Understanding stem cell states: naïve to primed pluripotency in rodents and humans
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Preface
The molecular mechanisms and signalling pathways that regulate the in vitro preservation of distinct pluripotent stem cell configurations, and their induction in somatic cells via direct reprogramming approaches, continue to constitute a highly exciting area of research. In this Review, we provide an integrative synthesis on recent discoveries related to isolating unique naïve and primed pluripotent stem cell states with altered functional and molecular characteristics, and from different species. We overview pathways underlying pluripotent state transitions and interconversion in vitro and in vivo. We conclude by highlighting unresolved key questions, future directions and potential novel applications of such pluripotent cell states.

Introduction
Pluripotency describes cells that have the potential to give rise to cells from all three embryonic germ-layers and primordial germ cells (PGCs), but not extra-embryonic tissues1. While pluripotency is a transient cell state in vivo, pluripotent cells can be derived from different stages of early embryonic development and indefinitely maintained in an artificially induced self-renewal state in vitro, by supplementing exogenous cues2. Thus, it is important to stress that self-renewal is not a defining feature of pluripotency and is only transiently assembled during early development. Pluripotency is highly dynamic and evolves at different stages of pre- and post-implantation stages3. However, the self-renewal aspect is a highly useful in vitro artificial “engineering trick”4 that has brought pluripotent stem cells to the front stage as a potential tool for tissue replacement, disease modelling and animal engineering technologies5.

There are multiple pluripotent stem cell types that can be isolated from vertebrates, including rodents and human, typically annotated based on their donor cell of origin (Fig. 1). Embryonic stem cells (ESCs) are isolated from the inner cell mass (ICM) of developing pre-implantation mouse or human blastocysts6,7. Epiblast stem cells (EpiSCs) are isolated from mouse post-implantation epiblasts8,9, however equivalent derivations have not been attempted with human embryos due to ethical complexities. Early rodent migrating PGCs can be converted in vitro into pluripotent ESC-like cells termed embryonic germ cells10. Mouse neonatal and adult spermatogonial stem cells can be reverted toward pluripotency and generate male germ stem cells (GSCs)11-14. The latter have the disadvantage of retaining only male imprint signature, which compromises their safety for clinical use13. Intriguingly, indefinitely stable and validated EGs and GSCs have not been isolated from primates thus far15,16 (Fig. 1).

Somatic cell reprogramming provides alternative routes for isolating pluripotent cell types. Human and rodent somatic cells can be artificially reprogrammed into ESC-like cells following reprogramming via nuclear transfer, termed NT-ESCs17-19. Ten years ago, Yamanaka established direct in vitro reprogramming of somatic cells to pluripotency via ectopic expression of defined factors20, that yield induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) without the need for oocytes or
embryos21-24 (Fig. 1). NT-ESCs and iPSCs offer the advantage for being able to generate patient specific pluripotent cells with genomic DNA identical to the donor somatic cell, however mitochondrial DNA in NT-ESCs is non-isogenic and provided by the a-nucleated donor oocytes25. The latter can be an advantageous in settings aiming at correcting maternally inherited mitochondrial diseases26-28.

While the above overview pertains to classify different pluripotent cell types based on their tissue derivation source, the growth conditions used to expand such cells dictate the pluripotent state they attain (ICM-like, ESC-like, EpiSC-like state etc.)29,30. iPSCs generated in classical mouse ESC growth conditions yield ESC-like iPSCs; while those reprogrammed in EpiSC growth conditions yield EpiSC-like iPSCs29,31. The same analogy applies to explanting rodent ICM cells in ESC or EpiSC growth conditions29,32. In comparison to developmentally restricted mouse EpiSCs, ESCs are highly competent in generating high-contribution chimeric mice after microinjection into host-blastocysts, retain a pre-X-inactivation state in female cell lines and reduced expression of lineage commitment factors29,30. Such attributes influence the utility of pluripotent cells in cell differentiation, animal transgenics and molecular disease modelling. Thus it is of critical importance to understand and define different pluripotent states and configurations, and their implications on pluripotent cell differences across different species4,33.

In this review we provide an integrative perspective on recent breakthroughs in understanding the diversity and complexity of pluripotent state regulation in vitro. This includes advances on preserving naïve pluripotency from non-rodent species and alternative EpiSC pluripotent states. We highlight unresolved issues, key questions and future directions in this exciting front of stem cell research.

Murine pluripotent states

Mouse ESCs were thoroughly shown to reside in an ICM-like state29, now referred to as the naïve state of pluripotency30, since they retain many of the molecular characteristics of ICM. In 2007, Mckay and Vallier groups derived a novel type of pluripotent cells termed EpiSCs from post-implantation rodent epiblasts8,9. In comparison to naïve ESCs, EpiSCs retain an alternative pluripotency configuration, commonly referred to a primed pluripotency30. Dramatic molecular and functional differences exist between different pluripotent cells, which subsequently influence their characteristics, function and safety.

Growth conditions for naïve pluripotency

To fully grasp the biology of mouse naïve ESCs and their developmental context, it is of relevance to review the evolution of growth conditions devised to isolate such cells over the course of the last thirty years. Martin and Evans derived ESCs from 129-mouse strain7,34, by utilizing mitotically inactive embryonic fibroblast cells (MEFs) as feeder cells and foetal bovine serum (FBS). Leukaemia Inhibitory Factor (LIF) that activates the STAT3/JAK pathway was later identified as a key ingredient that allowed expansion of mouse ESCs in FBS/LIF conditions without MEFs35,36 (Fig. 2). Such naïve mouse ESCs express hallmark pluripotency factors (e.g. Oct4, Nanog, Esrrb) and retain a pre-X inactivation state in female cell lines37 (Fig. 3). Functionally, ESCs can populate the host pre-implantation mouse ICM upon microinjection, and generate high-contribution chimeras with colonization of the germ-line niche38,39.

Smith group described the first serum- and feeder-free defined conditions for expanding mouse ESCs by combining low dose BMP4 with LIF40. Addition of small molecule inhibitors for MEK signalling, increased ESC derivation efficiency and stability41. Developing different defined conditions, all involving MEK inhibitors, which can be used to isolate murine ESCs, extended the latter observations. A cocktail combing 3 inhibitors termed ‘3i conditions’, was shown to
stabilize pluripotent cells without LIF, indicating existence of redundant pathways to isolate ESCs in vitro that can compensate for lack of LIF/Stat3 signalling. Notably, such cell configuration was labelled as “ground state pluripotency” since the cells in 3i were reported to grow independent of any exogenous signalling stimuli. However, this term is challenged by the fact that growth in these conditions heavily relies GSK3 inhibition that mimics WNT stimulation; and on exogenous insulin that activates PI3K/AKT signalling. Further, 2i/LIF conditions were adopted as an enhanced mean to expand murine ESCs, and the reduced proliferation in 3i conditions indicates a role for autocrine secreted FGF4 in promoting naïve ESC growth (Fig. 2).

“Alternative 2i” conditions, involving small molecule inhibitors for Gsk3 and Src pathways, have been shown to yield germ-line competent ESCs (Fig. 2). Paul and colleagues identified atypical PKC small molecule inhibitor Go6983 (aPKCi) as another stimulator for isolating murine ESCs together with LIF and/or MEK inhibitors. Single cell RNA-seq analysis has proven equivalent global heterogeneity between different naïve conditions, however the difference exists in the identity of genes that underlie heterogeneity in each condition.

Enriched conditions were important for deriving ESCs from other mouse strains that have until recently been considered “non-permissive” for deriving naïve ESCs. While 129-mouse strain derived ESCs could be expanded in FBS/LIF conditions, for other mouse strains like non-obese-diabetic ICR mice (NOD), supplementation of 2i or GSK3 inhibitors is essential for both derivation and maintenance. 3i and 2i/LIF conditions yielded rat ESCs, however these conditions are suboptimal. LIF/MEKi/aPKCi have been recently described as a more robust method to support rat ESCs in feeder free conditions (Figure 2,3).

The above discoveries underscore the relevance of analysing rodent ESCs expanded in different naïve conditions and from different genetic backgrounds. Further they emphasize the importance of other signalling pathways that remain to be deeply characterized in the context of pluripotency (Fig. 2). NF-kB inhibition has been implicated as a downstream effector underlying aPKC inhibition mediated support of naïve pluripotency, however other pathways, like Mbd3/NuRD repressor complex, can be neutralized by aPKCi (unpublished observations, J.H.H). SRC functions as a downstream target of ERK and Calcineurin-NFAT signalling to promote ESC differentiation, and its inhibition promotes naïve pluripotency.

The Hippo signalling pathway has been uncovered as cardinal regulator acting at epiblast vs. trophoblast segregation in late mouse morulas. The Hippo pathway is highly active in pluripotent epiblast cells, leading to exclusion of Yap/Taz effectors from the nucleus. Piccolo and colleagues indicated that Yap/Taz depletion in mouse naïve ESCs expanded in 2i/LIF prevents their differentiation, while Lian et al. have indicated Yap/Taz as essential regulators for stability of naïve ESCs expanded in FBS/LIF conditions. Systematic analysis of these findings in different defined conditions might resolve these seemingly opposing results (Fig. 3).

It should be noted that signalling pathways are often pleiotropic and may simultaneously have positive and negative effects on naïve pluripotency. For instance, nuclear β-catenin stabilization following Gsk3 inhibition, promotes naïve pluripotency via neutralizing the repressive activity of Tcf3 on its bound target genes in the nucleus. Cytoplasmic β-catenin promotes naïve pluripotency via increasing E-cadherin membrane stability. However, nuclear β-catenin can induce mesodermal gene expression through its Lef co-effectors. Yet, such differentiation priming effects are outweighed by naïve pluripotency promoting functions of β-catenin under optimized conditions. LIF has also been shown to promote primitive endoderm
specification in naïve pluripotency growth conditions\textsuperscript{56}. Such “non-purist” effects should be kept in mind when dissecting the role of signalling pathways on pluripotency.

The ample conditions to grow naïve murine ESCs have been important for better understanding and revisiting the roles of several classical pluripotency regulators. While Nanog was first purported to be absolutely essential and irreplaceable for establishing naïve pluripotency through iPSC reprogramming, cell fusion or EpiSC reversion\textsuperscript{57}, multiple conditions enable reprogramming of Nanog null donor cells \textit{in vitro}\textsuperscript{58,59}. Still however, Nanog null ESCs cannot be derived from mouse ICMs, indicating that while Nanog is indispensible for establishing pluripotency \textit{in vivo}, it is dispensable during \textit{in vitro} induction and maintenance by alternative pluripotency regulators like Esrrb and enriched growth conditions\textsuperscript{60}. The latter example highlights that \textit{in vitro} pluripotency maintenance and induction can not be considered “authentic”, as some \textit{in vitro} conditions can clearly potentiate the robustness of the naïve pluripotency program and compensate for deficiencies that are not sustainable \textit{in vivo}. Similarly, Klf2 knockout embryos do not present lethality at the pre-implantation stage, and naïve ESC in FBS/LIF conditions can tolerate Klf2 ablation\textsuperscript{61}. However ESCs in 2i only conditions, can no longer tolerate loss of Klf2\textsuperscript{61}, and LIF can compensate for the lack of Klf2.

Another emerging regulatory principle is that not all factors expressed in the ICM or ESCs necessarily promote naïve pluripotency, and some of them in fact are promoting its dissolution. However, they are tolerated by ESCs \textit{in vitro} due to the optimized and enriched \textit{in vitro} growth conditions used. For instance, Tcf3 binding represses the expression of its naïve pluripotency promoting target genes, leading to their partial repression, is tolerated in serum/LIF naïve conditions. However, Tcf3 neutralization by adding GSK3i boosts naïve pluripotency\textsuperscript{54}. In a similar manner, mouse ESCs tolerate Mbd3/NuRD complex expression although it partially represses naïve pluripotency targets like Esrrb and Tcfp21l\textsuperscript{62}. However, genetic ablation of Mbd3 leads to upregulation of master regulators of naïve pluripotency and allows LIF independent growth\textsuperscript{62}. Consistently, derivation of Mbd3 KO ESCs from null ICMs is uncompromised in 2i/LIF conditions\textsuperscript{63}. In summary, both Tcf3 and Mbd3 are expressed in the ICM and ESCs likely to set the stage for terminating the naïve pluripotency program. Thus the molecular characteristics of a pluripotent state fixated in a certain condition represent the net outcome of conflicting stabilizing and destabilizing factors simultaneously residing and conflicting in that state\textsuperscript{64}.

Collectively, it is important when analysing function of pluripotency regulators to systematically compare different naïve growth conditions, genetic backgrounds and \textit{in vivo} context\textsuperscript{65}. Such integrative analysis will likely unravel additional layers of underappreciated complexity and may resolve some conflicting results that stem for conducting analysis on pluripotent states with different molecular flavours\textsuperscript{52,53}.

\textbf{Growth conditions for primed pluripotency}

Primed EpiSCs were derived from post-implantation epiblasts of a variety of rodent strains in FGF2/Activin A conditions\textsuperscript{8,9} (Fig. 1). EpiSCs are capable of differentiating into cells of all three germ layers \textit{in vitro} or in teratoma assay, and thus are pluripotent. However, they are inefficient in yielding chimeric animals once injected in pre-implantation epiblasts (Fig. 3), likely because they have altered molecular characteristics and correspond to a more advanced developmental stage in comparison to the host pre-implantation environment\textsuperscript{8,9}.

While EpiSCs maintain Oct4 and Sox2 expression, they down-regulate most of the other pluripotency factors including Nanog, Esrrb, Klf2 and Klf4\textsuperscript{3}. EpiSCs have not undergone differentiation, but they upregulate lineage commitment factors like Otx2, Brachyury and Zic2\textsuperscript{56}.
Epigenetically, EpiSCs retain distinct characteristics from naïve ESCs: they inactivate X chromosome in females, upregulate global DNA methylation levels and acquire H3K27me3 at developmental regulators. Enhancer landscape and activity is rewired between naïve and primed states, and developmental regulator gene associated “seed enhancers” convert from a dormant to an active state in EpiSCs, thus pre-marking differentiation tendency of primed PSCs. Summary of divergent signalling and molecule characteristics between murine primed and naïve cells are highlighted in Fig. 2-3.

At the regulatory level, naïve and primed pluripotent cells have been shown to retain opposing dependence on epigenetic repressors (Fig. 4). Naïve ESCs tolerate loss of epigenetic repressors like Dnmt1, Dicer, Dger8, Eed, Mbd3 and Mettl3, and in fact renders these cells “hyper–naïve” and resistant to differentiation (Fig. 4). On the contrary, murine primed pluripotency maintenance and viability depends on these regulators, and their ablation destabilizes the murine primed pluripotent state (Fig. 4). Defining how the depletion of each of these repressors precisely destabilizes the primed configuration is of future interest.

Alternative growth conditions to expand murine EpiSCs have begun to emerge. Elegant work by Ying and colleagues showed that simultaneous use of a GSK3 inhibitor (that induces β-catenin stabilization), together with a Tankyrase small molecule inhibitor IWR1 (that up regulates Axin1/2 levels thus leading to retention of β-catenin in the cytoplasm) maintain novel primed EpiSCs without exogenous Fgf2/Activin A supplementation (Fig. 3). Removal of IWR1 leads to increased nuclear β-catenin shuttling and EpiSC differentiation. The mechanisms by which cytoplasmic β-catenin prevents EpiSC differentiation remains to be uncovered. It is tempting to speculate whether the recently described ability of cytoplasmic APC/Axin/β-catenin destruction complex to act as a sequestration “sink” for Yap/Taz and prevent their nuclear shuttling, is involved in the ability of GSK3i/IWR1 conditions to maintain EpiSCs. Notably, the latter alternative EpiSC state is different from EpiSCs expanded in classical Fgf2/Activin A conditions, and retains higher expression of naïve markers like Dppa2, 4, 5, and are thus relatively “less primed” (Fig. 3).

Recent studies indicate that different primed conditions used can endow EpiSCs with region specific characteristics of the post-implantation epiblasts. Tam and colleagues showed that EpiSCs expanded in Fgf2/Activin A correspond transcriptionally and functionally to anterior late-gastrula primitive streak cells. Belmonte and colleagues showed that alternative FGF2/IWR1 conditions generate murine EpiSCs corresponding rather to posterior-proximal epiblasts. Further, even in classical Fgf2/Activin A conditions distinct subpopulation of EpiSCs can co-exist, each representing different stages of post-implantation embryonic development.

Finally, the time length at which pluripotent cells are maintained under primed conditions greatly influences their characteristics and functionality. Counter intuitively; while murine PGCs are specified from the post-implantation epiblast in vivo, EpiSCs maintained in vitro for more than 7 days in FGF2/Activin A, lose competence to generate PGCs in response to Bmp4. Starting with naïve cells and inducing priming for no longer than 2-4 days, yields distinct primed cells highly competent for generating PGCLCs, termed EpiLCs. The latter are transcriptionally more similar to in vivo post-implantation epiblast than EpiSCs. Thus, the above paradigm indicates another aspect of artificial features that can be acquired by pluripotent cells once expanded indefinitely in vitro, in contrast to their in vivo “counterparts” that transiently exist during development.

Studies involving clonal lines and single cell analysis will be key for deeper understanding of features of region specific EpiSCs and shortly after in vitro induction from a naïve state in
different priming conditions. This may help understand how lineage priming is established at the single cell level during these key early developmental transitions and might be relevant for optimizing other differentiation protocols and predicting PSC behaviour.

**Interconversion between naïve and primed states**

As somatic cells can be reprogrammed into a naïve ESC-like state via combined overexpression of pluripotency factors together with LIF, primed EpiSCs can also be reverted to naïve iPSCs. Overexpression of Klf4 or Myc in EpiSCs, under LIF containing conditions, generates naïve ESCs. FBS/LIF signalling alone can be sufficient to induce such conversion from permissive mouse genetic backgrounds (i.e. 129 strains), but not from “non-permissive” ones like NOD, where supplementation of small molecules like 2i is necessary. Other factors like Nanog, Prdm14 and Esrrb have been shown to synergistically induce and boost the efficiency of this process. Explanting post-implantation E5.5-E7.5 epiblasts in naïve conditions also reverts them into naïve PSCs. The opposite conversion is attainable from in vitro and in vivo isolated naïve cells, as expanding murine naïve PSCs or ICMs in primed conditions leads them to gradually adapt an EpiSC state.

Studies focusing on in vitro molecular changes accompanying naïve to primed pluripotency conversion have unravelled key events in understanding mechanisms of reprogramming. Naïve ESCs expanded in 2i/LIF retain global hypo-methylated levels in both promoters and gene bodies, highly similar to those measured in ICMs. When transferred into LIF/FBS naïve conditions, this is accompanied by an increase in global DNA methylation levels, however promoter and enhancer regulatory regions remain protected from invasion by DNA methylation. Only after transfer into primed Fgf2/Activin A EpiSC inducing conditions, DNA methylation accumulates over enhancer and promoter regulatory elements.

Transitioning primed EpiSCs or naïve FBS/LIF PSCs into 2i/LIF conditions leads initially to dramatic changes in Oct4, Sox2 and Nanog pluripotency factor occupancy. Changes in H3K27me3 deposition and enhancer landscape follows only later, likely in response to the rewiring in transcription factor binding. Downregulation in DNA methylation follows next, which has mainly been attributed to downregulation in de novo DNA methyltransferase enzymes. It should be noted however, that ablation of Dnmt3a/b in ESCs in FBS/LIF condition does not lead to such rapid loss of DNA methylation, and other yet to be identified events might be involved in this rapid 2i induced epigenetic response. MEK/ERK inhibition influences polycomb interactions and leads to decreased occupancy of PRC2 and RNA PolII at developmental regulatory genes, leading to loss of H3K27me3 and increased PolII pausing at bivalent developmental regulatory genes.

Analysis of other molecular changes in naïve to primed transitions is likely to increase our knowledge of pluripotency regulation and lineage priming. Analysing other defined naïve pluripotency growth conditions (2i/LIF/PKCi, alternative 2i etc.) and in other rodents, will be important for discerning redundancies and specificities of different singling pathways and how they cross-talk with chromatin organization.

**Human conventional pluripotent cells**

Thomson group first isolated human ESCs in 1998 from bastocysts. Surprisingly, they were drastically different from murine ESCs in their characteristics and tissue culture requirements. FGF2 and TGFβ1, but not LIF, signalling are at the core signalling modules maintaining such conventional human ESCs derived from the ICM, or iPSCs obtained via direct in vitro reprogramming.
A primed pluripotent state

Differences between conventional human and mouse ESCs had been initially attributed only to unknown species genetic differences, since human ESCs were also derived from the ICM and not from post-implantation stages. However studies on different mouse strain derived stem cells have discerned a scenario where ICM cells can adapt in vitro into a primed state if naïve conditions that match the requirements of the particular genetic background of donor embryos used, are not devised. Specifically, NOD mice are relatively “less-permissive” than 129 mice to yield naïve ESCs/iPSCs, as LIF alone is not sufficient to maintain NOD naïve pluripotency and 2i/LIF are permanently required to stabilize and maintain this state in vitro in NOD PSCs.

Further, ICMs from both 129 and NOD strain expanded in primed conditions yield EpiSCs that are indistinguishable from EpiSCs derived from E6.5 embryos or in vitro from already established ESCs.

The relevance of the latter in vitro priming scenario to dictating conventional human ESC identity is supported by the fact that human conventional ESCs/iPSCs retain a great milieu of primed pluripotency features. This includes low expression of naïve pluripotency markers (e.g. KLF5, TFCP2L1, DPPA3), deposition of H3K27me3 over developmental genes, lack of exclusive nuclear localization of TFE3, loss of pluripotency upon inhibition of MEK/ERK pathway, lack of global hypomethylation as seen in ICM cells, lack of a pre x-inactivation state in most conventional female PSCs lines. Further, human primed ESCs do not tolerate complete loss of DNMT1, similarly to what has been shown for mouse EpiSCs (Fig. 4). Complete human KO ESCs have not been obtained thus far for DICER, MBD3 or METTL3 (Fig. 3).

Less primed than murine EpiSCs

In spite of the above, it is of critical importance to realize that human conventional/primed ESCs are not identical to murine EpiSCs, and can be considered relatively “less primed”. For instance, human ESCs do not upregulate FGF5 and N-CADHERIN as seen in murine EpiSCs, and express high-levels of E-CADHERIN as detected in mouse naïve ESCs. Human ESCs express high levels of some naïve markers like NANOG, PRDM14 and REX1 that are not expressed in murine EpiSCs. Moreover, human primed ESCs are functionally dependent on NANOG and PRDM14 and their ablation induces differentiation. DNA methylation distribution in human ESCs shows they rather correspond to murine naïve ESCs expanded in FBS/LIF conditions, rather than mouse FGF2/Activin A expanded mouse EpiSCs, as their promoters are protected from invasion by repressive DNA methylation. Further, while murine EpiSCs demonstrate exclusive TFE3 cytoplasmic localization and naïve 2i/LIF ESCs show exclusive nuclear TFE3 localization, human primed ESCs show an intermediate configuration where TFE3 is present in both the cytoplasm and the nucleus.

Human naïve pluripotent cells

The metastability of naïve and primed pluripotent state depending on the growth conditions applied, and the stringency in requirement for exogenous naïve pluripotency promoting factors to isolated naïve PSCs from previously “non-permissive” rodent strains, have underscored a scenario of whether unique and more stringent conditions can be applied to isolated previously unidentified alternative naïve-like pluripotent states in humans.

Transgene-dependent generation

2i/LIF conditions are not sufficient to maintain naïve human ESCs or iPSCs. However, additional transgene expression can induce an artificial transgene dependent state that may be of considerable interest. Continued exogenous OCT4/KLF4 or KLF2/KLF4 transgene expression
can maintain human ESCs/iPSCs in a unique pluripotent state in 2i/LIF conditions. Recently, these observations were extended by optimizing over-expression of KLF2/NANOG transgenes, allowing expansion of human naïve iPSCs in 2i/LIF. Smith and colleagues overexpressed KLF2 and NANOG transgenes in primed ESCs and expanded them in 2i/LIF/aPKCi conditions. These cells exhibited more extensive DNA demethylation, and strong upregulation of naïve markers like TFCP2L1, KLF2, and KLF4. However, as KLF2 is not expressed in the human ICM, and as 2i/LIF/aPKCi are insufficient to convert primed ESCs without exogenous transgene induction, and as transgene-free cells remain to be validated in 2i/LIF/aPKCi conditions, it is unclear whether this state is indefinitely stable without retaining leaky transgenes and/or MEFs as claimed by the authors. Further, independent examination of DNA methylation landscape in reset cells indicates aberrant global loss of imprinting, excessive hypomethylation of endogenous retroviral genes. Finally, while these growth conditions do not contain exogenous FGF or TGFβ1/Activin A cytokines, applying short-term inhibition of FGFR/TGFR signalling is not sufficient evidence to validate FGF/TGF/Activin A signalling independence.

While the field has shifted to study transgene independent conditions as detailed below, it should be noted that such transgene dependent states might be important, since it may be possible that robust naïve pluripotency currently obtained in mouse ESCs is a rodent specific phenomenon. Capturing human naïve PSCs identical to those obtained from mice might still involve genetic modifications. Nevertheless, the latter studies provide evidence for the possibility to generate naïve-like pluripotent states in humans and other species.

**Transgene independent generation**

Our team was the first to describe naïve conditions, designated as NHSM conditions, which entail complete ablation of MEK/ERK signalling and are compatible with indefinitely expanding genetically unmodified human PSCs both in MEF-containing and -free conditions. These naïve MAPK independent pluripotent cell lines could be derived from human pre-implantation embryos, through de novo iPSC generation, or from previously established primed ESCs/iPSCs. NHSM conditions contain 2i/LIF together with P38i, JNKi, aPKCi, ROCKi, low doses of FGF2 and TGFβ1 (or Activin A), and render human PSCs more similar, but not identical, to murine naïve PSCs. In fact these cells have features of so called naïve 2i/LIF “ground state” pluripotency, which are not found even in naïve mouse ESCs expanded in FBS/LIF. This includes exclusive nuclear localization of TFE3, and cleansing of H3K27me3 over developmental genes. Transcriptionally, these cells downregulated expression of lineage commitment markers like OTX2, ZIC2 and CD24 and moderately upregulated pluripotency genes (more prominently on MEFs). Enhancer rewiring has been attained in these human naïve PSCs as seen with mouse cells. The cells exhibited downregulation in DNMT3B and a mild global decrease in global DNA methylation levels, while maintaining imprinting integrity and chromosomal stability. While conducting chimeric analysis with human PSCs and using human embryos as hosts is ethically and legally forbidden, these human naïve PSCs cells showed better integration upon microinjection into host mouse morulas and were able to contribute at low-grade levels in mouse embryos up to E17.5.

Important publications describing alternative conditions that yield human ERK independent naïve pluripotent cells emerged soon after, each producing cells with different enhanced molecular properties. A combination of 2i/LIF, ROCKi, BMPRi, high doses of FGF2 and TGFβ1 were able to maintain human PSCs only in the presence of MEFs. These cells demonstrated transcriptional upregulation of pluripotency markers like STELLA and KLF5. Jaenisch team described conditions that adopted most of components found in NHSM (i.e. 2i/LIF, ROCKi, Activin A (instead of TGFβ1) - with or without FGF2 and JNKi)
supplemented inhibitors for BRAF and SRC pathways (conditions termed 5i/LA-MEF with optional inclusion of JNKi or FGF2). In comparison to the previous two studies, cells in 5i/LA-MEF conditions demonstrated a more impressive upregulation of naïve pluripotency markers. However, the cells did not down regulate DNMT3B, maintained an inactive X chromosome state in female cell lines, and demonstrated an unusual expression pattern of early pre-ICM genes.

Intriguingly, the process of converting primed cells back to naïve state in 5i/LA-MEF conditions is inefficient, taking two weeks to isolate initial clones that retain a very slow growth rate. Further, these conditions exclusively yield chromosomally abnormal cell lines. Thus, it remains to be determined whether such chromosomal abnormalities are in fact inherent to 5i/LA-MEF cells and dictate the properties described for this state, and are being selected for during this inefficient conversion process. Finally, DNA methylation profiling and whether these cells maintain epigenetic imprinting integrity is another important aspect that remains to be evaluated.

It is clear from the above summaries that none of the many already published conditions generate human naïve PSCs that are identical to mouse ESCs or human ICM. However, these studies implicate new signalling pathways and pave avenues for further optimization and characterization of such novel PSCs (Fig. 2). Mechanistically it will be interesting to test whether there is a connection between RAF and aPKC inhibition. Further, RHO signalling has been shown to promote YAP/TAZ nuclear localization in primed human ESCs and sustain their pluripotency. Thus it remains to be defined whether ROCKi influencing naïve pluripotency characteristics via YAP/TAZ modulation.

The role of FGF2, ACTIVIN A, TGFβ1 signalling, either autocrine or exogenously provided at low doses, remains to be understood in human naïve PSCs. The latter demonstrate upregulation of Activin like ligand GDF3, and human, but not mouse, ICM cells abundantly express Activin receptors. Thus, it is tempting to speculate that primed human ESCs are relatively less primed than murine Epiblast due to differences in response to Activin-like ligands, where it might promote some naïve features in human, but not in mouse. To conclude, systematic analysis of the response of pluripotent states from different species to a variety of TGF ligand family members is of importance (Fig. 2), while the possibility to generate human PSCs that are entirely independent of FGF and/or TGF signalling cannot be excluded.

Differences between mouse and human epiblasts

Recent studies focusing on single cell RNA-seq of human pre-implantation embryos are starting to provide answers to some of the questions highlighted above. While human and mouse blastocyst do not display morphological differences, they retain profound molecular differences at the cellular level. Human ICM epiblast cells do not express genes that are considered important pluripotency factors in mouse, such as KLF2 and ESRRB. Instead, KLF17 might have a human-specific role in the ICM, ERAS, an ESC specific form of RAS that is constitutively active, is not expressed in humans, as it became a pseudo-gene. Eras null mouse ESCs propagate slowly in FBS/LIF conditions, and whether they can be expanded in 2i/LIF conditions remains to be defined.

At the post implantation stage, dramatic differences exist between rodent and human embryos. Rodents are rather unusual as their post-implantation epiblast assumes egg-like cylinder shape, while in humans the post-implantation epiblast assumes a flat disc shape, like in most other mammals. While it might be impossible to conduct single cell analysis on early human post-implantation epiblasts, non-human primates might provide some relevant insights. Collectively, these species differences might directly influence the distinct pluripotent characteristics observed in PSCs from different species in vitro and their distinct growth
requirements. Further, they are of relevance for understanding the developmental context of human in vitro isolated pluripotent cells.

**A framework for classification of pluripotent states**

The advent of different conditions to isolate human naïve PSCs with distinct characteristics, and the limitations in conducting chimeric analysis in humans, simulate discussions and perspectives on classifying pluripotent states. It is often claimed that ability to derive ESCs for human ICMs in a newly devised growth condition constitutes “a gold standard” for proving naïveté\(^\text{108}\). However, it should be kept in mind that the pluripotent state identity is eventually dictated by the derivation growth condition and not by whether their source was from the pre- or post-implantation epiblast\(^\text{29,82}\). Utilization of OCT4 distal vs. proximal enhancer element as a binary distinguishing marker can be also misinterpreted\(^\text{96}\). Both OCT4 distal and proximal enhancer elements are active in naïve and primed states, both in humans and mice\(^\text{109,110}\). The difference rather emerges from their relative activity levels (high/low) and dominance.

Relying on a single attribute marker or functional test is limiting and must be accompanied by systematic analysis of ever increasing characteristics that continue to be uncovered for different pluripotent states (Fig. 3,4). Nevertheless, in our opinion, a molecular and functional characteristic that can be considered as a major divider between naïve vs. primed pluripotent states, is the response of a certain pluripotency circuitry to inhibition of MEK/ERK signalling (Fig. 5c). Human conventional ESCs and mouse EpiSCs rapidly collapse upon MEK/ERK inhibition, while naïve pluripotent cells rather tolerate and consolidate their naïveté following this challenge\(^\text{95}\). Emphasizing this molecular and functional quality is supported by the ability of MER/ERK inhibition to expand murine epiblast in ICMs and signifies consolidation of naïve pluripotency in vivo\(^\text{111}\).

Within the domains of the naïve and primed ground states of pluripotency, it is clear that if one considers a list of many naïve and primed pluripotency features originally described for mouse naïve 2i/LIF and primed FGF2/Activin A, different pluripotency growth conditions can simultaneously endow a mix of primed and naïve properties in the same cell type (Fig. 3). As such, pluripotent states can be classified as “more naïve” or “more primed” by having more of such properties (Fig. 6). Human primed ESCs have a number of naïve pluripotency features (e.g. protection of promoter regions from hypermethylation, dependence on Nanog). Murine naïve ESCs expanded in FBS/LIF conditions can give rise to “all-ESC” chimeric embryos and tolerate Dnmt1/Mettl3 ablation, however, they are globally hypermethylated and acquire H3K27me3 over developmental genes as seen in EpiSCs (Fig. 3,5c).

Other functional tests that can be used to assess the stringency and extent of naïveté in different primate naïve PSCs, is whether the cells can tolerate complete ablation of epigenetic repressors like METTL3, DNMT1, DGCR8 and MBD3\(^\text{4,65}\) (Fig. 3,4). Further, such tests might be useful for optimizing conditions that close the gap between mouse and human naïve pluripotent cells isolated thus far (Fig. 4, Box 1). Collectively, it will be informative to systematically annotate different naïve and primed states from many different species isolated thus far according to such criteria (Fig. 3).

**Implications and future directions**

Yamanaka’s breakthrough of reprogramming somatic cells to pluripotency has provided the foundation for deeper sleuthing of pluripotent states and the understanding that pluripotent
configurations can be reconfigured. The latter, feeds back and bares direct influence on issues associated with current hurdles and limitations related to human iPSC quality and characteristics (Box 2).

Perhaps one of the most fascinating questions related to the naïve to primed pluripotency continuum is “why do these divergent pluripotent configurations actually exist? The latter is often accompanied by the reductionist question of “Which cells are better to work with - naïve or primed?” In our opinion, as this phenomenon is deeply rooted in early embryonic development in vivo, it is likely that both configurations constitute essential and integral parts for safeguarding optimality and maximizing the benefits of multi-potency and lineage specification simultaneously. We hypothesize that naïve pluripotency emerged as an epigenetic erasure state that renders pluripotent cells free from lineage and epigenetic restriction, while simultaneously making these cells relatively less responsive to signalling pathways that might interfere with establishing such a lineage neutral state. After resetting, the induction of specification by morphogens may not be efficiently forced without a short “delay period”. As such, the naïve pluripotency network is gradually resolved and becomes more receptive to inductive cues at the post-implantation stage, and PSCs get differentially patterned/primed according to their spatial localization, before overt somatic differentiation occurs.

At the functional level, it remains to be thoroughly established whether using human naïve PSCs as a starting material, with or without a brief priming, would resolve hurdles currently faced in human in vitro PSC differentiation protocols: 1) Will human naïve PSCs yield increased consistency in differentiation outcome among independent iPSC lines\(^{112}\) 2) Can naïve PSC conditions yield better quality cells in different differentiation protocols when used as a starting material? 3) Can human naïve PSC facilitate the success of differentiation protocols that have not been conductive with conventional human PSCs? Encouraging support for the latter has recently been provided by showing the enhanced ability of human PSCs expanded in NHSM conditions (even in the absence of aPKCi) for undergoing in vitro differentiation into PGCs, a protocol that was inefficient from primed human PSCs\(^{113}\). The molecular rationale for evaluating the potential benefits highlighted above is that naïve pluripotency is more associated with cleansing of epigenetic repressive marks over regulatory regions, compared to primed cells\(^{68,97}\). This might enable more adequate activation of lineage specifiers during differentiation. Further, lineage biases in human primed PSCs are heavily associated with localized accumulation of repressive marks like DNA methylation\(^{114}\).

The recent advances in generating human naïve PSCs will continue to boost attempts to generate naïve-like PSCs from other species, and test same-species and inter-species embryo chimerism assays. Cynomolagus monkey naïve ESCs have been derived in NHSM conditions supplemented with Vitamin C, and gave rise to the first chimera competent ESCs, which following ICM-microinjection, yielded chimeric monkey foetuses\(^{115}\). Developmentally advanced mouse embryos (E10.5-E17.5) with low chimerism levels were obtained following injection of naïve human\(^{68}\) or monkey iPSCs\(^{116}\). These observations raise a variety of exciting challenges relating to defining what are the frequency, lineage preference and developmental quality of such integrated primate iPSC derived cells. Systematic efforts will be key to conclude whether humanized animal models might become relevant for disease modelling, studying human development or generate transplantable human organs.

Continued breakthroughs in single cell technologies and applying them on different pluripotent cell types and embryonic samples will facilitate defining properties that are relevant for adequate functionality of PSCs. This will help set standards for desired optimal starting material for stem cell based therapeutics and research (Box 1). It is expected that during this journey aiming at
allowing scientists to better control cell fate by deconstructing this previously underappreciated complexity of pluripotency, proposed criteria and standards will likely be debated and revised.
Box 1 | A 'dark side' of naïve pluripotency?

With the development of naïve conditions and efforts to endow these cells with more features of naivety, one question that emerges is “how much naivety is needed and is there a dark side for permanently maintaining PSCs under naïve conditions?”

Rodent ESCs expanded in 2i/LIF have an increased tendency for acquiring genomic abnormalities⁴³, and it remains unclear whether they occur as a by-product of non-specific activity of small molecule inhibitors used⁹⁶,¹¹⁷, or as a direct result of intrinsic molecular features of naïve pluripotency (e.g. increased ERV activity, reduction in epigenetic repressive marks). One can envision a scenario where such features can be tolerated in vivo where this configuration exists for only 1-2 days, while prolonged in vitro expansion of this state increases the occurrence frequency of such unwanted damaging events.

The latter concern may also relate to safeguarding the integrity of DNA methylation and imprinting in naïve PSCs expanded in vitro over an extended period of time. Studies focusing on loss of DNA methylation upon transfer of mouse PSCs into 2i/LIF conditions have quantified methylation after 10-24 days of transfer, and have documented rapid global loss of DNA methylation accompanied with relative resistance of retrotransposons and imprinting regions to such demethylation⁸⁴. However, it is unclear whether that latter described methylation state represents a final plateau that naïve cells achieve, or whether carrying out 2i/LIF cultures further eventually leads to erosion in the relative resistance of such regions to demethylation. Indeed, methylation over imprinted genes and retrotransposons are partially, yet significantly, reduced in 2i/LIF conditions⁸⁴.

If such effects are overwhelmingly frequent, researchers will have to re-evaluate how to optimize applying naïve conditions. One scenario might involve decreasing inhibitor levels as a mean to avoid excessive hypomethylation or other unwanted effects. An alternative scenario is to maintain cells in primed and transfer them into naïve conditions only for short time before initiation of differentiation.

Box 2 | Potential implications on iPSC reprogramming.

Recent studies have implicated how certain epigenetic regulators in fact have opposing effects on naïve and primed murine PSC maintenance⁶⁵. These findings might be relevant when comparing induction of pluripotency mechanisms in human vs. mouse, as human, but not mouse iPSCs, are typically reprogrammed in conventional/primed pluripotency conditions¹¹⁸. Consequently, some of the differences observed between human and mouse iPSC regulators might not be related to species differences but rather to the fact that distinct pluripotent states are being induced. Therefore, it would be imperative to expand human iPSC reprogramming regulator screens, and include different pluripotency conditions, as they might yield different outcomes.

Another implication of pluripotent state characteristics on reprogramming is whether naïve conditions might improve the quality of obtained iPSCs. It should be noted that, residual epigenetic memory involving DNA methylation in human iPSCs appears to be rather permanent even after extended cell passaging, while in naïve murine iPSCs, epigenetic memory was more reminiscent of incomplete reprogramming and faded after a few passages in vitro¹¹⁹. Thus, it should be tested whether the use of adequate naïve conditions might resolve such epigenetic memory in human iPSCs. Similarly, subtle epigenetic differences in DNA methylation found between NT-ESCs and iPSCs generated from the same human donor cells¹²⁰ might also be neutralized when deriving iPSCs in naïve conditions that mimic more closely the epigenetic features of ICM.
Figure 1 | Available and potential routes for deriving different mouse and human pluripotent cell types. A variety of pluripotent cell types can be derived from different embryonic cells harvested at various stages of mouse or human development. Alternatively, somatic cells can be reprogrammed via somatic cell nuclear transfer (SCNT) or in vitro reprogramming via exogenous transcription factors to generate iPSCs. All pluripotent cell types listed have been derived from both mouse and human donor cells, except for germ cell lineage derived pluripotent cells (EG and GSCs), which have not been stably derived yet in human or other primates. For therapeutic purposes, iPSCs and NT-ESCs have the advantage of being genetically identical to donor original somatic cells. However, NT-ESCs will retain mitochondria of the a-nucleated donor female oocyte. Spermatogonial germ stem cells are generated from spermatogonial stem cells that have already established exclusive male/paternal imprinting pattern, and so do GSCs derived from them. Such maternal imprint-free characteristics likely limits future therapeutic potential of GSCs even if eventually established from adult human males in the future.

Figure 2 | Signalling pathways and their influence on naïve and primed pluripotent states. Figure delineates different signalling pathways and their ability to positively or negatively regulate naïve and primed murine pluripotent cells. Please note how that the majority of signalling pathways delineated have opposing effects on murine naïve vs. primed pluripotent state stability (e.g. Lif/Stat3, Fgf2/Erk). It is important to highlight that other pathways not included in this scheme, are likely to be crucially involved in such regulation and will likely be further characterized over the next years. This may include Hippo, Rho, Notch and NFkB signalling. Purple dotted boxes highlight signalling pathways that may be acting differently in mouse vs. human PSC regulation. More specifically, it remains to be fully understood whether low dose of FGF2, TGF/ACTIVIN/NODAL and/or BMP4 influence human naïve pluripotency differently than previously observed in rodent naïve ESCs. Dotted arrow indicates potential links that remain to be established. (Image is reused and modified from our Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology Poster (http://www.nature.com/nrm/posters/pluripotency/index.html)).

Figure 3 | Naïve and primed pluripotent cell properties in different isolated PSCs. The scheme delineates in the first column on the left a list of different properties that distinguish between murine ESCs expanded in 2i/LIF (naïve) and murine EpiSCs expanded in Fgf2/Activin A (primed). The latter two states are used as a reference to annotate a variety of other naïve and primed conditions devised for mouse, rat, human or monkey PSCs. For each condition and for each stem cell property, we indicate whether it retains naïve-like (orange circle) or primed-like pattern (blue circle). Empty boxes indicate lack of characterization. This list of features is likely to expand with time and can be used to systematically annotate new pluripotent states isolated in unique conditions and from different species. (Image is reused and modified from our Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology Poster (http://www.nature.com/nrm/posters/pluripotency/index.html)).

Figure 4 | Opposing influence for repressors on murine naïve and primed pluripotent cells. Murine naïve and primed pluripotent cells do not only differ in their dependence on distinct signalling pathways or in their epigenetic profile, but also in their lineage decision-making. Murine naïve ESCs expanded either in 2i/LIF and FBS/LIF conditions, tolerate complete loss of epigenetic and mRNA repressors such as Dnmt1, Mbd3, Dicer, Dger8, Mettl3, Eed, Ezh2. Further, the latter modifications strengthens the equilibrium in favour of pluripotency promoting factors and generates “hyper-naïve” pluripotent cells that are relatively more resistant to differentiation and can tolerate withdrawal of LIF cytokine. Primed EpiSCs actually respond in
an opposite manner to the complete ablation of such repressors. Established murine primed EpiSCs naturally down regulate pluripotency factors and upregulate lineage priming factors. Ablation of repressors at this stage tips the balance toward differentiation and/or compromises cell survival. It should be noted that ablation of two different repressors (e.g. Mettl3 vs. Dgcr8) overall negatively influences primed pluripotency stability, this does not necessarily mean that the downstream events leading to the state collapse are identical, and thus should be thoroughly dissected in vitro and in vivo. (Figure 4 is modified from Geula et al. Science 2015 (Supplementary Figure S34)).

Figure 5 | **Key differences between mouse and human pre and post-implantation development in vivo.** (a) Scheme delineates similarities and differences in mouse and human early pre- and post-implantation development. While mouse and human embryos are not morphologically different up to the blastocyst stage, there are striking transcriptional differences as summarized in (b). Further, at the post-implantation stage, morphological differences in human vs. mouse embryo shape become striking including (i) differences in epiblast shape and (ii) extra-embryonic structures, as delineated in (a). In mouse, naïve ESCs (orange arrows) can be derived from ICM or post-implantation epiblast when naïve growth conditions are applied. Primed EpiSCs can be derived from post-implantation epiblast or ICM when primed culture conditions are used. Thus, growth condition rather than source dictates pluripotent state configuration acquired in vitro. A similar scenario applies for derivation of naïve and primed cells from human ICM depending on the growth conditions used. PSC derivations or molecular analysis on human post-implantation embryos cannot be conducted due to ethical issues. PE- Primitive Endoderm; TE – Trophoderm; ICM- Inner Cell Mass. (c) A model to explain the relativity of naivety within the naïve to primed pluripotency spectrum. One major molecular and functional criterion that can be considered for separating naïve and primed pluripotent cells is their ability to maintain and stabilize their pluripotent state in the absence of MEK-ERK1/2 activity (dashed black line). Within the naïve or primed pluripotent states, it is difficult to describe the pluripotent state of the cells in absolute terms, as naïve cells can have, to some extent, primed pluripotency features. Similarly, within the primed pluripotency spectrum, primed PSCs expanded in different conditions have different features and varying degrees of naivety (Figure 3). Finally, it is possible that supplementation of 2i/LIF conditions with small molecules such as aPKCi, FGFRi or NOTCHi will further consolidate naïve pluripotency features, particularly from other rodents like rats whose stability in 2i/LIF feeder free conditions should be further improved. Full annotation of different human pluripotent states will allow charting an equivalent landscape for human and monkey PSCs. (Images in a-b are reused and modified from our Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology Poster (http://www.nature.com/nrm/posters/pluripotency/index.html). Image in c is reused and modified from our Figure 3 in Manor et al. Curr. Opin. in Genetics & Development).
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Addgene plasmid repository: https://www.addgene.org/

ENCODE project: http://www.nature.com/encode/

Epigenome Roadmap project: http://www.nature.com/collections/vbqgtr

Mouse ES cell ChIP compendium: http://bioinformatics.cscr.cam.ac.uk/ES_Cell_ChIP-seq_compendium.html

CRISPR/CAS9 genome wide screen resource: http://genome-engineering.org/gecko/

Online poster by Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology on Pluripotent States: http://www.nature.com/nrm/posters/pluripotency/index.html
Glossary

Primordial germ cells (PGCs) – embryonic progenitor cells that give rise to germ cells in the gonads (sperm and oocytes).

Inner cell mass (ICM) - the mass of cells inside the pre-implantation blastocyst that will subsequently give rise to the definitive structures of the fetus.

Embryonic stem cells (ESCs) – *in vitro* expanded pluripotent cells that originate from the ICM.

Epiblast stem cells (EpiSCs)- *in vitro* expanded pluripotent cells that originate from the rodent post-implantation epiblast.

Embryonic germ cells – *in vitro* expanded pluripotent cells that are derived from embryonic PGCs.

Germ stem cells (GSCs) – *in vitro* expanded pluripotent stem cells that originate from neonatal or adult testis derived spermatogonial stem cells.

Nuclear transfer – cloning of somatic cell derived nucleus and its introduction into a-nucleated host oocyte.

Induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) – *in vitro* generated pluripotent cells derived via ectopic expression of defined exogenous factors in somatic cells.

Naïve pluripotency – pluripotent state that resembles pre-implantation pluripotent configuration(s).

Primed pluripotency – pluripotent state that corresponds to post-implantation embryonic configuration(s).

Ground state pluripotency – originally described as a state of pluripotency that is independent of exogenous activator signalling input or stimulation.

X inactivation – dosage compensation of X chromosome in female, where one of the X chromosomes gets epigenetically silenced.

Seed enhancers - subgroup of enhancers that are dormant in naive cells but become more active in primed pluripotent and somatic cells.

3i – Defined naïve pluripotency growth conditions combing 3 inhibitors (i) for MEK, FGF and GSK3 signalling.

2i/LIF – Defined naïve pluripotency growth conditions containing 2 inhibitors (i) for MEK and GSK3 together with LIF cytokine.

“Alternative 2i” – Defined naïve pluripotency growth conditions composed of 2 small molecule inhibitors for GSK3 and SRC pathways

LIF/MEKi/aPKCi - Defined naïve pluripotency growth conditions containing 2 inhibitors (i) for MEK and atypical PKC signalling, together with LIF cytokine.
FGF2/ACTIVIN A – Defined primed pluripotency growth conditions for mouse EpiSCs composed of recombinant FGF2 and ACTIVIN A cytokines.

FGF2/IWR1 - Defined primed pluripotency growth conditions for mouse EpiSCs composed of recombinant FGF2 and Tankyrase small molecule inhibitor, IWR1.

GSK3i/IWR1 - Defined primed pluripotency growth conditions for mouse EpiSCs composed of GSK3 pathway inhibitor and Tankyrase small molecule inhibitor, IWR1.

**Table of contents summary**

Hanna and colleagues review recent advances on molecular underpinnings of alternative primed- and naïve-like pluripotent states isolated in rodents and in man. They highlight potential benefits and identify key unanswered challenges in this rapidly evolving fundamental topic.
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**in vitro Isolated Pluripotent Cell Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Mouse</th>
<th>ESC</th>
<th>EpiSC</th>
<th>EG</th>
<th>GSC</th>
<th>iPSC</th>
<th>NT-ESC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
<td><strong>in vivo</strong></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-implantation embryo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blastocyst</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-implantation epiblast</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premordial germ cells (PGC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spermatogonial progenitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic cells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mouse</th>
<th>Rat</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Rhinoceros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naive/Primed</td>
<td>2L LIF</td>
<td>2L LIF</td>
<td>2L LIF</td>
<td>2L LIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEX-ERK dependence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term dependence on FGF2 signalling</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term dependence on TGF-α-activin A signalling</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant OCT4 enhancer</td>
<td>Distal</td>
<td>Prominent</td>
<td>Distal</td>
<td>Prominent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX2/3-mediated on developmental regulators</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global DNA hypomethylation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X chromosome inactivation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on DNMT1, Dicer, METTL3, MED3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluripotency markers (NANOG, KLF4, ENR2)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFE3 nuclear localization</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cdx4/Mhc, class 1</td>
<td>Low/low</td>
<td>High/med</td>
<td>Low/low</td>
<td>High/med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERV-H and HERV-ε expression</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhesin molecules</td>
<td>E-cadherin</td>
<td>N-cadherin</td>
<td>E-cadherin</td>
<td>N-cadherin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of pluripotency maintenance via Nanog or Pdcd4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitochondria</td>
<td>OxPhos, glycolytic</td>
<td>Glycolytic</td>
<td>OxPhos, glycolytic</td>
<td>Glycolytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence as initial starting cells for PGC/LC induction</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of colonization of host-pre-implantation ICM and contribution to chimeras</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypomethylation of promoter and enhancer regions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-Kit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for absence of exogenous L-Glutamine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitochondrial membrane activity and depolarization</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence as initial starting cell for TSC induction</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Empty boxes – results have not been reported thus far
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Differentiation and/or cell death
Figure 5
Figure 5