

This is a repository copy of *Reviving rare chicken breeds using genetically engineered sterility in surrogate host birds*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/155679/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Woodcock, Mark E, Gheyas, Almas A, Mason, Andrew S orcid.org/0000-0002-8222-3974 et al. (7 more authors) (2019) Reviving rare chicken breeds using genetically engineered sterility in surrogate host birds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. pp. 20930-20937. ISSN 1091-6490

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906316116>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Reviving rare chicken breeds using genetically engineered sterility in surrogate host birds

Mark E. Woodcock^{1,4}, Almas A. Gheyas^{1,4}, Andrew S. Mason¹, Sunil Nandi¹, Lorna Taylor¹, Adrian Sherman¹, Jacqueline Smith¹, Dave W. Burt², Rachel Hawken³, Michael J. McGrew^{1*}

¹The Roslin Institute and Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies, University of Edinburgh, Easter Bush Campus, Midlothian, EH25 9RG, UK

²The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia

³Cobb-Europe, Old Ipswich Road, Colchester CO7 7QR, UK

⁴MEW and AAG contributed equally to this work

*Corresponding author: mike.mcgrew@roslin.ed.ac.uk

Running title: Gene edited sterile surrogate hosts for rare breed conservation

Key words: sustainability, biodiversity, conservation, primordial germ cell, poultry, rare breeds, genome editing

Abstract

In macrolecithal species, cryopreservation of the oocyte and zygote is not possible due to the large size and quantity of lipid deposited within the egg. For birds, this signifies that cryopreserving and regenerating a species from frozen cellular material is currently technically unfeasible. Diploid primordial germ cells (PGCs) are a potential means to freeze down the entire genome and reconstitute an avian species from frozen material. Here, we examine the use of genetically engineered (GE) sterile female layer chicken as surrogate hosts for the transplantation of cryopreserved avian PGCs from rare heritage breeds of chicken. We first amplified PGC numbers in culture before cryopreservation and subsequent transplantation into host GE embryos. We found that all hatched offspring from the chimera GE hens were derived from the donor rare heritage breed broiler PGCs and using cryopreserved semen, we were able to produce pure offspring. Measurement of the mutation rate of PGCs in culture revealed 2.7×10^{-10} *de novo* SNVs were generated per cell division which is comparable to other stem cell lineages. We also found that endogenous Avian Leukosis Virus (ALV) retroviral insertions were not mobilised during *in vitro* propagation. Taken together, these results show that mutation rates are no higher than normal stem cells, essential if we are to conserve avian breeds. Thus, GE sterile avian surrogate hosts provide a viable platform to conserve and regenerate avian species using cryopreserved PGCs.

Significance

In the fields of conservation biology and sustainable agriculture, the ability to cryopreserve and revive animal species is paramount to efforts to preserve genetic diversity.

An innovative approach is to use sterile surrogate host animals for the transplantation of reproductive germ cells from rare/endangered animals. This technology has previously been utilised in mammals but is of particular importance for animals with lipid-filled zygotes/embryos such as fish and birds, which renders cryopreservation techniques inefficient.

We demonstrate that the female chicken rendered sterile using genome editing technology can be used as a surrogate host for transplanted cryopreserved germ cells and only lay eggs of the transplanted rare chicken breed. Our results suggest a novel way to preserve the biodiversity of bird species.

Introduction

Cryopreservation of the oocyte and zygote is not possible in macrolecithal species such as birds and fish due to the large amount of lipid deposited in the female oocyte (1-3). For avian species, this signifies that to conserve a breed of interest, birds must be maintained as extant breeding populations, which places them in danger to losses in biodiversity caused by population fluctuations and to the constant threat of extinction. The embryonic diploid reproductive germ cells from avian species offer an alternative means to cryopreserve the entire genotype of the germplasm (reproductive cells) from which a pure breeding population could be entirely reconstituted at a later date. This is a current research objective being pursued for both avian and fish species as a way to safeguard the genetic diversity of both farmed and rare/endangered breeds and species (2, 4, 5). The embryonic or primordial germ cells (PGCs) can be cryopreserved directly or, since their number is low in the early embryo (50-150 cells) (6-8), PGCs from a few select species can be propagated in culture to increase their number before cryopreservation (9-11).

The germ cell lineage is also believed to safeguard genetic information by having both high levels of homologous recombination and enzymes for DNA repair and by initiating programmed cell death when double strand breaks are formed (12-16). The mutation rate of vertebrate germ cells in culture has not been measured but is thought to be low in comparison to somatic cell lineages as intergenerational mutation rates are low in vertebrate species and during *in vitro* culture (17). Mammalian embryonic stem cells also have lower mutation rates *in vitro* (approximately 100-fold) when compared to somatic cells (18).

Chicken is one of the few species from which PGCs can easily be propagated *in vitro* to increase cell number using a defined medium (19). For chicken, PGCs from a single embryo can be expanded *in vitro* to >100,000 cells within four weeks and subsequently cryopreserved. Chicken PGCs can also be genetically modified during *in vitro* culture (9, 20-24). After thawing, PGCs transfer into the embryonic vascular system of 'surrogate host' embryos where they migrate to the forming gonads and will differentiate into functional gametes in the adult host (10, 25, 26). The adult surrogate host chickens are subsequently bred to generate offspring, some of which derive from the exogenous donor PGCs. Layer breeds of chicken, which have been selected for egg production, can be used as surrogate hosts for transplanted germ cells from other breeds of less fertile chicken and, conceivably, from other avian species (27-29). A major constraint to the use of this system is that the transmission rate from exogenous PGCs injected into layer chicken embryos can vary greatly between individual surrogate host animals and between the different chicken breeds used as surrogate hosts (25, 30). To circumvent this problem, chemical and physical methods have been used to ablate the endogenous germ cells of the surrogate host and have been shown to increase the transmission of donor cell genetics. However, these agents are highly toxic to both the developing surrogate host embryo and the mature host animal (10, 31-

33). Alternatively, the genetic ablation of a gene required for germ cell development has been used to eliminate the endogenous germ cells in both mammalian and fish species (34-38). These genetically sterile surrogate hosts were subsequently shown to efficiently generate offspring deriving from transplanted exogenous germ cells.

We recently used genome editors to disrupt the chicken *DDX4* (*Vasa*) gene which is located on the Z sex chromosome in bird species (39). In birds, males are the homogametic sex containing ZZ sex chromosomes whereas females are the heterogametic sex containing ZW sex chromosomes. In *DDX4* Z⁻W mutant females, we observed that PGCs were reduced in number in the developing embryo and entirely absent in the post hatch ovary, leading to ovarian atrophy and a failure to lay eggs. Accordingly, the transfer of exogenous donor germ cells into *DDX4* Z⁻W host females during embryonic development may rescue oocyte formation and restore egg production. Subsequent insemination of the *DDX4* surrogate host with cryopreserved semen from the same donor breed would permit the complete reconstitution of the breed from frozen cellular material.

In the present study, we demonstrate the reconstitution of a chicken breed from frozen cellular material. PGCs were first isolated from several rare traditional breeds of chicken and propagated *in vitro* to increase germ cell numbers before cryopreservation. We found that the genome of chicken PGCs was remarkably stable in culture: 0.65 *de novo* single nucleotide variants (SNVs) were generated per cell division giving mutation rates of 2.7×10^{-10} . Furthermore, endogenous ALVE retroviral insertions that are present in the chicken genome were not mobilised during *in vitro* propagation. *DDX4* Z⁻W hosts formed oocytes from exogenous donor female germ cells isolated from a different chicken breed and all offspring derived from the donor PGCs. Donor PGC development was also sex restricted in *DDX4* Z⁻W hosts; male PGCs did not generate viable oocytes indicating sex restricted gamete differentiation in birds. Insemination of the *DDX4* Z⁻W layer host with cryopreserved semen allowed the complete reconstitution of a heritage broiler chicken breed. These results demonstrate the power of using sterile avian surrogate hosts for regenerating avian species.

Results

Propagation of PGCs from rare and heritage chicken breeds *in vitro*

PGCs are present in the laid avian egg and reach a population of approximately 150 cells in the circulatory system of the chicken embryo at 60 hours of incubation (6, 40). To expand this small population of cells we sampled the embryonic blood from single embryos of a heritage broiler breed chicken. The Vantress heritage broiler chicken breed was first developed in the 1950s and maintained as a closed breeding population for the last thirty years (41). Embryonic blood was cultured in a defined medium containing either chicken serum or ovotransferrin (OT), an iron transporter supplement that can replace chicken serum in PGC culture media (19). PGC cultures were scored as positive if populations reached 50,000 cells within four weeks of *in vitro* culture. Under this criterion PGCs were successfully cultured *in vitro* from 40-56% of the embryos sampled (SI Appendix, Table S1). Primary cultures of female PGCs were obtained more efficiently using OT in place of chicken serum (61% versus 30%) with an average *in vitro* doubling time of 33.4 hours measured for both sexes. To extend these results to other chicken breeds, we obtained fertile eggs from several rare British chicken breeds (Cream Legbar, Marsh Daisy, Scots Dumpy, and Scots Grey) and assayed PGC growth using serum free medium containing OT. We successfully cultured both male and female PGCs from the majority of rare breed embryos sampled with the derivation rate reaching 90% for some breeds (SI Appendix, Table S1). PGC cultures for all these breeds were subsequently cryopreserved in vials containing 50,000 cells. PGCs survived cryopreservation well and proliferated robustly when re-cultured after thawing (SI Appendix, Fig. S1).

Germline transmission using female sterile surrogate hosts

Mouse embryonic stem cells and chicken PGCs have been shown to lose germ line competence after extended periods in culture (42). To measure both germ line transmission and loss of germline competence during *in vitro* propagation we continuously propagated the heritage broiler breed PGCs *in vitro* for a total time of 3 months or 6 months before cryopreservation. We genetically labelled individual cultures of male or female PGCs with a fluorescent marker using piggyBac transposons containing either GFP (green; 3 months) or tdTomato (red; six months) fluorescent reporter genes early on during this culture period. Using labelled PGCs (Fig. 1A and B) enables us to lineage trace the germ cells during embryonic development and to easily identify offspring deriving from the PGCs after injection into surrogate host embryos. Aliquots of frozen, labelled donor PGCs (green, 3months and red, 6 months) originally derived from a single male or female embryo were thawed and cultured for one week, mixed in equal numbers and approximately 4000 total PGCs were injected into the dorsal aorta of day 2.5 host embryos. The host embryos were generated from crossing a *DDX4* ZZ⁻ male with wildtype (ZW) layer hens to produce host embryos composed of four genotypes: ZZ, ZZ⁻, ZW, Z⁻W (39). Mixed male or female

heritage PGC cultures were injected separately into host embryos. Injected embryos were hatched and the founder host birds were raised to sexual maturity. Germline transmission from the donor PGCs was initially measured by mating the host birds and screening the offspring for GFP⁺ or tdTomato⁺ expression. As chromosomal integration events of transposon vectors are rare in cultured PGCs (one to three insert events per transfection experiment) we expect to detect fluorescence in 50% of the offspring arising from a transposon-labelled PGC due to meiotic reduction (21).

Six experimental sets of embryo injections were carried out into a total of 91 fertile eggs obtained from a ZZ⁻ *DDX4* male to ZW wildtype female cross. From this number, 59 F0 founder hosts (65%) successfully hatched. Founder hosts genotyped as ZZ or ZZ⁻ injected with female PGCs were not bred as female chicken PGCs have been previously shown to not form functional spermatozoa in male hosts (43, 44). It would be expected that females carrying a single Z chromosome will be sterile if the *DDX4* gene were knocked out, ZZ⁻ males carrying a single mutant *DDX4* allele would have normal fertility (39).

To assess germ cell colonisation of the ovary of sterile females, the ovary from a *DDX4* Z⁻ W host injected with female donor PGCs was first examined at 8 weeks post-hatch (pre-sexual maturity) (Fig. 1C). The ovary from this bird was entirely composed of fluorescent follicles with the majority of the mature follicles being GFP⁺, and a small number of follicles being RFP⁺ (Fig. 1D). This result suggests that PGCs of a single genotype cultured *in vitro* for shorter time periods outcompeted PGCs cultured for longer periods in the developing ovary. The remaining 15 female birds were raised to sexual maturity to measure germline transmission of the donor female germ cells. Four of the five *DDX4* Z⁻ W host hens injected with female PGCs began to lay eggs when they reached sexual maturity at 22 weeks post hatch and continued laying until 80 weeks of age. Egg production was normal in these females and no incidences of multiple ovulations (double yolked eggs) were observed. Egg laying measurements over a two month period found the injected *DDX4* Z⁻ W host hens were laying an average of 5.3 eggs per week which was lower but similar to the injected *DDX4* ZW control host hens (6.6-6.8 eggs per week). The *DDX4* Z⁻ W hens were inseminated with wildtype layer semen at 24 weeks of age and the resulting offspring were analysed for the fluorescent transgene by visual observation and PCR analysis (SI Appendix, Fig. S2). 280 eggs from four *DDX4* Z⁻ W hens (three hens co-housed, one hen housed separately) were collected and incubated, from which 218 chicks hatched. 95 of the offspring (44%) from the *DDX4* Z⁻ W hens were GFP or RFP fluorescent by visual observation and PCR positive for the transposon indicating that they were derived from the donor heritage broiler germ cells (Table 1, Fig. 1E, and SI Appendix, Fig. S2) with an average transmission rate of 87%. Only 2 offspring were positive for RFP fluorescence. The fertility (% day 18 eggs with embryos) was similar between the four *DDX4* Z⁻ W hosts and the five ZW wildtype hosts signifying ovulation and egg development proceeded normally in the *DDX4* Z⁻ W hens. Surprisingly, no fluorescent offspring were produced from ZW

host hens indicating that the donor female heritage broiler PGCs could not compete with the endogenous host germ cells in wildtype hens.

In *DDX4* Z⁻W hosts injected with male donor heritage PGCs, none of the five *DDX4* Z⁻W hens laid eggs. An analysis of the ovaries from these hens did not detect white or maturing yellow follicles (SI Appendix, Fig. S3). These results demonstrate that female heritage broiler donor cells could successfully generate offspring but only in the absence of endogenous germ cell competition, and male heritage broiler donor PGCs could not produce functional oocytes in female layer hosts even with the absence of competing germ cells.

To measure male donor germ cell transmission, male ZZ or ZZ⁻ *DDX4* cockerel hosts injected with male heritage broiler PGCs were raised to sexual maturity and mated to wildtype females. Two of the three ZZ⁻ birds injected with male PGCs were crossed with wildtype layer hens, after copy number PCRs showed high levels of GFP transgene DNA in their semen (SI Appendix, Fig. S4). However, no fluorescent offspring were observed indicating that the heritage broiler PGCs were unable to compete with the endogenous layer male germ cells in a wildtype host (Table 1, SI Appendix, Fig. S2).

To further verify the transmission rate from the *DDX4* Z⁻W hens injected with donor female heritage broiler germ cells, we analysed the offspring at embryonic stages. Embryo analysis revealed that a slightly higher number of the embryos were GFP⁺ (46%; 92% transmission rate) which suggests that the lower germ line transmission rate observed in hatchlings could be due to the toxicity of the transposon insertion or that some offspring were derived from endogenous host oocytes (SI Appendix, Table S2, Fig. S5). To accurately determine the pedigree of the offspring arising from the *DDX4* Z⁻W host hens a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of genetic variation was performed on genomic DNA from offspring, surrogate host brown layer chicken, and control heritage broiler chicken using a 60K chicken SNP genotyping assay (Fig. 2). We found that all offspring from *DDX4* Z⁻W surrogate hosts injected with heritage broiler donor PGCs clustered between the heritage broiler and brown layer host bird groupings indicating their hybrid origin. Offspring from ZW host birds clustered with the ZW surrogate hosts indicating that they were offspring of the host endogenous germ cells. These results indicate that all offspring from the *DDX4* Z⁻W host hens were derived from donor heritage PGCs.

As we determined that all offspring of the *DDX4* Z⁻W host hens were derived from the cryopreserved donor germ cells it would be possible to use cryopreserved heritage broiler semen, although an inefficient procedure for many chicken breeds, to regenerate pure heritage broiler offspring. To demonstrate that a pure chicken breed can be reconstituted from cryopreserved reproductive material, ie germplasm, we first artificially inseminated the *DDX4* Z⁻W host females with fresh semen from heritage broiler cockerels and three putative pure heritage broiler birds were produced (Fig. 3A). We next cryopreserved semen from a single heritage broiler cockerel and used this to inseminate a single *DDX4* Z⁻W female. Fertile eggs from this mating were obtained and incubated to hatch and a single putative pure heritage broiler bird was produced

(Fig. 3B). A PCA of these four offspring demonstrated that they clustered with Vantress heritage chicken confirming that they were reconstituted pure heritage broiler offspring (Fig. 2). Examination of GFP fluorescence and PCR analysis confirmed the presence of the GFP transgene in several of these offspring (SI Appendix, Fig. S6). Thus, it is possible to regenerate a breed of chickens from cryopreserved cells in a single step using sterile surrogate host hens (Fig. 4).

Genome stability of *in vitro* propagated PGCs

To assess genomic stability a karyotype analysis of the chromosomal complement is usually informative. In avian species this analysis is difficult due to the characteristics of the avian karyotype; the presence of a few macrochromosomes and many microchromosomes. For example, the chicken has a diploid number of 78 chromosomes: 10 pairs of macrochromosomes, 28 pairs of microchromosomes, and a pair of highly dimorphic sex chromosomes (45). A alternative approach is to examine the formation of *de novo* SNV and transposable element mobilisation during *in vitro* propagation. We analysed SNV formation in PGCs propagated from single cells as *de novo* SNVs might be undetectable when formed in larger cell populations. PGCs derived from individual embryos were cultured for 55 days and then single PGCs were isolated and expanded clonally to generate sufficient genomic DNA for whole genome re-sequencing (WGS). We compared the WGS data from eight single cell clones (derived from four male and four female PGC cultures) with WGS data from the original embryo and found that the average *de novo* SNV formation was 25.8 SNVs +/- 9.4 st.dev. formed during 55 days in culture which was equivalent to 39.6 cell generations (Fig. 5). PGC cultures, therefore, have a low mutation rate of 0.65 SNVs per cell per generation (2.7×10^{-10} per nucleotide per generation). 9 of a total of 140 SNVs (6.4%) were located in exonic sequences. On average, after 55 days in culture, only one coding mutations was found in the genome of each clone, none of which generated premature truncations (Supplementary file 1). We used the same WGS data from the eight single cell clones to analyse chromosomal coverage by read depth over the entire mapped genome and compared this coverage to the WGS data from the original embryo. Differences in coverage between chromosomes for the single cell clones when compared to coverage between chromosomes for the respective embryonic genomic sequence would indicate major chromosomal duplications/losses. This analysis indicated that the normal chromosomal complement was present in the cultured PGCs with no major aneuploidy events (SI Appendix, Fig. S7).

Avian Leukosis virus, subgroup E (ALVE) retrotransposons are evolutionarily recent retrotransposable elements found only in the genomes of the domestic chicken and its wild progenitor, the red jungle fowl (46). As such, these elements typically retain the ability to retrotranspose, moving and propagating by 'copy and paste' across the genome, particularly during periods of cellular stress and can lead to disease outbreaks (47-49). To measure the stability of endogenous ALVEs we first mapped these endogenous ALVEs in the Vantress heritage broiler breed. We then compared the location of the ALVE inserts between individual embryos

and PGCs isolated and cultured from those embryos, both in total PGC populations and after single cell isolation and propagation. A total of thirteen different ALVEs were identified across the twenty-four WGS datasets (Table S3). Twelve of these elements were previously identified within broilers (including a heritage Cobb dataset; Mason et al, manuscript in preparation), with the thirteenth (ALVE_ros304; 1:122,259,275; CACAGG) characterised in this study. Individual ALVE frequencies ranged from 0.05 to 0.85, and only ALVE_ros304 was present in all samples. All ALVE identification and genotype results matched exactly between the embryo, PGC cultures, and clonally propagated PGC data, suggesting that there was no allelic dropout or additional integration events following initial isolation and culture of the embryonic PGCs. It is, however, possible that additional integrations could have occurred in poorly assembled regions of the genome, and thus undetectable by our analysis. In summary, we carried out three independent measures of genome stability and identified no major instabilities during the *in vitro* propagation of PGCs.

Discussion

Diploid PGCs have the potential to be used for cryopreservation of bird species. Successful biobanking of birds using PGCs will have important applications for both *ex situ* conservation of endangered bird populations and conservation of biodiversity in both commercial and indigenous chicken breeds. We and others have demonstrated that PGCs from various commercial chicken breeds can be cultured for periods of several weeks before cryopreservation, and when thawed will migrate to the forming gonads of a surrogate host embryo and contribute to the genome of offspring (Woodcock et al., manuscript in preparation, 25, 50). Our current study demonstrates that PGCs can be cultured from most rare chicken breeds and the donor germ cells from a heritage broiler breed can rescue follicle development in the germ cell ablated layer hens leading to normal egg production and viable offspring (Fig. 4). We could not demonstrate germ line transmission from the PGCs of these other rare chicken breeds as they were raised under 'free range' conditions and are of unknown immunological status. However, our success with the heritage breed suggests that this methodology could be extended to all chicken breeds.

In general, donor chicken PGCs can contribute to the germline of wildtype surrogate hosts with varying efficiencies (10, 25, 26). We would have expected to see some level of germline transmission from the wild-type surrogate hosts used in these experiments. This loss of transmission implies that germ cells lose their ability to compete with endogenous germ cells when they are propagated in culture for at least 3 months, or that PGCs cultured from the broiler heritage line are unable to compete with endogenous germ cells in layer hens and layer roosters. However, only 2% of the offspring generated from Vantress heritage PGCs were derived from cells cultured for 6 months in comparison with 98% of the offspring from cells of the same

genotype cultured for 3 months. This suggests that the competence to compete for the gonadal niche is lost with cellular divisions. This loss of competence was first observed in the developing ovary of an 8-week post-hatch *DDX4* Z⁻W host. Further study of gonad development in the surrogate hosts is needed to determine when the contribution of germ cells to the follicular pool is determined. It is also possible that the defined medium using Activin A and FGF2 used to culture the PGCs does not reflect the *in vivo* gonadal niche and needs to be further optimised (19). Surprisingly, we did not observe germline transmission from male PGCs transplanted into female sterile hosts as has been previously reported by us and others when host sterility was induced using chemical means or irradiation (51, 52). We suggest that this observed difference may be attributed to either the breed of the donor male PGCs used in these experiments and/or that the *DDX4* Z⁻W female contains endogenous PGCs at pre-hatch stages which may compete with the donor male germ cells. Differences in germline transmission of donor PGCs injected into host embryos of different breeds has been previously observed (30). Our data suggests that the heritage broiler breed PGCs did not compete efficiently with endogenous PGCs in the wildtype layer host gonad. The future use of sterile surrogate host embryos should circumvent this issue of donor/host competition. Our results highlight the requirement to couple semen cryopreservation programmes with PGC cryopreservation. Alternatively, the development of a sterile male surrogate host would permit rare breed regeneration using only cryopreserved PGCs.

In this study we sought to determine the effect that propagating PGCs in culture has on their ability to contribute to the germline as loss of germline competence is observed with increasing periods of *in vitro* culture. Our experiments clearly demonstrated this effect. By challenging cells of a single genotype in a single host, we demonstrated that PGCs cultured for less time better competed for the stem cell niche, and gave rise to more offspring - although these experiments did only use a single PGC line. It is notable that the replacement of chick serum with ovotransferrin in the culture media significantly improved the rate of female PGC culture derivation for the Vantress Heritage line. Chick serum contains numerous amino acids, lipids, cytokines and growth factors, amongst other components. Currently it is unclear which of these factors may be detrimental to establishing female PGC cultures, or whether any serum components may adversely affect germline transmission or mutation frequency. Furthermore, cryopreservation of PGCs may also alter their competency in this context, and it would be interesting to investigate the effect freezing and thawing cultures has on transmission. Additionally, we measured the *de novo* mutation rate of PGCs during *in vitro* propagation. The number of SNV mutations that we detected in these experiments is approximately one every two doubling times or one every three days in culture. Somatic cells in culture have been shown to have a mutation rate of 4.7×10^{-8} per division for normal human fibroblasts (53). The mutation rate of mouse embryonic stem cells is thought to be low ($< 1 \times 10^{-9}$) (18). The mutation rate measured here was similar to that shown for embryonic stem cells but not as low as for human and mouse intergenerational mutation rates (17, 18). Lynch (54) estimate the intergenerational

mutation rate of 7.7×10^{-10} per site for somatic cells and 6.0×10^{-11} per site in the human germline. We also determined that the endogenous ALVE elements were stable in PGCs during extended *in vitro* culture. Both results suggest that *in vitro* expansion of avian PGCs for periods up to three months to increase cell number is not detrimental to the birds generated from these cells. In fact, sufficient PGCs for cryopreservation and regeneration of a breed can be generated within five weeks of *in vitro* cell culture.

Our results demonstrate the power of using sterile surrogate host hens for reconstituting chicken breeds from frozen material (Fig. 4). Our methodology clearly demonstrates the benefits of using genome editing technology to generate surrogate host chickens for the preservation of valuable chicken breeds and in aiding efforts to conserve genetic diversity. This work reflects recent efforts to use genetic modification to ablate the endogenous germline in other species such as fish and mammals (36, 55-57). This study also points to the need to determine if it will be possible to generate offspring of multiple individual genotypes from single surrogate chickens that have been injected with PGCs cultured from several embryos. As cryopreservation of poultry semen is problematic and varies in success between chicken breeds (58, 59), the generation of male sterile chicken will bypass the need for semen cryopreservation and permit the resurrection of a poultry breed in a single cross of surrogate host animals.

Methods

Animal Husbandry

The *DDX4* line of knockout chicken line was maintained on a Hy-Line Brown layer background. *DDX4* *ZZ*⁻ cockerels were mated with wildtype Hy-line hens to generate fertile eggs for injection and hatching and additional *ZZ*⁻ cockerels for line maintenance. Marsh Daisy, Cream Legbar, Scots Dumpy, and Scots Grey eggs were sourced from local UK poultry breeders. Fertile Vantress heritage broiler eggs were obtained from the Vantress heritage flock kept by Cobb Europe at the Colchester UK facility. Germline transmission experiments and the *DDX4* flock maintenance were conducted under UK Home Office license and regulations. The experimental protocol and studies were reviewed by the Roslin Institute Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Board (AWERB) Committee.

Culture and transfection of PGCs

PGC derivation and propagation were carried out as described in (19). Briefly, 1 μ l of blood isolated from a stage 15-16⁺ HH embryo was placed in culture medium containing 1x B-27 supplement, 0.15 mM CaCl₂, 2.0 mM GlutaMax, 1x NEAA, 0.1 mM β -mercaptoethanol, 1x

nucleosides, 1.2 mM pyruvate, 0.2% ovalbumin (Sigma), 0.01% sodium heparin (Sigma), 4 ng/ml FGF2 (R&D Biosystems), 25 ng/ml Activin A (PeproTech), in Avian Knockout DMEM (250 osmoles/litre, 12.0 mM glucose, containing no calcium chloride (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Custom modification of Knockout DMEM)). Either 5 µg/ml ovotransferrin (Sigma) or 0.2% chicken serum was added to the final culture medium. Female and male PGC cultures were derived from the Vantress heritage broiler line or rare breed chicken embryos and were frozen in avian KO-DMEM containing 4% DMSO, 5% chicken serum and 0.15 mM CaCl₂ an average of four weeks after derivation in aliquots of 50,000 PGCs and stored at -150°C. PGC cultures were frozen at least once before injections into surrogate host embryos or used for clonal DNAseq analysis. 50,000 cells were resuspended 250 µL serum/DMSO freezing mix, in polypropylene cryovials. Cells were frozen in a -80°C freezer, in an isopropanol jacket (Mr Frosty). Cryovials were stored at -150°C after overnight freezing. PGCs and embryos were sexed using W chromosome-specific primers as described in (10).

To fluorescently label cells for germline transmission, PGCs (approximately 2.0×10^5 cells and six weeks in culture) from the 81 (female) or the 19 (male) PGC cultures were transfected using 3 µl of DIMRIE-C (Life Technologies) with 2 µg of the piggyBac Hybase transposase and 2 µg of the transposon vector piggyBac-CAG-GFP-IRES-puromycin (PB-CGIP) (Macdonald, 2012) or piggyBac-CAG-TdTomato-IRES-puromycin (PB-CTIP), and selected with 0.5 µg/ml puromycin starting at 4 days post-transfection for two weeks. All PGCs were visibly fluorescent. Labelled PGCs were continuously propagated at $1.0\text{-}4.0 \times 10^5$ cells/ml, with media replaced every 2 days, until total time in culture reached either 3 months or 6 months, at which point cultures were frozen and stored at -150°C.

Germline transmission

GFP⁺ (cultured for 3 months) and TdTomato⁺ (cultured for six months) from either the E81 (female) or the E19 (male) PGC culture were thawed and cultured for 4-8 days, and then mixed 1:1. 1 µl of medium containing 5000 – 7000 female or male PGCs were injected into the dorsal aorta of stage 16⁺ HH embryos generated from crosses between ZZ males with a single *DDX4* allele (Taylor et al. 2017) and wildtype Hy-Line Brown layer hens (ZW). Eggs (ZZ, ZZ⁻, ZW, Z⁻W) were windowed at the pointed end prior to injection and 50 µl of 1x penicillin/streptomycin was injected into the cavity before resealing with shell membrane and melted parafilm. Seven injection experiments were carried out, and founders were screened by PCR for the presence of the GFP transgene to determine if they were Z-Z, Z⁻W or wild-type (ZZ or ZW) for the *DDX4* allele. To calculate germline transmission of injected PGCs, female founders were artificially inseminated with wildtype Hy-Line semen and founders were screened for fluorescence using Headsets (Biological Laboratory Instruments, Budapest). Both GFP⁺ and negative offspring were screened by PCR using primers for the GFP (ACGTAAACGGCCACAAGTTC, AAGTCGTGCTTCATGTG) and GAPDH (CAGATCAGTTTCTATCAGC, TGTGACTTCAATGGTGACA)

to confirm transmission results. Semen from male founders was screen by PCR for the presence of the GFP gene as described in (60) using transposon-specific primers (CACACCGGCCTTATTCCA, CAACGAGAAGCGCGATCACAT). Males were then individually housed with four Hy-Line Brown layer hens for natural mating. Additional eggs from founders which were not taken to hatch were windowed between days 3 and 5 of development and fluorescence was observed using a Zeiss AxioZoom.v16 microscope. Statistical analysis of germline transmission was carried out using Fisher's exact test, with significance taken as $p < 0.05$

Semen freezing

Semen was collected from broilers by the method of abdominal massage (61). Semen was diluted with 2.5 volumes of extender (2.85g sodium glutamate, 0.5g glucose, 0.25g inositol, 0.5g potassium acetate, 0.07g magnesium acetate-4H₂O, in 100ml sterile water, pH 7.0), cooled to 4°C, and supplemented with 6.5% dimethylformamide as cryoprotectant. The semen/cryoprotectant mixture was loaded into 0.5ml straws (IMV), heat sealed, and frozen on a rack 4cm above the surface of liquid nitrogen in an insulated container. The frozen straws were stored in liquid nitrogen. Straws were thawed in a water bath at 4°C, then inseminated into the everted oviduct of the recipient hen. Eggs were collected daily, and batches of eggs were set for hatching once per week.

Immunohistochemistry

Tissues were fixed in formalin for paraffin sections followed by Haemotoxylin/Eosin staining or cryo-embedded and processed for immunofluorescence (19).

Genomic DNA extraction

Tissue from the stage 15-16⁺ HH embryos sampled to derive the Vantress heritage PGC cultures was removed from eggs and stored at -80°C. Tissue was thawed and placed in lysis buffer (400 mM Tris/HCl pH8, 60mM EDTA, 150mM NaCl, 1% SDS, 100µg/ml Proteinase K (Thermo Fisher Scientific)) and incubated with gentle agitation at 55 °C for 3 hours. Lysed tissues were centrifuged (1 min, 13000 x g), and the supernatant was added to an equal volume of phenol/chloroform/isoamyl alcohol, mixing gently by inversion for 30 seconds. The emulsion formed was centrifuged (10 min, 12000 x g), and the aqueous phase added to an equal volume of chloroform, mixing by inversion, then repeating centrifugation. The aqueous phase was added to 0.8 volumes of isopropanol to precipitate genomic DNA, then repeating centrifugation and adding 0.8 ml cold 70% EtOH to wash. Supernatant was removed after a final centrifugation and the DNA was air-dried for 5-10 minutes and dissolved in 30 µl of 1x TE buffer.

For cultured PGCs, gDNA was extracted from 1.0 – 2.0 x 10⁶ cells using the Gentra Puregene Cell Kit (Qiagen, Cat. No. 158722), according to manufacturer's instructions. Air-dried DNA was

dissolved overnight at 4 °C in 50 µl of 1x TE buffer. Quality of gDNA was confirmed by Nanodrop and running 1 µl of gDNA on a 0.8% agarose gel.

Pedigree analysis using SNP chips

Genomic DNA was prepared from blood or chorio-allantoic membrane samples from G₁ chicks using cell lysis solution (Quiagen) and RNase A Solution (Sigma). Protein Precipitation Solution (Quiagen) was added and DNA was precipitated and resuspended. DNA from these G₁ chicks and DNA from control chickens (pureline commercial broiler, Vantress breed, putative hybrids, and control brown-layer Hy-line flock) were genotyped using a custom Cobb 60K Infinium Illumina array. A PCA was then completed using 60,000 genotypes from each of the base populations.

Sequencing and variant analysis

Cryopreserved cells for PGC cultures 19, 20, 70, and 81 were re-cultured for a total of 55 days at which point single PGCs were transferred in 96 well plates. Clonal cultures for each PGC culture (n = 2) were expanded until cells reached 4.0 x 10⁵ cells/ml, and then 1.0 x 10⁵ cells were taken approximately every 2 days, pelleted by centrifugation ready for genomic DNA (gDNA) extraction and WGS.

Whole genome re-sequencing

Short read, whole genome re-sequencing (WGS) was performed by Edinburgh Genomics (Edinburgh, UK). Embryo gDNA sample libraries were prepared using the Illumina TruSeq DNA PCR-free gel-free protocol with average insert sizes of 550 bp, and sequenced using the Illumina HiSeq 2500 instrument generating 250 bp, paired end (PE) reads. PGC gDNA samples were prepared later, again using the TruSeq library preparation but with average insert sizes of 350bp, sequenced using the Illumina HiSeqX platform generating 150 bp, PE reads.

Novel variant calling

Raw sequencing data were quality checked using FastQC Screen (62) and Illumina PE TRuSeq3-2 adapter sequences were removed using Trimmomatic v0.36 (63). Data were aligned to the chicken reference genome (*Gallus_gallus_5.0*; GenBank: GCF_000002315.4) using BWA-mem v0.7.15 (64). Alignment files were analysed and improved using PicardTools v2.9.4 (65) and GATK v3.7 (66) following the GATK best practices pipeline, and variants between the embryo and PGC sequencing data were called using Mutect2.

To distinguish between germline variants and novel variants occurring during cell culture, novel variants were retained as long as no alternative allele reads were present in the embryo sample from which the PGCs were isolated, allele read depth was at least 15, heterozygous alleles in the PGC sample had frequencies within a 95% CI and were not listed in the dbSNP chicken database and reads supporting variants were uniquely mapping. Only reads aligned to chromosomes 1 to

28, 30, 33, the mitochondrial genome and the sex chromosomes were used for calling novel variants. SNV rates were calculated as measured events per diploid avian genome containing 2.4×10^9 bp (Gallus_gallus_5.0; GenBank) and an average doubling time of 1.39 days (4 Vantress PGC lines measured in three biological replicates).

Chromosomal analysis

The coverage information was extracted from bam files in bedgraph format using the genomecov function in Bedtools 2.26.0. The sequence data was checked to ensure that the clonal lines have representation (i.e. coverage) of all the chromosomes as that would indicate there was no loss of entire chromosome during the culture process of the PGCs. Moreover, mean depths of sequencing coverage for each chromosome were compared between the clonal lines and their respective embryos in order to check if there was any major shift in overall coverage, as that might indicate possible loss or gain in part of a chromosome.

Detection of ALVE integration sites

ALVE integrations were identified in the embryo, PGC and clonal PGC WGS data using the obsERVer identification pipeline (Mason et al, manuscript in preparation) on Illumina paired end, whole genome resequencing data. Data were from ten heritage broiler embryos (E5, E13, E19, E20, E27, E48, E62, E70, E81 and E90), their matched PGC cultured isolates, and clonal PGC populations originating from PGC cultures 19, 20, 70 and 81. Briefly, obsERVer identifies ALVE integrations by aligning reads to an artificial pseudochromosome constructed of reference ALVE sequences, and then aligns clipped reads and their mates to the Gallus_gallus5.0 reference genome sequence (GenBank: GCF_000002315.4) to identify integration junction sites. Putative sites were validated by the clipped ALVE integration sequence and by comparison to previously identified sites pipeline (Mason et al, manuscript in preparation).

Identified ALVEs were genotyped directly by mapping reads to the reference genome assembly with BWA-mem v0.7.10 (64), and manipulating the map files with samtools v0.1.19 (67). Results from all matched datasets were compared to provide a measure of genetic stability following PGC culture from original embryonic tissue. ALVE sequence from clipped integration junction reads was used to identify terminal truncations and ALVE orientation.

Acknowledgements

We thank the members of the Roslin chicken facility (M. Hutchison, F. Brain, K. Hogan and F. Thomson) for care and breeding of the chickens, Jun Chen and Brenda Flack (Cobb-Vantress) for the SNP chip analysis. We thank Maeve Ballantyne for critical reading of the manuscript. This work was supported by the Institute Strategic Grant Funding from the BBSRC (BB/P0.13732/1 and BB/P013759/1) and Innovate UK Agri-Tech funding (BB/M011895/1). SN was partially funded by the IMAGE project which received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under the grant agreement n° 677353.

Competing interests

The authors declare no financial or non-financial competing interests

Table 1. Germline transmission rates from host hens injected with donor Vantress heritage broiler PGCs.

Host genotype	Sex of injected donor heritage PGCs	No. of host birds	No. of fertile host birds	No. of eggs laid per week per host hen [†]	No. of eggs incubated	Fertility [‡] (% of eggs incubated)	No. of chicks hatched (% of eggs incubated)	No. of chicks GFP-positive	No. of chicks RFP-positive	% Transmission [§]
ZW	♀	3	3	6.6	206	175 (85%)	146 (71%)	0	0	0
	♂	2	2	6.8	175	146 (83%)	144 (82%)	0	0	0
Z ⁻ W	♀	5	4	5.3	280	242 (86%)	218 (78%)	93	2	87%
	♂	5	0		not laying					
Z-Z	♂	2	2		378	363 (96%)	321 (85%)	0	0	0

The number of hosts injected with male or female PGCs for each donor genotype is shown, with numbers of eggs incubated and offspring hatched for each genotype.

[†] Laid eggs were counted during a 60 day period when hens were between 7-10 months of age and divided by the number of fertile hens present in pen. The maximum possible lay rate is 7.0 eggs per week.

[‡]Fertility: number of embryos detected by candling eggs at day 18 of incubation.

[§]% Transmission: the number of GFP/RFP-positive chicks per number of hatched chicks equals one half the transmission rate due to meiotic reduction.

Figures




Fig. 1. Germ line transmission using layer sterile surrogate hosts.

(A and B) Vantress heritage broiler PGCs labelled with GFP or TdTomato fluorescent reporter transposons. (C and D) Ovary from a *DDX4* Z⁻W hen at eight weeks post-hatch injected with labelled PGCs. (E) GFP⁺ offspring from *DDX4* Z⁻W host hens. *DDX4* Z⁻W hosts were artificially inseminated with layer semen and hatchlings were screened for fluorescence.




Fig. 2. PC analysis of offspring from *DDX4* Z-W and ZW surrogate hosts.

DNA samples were genotyped on a 66K SNP chip and analysed for principal components. Three chicken breeds were analysed; the Vantress heritage breed (blue), an independent pedigree broiler line (red), and the Hy-Line brown layer *DDX4* surrogate host line (brown). Offspring (green and grey) from the *DDX4* Z-W hosts clustered between the Vantress breed and the Brown layer line. Offspring (black) from a *DDX4* Z-W host inseminated with Vantress semen clustered with the Vantress breed chicken.




Fig. 3. Pure offspring produced from DDX4 Z W hens using heritage broiler semen.

(A) Fresh or (B) cryopreserved semen pooled from three adult males was used to fertile a *DDX4* Z W founder female. The pureline Vantress chick in (B) is show surrounded by two control layer offspring.




Fig. 4. Diagram of the reconstitution of a poultry breed using cryopreserved cells.

Cryopreserved female rare breed PGCs introduced into a sterile surrogate host hen inseminated with frozen rare breed semen will produce 'pure' rare breed offspring.




Fig. 5. Total SNVs mapped in eight clonal cell lines compared with somatic embryonic DNA.

PGCs were cultured from individual embryos then cultured clonally after being propagated 55 days in culture. PGC DNA was compared with somatic DNA from the original embryo. Line 19, 20 male PGCs; Line 70, 81 female PGCs. -A, -B and -C suffixes indicate individual clonal populations derived from each PGC line.

References

1. Petite JN (2006) Avian germplasm preservation: embryonic stem cells or primordial germ cells? *Poult Sci* 85(2):237-242.
2. Whyte J. BE, McGrew M.J. (2015) *Increased Sustainability in Poultry Production: New Tools and Resources for Genetic Management* (CABI Publishing, CABI Publishing).
3. Robles V, Cabrita E, & Herraes MP (2009) Germplasm cryobanking in zebrafish and other aquarium model species. *Zebrafish* 6(3):281-293.
4. Yoshizaki G & Lee S (2018) Production of live fish derived from frozen germ cells via germ cell transplantation. *Stem Cell Res* 29:103-110.
5. Glover JD & McGrew MJ (2012) Primordial Germ Cell Technologies for Avian Germplasm Cryopreservation and Investigating Germ Cell Development. *Journal of Poultry Science* 49(3):155-162.
6. Karagenc L, Cinnamon Y, Ginsburg M, & Petite JN (1996) Origin of primordial germ cells in the prestreak chick embryo. *Dev Genet* 19(4):290-301.
7. Tsunekawa N, Naito M, Sakai Y, Nishida T, & Noce T (2000) Isolation of chicken vasa homolog gene and tracing the origin of primordial germ cells. *Development* 127(12):2741-2750.
8. Ginsburg M, Snow MH, & McLaren A (1990) Primordial germ cells in the mouse embryo during gastrulation. *Development* 110(2):521-528.
9. van de Lavoie MC, et al. (2006) Germline transmission of genetically modified primordial germ cells. *Nature* 441(7094):766-769.
10. Macdonald J, Glover JD, Taylor L, Sang HM, & McGrew MJ (2010) Characterisation and Germline Transmission of Cultured Avian Primordial Germ Cells. *Plos One* 5(11).
11. Ma CG, Fan LC, Ganassin R, Bols N, & Collodi P (2002) Use of cultured primordial germ cells for production of transgenic fish. *Animal Cell Technology : Basic & Applied Aspects, Vol 12*:293-297.
12. Moreno SG, Dutrillaux B, & Coffigny H (2001) High sensitivity of rat foetal germ cells to low dose-rate irradiation. *Int J Radiat Biol* 77(4):529-538.
13. Vergouwen RP, et al. (1995) Radiosensitivity of testicular cells in the fetal mouse. *Radiat Res* 141(1):66-73.
14. Heyer BS, MacAuley A, Behrendtsen O, & Werb Z (2000) Hypersensitivity to DNA damage leads to increased apoptosis during early mouse development. *Genes Dev* 14(16):2072-2084.
15. Helle F (2012) Germ cell DNA-repair systems-possible tools in cancer research? *Cancer Gene Ther* 19(4):299-302.
16. Hajkova P, et al. (2010) Genome-wide reprogramming in the mouse germ line entails the base excision repair pathway. *Science* 329(5987):78-82.
17. Milholland B, et al. (2017) Differences between germline and somatic mutation rates in humans and mice. *Nat Commun* 8:15183.
18. Cervantes RB, Stringer JR, Shao C, Tischfield JA, & Stambrook PJ (2002) Embryonic stem cells and somatic cells differ in mutation frequency and type. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 99(6):3586-3590.
19. Whyte J, et al. (2015) FGF, Insulin, and SMAD Signaling Cooperate for Avian Primordial Germ Cell Self-Renewal. *Stem cell Reports* 5(6):1171-1182.
20. Leighton PA, van de Lavoie MC, Diamond JH, Xia C, & Etches RJ (2008) Genetic modification of primordial germ cells by gene trapping, gene targeting, and phiC31 integrase. *Mol Reprod Dev* 75(7):1163-1175.
21. Macdonald J, Taylor L, Sang HM, & McGrew MJ (2012) Genetic Modification of the chicken genome using transposable elements. *Transgenic Research* 21(4):912-913.
22. Schusser B, et al. (2013) Immunoglobulin knockout chickens via efficient homologous recombination in primordial germ cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 110(50):20170-20175.
23. Oishi I, Yoshii K, Miyahara D, Kagami H, & Tagami T (2016) Targeted mutagenesis in chicken using CRISPR/Cas9 system. *Sci Rep-Uk* 6.
24. Dimitrov L, et al. (2016) Germline Gene Editing in Chickens by Efficient CRISPR-Mediated Homologous Recombination in Primordial Germ Cells. *Plos One* 11(4):e0154303.
25. Song Y, et al. (2014) Characteristics of long-term cultures of avian primordial germ cells and gonocytes. *Biol Reprod* 90(1):15.
26. Choi JW, et al. (2010) Basic Fibroblast Growth Factor Activates MEK/ERK Cell Signaling Pathway and Stimulates the Proliferation of Chicken Primordial Germ Cells. *Plos One* 5(9).
27. van de Lavoie MC, et al. (2012) Interspecific germline transmission of cultured primordial germ cells. *Plos One* 7(5):e35664.
28. Liu C, et al. (2012) Production of chicken progeny (*Gallus gallus domesticus*) from interspecies germline chimeric duck (*Anas domesticus*) by primordial germ cell transfer. *Biol Reprod* 86(4):101.
29. Wernery U, et al. (2010) Primordial germ cell-mediated chimera technology produces viable pure-line Houbara bustard offspring: potential for repopulating an endangered species. *Plos One* 5(12):e15824.

30. Nakamura Y, *et al.* (2010) Efficient system for preservation and regeneration of genetic resources in chicken: concurrent storage of primordial germ cells and live animals from early embryos of a rare indigenous fowl (Gifujidori). *Reprod Fertil Dev* 22(8):1237-1246.
31. Trefil P, *et al.* (2017) Male fertility restored by transplanting primordial germ cells into testes: a new way towards efficient transgenesis in chicken. *Sci Rep* 7(1):14246.
32. Nakamura Y, *et al.* (2012) X-irradiation Removes Endogenous Primordial Germ Cells (PGCs) and Increases Germline Transmission of Donor PGCs in Chimeric Chickens. *J Reprod Develop* 58(4):432-437.
33. Nakamura Y, *et al.* (2010) Germline replacement by transfer of primordial germ cells into partially sterilized embryos in the chicken. *Biol Reprod* 83(1):130-137.
34. Slanchev K, Stebler J, de la Cueva-Mendez G, & Raz E (2005) Development without germ cells: the role of the germ line in zebrafish sex differentiation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 102(11):4074-4079.
35. Yoshizaki G, *et al.* (2016) Production of germ cell-deficient salmonids by dead end gene knockdown, and their use as recipients for germ cell transplantation. *Mol Reprod Dev* 83(4):298-311.
36. Park KE, *et al.* (2017) Generation of germline ablated male pigs by CRISPR/Cas9 editing of the NANOS2 gene. *Sci Rep* 7:40176.
37. Loveland KL & Schlatt S (1997) Stem cell factor and c-kit in the mammalian testis: lessons originating from Mother Nature's gene knockouts. *J Endocrinol* 153(3):337-344.
38. Lin Y & Page DC (2005) Dazl deficiency leads to embryonic arrest of germ cell development in XY C57BL/6 mice. *Dev Biol* 288(2):309-316.
39. Taylor L, *et al.* (2017) Efficient TALEN-mediated gene targeting of chicken primordial germ cells. *Development* 144(5):928-934.
40. Nakamura Y, *et al.* (2007) Migration and proliferation of primordial germ cells in the early chicken embryo. *Poult Sci* 86(10):2182-2193.
41. Sorene P (2016) The chicken of tomorrow (1948): Mankind's quest for a better hen. (Flashbak).
42. Carstea AC, Pirity MK, & Dinnyes A (2009) Germline competence of mouse ES and iPS cell lines: Chimera technologies and genetic background. *World J Stem Cells* 1(1):22-29.
43. Tagami T, Matsubara Y, Hanada H, & Naito M (1997) Differentiation of female chicken primordial germ cells into spermatozoa in male gonads. *Dev Growth Differ* 39(3):267-271.
44. Naito M, *et al.* (1999) Differentiation of donor primordial germ cells into functional gametes in the gonads of mixed-sex germline chimaeric chickens produced by transfer of primordial germ cells isolated from embryonic blood. *Journal of Reproduction and Fertility* 117(2):291-298.
45. Ellegren H (2005) The avian genome uncovered. *Trends Ecol Evol* 20(4):180-186.
46. Venugopal K (1999) Avian leukosis virus subgroup J: a rapidly evolving group of oncogenic retroviruses. *Res Vet Sci* 67(2):113-119.
47. Rigal M & Mathieu O (2011) A "mille-feuille" of silencing: epigenetic control of transposable elements. *Biochimica et biophysica acta* 1809(8):452-458.
48. Hu X, *et al.* (2017) Expression patterns of endogenous avian retrovirus ALVE1 and its response to infection with exogenous avian tumour viruses. *Arch Virol* 162(1):89-101.
49. Weiss RA (2006) The discovery of endogenous retroviruses. *Retrovirology* 3.
50. Nandi S, *et al.* (2016) Cryopreservation of specialized chicken lines using cultured primordial germ cells. *Poult Sci* 95(8):1905-1911.
51. Kagami H, *et al.* (1997) The developmental origin of primordial germ cells and the transmission of the donor-derived gametes in mixed-sex germline chimeras to the offspring in the chicken. *Mol Reprod Dev* 48(4):501-510.
52. Liu C, *et al.* (2017) Uniparental chicken offsprings derived from oogenesis of chicken primordial germ cells (ZZ). *Biol Reprod* 96(3):686-693.
53. Glaab WE & Tindall KR (1997) Mutation rate at the hprt locus in human cancer cell lines with specific mismatch repair-gene defects. *Carcinogenesis* 18(1):1-8.
54. Lynch M (2010) Rate, molecular spectrum, and consequences of human mutation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 107(3):961-968.
55. Taft RA, *et al.* (2013) The perfect host: a mouse host embryo facilitating more efficient germ line transmission of genetically modified embryonic stem cells. *PLoS One* 8(7):e67826.
56. Wargelius A, *et al.* (2016) Dnd knockout ablates germ cells and demonstrates germ cell independent sex differentiation in Atlantic salmon. *Sci Rep* 6:21284.
57. Koentgen F, *et al.* (2016) Exclusive transmission of the embryonic stem cell-derived genome through the mouse germline. *Genesis* 54(6):326-333.
58. Whyte J, Blesbois E, & MCGREW MJ (2016) Increased Sustainability in Poultry Production: New Tools and Resources for Genetic Management. *Sustainable poultry production in Europe*, ed Burton G, O'Neill, Scholey (CABI Publishing, Cambridge, MA, USA), Vol 31, pp 214-232.

59. Blesbois E, *et al.* (2007) Semen cryopreservation for ex situ management of genetic diversity in chicken: creation of the French avian cryobank. *Poult Sci* 86(3):555-564.
60. McGrew MJ, *et al.* (2004) Efficient production of germline transgenic chickens using lentiviral vectors. *Embo Reports* 5(7):728-733.
61. Quinn JP, Burrows WH, & Byerly TC (1937) Turkey-chicken hybrids. *Journal of Heredity* 28(5):169-173.
62. Wingett SW & Andrews S (2018) FastQ Screen: A tool for multi-genome mapping and quality control. *F1000Res* 7:1338.
63. Bolger AM, Lohse M, & Usadel B (2014) Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics* 30(15):2114-2120.
64. Li H (2013) Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. *eprint arXiv:1303.3997*.
65. Broad_Institute (2018) Picard tools.
66. McKenna A, *et al.* (2010) The Genome Analysis Toolkit: a MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Genome Res* 20(9):1297-1303.
67. Li H, *et al.* (2009) The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* 25(16):2078-2079.

Supplementary Information for

Reviving rare chicken breeds using genetically engineered sterility in surrogate host birds

Mark E. Woodcock, Almas A. Gheyas, Andrew S. Mason, Sunil Nandi, Lorna Taylor, Adrian Sherman, Jacqueline Smith, Dave W. Burt, Rachel Hawken, Michael J. McGrew

Michael J. McGrew

Email: mike.mcgreg@roslin.ed.ac.uk

This PDF file includes:

Tables S1 to S3

Figs. S1 to S7

Other supplementary materials for this manuscript include the following:

Datasets S1

Table S1. Derivation of Vantress heritage broiler and rare British Breed PGC cultures.

Chicken breed	Medium (bFGF, Activin)	Female PGC cultures (% sampled)	Male PGC cultures (% sampled)	Total	Doubling time
Vantress heritage	0.2% Chick serum	9/30 (30%)	14/27 (52%)	23/57 (40%)	
	Ovotransferrin	19/31 (61%)*	16/31 (52%)	35/62 (56%)	33.4
Cream Legbar	Ovotransferrin	2/5	2/3	4/8 (50%)	
Marsh Daisy	Ovotransferrin	3/3	5/6	8/9 (89%)	
Scots Dumpy	Ovotransferrin	1/2	2/2	3/4 (75%)	
Scots Grey	Ovotransferrin	4/4	5/6	9/10 (90%)	

Single embryos were sampled for 1 ul of blood which was cultured for four weeks then counted. Cultures containing more than 50,000 PGCs were scored positive and cultured for an additional week before cryopreservation.

Female Vantress PGC cultures were derived more efficiently in medium containing ovotransferrin than chicken serum, * $P < 0.05$. NA, not assayed. Doubling time (hours) was measured for two male and two female Vantress PGC cultures and averaged.

Table S2. Measurement of germline transmission of Vantress heritage PGCs in embryos.

Host genotype	Sex of donor PGCs	No. of host birds (n)	No. of eggs incubated	Fertility (% of eggs incubated)	No. of fluorescent embryos [†] (%)	% Transmission ^Ω
Z ⁻ W	♀	3	127	100 (79%)	46 (46%)	92%

Eggs from three of the four transmitting *DDX4* Z⁻W founders were incubated for three to five days, examined for fertility (embryo formed), then imaged for fluorescence.

[†]All embryos were GFP⁺ and no RFP⁺ embryos were observed.

^Ω% Transmission: the number of fluorescent embryos equals one half the transmission rate due to meiotic reduction.

Table S3. obsERVer-identified ALVEs in cultured PGCs and somatic tissues.

ALVE name	Location	Gene?	Str	Truncations	5	13	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	27	48	62	<u>70</u>	<u>81</u>	90
ALVE_ros020	1:27,455,648		+	1,444bp 5' D			h							
ALVE_ros025	1:48,792,745		-									h		
ALVE_ros304	1:122,259,275		+		h	h	H	H	H	H	H	H	h	H
ALVE_ros072	1:174,716,025	FRY int3	-	Solo LTR			h	h			h			
ALVE_ros096	2:45,122,080		-	274bp 5' D	h	h	h		h	H	h	H	H	H
ALVE_ros182	4:73,140,713		+			h							h	h
ALVE_ros212	5:57,418,292		-			h	h			h	h	h		h
ALVE_ros216	6:18,612,487		-			h		h		h			h	h
ALVE_ros232	8:17,457,109		-				h		h			H		
ALVE_ros010	9:11,871,576		-					H		h			h	h
ALVE_ros265	14:271,555		-				h	H	h				h	h
ALVEB6	14:9,367,708	GRIN2A int1	+						h		h			
ALVE_ros301	Z:62,551,355	HAPLN1 int1	-		h	H	h	h	H	h	H			H

ALVE locations are for the first position of the insertion hexamer in the Gallus_gallus5.0 assembly. ALVE presence/absence in each embryonic dataset is denoted by H/h, where H is homozygous for the ALVE and h is heterozygous. Three ALVEs were located within gene introns (ALVE_ros072, ALVEB6, ALVE_ros301). The reads supporting the integration junctions suggest that ten of the identified ALVEs have no detectable truncations, although this does not rule out internal deletions or rearrangements. Three ALVEs were identified as lacking the canonical structure. Read pairs surrounding ALVE_ros072 map congruently, but with a reduced insert size, suggesting it was a solo LTR. ALVE_ros096 appeared intact except for the 5' LTR sequence, and ALVE_ros020 had a 5' truncation of 1,455 bp relative to the reference ALVE1 sequence (GenBank: AY013303.1), removing the 5'LTR, p19 and p10 matrix genes, and the first 184 bp of p27 capsid protein gene. Underlined cells were clonal PGCs lines isolated at 55 days in culture. The other PGC lines were cultured an average of 46 days.




Fig. S1. Survival and proliferation of PGC cultures after cryopreservation.

(A) Frozen PGC aliquots containing 50,000 cells were thawed and (A) immediately counted then cultured for an additional 24 hours then re-counted. (B and C) PGCs were cultured for an additional six days and the growth rate over seven days (cell doublings/24hours) and total cell number on day 7 is shown.

Data are from three cell lines (two female (8F, 12F) and one male (Vantress 20BM) assayed in four independent experiments. Error bars = sem.




Fig. S2. PCR analysis for GFP transposon in offspring from surrogate host hens.

(A) PCR analysis of genomic DNA samples of hatchlings from surrogate host birds using primers specific to the GFP transgene. Bird numbers in green were positive for GFP fluorescence. (B) PCR analysis using primers specific for the *GAPDH* gene to verify DNA quality.




Fig. S3. Follicles are not present in the *DDX4*^ZW ovary injected with male PGCs.

(A) *DDX4*^ZW ovary injected with male PGCs. (B) ZW ovary injected with male PGCs. Arrows indicate mature follicles. Scale bar = 0.5 mm




Fig. S4. PCR analysis of *DDX4* ZW surrogate host semen.

PCR analysis of independent semen samples for presence of donor PGCs using primers specific for the GFP transposon.




Fig. S5. GFP fluorescence in embryos from *DDX4* ZW surrogate host hens.

Fertile eggs from *DDX4* ZW surrogate host hens were incubated for 3-5 days and imaged for GFP fluorescence.




Fig. S6. PCR analysis for GFP transposon in purebred offspring produced from *DDX4* Z⁻W host hen.

(A and C) PCR analysis of genomic DNA samples of hatchlings from surrogate host birds using primers specific to the GFP transgene. Bird numbers in green were positive for GFP fluorescence by visual screening. (A) Chicks (0489, 0490, 0491) were offspring produced from a single *DDX4* Z⁻W host hen inseminated with fresh Vantress heritage semen. (B) PCR analysis using primers specific for the *GAPDH* gene to verify DNA quality. (C) Chick FVS6 was produced from a single *DDX4* Z⁻W host hen inseminated with frozen Vantress heritage semen.



Fig. S7. Chromosome-wide mean coverage for different sets of clonal PGC lines and corresponding embryonic tissue

Total mean depths of sequencing coverage for each chromosome were compared between the clonal lines and their respective embryos to detect any major shift in overall coverage. Overall chromosomal coverage of the embryonic samples was lower due to the use of a different sequencing platform.