choi J, An W.** Requirement of histone methyltransferase  
1032 SMYD3 for estrogen receptor-mediated transcription. *J Biol Chem.* 2009;284:19867-19877.
- 1033 103. **Shi L, Sun L, Li Q, Liang J, Yu W, Yi X, Yang X, Li Y, Han X, Zhang Y, Xuan C, Yao**  
1034 **Z, Shang Y.** Histone demethylase JMJD2B coordinates H3K4/H3K9 methylation and promotes  
1035 hormonally responsive breast carcinogenesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2011;108:7541-7546.
- 1036 104. **Jeong KW, Andreu-Vieyra C, You JS, Jones PA, Stallcup MR.** Establishment of active  
1037 chromatin structure at enhancer elements by mixed-lineage leukemia 1 to initiate estrogen-  
1038 dependent gene expression. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2014;42:2245-2256.
- 1039 105. **Zhang X, Tanaka K, Yan J, Li J, Peng D, Jiang Y, Yang Z, Barton MC, Wen H, Shi,X.**  
1040 Regulation of estrogen receptor  $\alpha$  by histone methyltransferase SMYD2-mediated protein  
1041 methylation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2013;110:17284-17289.
- 1042 106. **Jiang Y, Trescott L, Holcomb J, Zhang X, Brunzelle J, Sirinupong N, Shi X, Yang Z.**  
1043 Structural insights into estrogen receptor  $\alpha$  methylation by histone methyltransferase SMYD2, a  
1044 cellular event implicated in estrogen signaling regulation. *J Mol Biol.* 2014;426:3413-3425.
- 1045 107. **Formosa T.** The role of FACT in making and breaking nucleosomes. *Biochim Biophys Acta.*  
1046 2013;1819:247-255.
- 1047 108. **Gurard-Levin ZA, Quivy JP, Almouzni G.** Histone chaperones: assisting histone traffic and  
1048 nucleosome dynamics. *Annu Rev Biochem.* 2014;83:487-517.
- 1049 109. **Edwards DP.** Regulation of signal transduction pathways by estrogen and progesterone.  
1050 *Annu Rev Physiol.* 2005;67:335-376.
- 1051 110. **Arao Y, Hamilton KJ, Ray MK, Scott G, Mishina Y, Korach KS.** Estrogen receptor  $\alpha$  AF-  
1052 2 mutation results in antagonist reversal and reveals tissue selective function of estrogen receptor  
1053 modulators. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2011;108:14986-14991.
- 1054 111. **Billon-Galés A, Krust A, Fontaine C, Abot A, Flouriot G, Toutain C, Berges H, Gadeau**  
1055 **AP, Lenfant F, Gourdy P, Chambon P, Arnal, JF.** Activation function 2 (AF2) of estrogen  
1056 receptor-alpha is required for the atheroprotective action of estradiol but not to accelerate  
1057 endothelial healing. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2011;108:13311-13316.



- 1058 112. **Adlanmerini M, Solinhac R, Abot A, Fabre A, Raymond-Letron I, Guihot AL, Boudou**  
1059 **F, Sautier L, Vessières E, Kim SH, Lière P, Fontaine C, Krust A, Chambon P,**  
1060 **Katzenellenbogen JA, Gourdy P, Shaul PW, Henrion D, Arnal JF, Lenfant F.** Mutation of  
1061 the palmitoylation site of estrogen receptor  $\alpha$  in vivo reveals tissue-specific roles for membrane  
1062 versus nuclear actions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2014;111:E283-290.
- 1063 113. **Pedram A, Razandi M, Lewis M, Hammes S, Levin ER.** Membrane-localized estrogen  
1064 receptor  $\alpha$  is required for normal organ development and function. *Dev Cell*. 2014;29:482-490.  
1065  
1066

1067 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

1068 **Figure 1.** Characterization of the E2-dependent genes in livers from ERWT and ERKO mice. A,  
 1069 Heatmap illustrating the mean expression values determined for E2-sensitive genes (left side) in  
 1070 placebo- (P) and 17 $\beta$  estradiol (E2)-treated ERWT animals or for genes whose expression was  
 1071 different between placebo-treated ERWT and ERKO mice (right side). Each column corresponds to  
 1072 data obtained for one animal. For the sake of clarity, expression values for each gene were normalized  
 1073 by the mean and standard deviation. The percentages of up- and down-regulated genes are indicated  
 1074 on the sides of each heatmap. B, Venn diagram depicting the overlap between genes regulated by E2  
 1075 in ERWT livers and genes whose expression differed between ERWT and ERKO mice.

1076 **Figure 2.** Characterization of the ER cistrome in mouse liver. A, ER ChIP-seq experiments were  
 1077 performed on chromatin prepared from placebo- (P) or E2-treated ERWT and ERKO livers. We  
 1078 systematically used different *p*-values at the peak-calling step to determine the ER cistrome under the  
 1079 different conditions. This panel represents the number of identified ER BSs as a function of the *p*-  
 1080 values used. The color code used in panel A is the same for the next ones. B, Overlap of the different  
 1081 ER cistromes obtained at diverse *p*-values. C, Venn diagram illustrating the common and specific ER  
 1082 BSs using ER cistromes determined at a *p*-value of 10<sup>-5</sup>. D, Heatmap representation of the ChIP-seq  
 1083 signal aligned to the center of ER BSs clustered depending on their overlap determined in panel C. E,  
 1084 Mean ER ChIP-seq signals obtained in ERWT or ERKO mouse livers at the 150 center base pairs of  
 1085 the BSs categories indicated beneath the graph. The upper histogram shows mean values  $\pm$  SD  
 1086 measured on the sites of interest whilst the bottom graph shows mean values  $\pm$  SD of 10 trials carried  
 1087 out on 10 different sets of a corresponding number of random sites.

1088 **Figure 3.** Validation of ER BSs. (A and B) ER ChIP-qPCR experiments were performed on livers  
 1089 from independent animals (numbers on the top of the panel) to validate ChIP-seq data. In Panel A, a  
 1090 fraction of the pool of DNA that was subjected to high-throughput sequencing (HTS) was used as a  
 1091 control. We used two panels of antibody: one directed against the C-terminal region of ER (left side  
 1092 of panels A and B) and the other targeting the N-terminal domain of the protein (A and B, right side).  
 1093 The mobilization of ER was evaluated on a series of genomic regions representing clusters of ER BSs  
 1094 engaged by ER in the presence of E2 or not (#1) or BSs specific for ERKO (#2) or ERWT P (#3)

1095 conditions. The results of these experiments are illustrated as a heatmap of values normalized to those  
 1096 of the promoter of the *Rplp0* gene, which is an ER-negative region. We also used additional negative  
 1097 and positive controls, located nearby the E2-sensitive *Gdf15* gene: Gdf15.2 and Gdf15.3, respectively.  
 1098 In panel B, the results of the experiments were hierarchically clustered to improve the clarity of the  
 1099 heatmap. The distance metric expressed as Pearson correlation is indicated on the right side of the  
 1100 panel. N.D stands for not determined.

1101 **Figure 4.** Specific features of the ER cistrome in mouse liver. A, Distribution of ER BSs determined  
 1102 in E2- or placebo-treated ERWT mouse liver towards annotated gene promoters and TSSs, exons and  
 1103 introns, and intergenic (distal) regions. B, Number of ER BSs located within a 1kb or 3kb window  
 1104 around the TSS of annotated genes in ERWT (P+E2) mouse liver when compared to ER binding data  
 1105 obtained in human breast cancer MCF-7 cells. Calculations were also made using an equivalent  
 1106 number of random regions with similar characteristics than the test ER cistrome determined in ERWT  
 1107 livers. C, Bar chart summarizing the distribution of distances separating E2-regulated genes in breast  
 1108 cancer cell lines or in ERWT mice liver or ER-dependent genes from their closest ER BS. Results are  
 1109 expressed as the percentage of the total population of genes considered. D, Fold-changes in gene  
 1110 expression by E2 in MCF-7 and ERWT mouse liver and in ERKO vs. ERWT liver are expressed as a  
 1111 function of their proximity to an ER BS. Distribution of values are depicted within the left part of the  
 1112 panel, while means  $\pm$  SD are plotted on the right side of the panel.

1113 **Figure 5.** Coordinated changes in H3K4me2 and H3K27ac levels at promoters of ER-dependent  
 1114 genes. A, Alignment of H3K4me2 and H3K27ac ChIP-seq signals generated from chromatin prepared  
 1115 from E2-treated livers of ERWT (red line) or ERKO (blue line) mice on a -5kbp/+5kbp window  
 1116 around the center of the ER BSs. B and C, Mean H3K4me2 and H3K27ac ChIP-seq signals at a -  
 1117 500/+500 bp window around the center of ERBSs (B) or within a 4 kb window centered around the  
 1118 TSS of genes with lower or higher expression in ERKO livers (down-or up-regulated, respectively). D,  
 1119 The fold-change of mean H3K27 values calculated for each of the promoters of down-or up-regulated  
 1120 genes in ERKO livers are plotted against variations of mean H3K4me2 signals. Values shown are  
 1121 expressed as the log<sub>2</sub> of the fold-changes.

1122 **Figure 6.** Affected profile of H3K4me2 enrichment of a fraction of ERBSs in ERKO livers. A,  
 1123 Heatmap representation of a k-mean clusterization of H3K4me2 and H3K27ac ChIP-seq signals  
 1124 obtained in ERWT and ERKO mice livers on ERWT ER BSs. The distribution of clustered ER BSs  
 1125 towards annotated genes' transcriptional start and termination sites (TSS and TTS, respectively),  
 1126 intragenic and intergenic (Distal) regions is indicated on the right side of each clusters, as well as the  
 1127 numbers of genomic sites within each cluster. B, Alignments of H3K4me2 and H3K27ac ChIP-seq  
 1128 mean signals within a -5kbp/+5kbp window centered on ER BSs of each clusters as defined from the  
 1129 k-mean analysis. Signals obtained in E2-treated livers of ERWT or ERKO mice are illustrated as a red  
 1130 or blue line, respectively. Insets represent magnified views of the center of the graphs and illustrate  
 1131 the observed shift from biphasic to monophasic curves of enrichment in H3K4me2.

1132 **Figure 7.** Chromatin status of ER BSs in ERWT and ERKO mouse livers. A, Independent anti-  
 1133 H3K4me1, H3K4me2 and H3K27ac ChIP-qPCR experiments were performed to validate ChIP-seq  
 1134 data. The presence of these marks on ER BSs from series #1 and #3, as defined in Fig. 3, is depicted  
 1135 within the illustrated heatmaps. Numbers on the top refer to the animals from which the chromatin  
 1136 preparations originated. Experiments were done twice per individual. Mean enrichment values  
 1137 calculated per individual are shown as normalized to a control negative ChIP experiment using the  
 1138 same chromatin samples. B, Heatmap illustrating the mean enrichment of indicated ER BSs in 5-mC  
 1139 and 5-hmC as tested by MeDIP- and hMeDIP-qPCR experiments, respectively. The values included  
 1140 within these graphs were obtained from three independent experiments performed on two different  
 1141 DNA samples originating from two different ERWT or ERKO animals. Data were normalized to  
 1142 values obtained using an internal negative control devoid of CpGs. Significant reduced (green) or  
 1143 gained (red) enrichment in histone marks or DNA modifications ERKO livers are indicated in the  
 1144 heatmaps on the right side of each panels. Calculated *p*-values from Mann-Whitney *t*-tests are  
 1145 indicated within the heatmap as follows: \* $< 0.05$ ; \*\* $< 0.01$ .

1146 **Figure 8.** Overlap of ER and Hnf4 $\alpha$  cistromes. A, Overlap of the ER BSs determined in E2-treated  
 1147 ERWT livers with those of Hnf4 $\alpha$  obtained at diverse *p*-values. B, Heatmap representation of ER and  
 1148 Hnf4 $\alpha$  ChIP-seq signals within a -5kbp/+5kbp window centered on ER BSs. Regions are sorted by  
 1149 their rank in ER ChIP-seq signal. C, Heatmap representing the overlap between the clusters of ER

1150 BSs as determined in Fig. 6 with Hnf4 $\alpha$  BSs determined at a  $p$ -value of  $10^{-5}$ . The numbers indicated  
 1151 represent the calculated overlaps.

1152 **Figure 9.** The Foxa2 cistrome is partially ER-dependent. A, Foxa2 ChIP-seq experiments were  
 1153 performed on chromatin prepared from E2-treated ERWT and ERKO livers. As carried out previously,  
 1154 we systematically used different thresholds to determine the number of Foxa2 BSs in each of the  
 1155 experimental conditions (orange and grey lines for ERWT and ERKO animals respectively). The  
 1156 number of ER BSs in ERWT (red curve) is given as reference. The color code used in panel A is the  
 1157 same for the next ones. B, Overlap of the different Foxa2 cistromes at diverse  $p$ -values with ER BSs  
 1158 or Foxa2 BSs determined in E2-treated ERWT livers (left and middle graphs), or Foxa2 BSs in E2-  
 1159 treated ERKO livers (right). C, Venn diagram illustrating the overlap of ER BSs with Foxa2 BSs in  
 1160 ERWT or ERKO mice at the chosen  $p$ -value of  $10^{-4}$ . D, Heatmap of Foxa2 normalized ChIP-seq  
 1161 signals obtained from ERWT or ERKO chromatin on conserved, lost or gained Foxa2 BSs. E, Mean  
 1162 Foxa2 ChIP-seq signals obtained in ERWT or ERKO mouse livers (orange or grey bars, respectively)  
 1163 at the 150 center base pairs of Foxa2 BSs. The upper histogram shows mean values  $\pm$  SD measured  
 1164 for conserved, gained or lost sites. Calculations were also carried out for 10 different sets of a  
 1165 corresponding number of random sites. Means  $\pm$  SD of these 10 random trials are illustrated within  
 1166 the bottom histogram. F, Anti-Foxa2 ChIP-qPCR experiments were performed on four liver  
 1167 chromatin samples originating from independent E2-treated ERWT or ERKO mice. A fraction of the  
 1168 pooled DNA sample that was subjected to HTS was also evaluated in parallel. The upper heatmap  
 1169 shows the values obtained on indicated tested genomic regions normalized to those obtained from a  
 1170 non-specific control (promoter of the *Rplp0* gene) and to the control ChIP sample. Significant reduced  
 1171 (green) or gained (red) mobilization of Foxa2 in ERKO livers is indicated in the lower heatmap.  
 1172 Calculated  $p$ -values from Mann-Whitney  $t$ -tests are indicated as follows: \* $< 0.05$ ; \*\* $< 0.01$ .

1173 **Figure 10.** Chromatin status of Foxa2 BSs in ERWT and ERKO mouse livers. A and B, Alignment of  
 1174 mean H3K4me2 (left side of the panel) or H3K27ac signals on categorized Foxa2 BSs. Insets  
 1175 represent magnified views of the center of the graphs and illustrate the observed shift from biphasic to  
 1176 monophasic curves of enrichment in H3K4me2. C, Heatmap representation of results obtained in  
 1177 independent anti H3K4me1, H3K4me2 and H3K27ac ChIP-qPCR experiments. The presence of these

1178 marks was followed in livers from ERWT and ERKO animals (numbers on the right refer to  
1179 individuals) at the indicated conserved or lost Foxa2 BSs. Experiments were done twice per individual.  
1180 Mean fold enrichment values shown are expressed as relative to a control negative ChIP experiment  
1181 using the same chromatin samples. D, Summary of MeDIP- and hMeDIP-qPCR assays, illustrated as  
1182 in panel B. The values included within these graphs were obtained in three independent experiments  
1183 performed on two different DNA samples originating from two different ERWT or ERKO animals.  
1184 Significant reduced (green) or gained (red) enrichment in histone marks or DNA modifications in  
1185 ERKO livers are indicated in the lower heatmaps. Calculated *p*-values from Mann-Whitney *t*-tests are  
1186 indicated as follows: \* $< 0.05$ ; \*\* $< 0.01$ .

1187 **Figure 11.** Multiple TFs may protect Foxa2 BSs from loss-of function in ERKO livers. A, Wordle  
1188 graphics (<http://www.wordle.net/website>) of enriched motifs for transcription factors binding within  
1189 lost Foxa2 BSs; as determined by the SeqPos algorithm (<http://cistrome.org/ap/>). B, Overlap of  
1190 categorized Foxa2 BSs with the cistromes of different transcription factors, all determined in mouse  
1191 liver except Nkx3-1 BSs which were identified in mouse prostate.

**Table 1.** E2- and ER-dependent liver transcriptomes associated functions.

		<b>Description</b>	<b>adjP</b>
<b>GO Biological Processes</b>	<b>E2-sensitive</b>	lipid metabolic process	0.063
		regulation of fibroblast growth factor receptor signaling pathway	0.063
		fibroblast growth factor receptor signaling pathway	0.063
		negative regulation of cellular response to growth factor stimulus	0.063
		negative regulation of fibroblast growth factor receptor signaling pathway	0.063
		alcohol metabolic process	0.063
		intracellular signal transduction	0.063
		enzyme linked receptor protein signaling pathway	0.063
		small molecule metabolic process	0.078
		organic substance metabolic process	0.078
		cellular response to fibroblast growth factor stimulus	0.078
		polyol metabolic process	0.078
	response to fibroblast growth factor stimulus	0.078	
	<b>ER-dependent (-E2)</b>	negative regulation of biological process	0.0008
		growth	0.0008
		oxidation-reduction process	0.0008
		negative regulation of cellular process	0.0014
		mammary gland development	0.0014
		regulation of growth	0.0020
		mammary gland alveolus development	0.0052
		mammary gland lobule development	0.0052
		developmental process	0.0052
		positive regulation of cell differentiation	0.0052
		metabolic process	0.0052
		multicellular organismal development	0.0081
		reactive oxygen species metabolic process	0.0081
		negative regulation of growth	0.0081
		lipid metabolic process	0.0090
positive regulation of reactive oxygen species metabolic process		0.0090	
single-organism metabolic process		0.0090	
positive regulation of developmental process		0.0090	
positive regulation of glucose import		0.0090	
organ development		0.0091	
regulation of body fluid levels	0.0091		
system development	0.0091		
anatomical structure development	0.0091		
regulation of glucose metabolic process	0.0091		
gastrulation with mouth forming second	0.0091		
<b>Pathways</b>	<b>E2-sensitive</b>	Adipogenesis (Wiki)	0.0021
		Metabolic pathways (Kegg)	0.0024
		Cytokine-cytokine receptor interaction (Kegg)	0.0036
	<b>ER-dependent (-E2)</b>	Adipogenesis (Wiki)	6.53e-06
		IL-3 Signaling (Wiki)	2.97e-05
		Leptin Insulin Overlap (Wiki)	5.94e-05
		ErbB signaling (Wiki)	0.0008
		PPAR signaling (Wiki)	0.0022
		IL-6 signaling (Wiki)	0.0032
		Amino Acid metabolism (Wiki)	0.0032
		Androgen Receptor Signaling (Wiki)	0.0035
		Metabolic pathways (Kegg)	2.43e-08
		Adipocytokine signaling (Kegg)	0.0001
		Glycine, serine and threonine metabolism (Kegg)	0.0003
		Fatty acid metabolism (Kegg)	0.0005
		Type II diabetes mellitus (Kegg)	0.0005
		Jak-STAT signaling pathway (Kegg)	0.0009
		Bile secretion (Kegg)	0.0011
		Retinol metabolism (Kegg)	0.0012
		PPAR signaling pathway (Kegg)	0.0012
Arachidonic acid metabolism (Kegg)	0.0014		
Hepatitis C (Kegg)	0.0042		
Insulin signaling pathway (Kegg)	0.0042		

Functional annotations are shown for GO Biological processes and for a compilation of Wiki and Kegg pathways. Adjusted Bonferroni p-values are indicated (adjP).



**Table 2.** Enriched DNA Motifs in identified ERBSs.

ERWT E2				ERWT P				ERKO			
CentDist		SeqPos		CentDist		SeqPos		CentDist		SeqPos	
Motif Family	Score	Factor	Z-Score	Motif Family	Score	Factor	Z-Score	Motif Family	Score	Factor	Z-Score
ERE	63.3457	ESR1	-54.177	ERE	19.8389	ESR1	-16.769	No Motif identified		SREBF1	-2.823
AR	27.5415	ESR2	-48.709	AR	9.2016	ESR2	-15.407			E2F6	-2.55
CEBP	19.9196	NR1H4	-41.196	SP1	7.07288	PPARG	-10.533				
CREB	17.3222	NR2F1	-38.985	CREB	6.725	Nr1d2	-9.025				
NF1	14.969	Nr1d2	-35.506	AP2	6.55955	PPARG::RXRA	-7.921				
FOX	14.6542	Rxra	-34.347	NRF	6.27122	Rxra	-7.705				
LRH1	14.6223	PPARG	-30.851	E2F	6.00375	NR1H4	-7.519				
SP1	13.5031	PPARA	-30.684	MINI	5.66217	NR2F1	-7.021				
PAX	13.3069	Esrrb	-28.943	HIC1	5.1859	RORB	-6.933				
E2F	13.2217	Nr1d1	-27.169	CEBP	5.1783	Nr1d1	-6.739				
FXR	12.0634	Nr2f2	-25.821	ETS	5.10736	PPARA	-6.595				
AP4	12.014	RORB	-25.117	EGR	5.08289	AR	-4.809				
AP2	11.8928	RARA	-25.044	SP3	5.00439	Zscan10	-4.476				
HIC1	11.8863	PPARG::RXRA	-24.754	ZF5	4.87866	Zfp161	-4.295				
HEN	11.097	ESRRA	-23.913	P53	4.82231	EGR3	-4.147				
AP1	10.8325	Hnf4a	-23.697	LMAF	4.81312	HMG1	-4.1				
ARP1	10.6548	NR0B1	-22.347	NF1	4.71645	ZSCAN4	-4.014				
ZF5	10.6078	RXR	-21.033	EBOX	4.64247	NR3C1	-3.894				
MEF3	10.5625	NR4A1	-20.62	GGG	4.44056	Rarg	-3.742				
MINI	10.5463	NR2C2	-20.308	FOX	4.33386	NR0B1	-3.544				
EBOX	10.5284	Rxrg	-20.177	CP2	4.1856	GMEB2	-3.438				
MIF1	10.3304	RORA	-20.112	SMAD	4.04632	NR2C2	-3.433				
GGG	10.2881	Rarg	-19.838	EBF	3.95207	EGR4	-3.42				
SMAD	10.1529	Nr5a2	-19.729	DEAF1	3.93445	Esrrb	-3.401				
LEF	9.80931	Cebpb	-18.033	PAX	3.88007	E2F3	-3.353				
HNF1	9.73785	Cebpa	-17.783	CAAT	3.86651	MTF1	-3.329				
HNF6	9.55107	CEBPE	-17.524	HEN	3.86643	NR3C2	-3.179				
ATCGAT	9.48478	SF1	-16.74	STAT	3.81298	RXR	-3.161				
BACH	9.09395	AR	-16.689	AP4	3.76367	PAX2	-3.14				
CACCC	9.07574	NR6A1	-16.346	DBP	3.75713	MafB	-3.116				
DBP	8.80169	CEBPD	-16.334	SRF	3.58963	E2F2	-3.069				
NRF	8.75417	THRB	-15.294	KAISO	3.5676	TP63	-2.723				
VMAF	8.74793	CEBPG	-15.105	CACCC	3.55511	PGR	-2.622				
P53	8.57691	NR3C1	-14.897	MEIS1	3.54119	NANOG	-2.603				
LMAF	8.54137	VDR	-14.558	IK	3.32866	VDR	-2.529				
CAAT	8.30663	NR3C2	-14.523	LRH1	3.1906	Egr2	-2.509				
CP2	8.17824	NR2F6	-14.179	WT1	3.17195						
		NR4A2	-14.073	ZNF219	3.14613						
		ESRRG	-13.415	RFX	3.0712						
		ATF2	-13.373	STAF	2.9954						
		ATF2::JUN	-13.185								
		ATF6	-12.984								
		THRA	-12.737								
		Jdp2	-12.54								
		THRB	-12.515								
		CREB3	-11.811								
		RARB	-11.735								
		NFIX	-11.73								
		NFIB	-11.623								
		ATF4	-10.996								
		NR2E3	-10.893								
		Creb5	-10.694								
		PAX2	-10.551								
		ATF1	-10.415								
		NFIC	-10.269								
		BATF3	-10.214								
		ATF7	-10.207								
		Foxa2	-9.851								
		PGR	-9.837								
		FOXA1	-9.831								
		Creb3l2	-9.414								
		NR112	-9.322								
		NFIL3	-9.241								
		Pax3	-9.197								

Motif analysis was performed using CentDist (<http://biogpu.ddns.comp.nus.edu.sg/~chipseq/webseqtools2>) and SePos (<http://cistrome.org/ap/>) algorithms. Sequences were declared enriched by when p-value<0.05 and Z-score>2.5. Only the 65 best sequences characterized by SeqPos are shown for ERBSs identified in E2-treated ERWT animals. Full analyses are depicted in the Supplemental File 3.

**Table 3.** Functional annotations of genes proximal to ERBSs from ERWT livers.

	<b>Term</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>MGI Expression</b>	TS23_liver; lobe	4.22e-40
	TS26_liver	6.67e-32
	TS26_liver and biliary system	1.03e-31
	TS24_liver	1.56e-27
	TS24_liver and biliary system	2.66e-24
	TS15_septum transversum; hepatic component	1.11e-15
	TS23_adrenal gland; medulla	3.13e-13
<b>GO Biological Process</b>	organic acid metabolic process	3.69e-49
	carboxylic acid metabolic process	2.74e-48
	cellular ketone metabolic process	6.43e-48
	lipid metabolic process	7.95e-48
	cellular response to hormone stimulus	1.87e-43
	cellular response to peptide hormone stimulus	1.25e-40
	monocarboxylic acid metabolic process	7.54e-38
	cellular response to insulin stimulus	4.52e-37
	response to peptide hormone stimulus	7.26e-36
response to insulin stimulus	2.78e-35	
<b>GO Molecular Function</b>	lyase activity	7.09e-15
	monocarboxylic acid binding	4.91e-14
	heme binding	2.99e-13
	apolipoprotein binding	6.24e-13
	transferring acyl groups	5.44e-11
	carboxylic acid binding	1.85e-12
	steroid binding	5.63e-12
	vitamin binding	2.74e-11
	steroid hydroxylase activity	1.69e-10
ligand-regulated transcription factor activity	1.02e-09	
<b>Mouse Phenotype</b>	abnormal lipid homeostasis	9.28e-75
	abnormal lipid level	1.01e-71
	abnormal circulating lipid level	8.51e-70
	abnormal liver physiology	8.41e-63
	abnormal hepatobiliary system physiology	8.27e-62
	abnormal triglyceride level	4.24e-61
	decreased cholesterol level	1.01e-52
	abnormal circulating cholesterol level	5.19e-52
	abnormal cholesterol level	1.09e-51
	abnormal cholesterol homeostasis	4.65e-50



Functional annotations were determined by GREAT [<http://bejerano.stanford.edu/great/public/html/index.php> (51)] using basic parameters (basal criteria for associating genomic regions with genes).

**Table 4.** Enriched DNA Motifs in categorized FoxA2 BSs.

Conserved		Gained		Lost	
Factor	Z-Score	Factor	Z-Score	Factor	Z-Score
Foxa2	-91.617	Foxa2	-23.414	Foxa2	-59.79
FOXA1	-90.958	FOXA1	-23.058	FOXA1	-59.536
FOX11	-81.908	FOX11	-22.795	FOX11	-56.216
Foxg1	-80.449	FOXB1	-21.524	Foxg1	-54.751
FOXB1	-78.905	FOXP1	-21.512	FOXP1	-52.788
FOXP1	-78.788	Foxg1	-21.297	Nkx3-1	-52.633
FOXD2	-75.482	Foxk1	-20.161	FOXB1	-50.984
FOXD3	-74.081	FOXL1	-19.777	FOXL1	-50.971
FOXL1	-73.89	FOXD2	-19.095	FOXD2	-48.341
Nkx3-1	-72.907	Nkx3-1	-18.785	FOXD3	-47.994
Foxk1	-72.123	FOXD3	-18.614	Foxk1	-47.988
FOXD1	-70.968	FOXD1	-17.878	FOXD1	-46.354
FOXC2	-67.3	FOXP3	-17.007	FOXP3	-44.639
FOXC1	-66.927	FOXO3	-16.517	FOXO3	-43.621
FOXO3	-66.241	FOXC2	-15.411	FOXC2	-39.98
FOXP3	-64.662	FOXC1	-14.102	FOXC1	-35.118
FOXF2	-51.748	FOXF2	-13.535	FOXF2	-34.484
Foxj1	-51.576	CEBPD	-12.481	Foxj1	-33.619
FOXJ3	-45.412	Cebpb	-12.292	Foxf1a	-29.292
Foxf1a	-40.616	CEBPE	-12.152	FOXJ3	-26.531
FOXH1	-32.447	Cebpap	-11.812	FOXH1	-22.446
CEBPE	-27.482	Foxj1	-11.6	Hnf4a	-15.71
Cebpb	-27.19	CEBPG	-11.278	Cebpb	-15.134
CEBPA	-26.856	FOXJ3	-9.067	CEBPA	-14.552
CEBPD	-26.765	Foxf1a	-8.978	CEBPE	-14.418
HNF4A	-26.219	Hnf4a	-8.801	CEBPD	-14.338
Foxq1	-24.216	FOXH1	-8.068	CEBPG	-13.844
CEBPG	-22.81	RXRb	-7.845	NR2C2	-13.376
FOXG1	-19.912	RXRA	-7.44	Rxrb	-12.575
NR2C2	-19.459	NR2F6	-7.128	NR2F1	-11.973
FOXJ2	-19.292	PPARA	-7.113	Ppara	-11.972
RXRb	-19.023	HLF	-7.05	NR2F6	-11.776
NR2F6	-18.985	NFIL3	-6.95	NR1H4	-11.079
RARA	-17.842	RARA	-6.798	Nr1d2	-10.656
NR2F1	-17.813	NR2C2	-6.428	RARA	-10.297
Nr2f2	-16.99	DBP	-6.041	Foxq1	-10.091
NR1H4	-16.511	Nr1d2	-5.836	FOXJ2	-9.851
NR2E3	-16.142	ATF4	-5.821	Rxra	-9.762
NR4A1	-16.003	NR1H4	-5.659	NFIX	-9.739
Nr1d2	-15.912	NR2F1	-5.438	Nr2f2	-9.385
Ppara	-15.867	ZSCAN4	-5.432	ZSCAN4	-9.131
SRY	-15.493	Pparg	-4.988	NFIC	-8.927
ZNF435	-15.351	Nr2f2	-4.944	FOXO6	-8.69
NFIL3	-15.241	Creb5	-4.864	Zscan10	-8.445
ESRRA	-15.067	NFIB	-4.757	NR4A1	-8.393
ATF4	-14.596	ATF7	-4.756	ESRRA	-8.372
FOXO4	-14.388	TEF	-4.756	NFIB	-8.199
FOXO6	-13.684	NR2E1	-4.534	HEY1	-8.186
NFIC	-13.639	Foxq1	-4.379	NR2E3	-8.143
Rxra	-13.167	NFIX	-4.329	Esrrb	-8.116

Motif analysis was performed using SeqPos algorithm (<http://cistrome.org/ap/>). Sequences were declared enriched by when p-value<0.05 and Z-score>2.5. Only the best 50 sequences characterized are shown. Full analyses are depicted in the Supplemental File 3.

Figure 1



**Figure 2**





Figure 3

A



B




Figure 4






Figure 5





Figure 6

**A**



**B**




Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9




Figure 10




Figure 11

