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Thesis overview

This thesis is based on the following publications:


This thesis comprises five chapters.

Chapter 1 presents the introduction. It summarizes the role of checkpoint kinase Mec1-Ddc2 in the DNA damage response. In chapter 1, an extensive account of the literature on Mec1-Ddc2 recruitment and activation at DNA damage sites is provided which sets the foundation for chapter 2.

Chapter 2 presents results that contribute the major finding of my thesis. This chapter focuses on how homodimers of Ddc2 are recruited to DNA damage sites via interaction with RPA. Based on structural, biochemical and *in vivo* data, the chapter presents a to-scale model of Mec1-Ddc2 bound to ssDNA-RPA complexes at DNA damage sites and shows that cell survival after UV-damage is dependent on Ddc2 homodimerization and recruitment to RPA. These results are published in Deshpande et al., *Molecular Cell* 2017.

Chapter 3 presents experimental results which show that an N-terminal region within the coiled-coil domain of human ATRIP is important for coiled-coil homodimerization.

Chapter 4 presents results on the role of the MRX protein complex as a structural linchpin that holds sister chromatids together at DNA double-strand breaks. This function of MRX is apparently dependent on its interaction with a domain in RPA that also binds Ddc2. The results are published in Seeber et al., *Molecular Cell* 2016.

Chapter 5 summarizes the major conclusions of this thesis and discusses the future directions.
Chapter 1:

Introduction

Our genomes carry the information that is necessary to maintain proper functioning of the cells in our body. It is imperative that this genetic information is protected in the face of genomic insults and transmitted faithfully across generations. Genomic insults alter the chemical structure of DNA by causing breaks in the phosphate backbone of DNA strands, either single strand breaks (SSB) or double strand breaks (DSB); or by introducing base modifications such as alkylation, oxidation and thymine dimerization among others (Figure 1). Failure to repair such DNA lesions can cause local mutations, while highly toxic lesions such as DSBs can generate gross chromosomal rearrangements such as deletions, translocations and fusions of chromosomes, ultimately leading to cell death.

DNA damage occurs at a constant rate of ~100,000 events per cell per day, and can arise from exogenous as well as endogenous sources. One of the most common sources of DNA damage is ultraviolet (UV) light and ionizing radiation (IR) from sunlight. Indeed, exposure to sunlight is sufficient to generate 100,000 lesions per cell per day (Hoeijmakers, 2009). Other exogenous sources of DNA insults include, for example, cigarette smoke, medical treatments that employ X-rays, ionizing radiation and chemotherapeutic agents. Endogenous sources, most of which are by-products of cell metabolism, include DNA depurination which can generate abasic sites, DNA deamination which can interconvert bases, replication errors and reactive oxygen species.

To counter these toxic genomic insults, cells have evolved DNA repair mechanisms specific for the different types of DNA damage. Nucleotide excision repair (NER) is the most versatile repair pathway since it processes structurally unrelated DNA lesions such as thymine dimers, bulky adducts and intra-strand crosslinks and repairs them using a cut and patch type reaction (Marteijn et al., 2014). Less complicated lesions resulting from base modifications are repaired by base excision repair (BER) (Lindahl and Barnes, 2000). DSBs are prominently repaired by either error-free homologous recombination (HR) or error-prone nonhomologous end-joining (NHEJ) (Chapman et al., 2012), whereas SSBs are processed by the single-strand break repair pathway (Caldecott, 2008). The mismatch repair (MMR) pathway resolves mispaired bases (Jiricny, 2006), whereas interstrand crosslinks are largely repaired by the proteins involved in the Fanconi anemia pathway, making use of enzymes and reactions implicated in the other types of repair (Deans and West, 2011).
Figure 1: Alteration of DNA structure by DNA damage. (A) UV-light causes thymine-thymine (T-T) dimerization of two consecutive thymines on the same strand of DNA, resulting in the disruption of normal base-pairing. (B) Guanine is alkylated by methyl methanesulfonate (MMS) to form O6-methylguanine which base pairs with a thymine instead of a cytosine, resulting in a C -> T point mutation. (C) Cytosine can undergo methylation and deamination to form a thymine, resulting in a C -> T point mutation.

Indeed, our cells have evolved exhaustive pathways involving at least 450 proteins that repair the constant barrage of DNA insults. Owing to the high frequency of DNA damage events, specificity of repair pathways for lesions and the dangerous consequences of improper repair, eukaryotic cells have developed stringent mechanisms to regulate the assembly and activation of the right repair proteins at the right place and at the right time. These regulatory mechanisms, in addition to the cell cycle checkpoints,
Collectively constitute a network of conserved and coordinated pathways called the DNA damage response (DDR). Efficient DDR is critical for protection of the genome and hence cell survival.

At the core of the DDR are two conserved kinases called Mec1 (Mitosis entry checkpoint 1, ATR in human and Rad3 in fission yeast *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*) and Tel1 (Telomere maintenance 1, ATM in human and fission yeast). Mec1 functions as an enzyme complex with its regulatory subunit Ddc2 (ATRIP, ATR Interacting Protein, in human, and Rad26 in *S. pombe*) and the function and stability of the two proteins are inter-dependent on each other (Cortez et al., 2001; Edwards et al., 1999; Paciotti et al., 2000; Wakayama et al., 2001). Therefore, Ddc2 is considered to be an obligate partner of Mec1. Unless noted otherwise, I will refer to the budding yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* protein nomenclature (see Table 1 for an overview of DDR protein names in several model organisms). Upon DNA damage, either of the kinases can get recruited to damage sites and induce the DDR by phosphorylating hundreds of targets that set in motion a signaling cascade which coordinates DNA repair and cell cycle progression (Friedel et al., 2009). Since these apical kinases play a role in the early recognition of DNA damage and the subsequent induction of the DDR signaling cascade, they are referred to as “DNA damage sensing kinases” or “Signal transducing kinases” (Figure 2).
Figure 2: DNA damage response pathway. Upon DNA damage (represented by a black triangle), long stretches of ssDNA are generated which rapidly get coated by RPA to form an ssDNA-RPA platform. This platform recruits sensor kinase Mec1-Ddc2 through co-sensor and co-activator proteins such as 9-1-1 and Dpb11. Activated Mec1 phosphorylates several targets including Rad9, Mrc1 and Sgs1 which act as adaptors for the key signaling kinase Rad53. Activated Rad53 further phosphorylates several effector kinases to control cell cycle progression, origin firing, DNA repair and replication fork stability.

Mec1 and Tel1 belong to the phosphoinositide 3-kinase related protein kinases (PIKK) family which shares similar domain organization and a conserved kinase domain (details on PIKKs are presented in section 4). There are, however, key differences between Mec1 and Tel1. In budding yeast, Mec1 responds to a gamut of genomic insults such as replication stress, UV-induced lesions, base adducts and DSBs (Figure 3) (Cimprich and Cortez, 2008), whereas Tel1 responds primarily to DSBs.

Figure 3: DNA structures that induce Mec1 activation. (A) Lesion (black triangle) in the lagging strand of the replication fork blocks the polymerase but not the helicase generating ssDNA regions with a dsDNA primer carrying a 5’ free end. (B) Lesion in the leading strand of the replication fork also generates ssDNA. Repriming events generate the requisite dsDNA primer with a 5’ free end to induce Mec1 activation. (C) UV-damage generates short ssDNA regions (30 nt) which are further resected to generate longer ssDNA regions (up to 2 kb) adjacent to dsDNA with a 5’ end. (D) DSBs undergo resection to generate ssDNA stretches which are adjacent to a 5’ end.
Mec1/ATR is essential for viability in several organisms from yeast to man and its loss causes lethality in early mice embryos (Brown and Baltimore, 2000). In contrast, Tel1/ATM is dispensable for cell viability (Shiloh and Ziv, 2013). However, mutations in ATM result in an elevated predisposition towards cancer and are found in 0.5 to 1.0% of the population (Renwick et al., 2006; Taylor et al., 1975). In fact, ATM is found to be mutated in a variety of cancers such as colorectal (Cancer Genome Atlas, 2012a), lung (Cancer Genome Atlas Research, 2012) and breast (Cancer Genome Atlas, 2012b), and is considered to be a tumor suppressor. On the other hand, cancer cells rarely carry mutations in ATR owing to the essential functions of ATR in maintaining genome integrity. Nevertheless, in some cancers, ATR may be a useful target for cancer therapy. Cancer cells replicate abnormally and are under a constant level of low replicative stress, accentuating the need for ATR for cell survival (Gorgoulis et al., 2005). Furthermore, some cancers have a dysfunctional DNA damage-induced G1 checkpoint owing to mutations in Rb, p53 or c-myc. This makes cancer cells over-dependent on the S-phase checkpoint which is regulated by the ATR kinase. Thus, by combining S-phase specific ATR inhibitors with DNA damaging agents to generate synthetic lethality, it is possible to selectively or preferentially kill cancer cells. Indeed, inhibition of the ATR kinase activity sensitizes cells to DNA damaging agents (Caporali et al., 2004; Cliby et al., 1998; Nghiem et al., 2002). These initial studies inspired the development of selective and potent ATR inhibitors such as VE-822, the first ATR inhibitor to enter clinical trials (Fokas et al., 2012).

**Table 1:** Conserved checkpoint proteins and their functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>S. cerevisiae</strong></th>
<th><strong>S. pombe</strong></th>
<th><strong>H. sapiens</strong></th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mec1-Ddc2</td>
<td>Rad3-Rad26</td>
<td>ATR-ATRIP</td>
<td>Sensor signaling kinase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel1</td>
<td>Tel1</td>
<td>ATM</td>
<td>Sensor signaling kinase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rfa1</td>
<td>Rad11/Rpa1</td>
<td>RPA70</td>
<td>ssDNA binding and protein-protein interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rad24-RFC</td>
<td>Rad17-RFC</td>
<td>RAD17-RFC</td>
<td>9-1-1 clamp loader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ddc1-Rad17-Mec3</td>
<td>Rad9-Rad1-Hus1</td>
<td>RAD9-RAD1-HUS1</td>
<td>Co-sensor and Mec1 activator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dpb11</td>
<td>Cut5/Rad4</td>
<td>TopBP1</td>
<td>Mec1 activator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dna2</td>
<td>Dna2</td>
<td>DNA2</td>
<td>Mec1 activator in S-phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrc1</td>
<td>Mrc1</td>
<td>Claspin</td>
<td>Checkpoint mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rad9</td>
<td>Crb2</td>
<td>53BP1, BRCA1</td>
<td>Checkpoint mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgs1</td>
<td>Rqh1</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Rad53 activation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rad53</td>
<td>Cds1</td>
<td>CHK2</td>
<td>Effector kinase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chk1</td>
<td>Chk1</td>
<td>CHK1</td>
<td>Effector kinase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mre11-Rad50-Xrs2</td>
<td>Mre11/Rad32-Rad50-Nbs1</td>
<td>MRE11-RAD50-NBS1</td>
<td>DSB resection, Tel1 recruitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exo1</td>
<td>Exo1</td>
<td>EXO1</td>
<td>NER gap resection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Mec1/ATR damage recognition

Being an apical DNA damage sensing kinase, Mec1 needs to rapidly localize to DNA damage sites and activate the DDR signaling cascade. The ability of Mec1 to respond to a wide spectrum of DNA damaging lesions and replication stress is largely dependent on the ability of Mec1 to recognize a common structural signal, replication protein A (RPA) bound to single-stranded DNA (ssDNA). This section reviews the current understanding of Mec1 recruitment to sites of DNA damage.

1.1. The ssDNA-RPA platform

Generation of long stretches of ssDNA is one of the earliest events and is a hallmark of DNA damage and replication stress. The functional uncoupling of replicative helicases and polymerases upon replication stress can expose up to 200 nucleotides (nt) of ssDNA (Sogo et al., 2002). End resection of DSBs for repair by HR and nuclease processing of NER intermediates of UV-induced lesions also generate long ssDNA gaps (Giannattasio et al., 2010; Paques and Haber, 1999), while the collision of a UV lesion with the replication fork can generate remarkably long ssDNA regions, extending up to 3 kb in length, as seen by electron microscopy (EM) (Lopes et al., 2006). R-loops or RNA:DNA hybrids that form as an aberrant intermediate of transcription, are a source of ssDNA and genomic instability (Skourti-Stathaki and Proudfoot, 2014). ssDNA is intrinsically more labile than dsDNA and tends to form secondary structures that might impede cellular processes. To prevent this, in the cell, most of the ssDNA generated during replication and repair is rapidly coated with the major ssDNA binding protein RPA (Alani et al., 1992).

RPA is a heterotrimeric complex consisting of the Rfa1, Rfa2 and Rfa3 subunits (RPA70, RPA32 and RPA14 in human). It was first described for its essential role in DNA replication (Wold and Kelly, 1988). Later, additional functions for RPA were uncovered in a wide array of processes, including DNA replication, recombination, repair, and DNA damage checkpoint activation (Zou et al., 2006). RPA primarily functions by protecting ssDNA from nucleases and secondary structure formation, but also by acting as a protein-protein interaction platform. RPA contains six oligosaccharide/oligonucleotide binding (OB) folds, each of which contains five β-strands forming a β-barrel structure that is present in other ssDNA binding proteins (Gomes et al., 1996). Four of the six OB-folds namely: N-OB, OB-A, OB-B and OB-C lie in the largest subunit Rfa1; one, OB-D, is present in the Rfa2 subunit, while OB-E lies in the smallest subunit, Rfa3 (Figure 4A). RPA binds ssDNA in three different modes depending on the length of ssDNA that it contacts (Figure 4B). Either it binds to 8 nt in a low-affinity mode that is initiated by OB-A and OB-B folds (Bochkarev et al., 1997), or it covers 12-23 nt in a medium-affinity mode that additionally involves the OB-C fold (Brill and Bastin-Shanower, 1998), or finally it contacts 30 nt in a high-affinity binding mode that involves the OB-D fold (Bastin-Shanower and Brill, 2001). RPA binds ssDNA strongly with a dissociation constant in the high picomolar range (Kim et al., 1994; Kim and Wold, 1995). Although a high resolution structure of the full length RPA has not yet been revealed, crystal structures of all RPA domains have been determined (Bochkareva et al., 2005; Fan and Pavletich, 2012; Feldkamp et al., 2014). These structural data along with nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) and small-angle X-ray
scattering (SAXS) experiments suggest that RPA is a modular protein complex with the N-OB domain being structurally and dynamically independent from the rest of the RPA molecule (Brosey et al., 2015).

Figure 4: The OB domains of RPA bind ssDNA. (A) Domain organization of RPA. RPA comprises three subunits, Rfa1, Rfa2 and Rfa3, which are represented in different shades of green. OB: Oligosaccharide/oligonucleotide binding; and WH: Winged helix domains are indicated by boxes. (B) ssDNA binding modes of RPA. RPA binds ssDNA in the low affinity mode (8 nt), medium affinity mode (12-23 nt), and the high affinity mode (30 nt) involving different subunits of RPA.

Interestingly, the N-OB domain in the Rfa1 subunit interacts with multiple proteins in the DDR pathway including Ddc1, Ddc2, Dna2, Mre11-Rad50-Xrs2 (MRX), and Sgs1, as well as p53 in mammals (Bochkareva et al., 2005; Hegnauer et al., 2012; Lin et al., 1996; Seeber et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2008; Zhou et al., 2015). Early genetic analysis of yeast RPA identified rfa1-t11, a charge reversal K45E point mutation in the basic cleft of the N-OB fold (Umezu et al., 1998). rfa1-t11 is about 1000-fold more sensitive than wild-type to DNA damage by UV-light and DNA alkylating agent MMS (Chen et al., 1998). The mutant is defective in recombination, but proficient in DNA replication (Soustelle et al., 2002). We recently showed that the K45E mutation disrupts a basic patch formed by the R44, K45 and R62 residues in the N-OB cleft (Seeber et al., 2016). In the same study, using genetic and biochemical analyses, we
showed that the MRX protein complex binds Rfa1, but not Rfa1-t11. In chapter 2, we elaborate on the interactions of Rfa1 and Rfa1-t11 with Ddc2 (ATRIP, ATR Interacting Protein, in human, and Rad26 in S. pombe), the regulatory partner of Mec1, and with Dna2, a nuclease-helicase involved in the maturation of Okazaki fragments. In conclusion, the ssDNA-RPA complex not only protects ssDNA in the cell, but also acts as a platform to recruit several proteins in the DDR pathway.

1.2. Mec1-Ddc2 recruitment to the ssDNA-RPA platform

The major mode of DNA damage recognition by Mec1-Ddc2 (ATR-ATRIP in human) occurs via the interaction of Ddc2 with the ssDNA-RPA platform (Zou and Elledge, 2003). Depletion of RPA in human cells and Xenopus egg extracts is defective in localizing ATR to sites of DNA damage and activating the ATR-mediated checkpoint pathway (Costanzo et al., 2003). The major interface of the Ddc2-RPA interaction involves the N-terminal 50 amino acid (aa) residues in Ddc2 (100 aa in ATRIP) and the N-OB domain of RPA subunit Rfa1 (Ball et al., 2007; Ball et al., 2005). NMR and mutagenesis experiments have proposed that a conserved acidic patch in the Ddc2 N-terminus is responsible for RPA binding and the disruption of this acidic patch reduced Ddc2 localization to DNA breaks and sensitized cells to DNA damage (Ball et al., 2007). The structural dissection of this interaction is presented in chapter 2. Notably, weaker RPA interacting domains in human ATRIP outside this N-terminal region may provide functional redundancy (Namiki and Zou, 2006).

If ssDNA-RPA is the major signal that recruits Mec1-Ddc2 and induces the DNA damage checkpoint activation, then normal replication processes which generate short ssDNA-RPA patches might activate Mec1 even in the absence of DNA damage. However, cells seem to tolerate the short ssDNA-RPA patches generated in S-phase and only when a certain threshold of ssDNA was reached, did Mec1 induce the checkpoint (Byun et al., 2005; Shimada et al., 2002) (Figure 5). Interestingly, the length of ssDNA generated correlates with Mec1/ATR mediated phosphorylation of major downstream effector kinase Chk1/CHK1 (Byun et al., 2005). The fact that Mec1 responds to different amounts of signal in different cell cycles supports the theory of a threshold signal for Mec1 activation (Shimada et al., 2002). The amount of the ssDNA-RPA signal required to breach this threshold, however, remains unclear. The ssDNA-RPA signal in the context of normal replication is kept at a minimum level by coupling DNA unwinding and DNA synthesis rates by the helicase and the polymerase, respectively. Functional uncoupling of the helicases and polymerases and subsequent generation of ssDNA-RPA can be achieved by treatment with MMS, DNA polymerase inhibitor aphidicolin, or hydroxyurea (HU), which inhibits ribonucleotide reductase and depletes deoxyribonucleotide (dNTP) pools. These drugs indeed activate the Mec1/ATR kinase dependent checkpoint (Walter and Newport, 2000). Interestingly, inhibition of DNA unwinding activity in the presence of DNA damage prevents Mec1/ATR-mediated checkpoint activation (Byun et al., 2005). This suggests that DNA damage per se is not sufficient to activate Mec1/ATR, but Mec1/ATR activation rather depends on the amount of ssDNA-RPA. Mec1/ATR can also be recruited by damage-specific repair proteins. For example, O6-methyl G/T mispairing that is
recognized by mismatch repair proteins Msh2-Msh6 (MutSα) can specifically recruit ATR-ATRIP, and this is sufficient for CHK1 phosphorylation (Yoshioka et al., 2006). Msh2-Msh3 (MutSβ) that bind to hairpins in the ssDNA-RPA complex, can also form a complex with human ATR-ATRIP and promote ATR checkpoint function in response to replication associated DSBs (Burdova et al., 2015).

Figure 5: Model of ssDNA-RPA generation after helicase-polymerase uncoupling. (A) Under non-damaging conditions, the rate of DNA unwinding by the MCM (minichromosome maintenance) helicase is functionally coupled to the rate of DNA synthesis by the leading and the lagging strand polymerases. Therefore, the amount of ssDNA-RPA in an intact replication fork is minimal and below the threshold for Mec1-mediated checkpoint activation. (B) Under damaging conditions, polymerase movement is stalled; however, the helicase continues to unwind DNA generating long ssDNA-RPA regions. ssDNA-RPA recruits Mec1-Ddc2 and induces checkpoint activation.
2. Mec1/ATR activation

Mere recruitment of Mec1-Ddc2 is not sufficient for its activation. Mec1/ATR activation is regulated by several co-factors that act redundantly to ensure checkpoint induction. Misactivation of Mec1/ATR in the absence of DNA damage creates cell cycle blocks and induces cellular senescence (Toledo et al., 2008). Therefore, it is important to activate Mec1 at the right place and at the right time. This is reflected in the redundancy of Mec1 activation pathways and the independent sensing of DNA damage by Mec1-Ddc2 and its co-activators. The following section describes the mechanisms of Mec1 activation.

2.1. Mec1/ATR maturation: Folding and assembling the kinase

Before Mec1-Ddc2 is localized to and activated at sites of DNA damage or replication stress, it needs to be folded and assembled. This maturation of Mec1-Ddc2 occurs even in the absence of genomic insults. Mec1, like other PIKK proteins, is large (2,368 aa) and contains extensive N-terminal α-helical HEAT (Huntingtin, Elongation factor 3, A subunit of protein phosphatase 2A and TOR1) repeats. The proper folding and assembly of the Mec1-Ddc2 complex are mainly regulated by the Hsp90 chaperone that binds the nascent client protein Mec1-Ddc2 via the R2TP (Rvb1 and Rvb2, Tah1, and Pih1) and TTT (Tel2, Tti1 and Tti2) co-chaperone complexes (Hurov et al., 2010; Pal et al., 2014; Takai et al., 2007). The Hsp90-R2TP-TTT chaperone complex also regulates proper folding and assembly of other PIKKs owing to their large size and extensive HEAT repeats. In addition, post-translational modifications by the SUMO (Small Ubiquitin-like Modifier) ligase PIAS3 and the kinase Nek1 appear to prime Mec1/ATR for efficient DNA damage response (Figure 6) (Liu et al., 2013; Wu and Zou, 2016).

![Figure 6: Model of Mec1-Ddc2 maturation and recruitment. Mec1-Ddc2 is folded and assembled, even before DNA damage, by the Hsp90-R2TP-TTT co-chaperone complex and priming kinase Nek1. After maturation, Mec1-Ddc2 complexes are recruited to sites of DNA damage through a direct interaction of Ddc2 and RPA. Recruited Mec1-Ddc2 is activated by the 9-1-1 checkpoint clamp and other factors (see Figure 7 for Mec1-Ddc2 activation).](image-url)
2.2. Co-activators of Mec1/ATR

ssDNA-RPA generated at DNA damage sites or after replication stress is not sufficient for checkpoint induction by Mec1, but requires a double-stranded primer with a free 5’ end (Figure 3) (MacDougall et al., 2007). The length of ssDNA adjacent to dsDNA positively correlates with Mec1 phosphorylation of Chk1. Such primed ssDNA structures containing long ssDNA tracts are formed as intermediates in various DNA repair processes and at stalled replication forks. However, during normal replication, such structures rarely feature long ssDNA tracts and therefore the threshold for Mec1/ATR activation might not be reached. The ds-ssDNA junction in the primed ssDNA structures recruits the Rad24-RFC clamp loader complex that binds the so-called 9-1-1 checkpoint clamp, which is a heterotrimeric ring-shaped protein complex containing Ddc1-Rad17-Mec3 in budding yeast (RAD9-HUS1-RAD1 in human and S. pombe) (Majka and Burgers, 2004). Crystal structures of the 9-1-1 clamp and the DNA polymerase associated trimeric sliding clamp PCNA (proliferating cell nuclear antigen) show structural similarity (Dore et al., 2009). However, distinct clamp loading complexes ensure specificity of 9-1-1 for 5’ junctions promoted by ssDNA-RPA, whereas PCNA gets recruited to 3’ junctions during normal DNA replication (Majka et al., 2006a). An important requirement of proper checkpoint signaling is the independent recruitment of the Mec1-Ddc2 and the 9-1-1 complexes to damage sites (Kondo et al., 2001; Melo et al., 2001). Under physiological salt concentrations, the 9-1-1 clamp, the clamp loader and the ssDNA-RPA platform are necessary for Mec1 phosphorylation of downstream target Rad53 (human Chk2, S. pombe Cds1) in vitro (Majka et al., 2006b). However, the Ddc1 subunit of the 9-1-1 clamp can directly activate Mec1 under low salt conditions i.e. 20 to 40 mM NaCl, in the absence of other factors. The Mec1 activation domain of Ddc1 lies in Ddc1’s poorly conserved unstructured C-terminal tail, and mutagenesis showed the requirement of two conserved aromatic residues in Ddc1, W352 and W544, for Mec1 activation in vitro (Navadgi-Patil and Burgers, 2009). In other organisms, however, direct activation of Mec1 by 9-1-1 is not conserved.

A conserved activator of Mec1/ATR is the essential replication protein Dpb11 (TopBP1 in human, Cut5/Rad4 in S. pombe). Through its multiple BRCA-1 C-terminal (BRCT) domains, yeast Dpb11 recognizes phosphorylated 9-1-1 subunit Ddc1 (residue T602), whereas human TopBP1 recognizes autophosphorylated ATR (residue T1989) (Delacroix et al., 2007; Furuya et al., 2004; Liu et al., 2011b). Once localized to damage sites, Dpb11 then activates Mec1-Ddc2 through an unstructured C-terminal tail (Navadgi-Patil and Burgers, 2008) and this activation is dependent on the interaction of the Dpb11 C-terminal tail with Ddc2 (Mordes et al., 2008). This tail is not conserved in human and instead ATR activation by TopBP1 is attributed to a region between the sixth and the seventh BRCT domains of TopBP1 (Kumagai et al., 2006). Like yeast, human ATR activation is promoted by TopBP1 interaction with ATRIP. Overexpression of this ATR-activating domain alone is sufficient to activate ATR. Additionally, tethering the ATR-activating domain to the PCNA clamp or the nucleosome, can bypass the requirement of the 9-1-1 clamp to activate ATR. Like Ddc1, the Dpb11 C-terminus and the TopBP1 ATR-activating domain harbor an unstructured tail that contains two conserved aromatic residues crucial for
Mec1/ATR activation. Although both Ddc1 and Dpb11 can activate Mec1 in vitro, their cellular function is most likely cell-cycle dependent. Whereas Ddc1 seems to activate Mec1 in G1-phase, Ddc1 and Dpb11 act redundantly to activate Mec1 in G2-phase (Navadgi-Patil and Burgers, 2009). Similarly, S. pombe Cut5 (ortholog of budding yeast Dpb11) is the predominant activator of Rad3 (Mec1 ortholog) in G1 (Lin et al., 2012). Contrasting reports show that Ddc1 and Dpb11 act redundantly in G1, whereas Ddc1 predominantly activates Mec1 in G2/M after UV damage (Puddu et al., 2011).

However, in S-phase cells, Mec1 can be activated even when the Mec1 activating domains of Ddc1 or Dpb11 are mutated. Biochemical screening of 39 proteins involved in DNA replication identified Dna2, a nuclease-helicase, as an S-phase specific Mec1 activator (Kumar and Burgers, 2013). Like Ddc1 and Dpb11, Dna2 harbors a Mec1-activating domain containing two aromatic residues (W128 and Y130) in an unstructured region. Mutations in ddc1, dpb11, and dna2, the three activators of Mec1, completely abolished the Mec1-mediated checkpoint in S-phase cells lacking the Tel1 kinase, Tel1 being a compensatory kinase of Mec1 (Sanchez et al., 1996). However, it is unknown whether human DNA2, like Ddc1 in yeast, activates ATR.

Recently, three separate studies identified a previously uncharacterized protein, ETAA1 (Ewing’s tumor-associated antigen 1) as an activator of ATR in humans (Bass et al., 2016; Haahr et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2016). ETAA1 activation of ATR is independent of TopBP1 and simultaneous depletion of ETAA1 and TopBP1 results in synergistic lethality, abolishes ATR checkpoint signaling and results in genomic instability. While TopBP1 is recruited by the 9-1-1 and the MRE11-RAD50-NBS1 (MRN) complexes, ETAA1 is an RPA-binding protein (Feng et al., 2016). 9-1-1 preferentially binds 5’ ds-ssDNA junctions in vivo, whereas RPA binds ssDNA. This might allow for different numbers and coverage of TopBP1 and ETAA1 proteins at DNA damage sites. Like other Mec1/ATR co-activators, ETAA1 contains an unstructured ATR-activating domain. Although, it is clear that an unstructured region containing two aromatic residues forms a motif that activates Mec1/ATR, the molecular details of how such a motif stimulates Mec1/ATR kinase activity are unclear.

Taken together, budding yeast contains at least three co-activators of Mec1: Ddc1, Dpb11 and Dna2 (Figure 7), whereas human cells contain at least two co-activators of ATR: TopBP1 and ETAA1. This redundancy of co-activators underscores the importance of a localized and timely activation of the Mec1/ATR checkpoint pathway. Indeed, artificial colocalization of Ddc1 and Mec1-Ddc2 induces Mec1 activation and checkpoint signaling even in the absence of DNA damage (Bonilla et al., 2008). Similarly, colocalization of Mrc1, a replisome component, and Mec1-Ddc2 is sufficient for Mec1 to phosphorylate Rad53 independent of co-activators Dpb11 and Ddc1 (Berens and Toczyski, 2012). Since misactivation of Mec1/ATR in the absence of DNA damage or replication stress can cause cellular senescence (Toledo et al., 2008), it is crucial that recruitment and activation of Mec1 are coupled and tightly regulated.
Figure 7: Cell-cycle dependent Mec1 activation. In budding yeast, the 9-1-1 checkpoint clamp activates Mec1 via two conserved aromatic residues (not shown) in the flexible C-terminal tail of the Ddc1 subunit. In G2 and S-phases, phosphorylated 9-1-1 recruits Dpb11, which activates Mec1 directly. In S-phase, Dna2 which is recruited to long 5’ flaps generated during lagging strand synthesis, can activate Mec1.

2.3. Amplifying Mec1/ATR signaling
Once Mec1/ATR is properly recruited and activated, post-translational modifications further stimulate Mec1/ATR kinase activity and amplify the DNA damage signaling pathway. After DNA damage, PRP19, a ubiquitin ligase, binds ssDNA-RPA and deposits K63 poly-ubiquitin chains on the RPA32 subunit of RPA (Marechal et al., 2014; Wan and Huang, 2014). These K63 linked chains are recognized by ATRIP promoting further recruitment of ATR-ATRIP complexes. Mutants of PRP19 defective in binding RPA or ubiquitin ligase activity, fail to efficiently phosphorylate ATR targets including RPA32 and Chk1. The PRP19-mediated signal amplification pathway is conserved in budding yeast. Similarly, RFWD3, another ubiquitin ligase gets recruited to RPA and ubiquitylates RPA in a DNA damage dependent manner to promote RPA and Chk1 phosphorylation (Elia et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2011a). In addition to ubiquitylation, SUMOylation strengthens Mec1/ATR signaling. Specifically, ATRIP modification by SUMO2/3 at K234 and K289 boosts the interaction of ATRIP with multiple proteins including ATR, RPA70, TopBP1 and the MRN complex (Wu et al., 2014). ATRIP carrying K234R and K289R mutations resulted in reduced ATR-ATRIP recruitment to damage sites and reduced Chk1 phosphorylation. Recently, it was shown that Sirtuin2 (SIRT2) interacts with and deacetylates K32 of ATRIP in response to replication stress (Zhang et al., 2016). Residue K32 lies in close proximity to the RPA-binding domain of ATRIP and K32 deacetylation promotes ATRIP binding to ssDNA-RPA, ATR autophosphorylation, and ultimately ATR checkpoint signaling.
2.4. Adaptor proteins for Mec1/ATR signaling

Adaptor or mediator proteins are a class of checkpoint proteins that act as regulatory nodes to activate specific signaling pathways. Rad9, the first checkpoint protein to be identified in budding yeast, is the prototypical adaptor. Rad9 (Crb2 in *S. pombe*) has no clear ortholog in higher organisms but is functionally homologous to BRCA1, 53BP1 and MDC1. Through its protein-protein interaction domains, Rad9 acts as an adaptor for Mec1-dependent Rad53 activation in the DNA damage checkpoint during G1 and G2/M phases, but not in the replication checkpoint in S-phase (Weinert et al., 1994). Rad9 localization to damage sites depends on the recognition of histone H3 lysine 79 methylation (H3K79me) by the Rad9 Tudor domain (Grenon et al., 2007), and histone H2A serine 129 phosphorylation (γ-H2A in yeast, γ-H2AX in human) by the Rad9 tandem BRCT domain (Hammet et al., 2007) (Figure 8). Methyltransferase Dot1 deposits the H3K79me mark, while Mec1 and Tel1 phosphorylate H2A serine 129 rapidly in response to DNA damage (Downs et al., 2000; Shroff et al., 2004; van Leeuwen et al., 2002). Furthermore, Rad9 itself is hyperphosphorylated by Mec1 and Tel1 in response to DNA damage (Vialard et al., 1998). Phosphorylated Rad9 is then recognized by the Rad53 forkhead-associated (FHA) domains, which increases the local concentration of Rad53 to damage sites (Sun et al., 1998). Mutations of Rad9 residues that are phosphorylated by Mec1 and Tel1, or mutations in Rad53 FHA domains, disrupt Rad9-Rad53 interaction and impair checkpoint activation (Lee et al., 2003; Schwartz et al., 2002). Thus, Rad9 acts as a mediator scaffold to localize Rad53 near the Mec1 kinase. In support of this model, one can bypass the requirement of Rad9 by creating a fusion of Rad53 to Mec1-Ddc2 (Lee et al., 2004). How Rad9 releases Rad53 to transduce the signal of damage once Rad53 is activated is unclear. The possibility of a negative feedback loop is suggested by the fact that Rad9 disassembles after it becomes phosphorylated by Rad53 (Usui et al., 2009). In conclusion, Rad9 is an adaptor for Rad53 activation in the DNA damage checkpoint in G1 and G2/M phases.
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**Figure 8:** Rad9-dependent Rad53 activation. Upon DNA damage in G1 and G2-phases, nucleosome modifications H3K79me and γ-H2A, recruit the Rad9 adaptor protein. Rad9 gets phosphorylated in a Mec1/Tel1-dependent manner. Phosphorylated Rad9 localizes Rad53 close to Mec1-Ddc2 to promote Rad53 activation.
In S-phase, yeast Mrc1 (Claspin in human) mediates Rad53 activation (Alcasabas et al., 2001; Tanaka and Russell, 2001). Indeed, a rad9Δ mrc1Δ double mutant fails to activate Rad53 and induces synthetic lethality. Similarly, in human cells, Claspin interacts with Chk1 and promotes Chk1 phosphorylation (Chini and Chen, 2003; Kumagai and Dunphy, 2000). In addition to its role in checkpoint signaling, Mrc1/Claspin plays a role in DNA replication. Mrc1, along with Tof1-Csm3, localizes to replication forks under normal S-phase conditions, and travels with the fork to promote efficient replication (Osborn and Elledge, 2003). Upon encountering replication blocks, Mrc1 and Tof1-Csm3 form a stable replisome pausing complex (Katou et al., 2003). In addition, Mrc1 and Tof1-Csm3 interact with leading strand polymerase epsilon and the MCM replicative helicase and thus couple DNA synthesis and unwinding activities (Bando et al., 2009; Lou et al., 2008). Upon replication stress, Mrc1/Claspin gets phosphorylated by Mec1/ATR (Alcasabas et al., 2001). Alanine substitution mutations of the phosphorylated residues of Mrc1 render Mrc1 proficient in replication but defective in checkpoint function. Furthermore, yeast Mrc1 phosphorylation was shown to be important for Mec1 recruitment to stalled forks (Naylor et al., 2009). However, human Claspin was shown to act downstream of TopBP1 and depletion of Claspin selectively abrogated ATR's ability to phosphorylate Chk1, but not other ATR targets (Liu et al., 2006).

RecQ family helicase Sgs1 (human BLM, S. pombe Rqh1) is also involved in activating Rad53 in response to replication stress (Frei and Gasser, 2000) and this activity is independent of Sgs1 helicase function (Bjergbaek et al., 2005). Upon replication stress, Sgs1 is phosphorylated by Mec1-Ddc2 and this phosphorylation is recognized by the Rad53 FHA domain (Hegnauer et al., 2012). In addition, Sgs1 constitutively associates with replication forks (Cejka et al., 2010). Therefore, Sgs1 acts as a mediator to recruit Rad53 close to Mec1 at stalled forks. Whereas Sgs1 and Mrc1 are epistatic for Rad53 activation at stalled forks, Sgs1 and 9-1-1 act in parallel pathways and hence show synergy (Bjergbaek et al., 2005). In human cells, the Sgs1 ortholog BLM was also reported to be a target of ATR phosphorylation, and plays a role in recovery from replication stress (Davies et al., 2004).

In addition to Rad9, Mrc1 and Sgs1, which act as cell cycle specific adaptors of the Mec1-Rad53 signaling pathway, the Mec1/ATR pathway can also be regulated by damage-specific repair proteins. For example, Fanconi anemia pathway proteins, FANCM and FAAP24, which are recruited to inter-strand crosslinks, are implicated in Mec1/ATR activation independently of the Fanconi anemia core complex (Collis et al., 2008). NER proteins and the Exo1 exonuclease process UV-lesions to expose ssDNA which recruits RPA and activates Mec1/ATR (Giannattasio et al., 2010). Thus Mec1/ATR activation is regulated by a wide variety of context-specific regulators.

3. Mec1/ATR targets

Once Mec1/ATR is assembled and activated at sites of DNA damage or replication stress, it phosphorylates several targets and initiates a signaling cascade to control the cell-cycle, regulate origin firing and protect the replication fork while coordinating DNA repair and recovery (Friedel et al., 2009). Over the last decade, proteomics approaches have revealed numerous Mec1/ATR targets (Bastos de
Oliveira et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2010; Hustedt et al., 2015; Smolka et al., 2007). In this section, I will discuss some of the key targets that are essential in maintaining genome stability.

3.1. Rad53/CHK1: The major Mec1/ATR target
In budding yeast, there are two effector kinases downstream of Mec1, Rad53 (CHK2 in S. pombe and humans) and Chk1 (CHK1 in humans and S. pombe) (Sanchez et al., 1999). Rad53 is the major effector kinase in budding yeast, while in S. pombe and higher eukaryotes, CHK1 (Chk1 in budding yeast) assumes this role. Rad53/CHK1 is rapidly phosphorylated on multiple sites in a Mec1/ATR dependent manner upon DNA damage or replication stress and is a hallmark of an active Mec1/ATR checkpoint pathway (Pellicioli and Foiani, 2005). As described in section 2.4., Rad53 recruitment to Mec1 is dependent on adaptor proteins, Rad9 and Mrc1. In humans, adaptor protein Claspin brings CHK1 and ATR together. Following phosphorylation and activation, Rad53/CHK1 is released from chromatin and transmits the checkpoint signal throughout the cell (Smits et al., 2006). This is especially important because Mec1/ATR is considered to be a local kinase that acts at sites of DNA damage. An important target of Rad53 is the Dun1 kinase (Zhou and Elledge, 1993). A diphosphothreonine motif in the Rad53 kinase is recognized by the Dun1 FHA domain, allowing Rad53-dependent phosphorylation and activation of Dun1 (Bashkirov et al., 2003; Pike et al., 2003).

3.2. Cell cycle control
Rad53 and Chk1 phosphorylate several targets to arrest the cell cycle including Cdc5, a polo-like kinase involved in mitosis regulation, Pds1 (securin), which inhibits metaphase to anaphase transition, and the Bfa1-Bub2 GTPase activating protein complex, which inhibits mitotic exit (Hu et al., 2001; Sanchez et al., 1999; Smits et al., 2000). In S. pombe and higher organisms, CHK1 kinase phosphorylates and thereby inhibits all three CDC25 (Mih1 in S. pombe) phosphatase isoforms that function to activate cyclin-dependent kinases (CDKs) (Furnari et al., 1997; Sanchez et al., 1997; Uto et al., 2004).

A key mechanism of Mec1/ATR regulation of the cell cycle occurs through control of origin firing. Indeed, cells lacking Mec1 or Rad53 fire late origins prematurely and show loss of viability (Santocanale and Diffley, 1998; Shirahige et al., 1998). Rad53 phosphorylates and inactivates three DNA replication factors, Sld3, Dbf4 (the regulatory partner of the Cdc7 kinase), and helicase subunit Mcm4 (Lopez-Mosqueda et al., 2010; Sheu et al., 2014; Zegerman and Diffley, 2010). In agreement, mutations in all the three targets, Sld2-Sld3, Dbf4 and Mcm4, activated late origins prematurely, similar to cells lacking Mec1 or Rad53 (Sheu et al., 2016). In human cells, ATR/CHK1 phosphorylates Dbf4 and Treslin (related to budding yeast Sld3) (Heffernan et al., 2007). CDKs phosphorylate Sld2 and Sld3 to create a binding site for the BRCT domains of Dpb11 (Tanaka et al., 2007; Zegerman and Diffley, 2007). This Sld3-Dpb11-Sld2 complex is important for the loading and activation of the Cdc45-Mcm2-7-GINS (CMG) replicative helicase. In response to replication stress, Rad53/CHK1-dependent phosphorylation of Sld3/Treslin prevents the interaction of Sld3/Treslin and Dpb11/TopBP1, which prevents late origin firing (Boos et al., 2011; Guo et
Thus, Mec1-Rad53 checkpoint signaling regulates cell cycle transitions to prevent duplication of an unrepaired genome.

In budding yeast, Mec1-Rad53 signaling activates the Dun1 kinase, which in turn phosphorylates and inhibits Sml1 and Dif1, inhibitors of ribonucleotide reductase (RNR) (Lee et al., 2008; Zhao and Rothstein, 2002). Thus, the Mec1-Rad53-Dun1 cascade causes an 8-fold increase in the dNTP pool, which facilitates cell survival in the face of DNA damage or replication stress (Chabes et al., 2003). Even under normal replication conditions, this pathway is important for dNTP regulation and cell survival. In fact, the lethality associated with mec1 deletion in yeast is not due to its checkpoint function, but due to its role in dNTP level regulation (Desany et al., 1998; Zhao et al., 1998). Therefore, up-regulating dNTP pools by sml1 deletion, is routinely used to suppress lethality associated with mec1 or rad53 deletions. Alternatively, increasing the RNR activity by deleting RNR inhibitors, such as dif1, crt1 and hug1, or overexpressing RNR1 or RNR3 can also bypass mec1 or rad53 deletions (Basrai et al., 1999; Huang et al., 1998; Wu and Huang, 2008; Zhao et al., 1998). In higher organisms, however, Mec1/ATR does not play an essential role in dNTP regulation, although ATR promotes accumulation of RNR subunit RRM2 in human cells (D'Angiolella et al., 2012).

3.3. Replication fork protection

In addition to dNTP regulation, a crucial function of Mec1 is the maintenance of replication fork stability in response to replication stress. Early studies suggested that Mec1 regulation of cell cycle, transcription, and late origin firing only make modest contributions to cell viability. On the other hand, Mec1 checkpoint signaling is essential for avoiding irreversible breakdown of stalled replication forks termed as ‘fork collapse’ (Tercero et al., 2003). Collapsed forks contain large ssDNA regions and hemi-replicated intermediates which may give rise to reversed forks, as seen by electron microscopy of HU-treated cells lacking Rad53 (Sogo et al., 2002).

One mechanism of Mec1/ATR protection of stalled forks is through SMARCAL1. SMARCAL1 binds RPA and regresses stalled forks to promote fork restoration (Ciccia et al., 2009). Both too much and too little of SMARCAL1 activity causes replication-associated DNA damage (Bansbach et al., 2009). ATR phosphorylates a conserved serine residue in SMARCAL1 which regulates its DNA processing activity to prevent fork collapse (Couch et al., 2013). Selective ATR inhibition deregulates SMARCAL1 activity and induces fork collapse by causing aberrant fork structures that give rise to DSBs.

Mec1/ATR is important to maintain the replisome components at sites of origin following replication stress (Cobb et al., 2003; Tercero et al., 2003). Quantitative chromatin immunoprecipitation analysis of HU-arrested forks showed that leading and lagging strand polymerases and Cdc45 dissociate in cells lacking Mec1. Similar assays in cells lacking Rad53, however, only showed displacement of the MCM helicase but not the polymerases and Cdc45, highlighting the distinct roles played by Mec1 and Rad53 at stalled forks. Similarly, in higher eukaryotes, chromatin association of PCNA, CDC45 and the POLD2 and POLE
polymerases was reduced in ATR-deficient cells after treatment with replicative polymerase inhibitor aphidicolin (Ragland et al., 2013). However, genome-wide analysis of replication forks suggest that replisome stability at stalled forks might be independent of the Mec1/ATR checkpoint (De Piccoli et al., 2012). Deep sequencing analyses suggest that the replisome stays on chromatin but randomly slides away from the early initiating sites in HU-treated cells lacking Mec1 or Rad53. Recent studies using isolation of proteins on nascent DNA also suggest that replication stress in ATR-deficient cells does not cause replisome destabilization, but rather altered chromatin association of other fork-associated proteins (Dungrawala et al., 2015).

The Mec1 checkpoint pathway also regulates the activity of nucleases and helicases at perturbed forks. In budding yeast, Rad53 hyperphosphorylates DNA helicases Pif1 and Rrm3 to inhibit their activity at HU-challenged forks, and thus prevents fork reversal, chromosome fragmentation, and genome instability (Rossi et al., 2015). Similarly, human Chk1 prevents aberrant origin firing, apoptosis and incorrect fork processing by the Mus81/Eme1 endonuclease and the Rqh1 DNA helicase (Doe et al., 2002; Forment et al., 2011). Similarly, S. pombe Cds1 (Rad53 in budding yeast) prevents unscheduled Mus81/Eme1-mediated fork processing (Froget et al., 2008). In addition, Cds1 phosphorylates Dna2 on S220 after HU treatment and increases the chromatin association and nuclease activity of Dna2 to prevent fork reversal at stalled forks (Hu et al., 2012). The exonuclease Exo1 is also phosphorylated and inhibited by the checkpoint kinases (Morin et al., 2008). Interestingly, the major function of Rad53 at stalled forks is to prevent Exo1-dependent replication fork collapse, since cells lacking Exo1 almost completely rescued the sensitivity of cells lacking Rad53 after treatment with MMS (Segurado and Diffley, 2008). As described in section 2.4., the Sgs1 helicase gets phosphorylated by Mec1 and acts as an adaptor protein for Mec1-dependent activation of Rad53. In addition, Mec1 phosphorylation of Sgs1 also regulates Sgs1 helicase activity to prevent fork collapse (Cobb et al., 2005). Importantly, prevention of fork collapse is dependent on the helicase activity of Sgs1 and not just the role of Sgs1 in recruiting Rad53 to perturbed forks. Thus, checkpoint kinases target numerous nucleases and helicases to prevent abnormal fork processing that may hinder replication fork restart after repair of DNA damage.

3.4. Coordination of DNA repair
DNA repair is coupled to the DNA damage checkpoint and therefore an important class of Mec1/ATR targets includes proteins involved in DNA repair. Mec1/ATR induces phosphorylation of proteins involved in the regulation of homologous recombination such as RAD51, BRCA1, WRN (Werner syndrome ATP-dependent helicase) and BLM in humans (Davies et al., 2004; Pichierri et al., 2003; Sorensen et al., 2005; Tibbetts et al., 2000). Although the direct implication of these phosphorylation events is not fully understood, the function is most likely prevention of aberrant strand-exchange events (Meister et al., 2005). In human cells, ATR has been shown to phosphorylate NER protein XPA to regulate its intracellular localization (Wu et al., 2007). Additionally, yeast checkpoint protein Ddc1, part of the 9-1-1 clamp, physically interacts with Rad14 (XPA ortholog) (Giannattasio et al., 2004). Similarly, 9-1-1 also
interacts with BER factors including MYH, Polβ, NEIL1, TDG, Fen1 and DNA Ligase I, and stimulates their enzymatic activities (Balakrishnan et al., 2009; Chang and Lu, 2005; Gembka et al., 2007; Guan et al., 2007a; Guan et al., 2007b; Toueille et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004). In S. pombe, Rad3 (Mec1 in budding yeast) dependent phosphorylation of Rad9 (Ddc1 in budding yeast) on T225 promotes Rad9 interaction with the post-replication repair protein Mms2 for efficient error-free repair and suppression of error-prone repair synthesis by translesion polymerases and strand invasion by Rhp51 (Kai et al., 2007). ATR signaling also targets the Fanconi-anemia protein FANCD2 to promote its localization to DNA damage for efficient inter-strand crosslink repair (Andreassen et al., 2004). Thus, Mec1/ATR signaling regulates DNA repair pathways in response to a variety of lesions.

4. Architecture of PIKKs
Phosphoinositide 3-kinase (PI3K)-related protein kinases (PIKKs) are a family of Ser/Thr protein kinases, whose kinase domains share homology with the PI3K lipid kinases, but lack lipid kinase activity (Baretic and Williams, 2014). Mammals express six PIKKs: ATR, ATM, mTOR (mammalian target of rapamycin), DNA-PK (DNA-dependent protein kinase), SMG1 and TRRAP. In budding yeast, the orthologs of four PIKK members, ATR (Mec1), ATM (Tel1), mTOR (Tor1p and Tor2p) and TRRAP (Tra1p) have been found, but that of SMG1 and DNA-PK are not known. These so-called "giant" kinases range in size between 2,547 and 4,128 aa in humans and share a common domain organization (Figure 9). The highly conserved kinase domain at the C-terminus is flanked by regions of sequence similarity called the FAT (FRAP, ATM, TRRAP) and the FATC (FAT C-terminus) domains. A large part of the N-terminus of the PIKKs consists of extensive α-solenoid helical HEAT repeats, as mentioned in section 2.1.
Figure 9: Domain organization of human PIKK proteins. The N-terminus is folded into α-helical HEAT repeats (shown in teal). HEAT repeats extend into a region of sequence similarity called FAT domain (shown in pink). KD represents the highly conserved kinase domain (shown in green). FATC is a highly conserved regulatory region at the C-terminus (shown in light orange).

Despite structural conservation, PIKKs serve diverse functions, reflecting their distinct subcellular distribution, substrate recognition and activation mechanisms, which depend on distinct regulatory subunits and co-activators (Table 2).

Table 2: Regulatory subunits and co-activators of major mammalian PIKKs. Yeast orthologs are mentioned in brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIKK</th>
<th>Regulatory subunit</th>
<th>Co-activator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATR (Mec1)</td>
<td>ATRIP (Ddc2)</td>
<td>TopBP1/ETAA1 (Ddc1, Dpb11, Dna2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATM (Tel1)</td>
<td>NBS1 (Xrs2)</td>
<td>MRE11/RAD50 (Mre11/Rad50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mTOR (Tor1p/Tor2p)</td>
<td>RAPTOR/RICTOR/mLST8 (Kog1/Tco89/Avo3/Lst8)</td>
<td>RHEB/TSC1/2/AMPK (Rhbp/Snf1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA-PKcs (?)</td>
<td>Ku 70/80</td>
<td>Ku/DNA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since their discovery in the mid-1990s, structural studies of PIKKs remained largely unsuccessful owing to their large size and complex architecture. The crystal structure of DNA-PKcs (DNA-PK catalytic subunit) at 6.6 Å resolution provided the first structural insights into PIKK architecture (Sibanda et al., 2010). The structure revealed that the α-helical HEAT repeats bend to form a hollow circular ring-like structure and allow the kinase domain to sit on top of it. A more detailed view of the PIKK architecture was provided with a high-resolution crystal structure of the mTOR C-terminus (encompassing the FAT/Kinase/FATC domains) in complex with accessory protein mLST8 (Yang et al., 2013). Surprisingly, the mTOR FAT domain was tightly associated with the kinase domain, while the highly conserved FATC domain interacted with the kinase activation loop. Moreover, structural analysis of the activation state of the kinase domain and mechanism of phosphotransfer, suggested that the crystallized kinase complex was intrinsically active even in the absence of additional regulatory subunits and shared the same catalytic mechanism as canonical protein kinases.

The last couple of years have seen a flurry of medium-resolution PIKK structures, largely owing to major advancements in the field of cryo-electron microscopy (cryo-EM). These cryo-EM structures include human mTORC1 (mTOR with subunits Raptor and mLST8) bound to a FK506 binding protein.
(FKBP)-rapamycin complex at 5.9 Å resolution (Aylett et al., 2016), a 6 Å resolution structure of the full-length Tor–Lst8 complex from the thermotolerant yeast *Kluyveromyces marxianus* describing the complex topology of the HEAT repeats using domain insertions (Baretic et al., 2016) (Figure 10A), human mTORC1 at 4.4 Å resolution (Yang et al., 2016), *S. pombe* ATM/Tel1 at 8.7 Å resolution (Wang et al., 2016), closed and open conformations of human ATM dimers (Baretic et al., 2017), human DNA-PKcs at 4.4 Å resolution (Figure 10B) and the DNA-PK holoenzyme at 5.8 Å resolution (Sharif et al., 2017). In addition to the 6.6 Å resolution crystal structure of DNA-PKcs (Sibanda et al., 2010), the Blundell lab has recently published a 4.3 Å resolution crystal structure of DNA-PKcs in complex with residues 539 to 732 of Ku80 which suggests an allosteric mechanism modulating DNA DSB repair (Sibanda et al., 2017). Remarkably, Mec1/ATR structures have not been reported except for a 22 Å resolution negative-stain EM map of *S. cerevisiae* Mec1-Ddc2 (Sawicka et al., 2016).

**Figure 10:** Structures of (A) Dimeric mTOR (PDB ID: 5FVM, Lst8 not shown) and (B) Monomeric DNA-PKcs (PDB ID: 5LUQ). Top and front views are shown. The N-terminal α-helical HEAT repeats are colored in teal. FAT domain is colored in pink. KD is colored in green. N and C termini are labeled.
A common theme that emerges from these structural studies is the oligomeric nature of PIKKs. DNA-PKcs, which is monomeric on gel filtration columns, was dimeric in the crystallographic asymmetric unit as well as in EM analysis. Thus, it is tempting to suggest that a DNA-PKcs dimer would align two broken DNA ends for ligation. Tel1/ATM, on the other hand, is catalytically inactive in its dimeric form. In response to DSBs, ATM is autophosphorylated on residue S1981, causing dissociation of inert dimers into catalytically active monomers (Bakkenist and Kastan, 2003). However, this dimer-monomer transition does not seem to be conserved in the case of ATR, since both ATR and ATRIP exist as oligomers before and after the induction of DNA damage (Ball and Cortez, 2005). These studies, however, were performed by tagging the proteins differentially, followed by immunoprecipitating with one tag and immunoblotting for the other tag. Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility that ATR-ATRIP may co-exist as monomers and oligomers. In fact, overexpressed and purified budding yeast Mec1-Ddc2 was monomeric (19%) as well as dimeric (81%) in negative-stain EM experiments (Sawicka et al., 2016). Furthermore, support for both monomeric and dimeric Mec1-Ddc2 species, can be found in the literature (Bomgarden et al., 2004; Itakura et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2005; Unsal-Kacmaz and Sancar, 2004). Despite several efforts, the homodimerization of Mec1-Ddc2 is poorly understood. For example, complete information about the homodimerization interfaces between Mec1-Ddc2 molecules is missing. Moreover, the binding interface between Mec1 and Ddc2 remains unclear. An important unanswered question is whether Mec1-Ddc2 undergoes conformational changes that reflect its activity. Another open question is: How do the two conserved aromatic residues present in the multiple Mec1 co-activators stimulate Mec1 catalytic activity? Clearly, high resolution structures of Mec1-Ddc2 are needed to fill these knowledge gaps and provide detailed mechanistic insights into Mec1 kinase regulation.

Despite structural conservation, PIKKs perform diverse functions due to dissimilar localization, activation and substrate recognition, mostly as a result of their respective regulatory subunits. Indeed, Mec1 forms an enzyme complex with its regulatory subunit Ddc2, since the functions and stability of the proteins are inter-dependent (Cortez et al., 2001; Paciotti et al., 2000). Cells lacking Ddc2 phenotypically mimic cells lacking Mec1 in yeast and higher organisms (Edwards et al., 1999; Rouse and Jackson, 2000; Wakayama et al., 2001). Therefore, mechanistic insights into how Ddc2 regulates Mec1 recruitment and activation are crucial. In the recently published 22 Å resolution negative-stain EM-map (Sawicka et al., 2016), the proposed electron density for Ddc2 was calculated by subtracting the Mec1-Ddc2 density from the Tel1 density after fitting in the mTOR density from PDB ID: 5FLC. Although, Mec1, Tel1 and mTOR carry HEAT repeats at their N-termini, the low sequence similarity and variability in length of the HEAT repeats in these three kinases suggest that the architecture of the N-terminal HEAT repeats might be different. This is especially relevant considering Mec1, Tel1 and mTOR use their HEAT repeats to interact with their different substrates. Therefore, a comparison of the HEAT repeat densities might lead to problematic outcomes. Thus, it is possible that the proposed Ddc2 electron density in the negative-stain EM map may have been incorrectly assigned.
To gain structural insights into Mec1-Ddc2 assembly and activation at DNA damage sites, I carried out structural, biochemical and in vivo experiments on the homodimerization and recruitment domains of Ddc2.
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Summary
Mec1-Ddc2 (ATR-ATRIP) is a key DNA damage-sensing kinase that is recruited through the single-stranded (ss) DNA binding replication protein A (RPA) to initiate the DNA damage checkpoint response. Activation of ATR-ATRIP in the absence of DNA damage is lethal. Therefore, it is important that damage-specific recruitment precedes kinase activation, which is achieved at least in part by Mec1-Ddc2 homodimerization. Here we report a structural, biochemical and functional characterization of the yeast Mec1-Ddc2-RPA assembly. High resolution co-crystal structures of Ddc2-Rfa1 and Ddc2-Rfa1-t11 (K45E mutant) N-termini, and of the Ddc2 coiled-coil domain (CCD) provide insight into Mec1-Ddc2 homodimerization and damage-site targeting. Based on our structural and functional findings, we present a Mec1-Ddc2-RPA-ssDNA composite structural model. By way of validation, we show that RPA-dependent recruitment of Mec1-Ddc2 is crucial for maintaining its homodimeric state at ssDNA, and that Ddc2’s recruitment domain and CCD are important for Mec1-dependent survival of UV-light induced DNA damage.
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SUMMARY

Mec1-Ddc2 (ATR-ATRIP) is a key DNA-damage-sensing kinase that is recruited through the single-stranded (ss) DNA-binding replication protein A (RPA) to initiate the DNA damage checkpoint response. Activation of ATR-ATRIP in the absence of DNA damage is lethal. Therefore, it is important that damage-specific recruitment precedes kinase activation, which is achieved at least in part by Mec1-Ddc2 homodimerization. Here, we report a structural, biochemical, and functional characterization of the yeast Mec1-Ddc2-RPA assembly. High-resolution co-crystal structures of Ddc2-Rfa1 and Ddc2-Rfa1-t11 (K45E mutant) N termini and of the Ddc2 coiled-coil domain (CCD) provide insight into Mec1-Ddc2 homodimerization and damage-site targeting. Based on our structural and functional findings, we present a Mec1-Ddc2-RPA-ssDNA composite structural model. By way of validation, we show that RPA-dependent recruitment of Mec1-Ddc2 is crucial for maintaining its homodimeric state at ssDNA and that Ddc2’s recruitment domain and CCD are important for Mec1-dependent survival of UV-light-induced DNA damage.

INTRODUCTION

Genome integrity is crucial for the survival of eukaryotic organisms. It is maintained by an evolutionarily conserved and meticulously coordinated network of pathways, collectively known as the DNA damage response (DDR). Ataxia telangiectasia mutated and Rad3 related (ATR, or Mec1 in budding yeast) and ataxia telangiectasia mutated (ATM, or Tel1 in budding yeast) are apical kinases of two key DDR signaling cascades. In contrast to ATM/Tel1, which is dispensable for viability (Shiloh and Ziv, 2013), ATR/Mec1 is essential in a number of organisms. Notably, its loss is early embryonic lethal in mice (Brown and Baltimore, 2000; Liu et al., 2000). In budding yeast, the lethality ensuing from loss of Mec1 can be suppressed by upregulating ribonucleotide reductase through a smi1 deletion (Zhao et al., 1998). Although viable, mec1Δ smi1Δ cells nonetheless remain extremely sensitive to DNA-damaging agents.

Mec1 forms a complex with its regulatory subunit Ddc2 (ATRIP in human), and the function and stability of the two proteins are completely dependent on each other (Cortez et al., 2001; Paciotti et al., 2000). In other words, loss of the catalytic subunit, Mec1, and of the regulatory subunit Ddc2 yield identical phenotypes in face of a wide variety of genomic insults, including replication stress, base adducts, UV-induced nucleotide damage, and double-strand breaks (DSBs) (Cortez et al., 2001; Edwards et al., 1999; Paciotti et al., 2000; Rouse and Jackson, 2002; Wakayama et al., 2001). Upon activation, Mec1-Ddc2 phosphorylates over 100 substrates (Bastos de Oliveira et al., 2015; Hustedt et al., 2015), initiating a signaling cascade that controls DNA repair and fork restart as well as cell-cycle progression, replisome stability, and deoxynucleotide triphosphate (dNTP) levels (Friedel et al., 2009).

DNA damage or replication stress exposes long stretches of single-stranded (ss) DNA, which are rapidly bound by replication protein A (RPA) to form an ssDNA-RPA complex (Alani et al., 1992). The ssDNA-RPA platform recruits Mec1-Ddc2 (Dubrana et al., 2007; Rouse and Jackson, 2002; Zou and Elledge, 2003); however, this recruitment is not sufficient to induce Mec1 activation. In Xenopus egg extracts, ATR/Mec1-dependent checkpoint activation required the presence of double-stranded (ds) DNA adjacent to the ssDNA stretch, a structure recognized by the so-called 9-1-1 clamp (MacDougall et al., 2007). Similarly, the long unstructured C-terminal tail of 9-1-1 subunit Ddc1 can activate Mec1 kinase in vitro (Majka et al., 2006a), as well as in vivo, when artificially targeted together with Ddc2 to an integrated array of binding sites (Bonilla et al., 2006). Mec1-dependent phosphorylation of Ddc1 in turn recruits Dpb11 (TopBP1 in human), which further activates Mec1/ATR (Furuya et al., 2004; Kumagai et al., 2006; Puddu et al., 2008).

The hierarchy of factors contributing to Mec1 activation is influenced by the cell cycle. In G1 phase, Ddc1 is the predominant activator and in S/G2, Ddc1 and Dpb1 act redundantly (Navadgi-Patil and Burgers, 2009), whereas the Dna2 and Sgs1 helicases also contribute to activate Mec1 in S phase cells (Frei and Gasser, 2000; Kumar and Burgers, 2013). This redundancy underscores the significance of a localized and timely activation of Mec1-Ddc2, which is a highly relevant feature of...
the kinase, given that Mec1 activation in the absence of damage causes cellular senescence (Toledo et al., 2008).

In the DDR pathway, Ddc2 plays a crucial, non-redundant role in checkpoint activation, and cells lacking Ddc2, like those lacking Mec1, are non-viable. Deletion analysis within the DDC2 gene identified an RPA-binding domain (RBD) at its N terminus (Ball and Cortez, 2005; Kim et al., 2005), which is followed by a predicted CCD (Ball and Cortez, 2005; Itakura et al., 2005) and a Mec1 interaction domain in the C terminus that is essential for cell viability (Wakayama et al., 2001; Figure 1A). The RBD interacts with the N-terminal oligonucleotide/oligosaccharide (N-OB) domain of RPA’s largest subunit (Rfa1 in yeast; RPA70 in human), which serves as a platform for interaction with multiple DDR proteins, including Ddc1, Dna2, Mre11-Rad50-Xrs2 (MRX), and Sgs1 in yeast, as well as p53 in mammals (Hegnauer et al., 2012; Lin et al., 1996; Seeber et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2008; Zhou et al., 2015). Due to the lack of structural information for Ddc2, it remained unclear how Ddc2 recognizes or binds the Rfa1 N-OB domain, although a theoretical model has been proposed (Ball et al., 2007). Interestingly, a yeast mutant in which the Rfa1 N-OB domain carries a charge reversal mutation (K45E; or rfa-t11) renders cells defective in recombination and DNA repair but proficient in replication (Chen et al., 1998; Seeber et al., 2016; Soustelle et al., 2002; Umezu et al., 1998).

Like the RBD of Ddc2, its CCD is well studied on a functional, but not structural, level. The CCD of the human homolog ATRIP was needed for ATRIP oligomerization, stable ATR-ATRIP complex formation, ATRIP’s recruitment to DNA lesions, and the activation of checkpoint signaling (Ball and Cortez, 2005; Itakura et al., 2005). Interestingly, replacing the ATRIP CCD with a heterologous dimerization domain restored stable ATRIP oligomerization, complex formation, and recruitment, but not checkpoint activation (Ball and Cortez, 2005), arguing that oligomerization per se is not sufficient for ATR-ATRIP activation. Surprisingly, however, deletion of the Ddc2 CCD in S. cerevisiae did not yield an obvious phenotype (Bandhu et al., 2014). In conclusion, it remained unclear how the structure of Ddc2’s RBD and CCD might contribute to the assembly of Mec1-Ddc2 complexes at sites of damage.

Figure 1. Architecture of the Ddc2N-Rfa1N Complex

(A) Schematic diagram of Ddc2 and Rfa1 constructs used for crystallization. CCD, coiled-coil domain; Kl, Kluveromyces lactis; OB, oligonucleotide/oligosaccharide binding; RBD (denoted by *), Rfa1-binding domain; Sc, Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Black bars above protein segments indicate protein-protein interactions.

(B) Crystal structure of the Ddc2N-Rfa1N complex in cartoon representation; ScRfa1N is colored in green and KlDdc2N in blue. Two loops lacking electron density due to flexibility are indicated by dashed lines. RBD, CCD, and N-terminal OB (N-OB) fold cleft are highlighted.

(C) Superposition of the crystal structure of ScDdc2CCD (cyan) onto the CCD of KlDdc2N (blue) in cartoon representation. Residues involved in dimerization are shown as colored sticks. Salt bridges are indicated by arrows. Length of the CCD is indicated. RMSD, root-mean-square deviation.

See also Figure S1.
Here, we present crystal structures of Ddc2CCD, Ddc2RBD+CCD-Rfa1N-OB, and Ddc2RBD+CCD-Rfa1N-OBt11 complexes and analyze the functional role of Ddc2 N-terminal domains in vitro and in vivo. Importantly, our Ddc2-Rfa1 crystal structure provides the missing link to existing structural data, allowing us to propose a mode of assembly for Mec1-Ddc2 on the ssDNA-RPA platform at sites of DNA damage. On the functional side, we reveal a complete dependency on the Ddc2 N terminus for cell survival following inefficient repair of UV-induced damage and generation of ssDNA gaps. Our model provides an explanation of how recruitment to ssDNA can itself contribute to dimerization and activation of the Mec1-Ddc2 complex. It also suggests a role for the Ddc2 CCD as a structural spacer, allowing Mec1 to selectively phosphorylate targets locally.

RESULTS

Architecture of the Ddc2N-Rfa1N Complex

To gain structural insights into recruitment and oligomerization of Mec1-Ddc2 by RPA, we co-crystallized Ddc2N, residues 1–109 from the budding yeast Kluyveromyces lactis, and Rfa1N, residues 1–132 from Saccharomyces cerevisiae (Figure 1A), and determined its crystal structure at 1.9 Å resolution (Figure 1B). High sequence conservation (33% identity; Figure S1) allowed us to substitute K/Dcc2N for ScDdc2N to obtain well-diffracting crystals. Ddc2N includes the RBD (residues 10–30) and the CCD (residues 35–109) connected by a short linker. Rfa1N contains a five-stranded beta barrel N-OB fold flanked by two flexible loops, forming a basic-hydrophobic cleft. The structure of the Ddc2N-Rfa1N complex was experimentally determined by single-wavelength anomalous diffraction (SAD) using selenomethionine-labeled Rfa1N (Table 1). The complex crystalized in space group P2₁2₁2₁ with four protein chains per asymmetric unit. The entire Ddc2 CCD dimerizes to form a parallel coiled-coil, which allows two Ddc2 RBDs to interact with two Rfa1N molecules, creating the A₂B₂ stoichiometry. Because Ddc2 molecules coat ssDNA in a “beads on a string” fashion (Alani et al., 1992), it is reasonable to propose that the two Rfa1N molecules in our crystal structure resemble two adjacent RPA molecules on a physiological stretch of ssDNA. Thus, the A₂B₂ architecture of the Ddc2N-Rfa1N complex could represent the biological assembly of homodimers of the Mec1-Ddc2 heterodimer on ssDNA-RPA.

Ddc2N Homodimerizes through the CCD

The Ddc2 CCD is formed by two 103-Å-long parallel z helices and creates a 2-fold symmetry axis running along the center of the CCD (Figure 1B). The CCD homodimer is stabilized by classical hydrophobic knobs-into-holes leucine side-chain interactions at both ends, where additional polar side chains interact. The CCD opens up in the middle section, where polar side chains Asp65, Gln68, or His79 occupy the center, allowing access of solvent. To validate the CCD arrangement present in the K. lactis protein, we also determined the crystal structure of ScDdc2CCD (S. cerevisiae Ddc2 CCD; residues 73–136) at 2.1 Å resolution (Table 1) and found that the crystallographic ScDdc2CCD homodimer and the K. lactis CCD superimpose well (root-mean-square deviation [RMSD] = 1.15 Å), with all structural features of dimerization being conserved (Figure 1C). This is consistent with the sequence conservation (39% identity) of the two Ddc2 CCDS (Figure S1). In conclusion, the CCD is an extended helix (103 Å) that homodimerizes in a parallel orientation, thus being well-positioned to serve an architectural role in the enzyme complex.

Ddc2N binds Rfa1N by Polar and Hydrophobic Interactions

The conserved acidic-hydrophobic motif in the K/Ddc2 RBD interacts with the basic-hydrophobic cleft of ScRfa1N (Figure S2A). The Ddc2 RBD, formed by residues 10–30 (Figure 2A), consists of a short z helix (residues 12–15) followed by a rigid proline-rich turn (residues 16–28), which together contribute to a buried surface area of ~850 Å² in the Ddc2N-Rfa1N complex (Figures 2B and S2B). Detailed protein-protein interface analysis by proteins, interfaces, structures, and assemblies (PISA) (Krissinel and Henrick, 2007) identified key residues on both proteins, highlighting the dual polar-hydrophobic character of the interaction. The Rfa1N-interacting residues of K/Ddc2 RBD are mostly conserved in ScDdc2 RBD (blue circles, Figure 2A).

The Ddc2N-Rfa1N interface can be classified into four spatially distinct regions (panels 1–4, Figure 2C). To confirm these and extend the analysis to ScDdc2N, we determined the dissociation constant (Kd) using microscale thermophoresis (MST) of Cy5-labeled ScDdc2 RBD (residues 7–27) and ScRfa1N that was either wild-type (WT) or carried alanine substitutions that were predicted to weaken the interaction (labeled Rfa1N KREK for K58A, R62A, E86A, and K95A). The ScDdc2 RBD peptide bound ScRfa1N WT with nanomolar affinity (Kd = 0.43 ± 0.08 μM), whereas ScRfa1N KREK failed to interact with ScDdc2 RBD (Figure 2D). In conclusion, Ddc2N binds Rfa1N by polar and hydrophobic interactions with a moderately high affinity, and the residues involved for this interaction are conserved.

Ddc2 interacts with Rfa1-t11 Mutant Protein

The rfa1-t11 strain carries a K45E mutation close to the Ddc2-RPA interface, which renders cells defective in recombination and repair after damage by UV light, hydroxyurea (HU), Zeocin, and methyl methanesulfonate (MMS) but still able to carry out unperturbed DNA replication (Chen et al., 1998; Soustelle et al., 2002; Umezu et al., 2002). We found that the ScDdc2 RBD peptide bound ScRfa1N WT with nanomolar affinity (Kd = 0.43 ± 0.08 μM), whereas ScRfa1N KREK failed to interact with ScDdc2 RBD (Figure 2D). In conclusion, Ddc2N binds Rfa1N by polar and hydrophobic interactions with a moderately high affinity, and the residues involved for this interaction are conserved.
recruiting Ddc2 to ssDNA reported earlier (Zou and Elledge, 2003), although Rfa1-t11 still binds Ddc2 with significant affinity.

Recently, an N-terminal peptide (residues 1–20) of human Dna2, a nuclease-helicase, was co-crystallized with the human RPA N-OB domain (Zhou et al., 2015; PDB: 5EAY). R41 of human Rfa1, equivalent to K45 of yeast Rfa1 (mutated in rfa1-t11), was involved in a salt bridge with E6 of Dna2. Based on sequence alignments, we hypothesized that residues 355–372 of yeast Dna2 might interact with Rfa1 N in an rfa1-t11-sensitive manner. To test this hypothesis, we performed MST using Cy5-labeled ScDna2 RBD (residues 355–372) and purified ScRfa1N WT or ScRfa1N-t11. The ScDna2 RBD peptide bound ScRfa1N WT with an affinity of $K_d = 118 \pm 8 \mu M$ (Figure 3A) but failed to bind ScRfa1N-t11 (Figure S4A). Similarly, we have previously shown that a peptide of the MRX complex (Rad50 residues 145–162) binds Rfa1N with an affinity of $K_d = 63 \pm 7 \mu M$ in an rfa1-t11-sensitive manner (Seeber et al., 2016). In conclusion, the basic cleft compromised by the rfa1-t11 allele affects some, but not all, Rfa1N ligands. Whereas the Rfa1-Dna2 and Rfa1-MRX interactions are strongly compromised by the mutation, the Ddc2 RBD shows only minor sensitivity to the K45E substitution, arguing that Ddc2 binds Rfa1N in a distinct manner.

We next determined the crystal structure of Ddc2N in complex with Rfa1N-t11 at 2.4 Å resolution (Table 1). Similar to WT Ddc2N-Rfa1N, the Ddc2N-Rfa1N-t11 complex crystallized in the P2_12_1_2 space group, with comparable unit cell constants and contained the same A2B2 oligomer (Figure S3). There were no significant conformational changes in the overall arrangement
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of domains or mode of binding. In the WT Ddc2N-Rfa1N structure, K45 is found in a short 310 helix toward the end of a loop that connects the first and second β strand of the N-OB-barrel, lining one side of the Ddc2 RBD binding cleft. The K45 side chain was not involved in Ddc2N binding and in fact pointed away from the Ddc2 RBD, as did the E45 side chain in the mutant crystal structure (Figure 3B), explaining why Rfa1N-t11 is capable of binding Ddc2N. To confirm this, we tested Ddc2N-Rfa1N-t11 binding in aqueous pull-down experiments. Purified histidine-tagged Rfa1N and Rfa1N-t11 proteins were immobilized on Ni2+ magnetic beads and incubated with purified untagged ScDdc2N. Eluates were analyzed on SDS-PAGE and by mass spectrometry. ScDdc2N was recovered with both Rfa1N WT and Rfa1N-t11 proteins (lanes 5 and 7, Figure 3C), but not in the presence of beads alone (lane 8, Figure 3C). This was confirmed by subjecting eluates to mass spectrometry.

After characterizing the Ddc2N-Rfa1N-t11 interaction in vitro, we tested the interaction in vivo using budding yeast strains, in which the endogenous DDC2 locus was replaced by a C-terminal DDC2-GFP fusion or in either a WT RFA1 or rfa1-t11 background. We performed immunoprecipitation with anti-GFP antibody and probed for Rfa1 using a polyclonal anti-Rfa1 antibody. Bolstering our structural and biochemical findings, Rfa1-t11 precipitated with Ddc2-GFP as efficiently as WT Rfa1

Figure 2. Ddc2N Binds Rfa1N by Polar and Hydrophobic Interactions
(A) Multiple sequence alignment of Ddc2 RBD (residues 10–30); Ag, A. gossypii. Secondary structure elements of the KI Ddc2 RBD present in the crystal structure are indicated at the top (α, a helix; TT, turn). Blue dots represent residues that interact with ScRfa1N. Identical and highly conserved residues are colored and bordered in blue, respectively.
(B) Structural overview of KI Ddc2 RBD (blue) binding to ScRfa1N (green) in cartoon representation. ScRfa1N is also shown as transparent surface. Sub-interfaces of the Ddc2N-Rfa1N complex are numbered 1–4.
(C) Close-up view of the Ddc2N-Rfa1N sub-interfaces (panels 1–4). Residues involved in binding are displayed as colored sticks. Inter-molecular polar interactions are highlighted as orange dashed lines, whereas intra-molecular polar interactions are in green.
(D) Microscale thermophoresis (MST) analysis of binding of Cy5-labeled ScDdc2 RBD to ScRfa1N WT (wild-type) and ScRfa1N KREK (K58A, R62A, E86A, and K95A; black data points). Kd represents dissociation constant. ∆Fnorm (%,) represents change in fluorescence during thermophoresis normalized to initial fluorescence. Data are represented as mean ± SEM from three independent measurements. See also Figure S2.
We minimized any impact that contaminating nucleic acids might have on the Ddc2-Rfa1-t11 interaction by performing the binding assay in the presence of the nuclease Benzonase.

To extend this analysis to DNA-damage-specific recruitment of Ddc2, we analyzed Ddc2-GFP foci formation by exposing WT and rfa1-t11 cells expressing DDC2-GFP to either 0.2 M HU (which causes replication stress) or 0.5 μg/mL 4-NQO for 0, 30, 60, 90, and 120 min prior to fixation for microscopy. (E) Example images of S phase cells exposed to 0.5 μg/mL 4-NQO for 120 min show Ddc2 foci (white arrowheads). (F) Quantification of S phase cells containing Ddc2-GFP foci is shown (N = 3 and n ≥ 100 per N; N indicates independent experiments and n indicates number of cells counted). n.s., not significant; *p < 0.05 (chi-square test). Data are represented as mean ± SD from three independent experiments.

See also Figures S3 and S4 and Table S1.

(Figures 3D and S4B) and neither bound to GFP alone. We minimized any impact that contaminating nucleic acids might have on the Ddc2-Rfa1-t11 interaction by performing the binding assay in the presence of the nuclease Benzonase.
4-Nitroquinoline N-oxide (4-NQO), a UV-mimetic agent. As expected, after damage induction, Ddc2-GFP formed distinct sub-nuclear foci (Figure 3E). Consistent with the in vitro data, we could not measure significant differences in Ddc2 focus formation between rfa1-t11 mutant and WT RFA1 strains after treatment with HU (Figure 3F). However, upon treatment with 4-NQO, we measured a significant reduction in Ddc2 foci formation in the rfa1-t11 strain (Figure 3F). Whereas UV-induced thymine dimers can be repaired by short-patch nucleotide excision repair (NER), obviating the need for checkpoint activation, it has been shown that unrepairied UV/4-NQO damage generates ssDNA (Giannattasio et al., 2010; Lopes et al., 2006), consistent with the strong Rfa1-t11 we measured a significant reduction in Ddc2 foci formation in the rfa1-t11 strain (Figure 3F). Whereas UV-induced thymine dimers can be repaired by short-patch nucleotide excision repair (NER), obviating the need for checkpoint activation, it has been shown that unrepairied UV/4-NQO damage generates ssDNA (Giannattasio et al., 2010; Lopes et al., 2006), consistent with the strong...

Figure 4. Ddc2 RBD and CCD Function Additively under DNA Damage Conditions

(A) Schematic diagram of ScDdc2 mutants used in this study and integrated into isogenic yeast strains.

(B) DNA damage sensitivity of ddc2 mutants. A 5-fold dilution series of isogenic yeast strains with indicated genotypes (see also Table S1) on YPAD plates without or with 100 μM UV light, 1.2 μg/mL 4-NQO, 0.1 M HU, or 0.1 μg/mL MMS. Plates were incubated at 30 °C for two days. (C) Rad53 phosphorylation of strains used in (B) monitored by western blotting with anti-Rad53 antibody after synchronization in the G1 phase of the cell cycle (by α-factor) and release for indicated times into either 0.2 μg/mL 4-NQO or 0.2 M HU.

(D) Rad53 phosphorylation of isogenic strains GA-1981, 6354, 9479, and 9970 (see also Table S1) monitored as in Figure 4C.

(E) Isogenic strains GA-8163, 9485, and 9417 (see also Table S1) were synchronized in the G1 phase of the cell cycle (α-factor) and released for indicated times into 2 μg/mL 4-NQO. Lysates were probed with anti-Rad53 antibody (Santa Cruz Biotechnology), anti-phospho-S122-Rfa2 antibody (Rockland), and anti-phospho-S129-H2A antibody (Sigma).

(F) Quantification of the intensities of Rfa2 phospho-S122 and H2A phospho-S129 normalized to actin loading control. Data are represented as mean ± SD from two independent experiments. See also Figure S5 and Table S1.
ddc2ΔN exo1Δ mutants upon 4-NQO treatment. In the presence of Exo1, Rad53 phosphorylation was strongly reduced and delayed in ddc2ΔN cells, whereas, in the absence of Exo1, ddc2ΔN cells failed to phosphorylate Rad53, even after 30 min of 4-NQO treatment (Figure 4D). However, ddc2ΔN mutation did not further sensitize exo1Δ mutants (Figure S5B), indicating that ssDNA generated by Exo1 is crucial for the Mec1-Ddc2 function for survival after 4-NQO and UV-induced damage, which is not necessarily correlated with Rad53 activation (Figure 4D).

Next, we tested whether the Ddc2 N terminus, especially the 103-Å-long CCD, would serve not only as a recruitment domain but also as a structural spacer that might allow Mec1 to selectively phosphorylate DNA-bound targets in cis while remaining bound to ssDNA-RPA. In ddc2ΔCCD and ddc2ΔN mutants lacking Tel1, we monitored phosphorylation of three Mec1 substrates following treatment with 2 μg/mL 4-NQO (Figure 4E). First, we scored Rad53 phosphorylation, as Rad53 diffuses freely and its phosphorylation should not be dependent on a structural spacer. Indeed, in this case, the ddc2ΔCCD mutant was as proficient as WT Ddc2 for Rad53 phosphorylation, whereas ddc2ΔN was deficient. Next, we tested the phosphorylation of S122 in the RPA subunit 2 (Rfa2-S122), which is localized to ssDNA sites. Again, ddc2ΔCCD cells modified S122 efficiently, with only a minor reduction over WT cells, whereas ddc2ΔN cells showed a significant reduction (39% of the ddc2ΔCCD level; Figures 4E and 4F). On the other hand, for the phosphorylation of histone H2A on S129, a degree of substrate selectivity to the RPA-bound Mec1 kinase.

**Ddc2 RBD and CCD Are Critical for Ddc2 Focus Formation after 4-NQO or UV Damage in S Phase**

To measure Ddc2 recruitment to 4-NQO damage sites quantitatively in ddc2 mutants, we generated red fluorescent protein (RFP)-tagged Rfa1 and GFP-tagged Ddc2 in WT and Ddc2 mutants. All fusion proteins were C-terminally tagged and expressed from their endogenous loci under the genomic promoter. Consistent with previous reports, G1 phase cells rarely form Rfa1/Ddc2 foci, regardless of 4-NQO or UV treatment (Figure 5A; Lisby et al., 2004). S phase cells, however, showed punctate sub-nuclear Rfa1/Ddc2 foci in 15%–20% untreated cells, indicative of endogenous damage, and both markers showed an increase in focus number after 4-NQO or UV, as
western blotting with indicated antibodies in the absence of DNA damage. See also Figure S6 and Table S1.

GA-9842, 9843, and 9846 (see also Table S1) were subjected to anti-GFP IP and found two things. First, in agreement with the earlier work, the earlier version of the protein (WT Ddc2) was not as efficiently recovered in immunoprecipitates of PK-Ddc2 as the WT Ddc2 (Figure 6B). This indicates that the Ddc2 CCD is nonetheless essential for homodimerization in the absence of DNA damage. All three constructs defined under physiological salt concentrations (Andersen, 2017; Majka et al., 2006b; Unsal-Kacmaz and Sancar, 2004). Conversely, in our hands, size-exclusion chromatography coupled with multi-angle light scattering (SEC-MALS) analysis showed that recombinant ScDdc2N and ScDdc2 CCD were monomeric (Figures S6A and S6B), suggesting that the Ddc2 CCD is not a constitutive dimer. To test whether the Ddc2 CCD is nonetheless important for homodimerization in vivo, we created WT, ddc2ΔN, ddc2ΔRBD, and ddc2ΔCCD strains in a diploid background, wherein one endogenous allele of DDC2 was C-terminally GFP tagged and the other allele was C-terminally PK tagged. In the absence of DNA damage, immunoprecipitation of WT GFP-Ddc2 co-precipitated WT PK-Ddc2; however, PK-Ddc2ΔN did not co-precipitate with GFP-Ddc2ΔN (Figure 6A). Importantly, PK-Ddc2ΔRBD, but not PK-Ddc2ΔCCD, was recovered from immunoprecipitates of GFP-Ddc2ΔRBD and GFP-Ddc2ΔCCD, respectively, arguing that the CCD, but not the RBD, is essential for Ddc2 homodimerization in the absence of DNA damage. All the mutant forms of Ddc2 tested here retain the ability to associate with Mec1 and form a Mec1-Ddc2 heterodimer.

We next tested whether the response to DNA damage would alter the observed domain-dependent interaction. From the lysates of cells treated with 2 μg/mL 4-NQO, PK-Ddc2 and RBD strains were not as efficiently recovered in immunoprecipitates of GFP-Ddc2ΔRBD as the WT Ddc2 (Figure 6B). This indicates that the Ddc2 RBD promotes Ddc2 homodimerization in the presence of UV-mimetic stress, but not in the absence of the damage. On the other hand, the Ddc2 CCD is essential for homodimerization both in the presence and absence of damage. Of course, these experiments do not exclude that interactions between the Mec1 moieties could also contribute to homodimerization of the Mec1-Ddc2 heterodimer, i.e., to the (Mec1-Ddc2)2 assembly.

**DISCUSSION**

**Assembly of Mec1-Ddc2 on ssDNA-RPA**

Our structural, biochemical, and in vivo findings allowed us to define the structural building blocks to model the higher-order Mec1-Ddc2 assembly on ssDNA-RPA at sites of DNA damage. The Ddc2N-Rfa1N crystal structure provides the missing link between the crystal structure of the ssDNA-RPA complex (Fan and Pavletich, 2012; PDB: 4GNX) and the negative-stain electron microscopy (EM) map of a homodimer of heterodimeric Mec1-Ddc2 (Sawicka et al., 2016; EMDB-4085). Specifically, the RPA construct in the crystal structure of ssDNA-RPA lacks the Rfa1 N-OB domain that is present in our Ddc2N-Rfa1N crystal structure. Similarly, the thin and long Ddc2 CCD dimer (6 x 103 Å) is absent in the ~22-Å negative-stain (Mec1-Ddc2)2 map. Indeed, Ddc2N is expected to be masked or averaged out due to the weak contrast of the thin CCD and its conformational flexibility.

To ascertain the position of Ddc2N with respect to the Mec1-Ddc2 core complex, we tagged the N terminus of K1Ddc2 with residues 840–978 of the ScSir3 winged helix dimerization domain (Sir3wh) (Oppikofer et al., 2013). We then co-expressed and purified Sir3wh-Ddc2 with K1Mec1N (residues 1–341) and subjected the Sir3wh-Ddc2-Mec1N homodimeric complex to negative-stain EM to gain structural information. 2D class averages of (Sir3wh-Ddc2-Mec1N)2 showed strong contrast for dimeric Sir3wh and core domains of Ddc2-Mec1N but weak contrast for Ddc2N (located between globular domains of Ddc2-Mec1N and Sir3wh; Figure S7A). Our EM analysis confirmed two things. First, in agreement with the earlier

**Figure 6. Ddc2 RBD Is Essential for Homodimerization under Damage Conditions**

Extracts from cycling cultures of diploid *S. cerevisiae* strains GA-9842, 9843, 9844, 9845, and 9846 (see also Table S1) were subjected to anti-GFP IP and western blotting with indicated antibodies in the absence of DNA damage (A) or after 30 min exposure to 2 μg/mL 4-NQO (B). See also Figure S6 and Table S1.

**Ddc2 RBD Is Essential for Homodimerization under Damage Conditions**

To examine the roles of these subdomains in homodimerization, we performed pull-down studies. Recent work has shown the co-existence of monomer-dimer species (Mec1-Ddc2 and [Mec1-Ddc2]2), when Mec1-Ddc2 was overexpressed and purified under physiological salt concentrations (Andersen, 2017; Sawicka et al., 2016). Discrepancies in the literature regarding the size of the Mec1-Ddc2 complex may argue for a dynamic equilibrium between pools of Mec1-Ddc2 and (Mec1-Ddc2)2 (Bomgardner et al., 2004; Itakura et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2005; Majka et al., 2006b; Unsal-Kacmaz and Sancar, 2004). Conversely, in our hands, size-exclusion chromatography coupled with multi-angle light scattering (SEC-MALS) analysis showed that recombinant ScDdc2N and ScDdc2 CCD were monomeric (Figures S6A and S6B), suggesting that the Ddc2 CCD is not a constitutive dimer. To test whether the Ddc2 CCD is nonetheless important for homodimerization in vivo, we created WT, ddc2ΔN, ddc2ΔRBD, and ddc2ΔCCD strains in a diploid background, wherein one endogenous allele of DDC2 was C-terminally GFP tagged and the other allele was C-terminally PK tagged. In the absence of DNA damage, immunoprecipitation of WT GFP-Ddc2 co-precipitated WT PK-Ddc2; however, PK-Ddc2ΔN did not co-precipitate with GFP-Ddc2ΔN (Figure 6A). Importantly, PK-Ddc2ΔRBD, but not PK-Ddc2ΔCCD, was recovered from immunoprecipitates of GFP-Ddc2ΔRBD and GFP-Ddc2ΔCCD, respectively, arguing that the CCD, but not the RBD, is essential for Ddc2 homodimerization in the absence of DNA damage. All the mutant forms of Ddc2 tested here retain the ability to associate with Mec1 and form a Mec1-Ddc2 heterodimer.

We next tested whether the response to DNA damage would alter the observed domain-dependent interaction. From the lysates of cells treated with 2 μg/mL 4-NQO, PK-Ddc2 and RBD strains were not as efficiently recovered in immunoprecipitates of GFP-Ddc2ΔRBD as the WT Ddc2 (Figure 6B). This indicates that the Ddc2 RBD promotes Ddc2 homodimerization in the presence of UV-mimetic stress, but not in the absence of the damage. On the other hand, the Ddc2 CCD is essential for homodimerization both in the presence and absence of damage. Of course, these experiments do not exclude that interactions between the Mec1 moieties could also contribute to homodimerization of the Mec1-Ddc2 heterodimer, i.e., to the (Mec1-Ddc2)2 assembly.
Due-long linker is found between the Rfa1 N-OB and OB-A, allowing flexible spacer. Our model reveals that two adjacent ssDNA-RPA molecules recruit one (Mec1-Ddc2)2 entity to the large (Mec1-Ddc2)2 core module to move without encountering the DNA and thus preventing steric clashes with the damage sites. This model also allows Mec1 kinase to phosphorylate multiple spatially distinct substrates while remaining bound, gaining flexibility from two long unstructured linkers. The first 50-residue-long linker is found between the Rfa1 N-OB and OB-A domains and can reach a maximum distance of ~158 Å. This linker was in fact reported to be highly flexible (Brosey et al., 2015). The second linker, between Ddc2N and the Mec1-Ddc2 globular core, is 64 residues long and maximally ~210 Å long. Both linkers show little amino acid conservation, yet their existence is conserved and their lengths increase from yeast to man. This is consistent with the proposed function as a flexible spacer. Our model reveals that two adjacent ssDNA-bound RPA molecules recruit one (Mec1-Ddc2)2 entity to form the principal building block of the Mec1-Ddc2 higher-order assembly.

Our data suggest that Ddc2N is a non-constitutive homodimer. Due to the presence of long linkers in Ddc2 and RPA that flank Ddc2N, it is reasonable to propose that Ddc2N homodimerization is independent of the Mec1-Ddc2 globular core homodimerization. Because the binding affinity of the RBD-Rfa1N interaction (Kd = 0.43 μM) was much higher than that of Ddc2N homodimerization, we propose that Ddc2 recruitment to ssDNA-RPA arrays increases the local concentration of the Ddc2 N terminus, promoting its homodimerization. The model reinforces our finding that the Ddc2 RBD becomes critical to maintain Mdc2 homodimerization only in response to DNA damage. Another explanation of the RBD-dependent homodimerization of Mec1-Ddc2 could be that the activation of Mec1-Ddc2 at damage sites, e.g., binding of Mec1-Ddc2 to Dpb11, induces a conformational change that weakens the Mec1-Ddc2 core homodimerization, increasing the dependency of Mec1-Ddc2 homodimerization on the Ddc2 N terminus. This may be a regulatory feature that helps prevent improper Mec1 activation in the absence of sufficiently long stretches of ssDNA. Indeed, in human cells, ATR failed to phosphorylate downstream effectors when the ATRIP CCD was replaced by the constitutively homodimeric GCN4 CCD (Ball and Cortez, 2005). A further means to regulate Mec1 activation could be recognition of homodimeric Ddc2 CCD by Mec1 co-activators, such as Dpb11 and 9-1-1.

Exo1-Dependent Assembly of (Mec1-Ddc2)2 Molecules on ssDNA-RPA after UV Damage

RPA binds ssDNA in three different modes, depending on the length of ssDNA that it contacts: either the 8-nt low-affinity mode; the 12- to 23-nt medium-affinity mode; or the 30-nt high-affinity mode (Bochkareva et al., 2001). Because two RPA molecules bind one (Mec1-Ddc2)2 entity, we expect 60 nt (high-affinity mode) to be the minimum length of ssDNA that is required to assemble (Mec1-Ddc2)2 efficiently. Indeed, it was reported that, in the presence of RPA, Ddc2 binds more efficiently to 75-nt ssDNA (space for two RPA molecules) than it does to 50-nt or 30-nt ssDNA (space for one RPA molecule; Zou and Elledge, 2003). Thus, it is clear that Mec1-Ddc2 is efficiently recruited to an Exo1-expanded ssDNA gap, where long arrays of RPA bound to ssDNA in high-affinity mode are present. Of course, Mec1 recruitment and activation on ssDNA is dependent on the Ddc2N-Rfa1N interaction, and ddc2ΔN cells showed greatly delayed and reduced Rad53 phosphorylation upon 4-NQO treatment (Figure 4D). Notably, Rad53 was still phosphorylated at low levels. On the other hand, in exo1Δ cells, the initial 24- to 30-nt gap cannot be elongated and long RPA-Mec1-Ddc2 arrays cannot build up. Congruently, we observed delayed and reduced Rad53 phosphorylation, hinting at a weak recruitment and dimerization mode for Mec1-Ddc2, even to the 24- to 30-nt short gap. It is imaginable that one Mec1-Ddc2 homodimer binds to two of the three RPA molecules that could occupy the initial 24- to 30-nt gap generated during NER in the 8-nt low-affinity mode. Such a scenario could still trigger weak and delayed Rad53 phosphorylation. Together, these mechanistic insights explain why ddc2ΔN and exo1Δ were additive for Rad53 phosphorylation upon 4-NQO treatment and that the delayed and reduced Rad53 activation in the case of ddc2ΔN is dependent on Exo1.

Interestingly, the additivity of ddc2ΔN and exo1Δ for Rad53 phosphorylation does not reflect on cell survival in our drop assays (Figure S5B). Nonetheless, the epistasis between ddc2ΔN and exo1Δ on survival assays suggests that Exo1-dependent ssDNA formation is crucial to fulfill Mec1-Ddc2 function in response to UV damage. This discrepancy between Rad53 activation and cell survival assays may reflect the distinct natures of the two experiments; Rad53 phosphorylation was done in liquid cultures acutely exposed to 4-NQO, whereas, for the drop assay, colonies were continuously exposed to 4-NQO for two days on plates, where both Exo1 and Mec1-Ddc2 may be involved in an alternative rescue pathway. Taken together, we suggest that, in the presence of UV lesions, Exo1 extends short un repaired ssDNA gaps to recruit Mec1-Ddc2 efficiently by means of the Ddc2N-Rfa1N interaction, promoting checkpoint induction and survival (Figure 7A). This occurs, apparently, in S phase cells.

Activation of (Mec1-Ddc2)2 on ssDNA-RPA at DNA Damage Sites

Finally, we extrapolated our composite to-scale model to mimic Mec1-Ddc2 activation on ssDNA-RPA after DNA damage (Figure 7B; see STAR Methods for assembly details). The model recapitulates the role of Ddc2N as both a recruitment and spacer module that may allow Mec1 kinase to phosphorylate spatially
Figure 7. Assembly and Activation of Mec1-Ddc2-RPA at DNA Damage Sites
(A) Schematic diagram of the DNA damage response to a UV lesion. In the first step, early NER factors recognize the damage and excise a 24- to 30-nt gap containing the lesion. In the second step, the NER reaction is completed by gap-filling DNA synthesis and ligation (short-patch NER). An impediment between these two steps, e.g., replication fork or opposing lesion, allows Exo1 exonuclease to process the 24- to 30-nt gap and generate long ssDNA gaps, which recruit Mec1-Ddc2 via the Ddc2N-Rfa1N interaction. Mec1 induces checkpoint activation by phosphorylating multiple substrates, including Rad53, RPA, and Exo1, to allow DNA repair (long-patch NER).
(B) To-scale composite structural model of the Mec1-Ddc2-RPA assembly (see also Figure S7B) and activation at DNA damage sites (see STAR Methods for assembly details). (1) indicates the ssDNA-RPA platform, (2) indicates assembly of (Mec1-Ddc2)2 on the ssDNA-RPA platform via Ddc2N-Rfa1N interaction, (3) indicates activation of Mec1 kinase, and (4) indicates phosphorylation of Rad53 and checkpoint induction. See also Figure S7.
distinct targets, including proximal or readily diffusing targets like RPA and Rad53, but also more distal substrates like histone H2A, 9-1-1, and Dpb11, thanks to the extended C-terminal linkers (dotted lines; see also Figure S7B). The capacity of Ddc2 for spatial flexibility may also facilitate an efficient activation of Mec1 by the long unstructured C-terminal tails of either the Ddc1 subunit in the 9-1-1 clamp or of Dpb11. The model is consistent with the notion that the recruitments of 9-1-1-Dpb11 and/or (Mec1-Ddc2)2 to damage are largely independent events (Kondo et al., 2001; Melo et al., 2001), which may reduce the likelihood of untimely Mec1 activation. Once activated, Mec1-Ddc2 appears to remain bound and act locally on substrates in the vicinity, given that it forms a bright focus at the site of damage (Dubrana et al., 2007). Thus, the structures presented here and the composite model of the Mec1-Ddc2 higher-order assembly on ssDNA-RPA that they enabled have elucidated structural features of the enzyme complex that have functional implications for the activation and target recognition of this kinase. We find that these unusual Mec1/ATR characteristics are crucial for the maintenance of genomic integrity in face of genomic insult.
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### STAR METHODS

#### KEY RESOURCES TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REAGENT or RESOURCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>IDENTIFIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antibodies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Rad53</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Cat#sc-6749; RRID: AB_668092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-actin</td>
<td>Millipore</td>
<td>Cat#MAB1501; RRID: AB_2223041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-GFP</td>
<td>Roche</td>
<td>Cat#11814460001; RRID: AB_390913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-GFP</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Cat#sc-8334; RRID: AB_641123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-phospho-Ser122-Rfa2</td>
<td>Rockland</td>
<td>Cat#600-401-447; RRID: AB_217960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-phospho-Ser129-H2A</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>SG-2397 (custom made); N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Mec1</td>
<td>SDIX</td>
<td>Q5230 (custom made); N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Rfa1</td>
<td>Agrisera</td>
<td>Cat#AS07 214, RRID: AB_1031803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-PK</td>
<td>Acris</td>
<td>Cat#SM1691; RRID: AB_1621125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bacterial and Virus Strains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.coli BL21 (DE3)</td>
<td>NEB</td>
<td>Cat#C2527H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.coli B834 (DE3)</td>
<td>Novagen</td>
<td>Cat#69041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH10Bac</td>
<td>Thermo Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#10361012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemicals, Peptides, and Recombinant Proteins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroxyurea</td>
<td>USBiological</td>
<td>Cat#H9120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-NQO</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#N8141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyl methanesulfonate</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#129925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha-factor mating pheromone</td>
<td>Zymo Research</td>
<td>Cat#Y1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Commercial Assays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SelenoMethionine Medium Complete</td>
<td>Molecular Dimensions</td>
<td>Cat#MD12-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Fusion HD Cloning kit</td>
<td>Clontech</td>
<td>Cat#639650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deposited Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ddc2&lt;sup&gt;N&lt;/sup&gt;-Rfa1&lt;sup&gt;N&lt;/sup&gt; crystal structure</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>PDB: 5OMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ddc2&lt;sup&gt;N&lt;/sup&gt;-rfa1&lt;sup&gt;N&lt;/sup&gt;-t11 crystal structure</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>PDB: 5OMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScDdc2&lt;sup&gt;CDC48&lt;/sup&gt; crystal structure</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>PDB: 5OMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ssDNA-RPA crystal structure</td>
<td>Fan and Pavletich, 2012</td>
<td>PDB: 4GNX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleosome crystal structure</td>
<td>Wang et al., 2013</td>
<td>PDB: 4JJN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rfa2 winged helix crystal structure</td>
<td>Feldkamp et al., 2014</td>
<td>PDB: 4OU0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1-1 crystal structure</td>
<td>Dore et al., 2009</td>
<td>PDB: 3G65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mec1-Ddc2)&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; negative-stain EM</td>
<td>Sawicka et al., 2016</td>
<td>EMDB:4085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw fluorescence microscopy images</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td><a href="https://doi.org/10.17632/shzvjbh8t.1">https://doi.org/10.17632/shzvjbh8t.1</a> <a href="https://doi.org/10.17632/83p9ghggs.1">https://doi.org/10.17632/83p9ghggs.1</a> <a href="https://doi.org/10.17632/g5tzf57v28.1">https://doi.org/10.17632/g5tzf57v28.1</a> <a href="https://doi.org/10.17632/jpkhhyw">https://doi.org/10.17632/jpkhhyw</a> withheld.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw data for gels, blots and EM images</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td><a href="https://doi.org/10.17632/48xj5b2g86.1">https://doi.org/10.17632/48xj5b2g86.1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental Models: Cell Lines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBCO Sf9 cells</td>
<td>Thermo Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#11496015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental Models: Organisms/Strains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. cerevisiae: Strain background: W303</td>
<td>Hannah Klein Laboratory</td>
<td>HKYS79-10A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recombinant DNA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pOPINF vector</td>
<td>Addgene</td>
<td>Cat#26042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pAC8 vector</td>
<td>Nicolas H. Thomae Laboratory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
CONTACT FOR REAGENT AND RESOURCE SHARING

Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the Lead Contact, Susan M. Gasser (susan.gasser@fmi.ch).

METHOD DETAILS

Protein engineering and purification from *E. coli*

*KdDdc2* (residues 1-109) from *K. lactis*; and ScDdc2N (residues 1-136), ScDdc2CCD (residues 73-136), Rfa1N (residues 1-132), Rfa1N-t11 (residues 1-132; K45E), Rfa1N KREK (residues 1-132; K58A, R62A, E86A, K95A) from *S. cerevisiae* were separately cloned into pOPINF vectors using the In-Fusion system (Clontech) (Berrow et al., 2007) and individually expressed in *E. coli* BL21(DE3). Cells expressing appropriate target were pelleted, resuspended in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 500 mM NaCl, 20 mM imidazole, 0.2% Tween-20) then rapidly frozen on dry-ice and stored at −80°C. The frozen cell suspension was thawed at room temperature and supplemented with complete EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Roche) and Benzonase (Sigma) before sonication. The lysate was clarified by ultracentrifugation and then affinity purified via an N-terminal His6 tag using Ni-NTA Superflow resin (QIAGEN). His-tag was removed using His-tagged 3C protease and a second round of affinity purification. Lastly, target was purified using a Superdex 75 HiLoad 16/60 (GE Healthcare) column equilibrated in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP. Only in the case of Ddc2N, anion exchange purification was done using a HiTrap Capto Q (GE Healthcare) column before size exclusion chromatography. Incorporation of seleno-methionine was performed with *E. coli* B834(DE3) as described by Molecular Dimensions’ seleno-methionine media kit.

Protein engineering and purification from *Sf9*

Sir3wH-Ddc2 (KfDdc2 lacking residues 115-127 N-terminally fused to ScSir3 winged helix dimerization domain residues 840-978) and Mec1N (KfMec1 residues 1-341 N-terminally tagged with Strep-II) were cloned into separate pAC-derived vectors (Abdulrahman et al., 2009). Recombinant baculoviruses were prepared using the flashBAC system. The Sir3wH-Ddc2-Mec1N complex was expressed in Sf9 insect cells by co-infection of separate baculoviruses encoding Sir3wH-Ddc2 and Strep (II) tagged Mec1N. Cells expressing appropriate target(s) were lysed in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 2 mM MgCl2, 2 mM TCEP, 0.2% Tween-20) then rapidly frozen on dry-ice and stored at −80°C. The frozen cell suspension was thawed at room temperature and supplemented with complete EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Roche) and Benzonase (Sigma). Following ultracentrifugation, target was extracted by Strep-Tactin Sepharose (IBA) affinity chromatography. The target was removed by overnight TEV protease treatment. The protein was then separated by a HiTrap Capto Q (GE Healthcare) anion-exchange column and lastly subjected to size exclusion chromatography on a Superdex 200 HiLoad 16/600 (GE Healthcare) column equilibrated in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl and 1 mM TCEP.
**Crystallization**

Nanoliter crystallization experiments were performed with a Phoenix dispensing robot (Art Robbins) using the sitting-drop vapor diffusion method at 20°C. Ddc2N-Rfa1N co-crystals were obtained by mixing 1 mM K/Ddc2N and 1.2 mM seleno-methionine labeled ScRfa1N at 4°C for 30 min and later at 20°C for 3 days in the presence of 0.2 M ammonium citrate tribasic pH 7.0 and 20% PEG 3350. Crystals were harvested and flash cooled in liquid nitrogen after cryoprotection with 20% ethylene glycol, 0.2 M ammonium citrate tribasic pH 7.0 and 20% PEG 3350. Ddc2N-Rfa1N-t11 co-crystals were obtained by mixing 1 mM K/Ddc2N and 1.2 mM ScRfa1N-t11 at 4°C for 30 min and later at 20°C for 3 days in the presence of 0.2 M lithium sulfate monohydrate, 0.1 M Bis-Tris, pH 6.5 and 25% PEG 3350, were harvested and flash cooled in liquid nitrogen after cryoprotection with 18% ethylene glycol, 0.2 M lithium sulfate monohydrate, 0.1 M Bis-Tris, pH 6.5 and 25% PEG 3350. ScDdc2CCD crystals, obtained in 5 days after mixing 0.5 mM ScDdc2CCD with 0.1 M Tris-HCl, pH 8.5 and 24% PEG 400, were harvested and flash cooled in liquid nitrogen after cryoprotection with 25% ethylene glycol, 0.1 M Tris-HCl, pH 8.5 and 24% PEG 400.

**Data collection and structure determination**

Diffraction data were collected at the Swiss Light Source (Villigen, Switzerland) beamlines X06DA using a Pilatus 2M-F detector (Dectris) and X10SA using a Pilatus 6M detector. Ddc2N-Rfa1N and Ddc2N-Rfa1N-t11 co-crystals belonged to space group P2_12_1 (four chains per a.u. in both cases) and diffracted to 1.9 Å (\(\lambda_{\text{peak}} = 0.979\) Å) and 2.4 Å (\(\lambda = 1.000\) Å). ScDdc2CCD crystallized in space group P2_2_2_1 (one chain per a.u.) and diffracted to 2.1 Å (\(\lambda = 1.000\) Å). For all projects, diffraction data were integrated and scaled using the XDS program package (Kabsch, 2010). The structure of Ddc2N-Rfa1N was solved by single anomalous dispersion filter before injection. The structure of Ddc2N-Rfa1N was solved by the molecular replacement method with PHASER (McCoy et al., 2007) using Ddc2N-Rfa1N and PDB: 1A92 as search models, respectively. For all projects, phases were then used for automatic model building in PHENIX (Adams et al., 2011) and BUCCANEER (Cowtan, 2006) followed by manual completion of the model using COOT (Emsley et al., 2010). The structures were refined by the crystallographic simulated annealing routine followed by individual B-factor refinement in PHENIX and further rounds of manual rebuilding in COOT and refinement in BUSTER (Bricogne, 2011). The final structures were validated using Molprobity (Chen et al., 2010) and COOT. Structural images for figures were prepared with PyMOL (http://www.pymol.org/).

**Molecular mass measurement by SEC-MALS**

Purified ScDdc2N and ScDdc2CCD were concentrated up to 300 μM and 260 μM respectively, and filtered through a 0.1 μm Amicon filter before injection. 38 μL of each protein was separated on a Superdex 200 10/300 GL gel-filtration column (GE Healthcare) equilibrated in 20 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 200 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP, 0.02% NaN_3 at a flow rate of 0.65 mL/min. Light scattering was recorded on an in-line miniDAWN TREOS three-angle light scattering detector (Wyatt Technology) and protein concentration detected with an in-line Optilab Trex refractive index detector. The weight-averaged molecular mass of material contained in chromatographic peaks was determined using ASTRA 6 software (Wyatt Technology).

**Microscale thermophoresis**

Experiments were carried out in 20 mM Tris-HCl buffer, pH 8.0, containing 150 mM NaCl, 0.05% Tween-20 and 0.5 mg/ml BSA. Purified Rfa1N, Rfa1N-t11, Rfa1N KREK and N-terminal Cy5-labeled peptides of S. cerevisiae Ddc2 (\(\text{Sc} -\text{GEFSSDDDDLLEGLTRPRP} \text{-C} \)) and Dna2 (\(\text{Sc} -\text{SSDEFSDSSLLELLNETQ} \text{-C} \)) (JPT Peptide Technologies, Berlin, Germany) were centrifuged at 13,200 L of each solution was filled into Monolith NT (NanoTemper Technologies GmbH). Thermophoresis was measured using a Monolight NT.115 instrument (NanoTemper Technologies GmbH) at 23°C with 5 s/30 s/5 s laser on/off/on times, respectively. Instrument parameters were adjusted to 1%–20% LED power and 20% MST power. Data of three independently pipetted measurements were analyzed (NT.Analysis software version 1.5.41, NanoTemper Technologies GmbH) using the signal from thermophoresis and plotted using GraphPad Prism version 6.01 (La Jolla, CA, USA).

**Immunoprecipitation and western blotting**

Yeast strains are described in Table S1. If not stated otherwise, cells were cultured at 30°C in YPAD medium using standard procedures. For anti-GFP IP, 100 mL of log-phase culture was harvested by centrifugation, washed once with cold phosphate buffered saline, and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen. The pellet was resuspended in IP buffer (50 mM HEPES pH 7.4, 150 mM NaCl, 2 mM EDTA, 0.5% NP-40) supplemented with Complete Protease Inhibitor and PhosSTOP tablets (Roche). In anti-GFP IP experiments to check RPA interaction, Benzonase nuclease was also added to the IP buffer. Cells were mechanically lysed by bead beating and the lysate was mixed with anti-GFP antibody (Roche Cat#11814460001) crosslinked to Dynabeads Protein G. Binding reaction was carried out at 4°C for 1.5 hr. After washing thrice with IP buffer, bound proteins were eluted with 0.2 M Glycine pH 1.9 and analyzed by western blotting. Anti-GFP antibody (Santa Cruz Cat#sc-8334) was used for western blots.
For western blot experiments, log-phase cultures were arrested in the G1 phase using alpha-factor mating pheromone for 80 min. Cultures were then mock treated or treated with DNA damaging agents. Cells were harvested at different time points and protein samples were prepared by NaOH/Trichloroacetic acid precipitation. Samples were resuspended in 50 μL of NuPAGE sample buffer supplemented with 50 mM DTT. Samples were boiled, electrophoresed by SDS-PAGE, and then transferred to PVDF membranes. The membranes were blocked with TBST (20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 0.1% Tween 20) containing 5% BSA or 5% nonfat dried milk, and probed overnight with primary antibodies, followed by 1 hr incubation with secondary antibodies coupled to peroxidase. Blots were developed by using enhanced chemiluminescence.

**Yeast drop assays**

Overnight cultures of yeast cells were adjusted to OD_{600} of 0.1 and serially diluted 5-fold up to six dilutions. 2.5 μL of cells were dropped onto YPAD plates with or without DNA damaging agents and allowed to grow for two days at 30°C before taking photographs.

**Fluorescence microscopy**

Cells were grown in synthetic complete (SC) media (Formedium DSCK1000) complemented with all amino acids and with 4x additional adenine (72 mg/L) to prevent autofluorescence. In addition, cells were transformed with plasmid pRS402 #1388 conveying the ADE2 gene to reduce autofluorescence. To induce UV damage, 5 mL log phase culture was pelleted and resuspended in 200 μL of fresh SC media, spread on a YPAD plate and left for 5 min to dry. Cells were exposed to 100 J/m² UV using a Stratagene UV Stratalinker 2400. Following this, cells were washed off the YPAD plate and suspended in fresh SC media. Cells were fixed in fresh paraformaldehyde (PFA) 4% w/v for 5 min, washed six times in PBS and then attached to a 0.17 mm glass coverslip using Concanavalin A. Fixed cells were stained with DAPI by suspending the cells in a DAPI-PBS solution of 50 ng/mL DAPI for 30 min and then washed in PBS three times. Cells were imaged on a Nikon Eclipse Ti microscope, an EM-CCD Cascade II (Photometrics) camera, an ASI MS-2000 Z-piezo stage, and a PlanApo 3100, numerical aperture (NA) 1.45 total internal reflection fluorescence microscope oil objective and Visiview software. RFP was excited using a Coherent Sapphire 561 nm, 200 mW laser. GFP and DAPI were excited with Tiptica iBEAM SMART 488 nm and 405 nm lasers, respectively. Brightfield images were acquired with a Lumencore Sola SM II LED light engine.

**Negative-stain electron microscopy**

0.02 mg/mL of Sir3wH-Ddc2-Mec1^{N} in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP was used for adsorption on glow-discharged Quantifoil grids (S7/2, Cu 400 mesh, Quantifoil Micro Tools GmbH, Grosslögichau, Germany) coated with a continuous thin carbon film floated from mica. Samples (4 μL) were applied to the grids and, after blotting, negatively stained with 2% (w/v) uranyl acetate. Data were acquired with a Philips CM200FEG transmission electron microscope in low-dose mode operated at 200 keV. Images were recorded with a TVIPS F416 camera at a nominal magnification of × 50,000, resulting in a pixel size of 2.2 Å at the specimen level. Images were recorded by varying the defocus between −1.5 and −3.0 μm. 7,535 particles were picked using e2boxer.py (EMAN2) (Tang et al., 2007). Contrast transfer function parameters were calculated using sxcter.py (SPARX) (Hohn et al., 2007) and reference-free 2D class averages were generated using the Iterative Stable Alignment and Clustering (ISAC) method in SPARX (Yang et al., 2012).

**Modeling structural assemblies**

Composite structural models were assembled using crystal structures of the ssDNA-RPA complex (PDB: 4GNX), nucleosome core particle (PDB: 4JJN), Rfa2 winged helix (wH) domain (PDB: 4OU0), the 9-1-1 complex (PDB: 3G65), negative-stain EM map of (Mec1-Ddc2)_{2} (EMDB-4085) and homology models of Dpb11 BRCT domains based on closest structural homologs of known structures identified in HHpred searches (PDB: 1L7B, 3L46, 3UEN, 4BMD). The (Mec1-Ddc2)_{2} EM map was segmented along the 2-fold symmetry axis to highlight its homodimeric state using the Segger tool in UCSF Chimera (Pettersen et al., 2004). All composite structural models were assembled using PyMOL.

**QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSES**

**MST binding assay**

Data are represented as mean ± SEM of three independent experiments. Data were analyzed by NT.Analysis software version 1.5.41 (NanoTemper Technologies GmbH) and the dissociation constant (K_{d}) was calculated using GraphPad Prism version 6.01 (La Jolla, CA, USA). The details of the analysis are described in figure legends.

**Immunoblots**

Intensity calculation of immunoblots was done using Fiji image processing package. The band areas were boxed and backgrounds were subtracted. The bands of target protein were normalized to an appropriate loading control. Data are represented as mean ± SD from independent replicates. The details are described in figure legends.
**Fluorescence microscopy**

Fluorescence images were deconvolved using Huygens professional and the classic maximum likelihood estimate algorithm with a signal/noise ratio of 10, automatic background estimation and 40 iterations. For foci number quantification, Z stacks were obtained by taking 35 slices at 200 nm intervals. The EMCCD gain was set to 800 in all cases except to the brightfield were it was set to 1. Exposure times were: 30 ms DAPI, 100 ms GFP, 100 ms RFP, 10 ms brightfield. “Bright foci” were counted and defined as foci that have clear borders. Thresholding was applied in Fiji to help see foci over background nuclear signal. At least 100 cells were counted per replicate. Data are represented as mean ± SD from three independent replicates. The details of statistical analysis are described in figure legends.

**DATA AND SOFTWARE AVAILABILITY**

**Accession Numbers**

The accession numbers for the crystal structures reported in this paper are PDB: 5OMB (Ddc2\textsuperscript{N}-Rfa1\textsuperscript{N}), 5OMC (Ddc2\textsuperscript{N}-Rfa1\textsuperscript{N-}t11) and 5OMD (ScDdc2\textsuperscript{CCD}).

Original data used to generate any of the figure panels have been deposited at Mendeley:

- https://doi.org/10.17632/shzvjbhht8.1
- https://doi.org/10.17632/83p9ghggs.1
- https://doi.org/10.17632/g5tzf37v28.1
- https://doi.org/10.17632/pkhhywwhx.1
- https://doi.org/10.17632/48xj5b2g86.1
Figure S1: Pairwise sequence alignments of Ddc2N and Rfa1N (See also Figure 1)

Identical residues of Ddc2N and Rfa1N are colored in blue and green respectively. Highly conserved residues are bordered. Numbers on top of the alignment refer to the K. lactis protein sequence. Secondary structure elements present in the Ddc2N-Rfa1N crystal structure (see also Figure 1B) are indicated on top of the alignment (α, α-helix; β, β-strand; TT, turn; η, 3.10 helix). Polar (inverted triangles) and hydrophobic (oval) residues of the Ddc2N-Rfa1N interface are highlighted. K45, the residue mutated in rfa1-t11, is indicated by a star. Sc: Saccharomyces cerevisiae; Kl: Kluyveromyces lactis.
Figure S2: Ddc2N binds the Rfa1N basic-hydrophobic cleft (See also Figure 2)

A) Rfa1N is displayed as a surface and colored according to the surface electrostatic potential, ranging from blue (basic) to red (acidic). Hydrophobic surface patches are shown in white. Surface electrostatic potential was computed using the APBS plug-in implemented in PyMOL (www.pymol.org).

B) Detailed view of the binding of Ddc2 RBD to Rfa1N present in the Ddc2N-Rfa1N crystal structure (see also Figure 2B). Rfa1N is displayed as a green cartoon model whereas Ddc2 RBD is shown as sticks (blue, atom colors). A composite simulated annealing 2mFo-DFc omit electron density map contoured at 0.8 σ is displayed in gray.
Figure S3 (related to Figure 3)

Figure S3: Crystal structure of Ddc2^N-Rfa1^N-t11 (See also Figure 3)

Crystal structure of the Ddc2^N-Rfa1^N-t11 complex in cartoon representation; Rfa1^N-t11 is colored in gray and Ddc2^N is colored in blue. Two loops lacking electron density due to flexibility are indicated by dashed lines. The RBD and the CCD are labeled.
Figure S4 (related to Figure 3)

A) MST analysis of binding of Cy5-labeled ScDna2 RBD and ScRfa1^N-t11. K_d represents dissociation constant. ΔF_norm (‰) represents change in fluorescence during thermophoresis normalized to initial fluorescence. n.d. means not detectable (>1mM). Data are represented as mean ± SEM from three independent measurements.

B) Quantification of the intensities of Rfa1 wt and Rfa1-t11 bands normalized to the intensities of Ddc2-GFP bands after immunoprecipitation with Ddc2-GFP using an anti-GFP antibody. Data are represented as mean ± SD from three independent experiments. n.s. = not significant.

C) A 5-fold dilution series of isogenic strains GA-1981, 9827/8, 9835/6 (see also Table S1) on YPAD plates without or with 30 J/m² UV or 0.01 M HU. Plates were incubated at 30°C for two days.

Figure S4: Ddc2 can bind the Rfa1-t11 mutant protein (See also Figure 3)
A) MST analysis of binding of Cy5-labeled ScDna2 RBD and ScRfa1^N-t11. K_d represents dissociation constant. ΔF_norm (‰) represents change in fluorescence during thermophoresis normalized to initial fluorescence. n.d. means not detectable (>1mM). Data are represented as mean ± SEM from three independent measurements.

B) Quantification of the intensities of Rfa1 wt and Rfa1-t11 bands normalized to the intensities of Ddc2-GFP bands after immunoprecipitation with Ddc2-GFP using an anti-GFP antibody. Data are represented as mean ± SD from three independent experiments. n.s. = not significant.

C) A 5-fold dilution series of isogenic strains GA-1981, 9827/8, 9835/6 (see also Table S1) on YPAD plates without or with 30 J/m² UV or 0.01 M HU. Plates were incubated at 30°C for two days.
Figure S5: $ddc2\Delta N$ is additive with $rad53\Delta$ but epistatic with $exo1\Delta$ (See also Figure 4)

A) A 5-fold dilution series of isogenic strains GA-7371, 8891, 7373 and 10070 (see also Table S1) on YPAD plates without or with 0.01 μg/ml 4-NQO or 0.03 μg/ml 4-NQO. Plates were incubated at 30°C for two days.

B) A 5-fold dilution series of isogenic strains GA-1981, 6354, 9479 and 9970 (see also Table S1) on YPAD plates without or with 0.12 μg/ml 4-NQO or 40 J/m² UV. Plates were incubated at 30°C for two days.
Figure S6: ScDdc2N and ScDdc2CCD are monomeric in solution (See also Figure 6)

Size-exclusion chromatography coupled with multi-angle light scattering (SEC-MALS) analysis of ScDdc2N and ScDdc2CCD. The Rayleigh ratio is indicated by the blue trace and the molar mass is shown by the black line. Experiments were performed in a buffer containing 150 to 200 mM NaCl.

A) The measured molar mass for monomeric ScDdc2N (16.22 kDa) was calculated over peak fractions covering the elution volume 14.3 ml to 16 ml, which represent a monodisperse sample (polydispersity = 1.000).

B) The measured molar mass for monomeric ScDdc2CCD (7.83 kDa) was calculated over peak fractions covering the elution volume 16.9 ml to 18.1 ml, which represent a monodisperse sample (polydispersity = 1.000).
Figure S7 (related to Figure 7)

A) Representative 2D class averages of Sir3wH-Ddc2-Mec1\textsuperscript{N} generated by SPARX. Pink arrows indicate Sir3wH homodimers linked to Ddc2; blue arrows indicate Ddc2-Mec1\textsuperscript{N}. Bar = 10 nm. Sir3wH-Ddc2-Mec1\textsuperscript{N} was purified from S\textsuperscript{f}9 cells and 0.02 mg/ml of pure protein was stained with 2% (w/v) uranyl acetate. 300 micrographs were collected and 7,535 particles were subjected to 2D classification.

B) Surface representation of the Mec1-Ddc2-RPA-ssDNA composite structural model assembled by combining the following structures: Crystal structure of an ssDNA-RPA complex lacking Rfa2wH and Rfa1\textsuperscript{N} - PDB ID: 4GNX; negative-stain EM map of (Mec1-Ddc2)\textsubscript{2} - EMD-4085; and crystal structure of the Ddc2\textsuperscript{N}-Rfa1\textsuperscript{N} complex - this study. RPA lacking Rfa2wH is shown as green surface. ssDNA is shown as red and white surface. The (Mec1-Ddc2)\textsubscript{2} EM map is segmented along the two-fold symmetry axis to highlight its homodimeric state. One Mec1-Ddc2 heterodimer is displayed in blue, while the other Mec1-Ddc2 heterodimer is displayed in cyan. Unstructured linkers are represented by dashed lines; aa represents amino acid residues. The putative conformational freedom of (Mec1-Ddc2)\textsubscript{2} owing to its flexible linkers is highlighted by two representatives of an ensemble which are displayed with transparent surfaces. The kinase domain is labeled.

Figure S7: To-scale model of Mec1-Ddc2-RPA-ssDNA assembly (See also Figure 7)
Table S1: Yeast strains used in this study (Related to Figures 3, 4, 5, 6, S4C and S5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strain</th>
<th>genotype</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GA-1981</td>
<td>MATα, ade2-1, trp1-1, his3-11, -15, ura3-1, leu2-3, -112, can1-100 (W303), RAD5</td>
<td>H.L. Klein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-1982</td>
<td>MATα, ade2-1, trp1-1, his3-11, -15, ura3-1, leu2-3, -112, can1-100 (W303), RAD5</td>
<td>H.L. Klein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-4968</td>
<td>GA-1981 with rfa1-t11</td>
<td>Seeber et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-6354</td>
<td>GA-1981 with exo1::Kan</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-6905</td>
<td>GA-1981 with rad26::NAT</td>
<td>H.L. Klein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-6909</td>
<td>GA-1981 with rad16::NAT</td>
<td>H.L. Klein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-7371</td>
<td>GA-1981 with smi1::Kan</td>
<td>Hustedt et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-7373</td>
<td>GA-1981 with smi1::Kan, rad53::URA3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-8163</td>
<td>GA-1981 with tel1::HIS3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-8705</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::DDC2-GFP-Kan, RFA1-RFP-HIS3</td>
<td>Hustedt et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-8891</td>
<td>GA-1981 with smi1::Kan, ddc2::ddc2ΔN</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9149</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::DDC2-GFP-HIS3, smi1::Kan</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9417</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔN, tel1::URA3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9479</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔN</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9480</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔRBD</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9482</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔRBD, tel1::URA3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9483</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔCCD</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9485</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔCCD, tel1::URA3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9487</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔN, rad16::NAT</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9490</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔN, rad26::NAT</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9827</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::DDC2-GFP-HIS3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9828</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::DDC2-GFP-HIS3, rfa1-t11</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9835</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔN-GFP-HIS3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9836</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔN-GFP-HIS3, rfa1-t11</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9842</td>
<td>MATα/MATα, DDC2-PKx9::TRP1/DDC2-GFP-HIS3, W303, RAD5</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9843</td>
<td>MATα/MATα, ddc2::ddc2ΔN-PKx9::TRP1/ ddc2::ddc2ΔN-GFP-HIS3, W303, RAD5</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9844</td>
<td>MATα/MATα, ddc2::ddc2ΔRBD-PKx9::TRP1/ ddc2::ddc2ΔRBD -GFP-HIS3, W303, RAD5</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9845</td>
<td>MATα/MATα, ddc2::ddc2ΔCCD-PKx9::TRP1/ ddc2::ddc2ΔCCD -GFP-HIS3, W303, RAD5</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9846</td>
<td>MATα/MATα, DDC2-PKx9::TRP1/DDC2, W303, RAD5</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9961</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔRBD-GFP-HIS3, RFA1-RFP-HIS3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9962</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔCCD-GFP-HIS3, RFA1-RFP-HIS3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9965</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔN-GFP-HIS3, RFA1-RFP-HIS3</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9970</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔN, exo1::Kan</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9972</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔRBD, exo1::Kan</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-9974</td>
<td>GA-1981 with ddc2::ddc2ΔCCD, exo1::Kan</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA-10070</td>
<td>GA-1981 with smi1::Kan, rad53::URA3, ddc2::ddc2ΔN</td>
<td>this study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3:
ATRIP CCD dimerization depends on a predicted helix within the CCD

This chapter provides additional data, which is unpublished.

Summary
The coiled-coil domain (CCD) is a common oligomerization motif that is formed by approximately 10% of all amino acids in the proteome. CCDs consist of two to seven α-helices coiled around each other into a left-handed supercoil that features a heptad repeat of primarily hydrophobic residues. Some CCDs contain short sequences, so-called “trigger” sequences that promote the oligomerization of the entire CCD. The CCD oligomerization of the checkpoint protein ATRIP is not well studied. Using size-exclusion chromatography coupled with multi-angle light scattering (SEC-MALS), we report that the human ATRIP CCD is dimeric in solution, while the CCD of the S. cerevisiae ortholog Ddc2 is monomeric in solution. Secondary structure prediction suggests that both the orthologs contain a short N-terminal helix followed by a longer helix. Interestingly, we observed that the short N-terminal helix acts as a trigger sequence and is essential for CCD dimerization in human ATRIP but not yeast Ddc2.
Introduction

Coiled-coils were first described in the early 1950s by Francis Crick and Linus Pauling independently (Crick, 1952; Pauling and Corey, 1953). They noted that α-helices wrap around each other and their side chains pack in a knobs-into-holes manner. Since then, this ubiquitous repeat motif has been extensively studied. A typical coiled-coil consists of a heptad repeat, \( abcdefg \), where \( a \) and \( d \) represent conserved hydrophobic amino acids, whereas \( e \) and \( g \) are solvent-exposed, polar residues (Figure 1). This amphipathic nature drives coiled-coil formation by burying the hydrophobic residues.

![Figure 1: Coiled coil architecture. (A) Top view of the crystal structure of S. cerevisiae Ddc2 CCD (residues 73-136) (PDB ID: 5OMD, chapter 2) shown as gray cartoon. Hydrophobic residues are shown as blue sticks. Polar residues are shown as orange sticks. (B) Wheel diagram showing the heptad repeat in two parallel helices forming a coiled-coil (top view). Amino acid positions \( a \) and \( d \) (shown in blue) are occupied by hydrophobic residues and form the hydrophobic core, whereas amino acid positions \( e \) and \( g \) (shown in orange) are occupied by polar residues.](image)

CCDs primarily function as oligomerization domains and have been proposed to act as molecular spacers or molecular rulers that either isolate functional domains or scaffold large protein complexes. Examples of such spacers are the 50 nm long outer membrane protein Omp-α CCD, the 110 nm long yeast spindle pole body protein Spc110 CCD, the 50 nm long cohesin CCD, and the 120 nm long DNA damage response protein Rad50 CCD (Engel et al., 1992; Hopfner et al., 2002; Kilmartin et al., 1993; Soh et al., 2015). An interesting feature of several CCDs is the presence of short sequences within the coiled-coil that are necessary for its oligomerization. The so-called “trigger” sequences are believed to form earlier in the folding process and probably act as a seeding event that promotes the oligomerization of the rest of the coiled-coil. Examples of such trigger sequences include the 13-residue autonomous helical folding unit within cortexillin I and GCN4; and a 7-residue sequence within the type I macrophage scavenger receptor (Frank et al., 2000; Kammerer et al., 1998; Steinmetz et al., 1998). Deleting such sequences was shown to prevent proper coiled-coil assembly.
Sequence analysis of the DNA damage response protein ATRIP predicts that residues 110-214 may fold into a CCD (see Results and discussion). Indeed, deletion of the predicted ATRIP CCD in human cells, disrupted ATRIP oligomerization, ATRIP interaction with its obligate partner ATR, and the recruitment of ATR-ATRIP to DNA damage sites (Ball and Cortez, 2005). However, this study did not reveal the degree of oligomerization of ATRIP. Recent structural and biochemical studies of the budding yeast Mec1-Ddc2 (Sawicka et al., 2016) and the Ddc2 N-terminus (see chapter 2) suggest that Ddc2 can exist as both monomer and dimer.

In this chapter, I describe the SEC-MALS analysis of human ATRIP and S. cerevisiae Ddc2 CCD. Our results suggest that the human ATRIP CCD contains a trigger sequence which is important for CCD dimerization.

**Results and discussion**

Sequence analysis using PCOILS (https://toolkit.tuebingen.mpg.de/#/tools/pcoils) of human ATRIP and S. cerevisiae Ddc2, hereafter referred to as HsATRIP and ScDdc2, respectively, predicted that residues 110-214 of HsATRIP, and residues 58-136 of ScDdc2, form a CCD (Figure 2A). Interestingly, secondary structure prediction by PSIPRED suggested that HsATRIP residues 110-138 may form a short α-helix, while residues 140-214 may form a longer α-helix (Figure 2B). Similarly, ScDdc2 residues 58-71 may form a short α-helix, while residues 73-136 may form a longer α-helix.
Therefore, we expressed and purified the following four protein constructs: HsATRIP residues 110-214, HsATRIP residues 140-214, ScDdc2 residues 58-136 and ScDdc2 residues 73-136 (Figure 3). All the constructs could be easily purified to homogeneity.

**Figure 2:** Coiled-coil and secondary structure prediction (A) Prediction of coiled-coil formation using PCOILS of HsATRIP and ScDdc2 aa residues 1-250. (B) Secondary structure prediction using PSIPRED of HsATRIP and ScDdc2 aa residues 1-250. α-helix formation predicted by PSIPRED is indicated in red, while β-strand formation is indicated in green.

**Figure 3:** Schematic diagram of (A) HsATRIP (in blue) and (B) ScDdc2 (in green) constructs used for SEC-MALS. Helix formation predicted by PSIPRED is indicated. Amino acid boundaries are indicated.
Using SEC-MALS, we tested the oligomerization state of all the four CCD constructs. Surprisingly, HsATRIP 110-214 was dimeric, whereas, HsATRIP 140-214 was monomeric (Figure 4). This might suggest that residues 110-139 are necessary for coiled-coil dimerization. Since residues 110-138 are predicted to fold into a short α-helix, it is possible that residues 110-138 may act as a trigger sequence for ATRIP CCD dimerization. Unexpectedly, both ScDdc2 58-136 and 73-136 were monomeric even at the highest injected concentration of 1.7 mM in our SEC-MALS experiments (Figure 4). This suggests that the presence of a trigger helix, if at all, is not conserved in the yeast and human orthologs.

![Figure 4: SEC-MALS analysis of HsATRIP and ScDdc2 constructs.](image)

Interestingly, ScDdc2 73-136 formed a crystallographic dimer (chapter 2, Figure 1C). These results suggest that the Ddc2 CCD might not be a constitutive dimer and dimerization might be regulated to control the function of the Mec1-Ddc2 complex. Indeed, in human cells, replacing the CCD of ATRIP with a heterologous CCD from transcription factor GCN4, restored ATR-ATRIP oligomerization, stable ATR-
ATRIP interaction and recruitment to DNA damage sites (Ball and Cortez, 2005). It is imaginable that the homodimerization of the ATRIP CCD trigger helix is regulated by DNA damage, for example, DNA damage might promote trigger helix homodimerization and therefore ATR signaling, while repair of DNA damage might disrupt trigger helix homodimerization to attenuate ATR-mediated checkpoint pathway. In conclusion, we suggest that the ATRIP CCD dimerization might be regulated by a trigger helix at its N-terminus.

Methods

Protein engineering and purification from E. coli
HsATRIP residues 110-214, HsATRIP residues 140-214, ScDdc2 residues 58-136, ScDdc2 residues 73-136 and ScDdc2 residues 1-136 were separately cloned into pOPINF vectors using the In-Fusion system (Clontech) and individually expressed in E. coli BL21(DE3). Cells expressing appropriate target were pelleted, resuspended in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 500 mM NaCl, 20 mM imidazole, 0.2% Tween-20), then rapidly frozen on dry-ice and stored at −80°C. For each target, the frozen cell suspension was thawed at room temperature and supplemented with complete EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Roche) and Benzonase (Sigma) before sonication. The lysate was clarified by ultracentrifugation and then affinity purified via an N-terminal His6 tag using Ni-NTA Superflow resin (Qiagen). His-tag was removed using His-tagged 3C protease and a second round of affinity purification. Lastly, target was purified using a Superdex 75 HiLoad 16/60 (GE Healthcare) column equilibrated in 20 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP, 0.02% NaN₃.

Molecular mass measurement by SEC-MALS
SEC-MALS experiments were performed as in chapter 2. Purified proteins were concentrated up to 0.3 mM (1.7 mM for ScDdc2 58-136), and filtered through a 0.1 μm Amicon filter before injection. 38 μl of each protein was separated on a Superdex 200 10/300 GL gel-filtration column (GE Healthcare) equilibrated in 20 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 200 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP, 0.02% NaN₃ at a flow rate of 0.65 ml/min. Light scattering was recorded on an in-line miniDAWN TREOS three-angle light scattering detector (Wyatt Technology) and protein concentration detected with an in-line Optilab Trex refractive index detector. The weight-averaged molecular mass of material contained in chromatographic peaks was determined using ASTRA 6 software (Wyatt Technology).
References


Chapter 4:
RPA mediates recruitment of MRX to forks and double-strand breaks to hold sister chromatids together

Andrew Seeber1, Anna Maria Hegnauer2, Nicole Hustedt2, Ishan Deshpande1, Jerome Poli2, Jan Eglinger2, Philippe Pasero3, Heinz Gut2, Miki Shinoara4, Karl Peter Hopfner2, Kenji Shimada2, Susan M. Gasser1

1Friedrich Miescher Institute for Biomedical Research (FMI), Maulbeerstrasse 66, 4058 Basel, Switzerland
2University of Basel, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Klingelbergstrasse 50, CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland
3Institute of Human Genetics, CNRS UPR 1142, 34090 Montpellier, France
4Institute for Protein Research, Osaka University, Suita, Osaka 565-0871, Japan
5Gene Center LMU Munich, Feodor-Lynen Strasse 25, 81377 Munich, Germany

Published in Mol Cell, 2016, 64(5):951-966.

Summary
The Mre11-Rad50-Xrs2 (MRX) complex is related to SMC complexes that form rings capable of holding two distinct DNA strands together. MRX functions at stalled replication forks and double-strand breaks (DSBs). A mutation in the N-terminal OB fold of the 70 kDa subunit of yeast replication protein A, rfa1-t11, abrogates MRX recruitment to both types of DNA damage. The rfa1 mutation is functionally epistatic with loss of any of the MRX subunits for survival of replication fork stress or DSB recovery, although it does not compromise end-resection. High-resolution imaging shows that either the rfa1-t11 or the rad50Δ mutation lets stalled replication forks collapse and allows the separation not only of opposing ends but of sister chromatids at breaks. Given that cohesin loss does not provoke visible sister separation as long as the RPA-MRX contacts are intact, we conclude that MRX also serves as a structural linchpin holding sister chromatids together at breaks.
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SUMMARY

The Mre11-Rad50-Xrs2 (MRX) complex is related to SMC complexes that form rings capable of holding two distinct DNA strands together. MRX functions at stalled replication forks and double-strand breaks (DSBs). A mutation in the N-terminal OB fold of the 70 kDa subunit of yeast replication protein A, rfa1-t11, abrogates MRX recruitment to both types of DNA damage. The rfa1 mutation is functionally epistatic with loss of any of the MRX subunits for survival of replication fork stress or DSB recovery, although it does not compromise end-resection. High-resolution imaging shows that either the rfa1-t11 or the rad50D mutation lets stalled replication forks collapse and allows the separation not only of opposing ends but of sister chromatids at breaks. Given that cohesin loss does not provoke visible sister separation as long as the RPA-MRX contacts are intact, we conclude that MRX also serves as a structural linchpin holding sister chromatids together at breaks.

INTRODUCTION

The DNA damage and intra-S phase checkpoints are important response mechanisms that allow cells to deal with damage from exogenous or endogenous sources both by arresting the cell cycle when necessary and by activating the appropriate repair machinery (Ciccia and Elledge, 2010; Harrison and Haber, 2006; Hustedt et al., 2013). Central to the checkpoint response are the conserved checkpoint kinases Mec1-Ddc2 (ATR-ATRIP) and Tel1 (ATM). Importantly, the trimeric complex that binds single-strand DNA (ssDNA), replication protein A (RPA), acts as a recruitment platform for checkpoint and repair proteins, including but not limited to Mec1-Ddc2 and 9-1-1, the DNA damage clamp, both at stalled forks and at DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) (Paciotti et al., 2000; Rouse and Jackson, 2002; Xu et al., 2008; Zou and Elledge, 2003; Kanoh et al., 2006; Majka et al., 2006). The failure of RPA to coat ssDNA results in replication catastrophe and also compromises homologous recombination (HR), underscoring the crucial role of this complex (Hustedt et al., 2013; Toledo et al., 2013). Although checkpoint activation coordinates cell cycle events, the maintenance of the physical structure of a stalled fork or a DSB is also crucial for repair, especially repair that is based on recombination with a sister chromatid (Bjergbaek et al., 2005; Petermann and Hellday, 2010; San Filippo et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2004).

Structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC) complexes are central to long-range chromatin organization and are required for the proper meiotic segregation of replicated DNA, chromosome condensation, and homology-based DNA repair (Uhlmann, 2016). SMC proteins are characterized by a distinct coiled-coil domain that contains a hinge, allowing the coil to fold back on itself, bringing the N- and C-terminal globular domains together (Hirano, 2006). The best characterized SMC protein complex is cohesin, which comprises two SMC proteins, Smc1/3, and two non-SMC proteins, Scc1 (Mcd1) and Scc3. The latter serve as a clasp to bridge the head domains of Smc1/3. This complex keeps sister chromatids paired, particularly in G2 and prometaphase (Uhlmann et al., 1999). Cohesin is also recruited to DSBs and stalled replication forks, where it contributes to repair (Heidinger-Pauli et al., 2008; Ström et al., 2007; Ström and Sjögren, 2007; Unal et al., 2004, 2007) and replication fork recovery (Tittel-Elmer et al., 2012).

The Mre11/Rad50/Xrs2 (MRX) complex is structurally similar to cohesin and is often characterized as the first responder to a DSB (Libby et al., 2004). MRX promotes the initiation of end-resection with the co-factor Sae2 (CTIP) (Garcia et al., 2011; Lengsfeld et al., 2007; Mimitou and Symington, 2008; Williams et al., 2009). Although abundant data implicate MRX in
Figure 1. rfa1-t11 Is Checkpoint Proficient and Is Epistatic with Loss of MRX on HU

(A) Diagram of the three subunits of RPA. Rfa1 (ScRPA70) contains four OB domains. Unlike the others, the N-OB binds DNA poorly but binds proteins.

(B) Crystal structure of budding yeast Rfa1-t11 1–132 in cartoon with the five-stranded β-barrel forming the OB fold colored in dark green. Residues 1–4 are not shown. The E45 side chain is indicated in blue atom colors, while helices and coiled elements are in pale yellow. *Putative MRX-binding site. Right: E45 in the Rfa1-t11 structure with residues R44, K45E, and R62 displayed as sticks and blue atom colors. K45E disrupts this basic patch.

(C) G1 arrest-release into 0.2M HU

D) EMAP 0 mM HU

E) YPAD 20 mM HU 0.003% MMS 20 μg/ml Zeocin

F) YPAD 10 mM HU 0.005% MMS

(legend continued on next page)
checkpoint activation, telomere elongation, and initiation of resection (reviewed in Stracker and Petri, 2011; Lafrance-Vanasse et al., 2015), only a few studies have asked whether it plays a structural role at damage. Supporting this, it was shown that the two sides of a DSB separate from each other in ~12%–15% of cells lacking MRX (Kaye et al., 2004; Löbachev et al., 2004). MRX is thought to form a dimer complex with two Rad50 subunits, which, like Smc1 and Smc3 in cohesin, have long coiled-coil arms that can stretch up to ~600 Å (de Jager et al., 2001a; Hopfner et al., 2002; Moreno-Herrero et al., 2005). These coiled-coil arms can dimerize at their tips through a zinc hook domain, allowing the formation of ring-like structures or higher order oligomers that could hold two DNA molecules together (de Jager et al., 2001b; Hopfner et al., 2002). Functional studies showing that the hook domain is essential for MRX function in DNA repair, telomere maintenance, and meiotic DSB formation (Hohl et al., 2011; Wiltzius et al., 2005) are consistent with this hypothesis but do not prove it. Genetic data also implicate MRX in the repair of DSBs by sister chromatid exchange (González-Barrera et al., 2003; Hartuski et al., 2001).

Our study starts from the discovery of an epistatic relationship between a point mutation in the large subunit of RPA, rfa1-t11, and null alleles of MRE11, RAD50, or XRS2, under conditions of replication stress in S. cerevisiae. The rfa1-t11 allele bears a single point mutation (K45E) in the N-oligonucleotide binding (OB) fold of Rfa1, which renders the strain deficient for both mitotic checkpoint and meiotic DSB formation (Hegnauer et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2008). All strains are W303 + isogenic strains (Table S1). Functional studies showed that the N-terminal OB domain is responsible for the recruitment of ATRIP and Sgs1 in budding yeast, and Rad9 and p53 in mammalian cells (Ball et al., 2007; Bochkareva et al., 2005; Dutta et al., 1993; Flynn and Zou, 2010; Hegnauer et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2008). In earlier studies, RPA was mutagenized for non-lethal mutations, in order to identify crucial binding partners and domain-specific functions (Binz and Wold, 2008; Umezu et al., 1998; Zou et al., 2008). A previously characterized mutation, rfa1-t11 (K45E), was reported to be specifically defective in HR, while supporting normal DNA replication (Kanoh et al., 2006; Wang and Haber, 2004). The lysine-to-glutamate charge reversal maps to the binding pocket of the N-terminal OB fold. Intriguingly, it confers recessive sensitivity to hydroxyurea (HU), which induces replication stress by inhibiting dNTP synthesis (Figure S1A), although without HU there was no delay in S phase entry: replication forks fire and progress without pausing or forming aberrant recombination intermediates (Figures S1B and S1C).

To understand the structural changes provoked by the K45E substitution, we expressed, purified, and crystallized the mutant N-terminal OB fold of yeast Rfa1 (aa 1–132) and solved its structure at 1.8 Å (Table 1) using the single-wavelength anomalous diffraction method (Supplemental Experimental Procedures). Indeed, the rfa1-t11 mutation disrupts a basic patch in the binding pocket of the N-terminal OB fold, as the mutant residue protrudes into the binding cleft. Given that the ligands of this domain are acidic, we predicted that this K45E mutation might interfere with protein-protein interactions that are important at stalled forks.

The N-terminal OB domain is responsible for the recruitment of ATRIP/Ddc2 to ssDNA and activation of the ATR kinase (Rouse and Jackson, 2002; Zou and Elledge, 2003). Mec1-Ddc2 is responsible for the vast majority of Rad53 phosphorylation induced by replication stress (Hustedt et al., 2013). Therefore, we tested for defects in checkpoint activation on a synchronized population of rfa1-t11 cells, after releasing from G1 arrest into 0.2 M HU for 90 min. Rad53, however, was efficiently activated in the rfa1-t11 mutant and showed a pronounced shift in electrophoretic migration (Figure 1C). A similar assay in a strain bearing rfa1-t11 combined with tel1Δ showed the same shift, arguing that Rad53 activation on HU is primarily mediated by Mec1 (Figure S1D). Importantly, impaired Mec1 kinase activation is not responsible for the rfa1-t11 mutant’s sensitivity to HU.

RESULTS

The rfa1-t11 K45E Mutation Disrupts a Basic Patch in Rfa1’s N-OB Binding Pocket

The ssDNA-binding protein RPA is composed of three subunits, all of which are essential for cell viability during bud yeast (Figure 1A). The largest subunit (ScRpa70 or Rfa1) contains 4 OB fold domains, three of which are implicated in ssDNA binding, while the N-terminal OB-fold serves as a recruitment platform for other proteins involved in replication stress and DSB repair, including Ddc2/ATRIP and Sgs1 in budding yeast, and Rad9 and p53 in mammalian cells (Ball et al., 2007; Bochkareva et al., 2005; Dutta et al., 1993; Flynn and Zou, 2010; Hegnauer et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2008).

MRX and rfa1-t11 Show Similar Epistatic Miniarray Profile Patterns in Response to Replication Stress

To identify rfa1-t11’s pathway of action, we performed an epistatic miniarray profile (EMAP) to compare the growth of rfa1-t11 and 34 other query strains crossed to 1,311 deletion alleles, grown in 0, 20, or 100 mM HU (Hustedt et al., 2015). This resulted in a gene network of 45,885 interactions that had either synergistic or suppressive effects or failed to grow altogether on HU (Figures 1A, S2A, and S2B). One can correlate the patterns of sensitivity to identify genetic pathways affected similarly by specific mutants, because mutants that share phenotypic correlations often share functionality (Morrison et al., 2007; Dunham et al., 2009).
We created double mutants of rfa1-t11 with deletions of MRE11, RAD50, or XRS2 and tested them for epistasis on a range of DNA-damaging agents. Confirming the EMAP, we found that the sensitivity of rfa1-t11 for growth on HU is completely epistatic with mre11Δ, rad50Δ, or xrs2Δ. That is, single and double mutants had nearly identical survival rates on HU (Figure 1E). The same is true for the triple mutant, rfa1-t11 mre11Δ xrs2Δ, on either HU or methyl methanesulfonate (MMS), an alkylating agent that also delays replication fork progression. On Zeocin, which induces single- and double-strand breaks, the two complexes again appeared to act on a common survival pathway, as the double mutants lacked additivity, although MRX loss of function alleles were significantly more sensitive than rfa1-t11. Nonetheless, these data confirmed that rfa1-t11 likely acts through MRX and not on a parallel repair pathway at stalled forks and DSBs.

We next tested whether the rfa1-t11 allele is epistatic or additive with mutations in Mec1, the checkpoint kinase, or the recombination protein Rad51. If rfa1-t11’s main defect were an inability to load or modulate Rad51 on HU (Kantake et al., 2003), one would expect these two mutants to be epistatic. However, neither rad51Δ nor mec1-100 was epistatic with the rfa1-t11 allele (Figure 1F), each showing a synthetic lethality with rfa1-t11 on HU. Similarly, ddc1Δ, which compromises the 9-1-1 complex, showed synthetic lethality in combination with rfa1-t11 on HU (data not shown). Our data suggest that RPA works with MRX to maintain replication fork integrity on HU, defining a pathway that acts in parallel to checkpoint activation and to Rad51 (Figure 1F). Consistently, rad51Δ was synergistically sensitive with mre11Δ and mec1-100 on HU or MMS (Figure 1F).

### The Replication Fork Is Unable to Resume after HU-Induced Arrest in the rfa1-t11 Mutant

To examine how rfa1-t11 affects replication fork integrity, we scored the resumption of replication after release from an acute fork arrest in 0.2 M HU. After 6 hr on HU, the recovery rate for mec1-100 cells is <10% of wild-type (wt) levels, while both the mre11Δ and rfa1-t11 strains reduce recovery to about 20% of WT levels. Strikingly, the rfa1-t11 mutant is again completely epistatic with the loss of Mre11 and is synergistically lethal with mec1-100 (Figure 2A). This places the rfa1-t11 defect on the pathway through which MRX ensures fork restart on HU (Figures 1D, 1E, and S2).

To see if this reflects the loss of DNA polymerase α (polα) at forks arrested by 0.2 M HU, we scored the presence of polα at forks that were arrested synchronously near early firing origins, using chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) (Cobb et al., 2003). In contrast to results in an isogenic WT background, we scored a striking loss of DNA polα at ARS607 in the rfa1-t11 mutant (Figure 2B). This does not reflect an impaired checkpoint response, as there is no polα at the late firing origin ARS501 (Figure 2B). In contrast, in mec1-100 cells, impaired Rad53 activation allows late origin firing (Cobb et al., 2005).

To see if the resumption of DNA synthesis after HU arrest is compromised by rfa1-t11, we performed a DNA combing assay that measures fork progression by incorporation of BrdU, a thymidine analog, after a transient exposure to 0.2 M HU and release into HU-free media. Whereas WT forks resume

### Table 1. Crystallographic Data Collection and Refinement Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Rfa1-t11Δ-132 Se-Met Peak*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
<td>P 2₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit cell dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a, b, c (Å)</td>
<td>29.62, 115.35, 69.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α, β, γ (°)</td>
<td>90.0, 90.7, 90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution range (Å)</td>
<td>50.0–1.8 (1.85–1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength (Å)</td>
<td>0.97941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (%)</td>
<td>95.4 (86.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy (%)</td>
<td>2.4 (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsym (%)</td>
<td>0.079 (0.527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l-ref (%)</td>
<td>8.0 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC (1/2) (%)</td>
<td>99.5 (67.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique reflections</td>
<td>80,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refinement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwork</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwiso</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution range (Å)</td>
<td>44.3–1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections (all)</td>
<td>41,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections (test set)</td>
<td>2,086 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of atoms</td>
<td>4,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure of merit</td>
<td>0.415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Factors (Å²)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvent</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RMSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond lengths (Å)</th>
<th>0.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond angles (°)</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ramachandran Plot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowed (%)</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outliers (%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data collection statistics are reported for unmerged Friedel pairs.

*Values in parentheses refer to the highest-resolution shell.

et al., 2007). For example, the histone variant HTZ1 pattern correlates best with the nucleosome remodeler SWR1, which incorporates Htz1 into nucleosomes (Figures 1D and S2B).

To our surprise we found that rfa1-t11 correlated most strongly with mre11Δ in both the absence and presence of 20 mM HU (Figure 1D). On 100 mM HU (Figure S2B), the EMAP pattern of rfa1-t11 correlated additionally with mec1-100, an S phase defective allele of Mec1 kinase that is particularly sensitive to HU (Paciotto et al., 2001). Consistently, at 100 mM HU the rfa1-t11 and mre11Δ EMAPs were similar to the template switch pathway, whereas at 20 mM the patterns of sensitivity scored for mre11Δ and rfa1-t11 resemble a null allele of replication fork component mrc1Δ. This led to a deeper examination of the genetic relationship of rfa1-t11, mec1-100, and the MRX complex.
elongation, the rfa1-t11 mutant is strongly impaired in the resumption of DNA synthesis (Figures 2D and 2E, white arrows). Again, we note that the rfa1-t11 defect is additive with mec1-100. Similar phenotypes have been observed in MRX deletion alleles, although not for nuclease-deficient Mre11 mutants (Tittel-Elmer et al., 2009).

**rfa1-t11 Interferes with Recruitment of MRX to Stalled Replication Forks**

Given the epistasis of mec1-100 with rfa1-t11, we examined whether the K45E mutation in RPA compromises the recruitment of MRX to stalled replication forks. We performed PK-tagged Rad50 ChIP after treatment with 0.2 M HU in WT and mutant strains. Indeed, by quantitative ChIP for Rad50-PK, we found that Rad50 recruitment to stalled forks at ARS607 was compromised by the rfa1-t11 mutation (Figure 2F). To make sure that this was a general phenomenon and not unique to one site, we performed genome-wide ChIP of HA-tagged Rad50 on cells synchronously released from α-factor into 0.2 M HU. Figure 2G shows the pattern of Rad50 binding across a typical domain on Chr3, which includes several origins and non-origin binding sites. Whereas Rad50 binding at non-origin sites was not impaired in the rfa1-t11 strain, its signal was strongly reduced at origins. We integrated this over all origins of the yeast genome (Figure 2H) and found ≥50% reduction in MRX (Rad50) at origins on HU. Combining our data with observations of Tittel-Elmer et al. (2012), we propose that Rfa1 recruits MRX to stalled replication forks, the failure of which allows replication fork collapse on HU soon after origin firing. This pathway of fork maintenance is independent of Rad53 activation (Figure 2I).

**MRX Interacts with RPA through the N-OB Fold of Rfa1**

The epistasis and recruitment data on HU suggested that RPA might directly bind MRX. To detect this interaction and monitor its response to the rfa1-t11 mutation, we co-immunoprecipitated Rad50-PK from extracts of WT and rfa1-t11 strains, probing for Rfa1 with an antibody that reacts equally with mutant and WT Rfa1 (Figure 3A). We find that Rad50 can indeed co-purify Rfa1, while it binds rfa1-t11 less efficiently (Figure 3B). The converse precipitation (i.e., by anti-Rfa1) confirmed that the MRX interaction was sensitive to the rfa1-t11 mutation. The binding did not depend on DNA or RNA, since recovery was unchanged after treatment with Benzonase, which degrades nucleic acids (Figures 3B and 3A). Pull-downs from cell extracts using antibody specific for Xrs2 recovered Rad50 and Rfa1 but failed to recover rfa1-t11 (Figure 3B).

To determine the component of MRX that binds Rfa1, we repeated the Rad50-PK pull-down from extracts of mec1-100 or xrs2Δ strains. Rad50-PK precipitated a lower amount of Rfa1 in the absence of either Mre11 or Xrs2, suggesting either the existence of multiple contacts between Rfa1 and MRX or a need for MRX complex integrity for the interaction (Figure 3C). A double point mutation in Xrs2 (xrs2-AA) that disrupts Mre11 binding and/or the truncation (xrs2-654) of the Xrs2 C terminus (Shima et al., 2005) compromised Rfa1 recovery to the same extent as rfa1-t11 in XRS2Δ cells (Figure S3B), suggesting a role for MRX conformation or complex integrity in Rfa1 interaction.

Finally, we examined the specificity of binding by comparing yeast two-hybrid (Y2H) interactions of Rfa1 with rfa1-t11. Intriguingly, both Mre11 and Xrs2 bound Rfa1 by Y2H, but only Xrs2 binding was rfa1-t11 sensitive (Figures S3C and S3D). Y2H with Rad50 was not possible because the cloned fusions were lethal. Unfortunately, Y2H does not exclude that the endogenous MRX subunits form tertiary complexes with the bait during the assay, and thus from the Y2H and pull-down results we concluded only that multiple contact sites exist between MRX and RPA, with a subset being sensitive to the rfa1-t11 mutation.

To map the interactions more precisely, we used a scanning peptide microarray that consisted of 206 18-aa-long peptides (overlapping by 9 aa), covering all of MRX, except the coiled-coiled arms of Rad50. The peptides were spotted onto glass slides in triplicate and were incubated with purified recombinant Rfa1 or rfa1-t11 N-OB domains (Figure 3D). Bound proteins were visualized through anti-Rfa1 staining and a secondary Alexa647-tagged antibody, whose fluorescence was quantified on a protein array analyzer (ImageJ plugin; see Supplemental Experimental Procedures). The efficiency of binding of either Rfa1 or rfa1-t11 is plotted in Figure 3E, and the full list of peptides and their associated intensities are listed in Table S2.

We scored several clusters of Rfa1-binding peptides that were sensitive to the rfa1-t11 mutation: namely, in the nuclease domain of Mre11, in the ATPase domain of Rad50, and two defined regions in Xrs2, one each in the N-terminal FHA domain and the C-terminal Mre11-binding domain (Figure 3E). When mapped onto the 3D structure of Mre11-Rad50 (Seifert et al., 2015), the peptides cluster in two surface areas: the double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) binding cleft of the Rad50 dimer, and a surface patch on the lateral side of the Mre11 phosphodieserase domain (Figure 3F). Although peptides from Xrs2 also showed differential interaction, two of these map to binding sites for other proteins, and they do not cluster as do those in Mre11 or Xrs2.

---

**Figure 2. Resumption of Replication after HU-Induced Stalling Fails in the rfa1-t11 Mutant**

(A) Recovery assay after G1 arrest with α-factor and release into 0.2 M HU of indicated mutants (rfa1-t11, mec1-100; n = 3).
(B) ChIP of DNA pols at either the early-firing ARS607 or late-firing ARS501 (Cobb et al., 2003) after release from G1 arrest into 0.2 M HU (n = 3).
(C) Experimental scheme of DNA combing: synchronized cells are released into 0.2 M HU with a BrdU analogue for 90 min, after which the HU is washed out and the cells are allowed to recover again with analogue. DNA was combed and new synthesis was visualized by antibodies against BrdU and DNA.
(D) Example images of DNA combing with gaps (white arrows) and shorter lengths of newly synthesized DNA in mutant backgrounds.
(E) Cumulative frequency graph showing the non-replicated fiber fraction in WT and mutant strains.
(F) Rad50-PK ChIP to ARS607 after release from α-factor into 0.2 M HU (n = 3).
(G) Example plots of genome-wide Rad50-HA ChIP-chip showing loss of Rad50 at origins 307–309 in rfa1-t11.
(H) Boxplots of Rad50 ChIP-chip signals at all origins after release in to 0.2 M HU for 60 min at 25°C, in indicated strains. Error bars represent the SEM.
(I) Model placing rfa1-t11 on a pathway with MRX, parallel to Mec1 activation, to confer replication fork integrity.
Figure 3. The Interaction between MRX and Rfa1 Is Disrupted in rfa1-t11
(A) Western blot showing that the Rfa1 antibody recognizes the N-OB of both Rfa1 and rfa1-t11 equally.
(B) Co-immunoprecipitation from yeast extracts in WT RFA1 and rfa1-t11 using either antibodies against the PK tag, Xrs2, or Rfa1. Samples were Benzonase treated (Figure S3A).
(C) Rad50-PK co-immunoprecipitation as in (A) using the indicated mutants.
(D) Scheme of MRX scanning peptide microarray probed with N-OB of either Rfa1 or rfa1-t11. Two hundred six peptides (18 aa each) were spotted onto a glass slide for binding to Rfa1 or rfa1-t11 N-OB from (A). Supplemental Experimental Procedures describe signal detection and quantitation.
(E) Interaction heatmaps for either Rfa1 or rfa1-t11 across MRX. Arrows indicate regions of strong (red) binding sensitive to the rfa1-t11 mutation (n = 3).

(legend continued on next page)
Rad50. Microscale thermophoresis (MST) showed that the Rad50 peptide 17 had the highest affinity for Rfa1-N (Figure 3G). The other peptides tested showed weaker binding. This does not rule out that they contribute to a binding site but suggests that the ATPase-domain of Rad50 contains a key interaction site, which is indeed sensitive to the K45E mutation.

mre11Δ rfa1-t11 tel1Δ mec1-100 wt

mre11Δ rfa1-t11 tel1Δ mec1-100 wt

rfa1-t11 Impairs Mec1-Dependent Checkpoint Activation at DSBs

Because rfa1-t11 had previously been shown to be important to recruit Ddc2 (ATRIP) and Mec1 (ATR) to a DSB (Dubrana et al., 2007; Zou and Elledge, 2003), we next interrogated its genetic relationship with mec1-100 on Zeocin, which induces both single- and double-strand breaks. Although rfa1-t11 is sensitive to Zeocin, mec1-100 has a mild slow-growth phenotype (Figure 4A). In contrast to growth on HU, where the combination of rfa1-t11 and mec1-100 was synthetically lethal, the combination of rfa1-t11 and mec1-100 was only slightly additive on Zeocin. MRX both helps recruit the DNA damage checkpoint kinase Tel1 (ATM) to DSBs (Nakada et al., 2003a, 2003b) and promotes resection to allow Ddc2-Mec1 activation, explaining their epistasis.

To check the epistatic relationship of Rfa1 and Mre11 on Zeocin, we scored the effects of rfa1-t11, mre11Δ, tel1Δ, and their pairwise combinations on Rad53 phosphorylation. We found that rfa1-t11 and mre11Δ mutations compromised checkpoint activation by Zeocin to a similar degree (Figure 4B), yet in the case of rfa1-t11, the impaired checkpoint response was strongly additive with tel1Δ; that is, the tel1Δ rfa1-t11 completely failed to activate the DNA damage checkpoint

Figure 4. rfa1-t11 Has a Diminished Checkpoint Response to DSBs, but Resection Is Intact

(A) A 10× dilution series on YPAD ± HU and Zeocin of isogenic strains with the indicated genotypes. (B) Western blot showing Rad53 phosphorylation upshift after release from α-factor to 250 μM/ml Zeocin. No Rad53 phosphorylation was detectable in tel1Δ rfa1-t11. Mcm2 is the loading control. (C) γH2A ChIP to a HO-induced DSB at MATα (van Attikum et al., 2007) at 120 min after cut induction (n = 4). (D) Cut efficiency time course from Figure 5A showing that WT and rfa1-t11 have similar cut efficiencies. After replication, both sisters are likely to be cut at once. (E) QAOS assay showing equal accumulation of ssDNA at 1.6kb from the DSB at MATα in WT and rfa1-t11, reproduced from Dubrana et al. (2007). Error bars represent SEM.

(F) Crystal structure of Chaetomium thermophilium Mre11-Rad50 dimer with dsDNA (Seifert et al., 2015). Peptides scored in the microarray as strongly interacting with RFA1 OB fold domain are highlighted in red. (G) Purified Rfa1-N (dilution series from 0.12 to 1,000 μM) was incubated with 25 μM Cy5-labeled Rad50 and Mre11 peptides for 15 min at rt. Dissociation constant $K_D$ of 63.6 ± 7 μM is for Rad50 peptide 17 and Rfa1-N (n = 3), error bars represent SEM, and Δ$F_{norm}$ ($\psi_0$) represents change in fluorescence during thermophoresis normalized to initial fluorescence. A detailed list of peptides is provided in Table S2.
(Figure 4B). This suggests that the rfa1-t11 defect in checkpoint at DSBs arises from the loss of Mec1 (ATR) activity. Indeed, by ChiP rfa1-t11 and rad50Δ were shown to reduce the accumulation of phosphorylated H2A (γH2A, a Mec1 target), at an HO-induced DSB (Figure 4C). We conclude that rfa1-t11 compromises the Mec1 checkpoint response at DNA breaks (i.e., on Zeocin) but does not impair Mec1 activation at stalled forks. This difference likely stems from the redundancy of co-activators and mediators at stalled forks, namely, 9-1-1, Dbp11, Dna2, Mrcl, Sgs1, and RPA (Hustedt et al., 2013). We note that although DSB activation of checkpoint kinases was compromised by rfa1-t11, both the efficiency of HO endonuclease cleavage and resection rates were at WT levels (Figure 4DE).

**rfa1-t11 Reduces Recruitment of MRX to DSBs and Reduces Repair Efficiency**

To see whether RPA is implicated in the recruitment or stabilization of MRX at DSBs, possibly by binding either a short overhang or an internal ssDNA stretch, we measured the recruitment Rad50-PK to a HO endonuclease-induced DSB at MAT by ChiP. Consistent with previously published results, MRX binding is strongest at early time points and close to the cut site (compare 0.6 versus 1.6 kb probes). This interaction is reduced (although not entirely eliminated) in the rfa1-t11 mutant (Figure 5A). Consistently, Mrcl1-YFP focus formation was reduced by roughly 50% in response to Zeocin in the rfa1-t11 mutant (Figure 5B). One further function attributed to MRX at DSBs is the recruitment of cohesin (Unal et al., 2004, 2007). We therefore tested whether rfa1-t11, like rad50Δ, fails to recruit cohesin to an HO-induced DSB. ChiP for cohesin subunit Scc1-HA (Mcd1) at a DSB confirmed that both mutants reduce cohesin recruitment similarly after HO induction (Figure 5C).

In contrast to the observation that rfa1-t11 decreases MRX levels at DSBs, it was recently reported that the loss of Sae2 leads to more MRX at DSBs (Chen et al., 2015; Gobbini et al., 2015). We therefore tested whether sae2Δ would compensate for the reduced RPA-MRX binding in the rfa1-t11 mutant. Indeed, growth defects of rfa1-t11 on Zeocin, HU, MMS and the topoisomerase I inhibitor camptothecin were partially rescued by the elimination of Sae2 (Figure 5E). Again, this supports the model that rfa1-t11 confers sensitivity to DNA damage because of impaired MRX recruitment.

To see if rfa1-t11 affects DSB repair by a pathway other than HR, we tested the impact of the mutation on repair by end-joining of two incompatible DSBs that flank a URA3 reporter gene (Ma et al., 2003; Matsuizaki et al., 2012). After cleavage and repair, the survivors are either URA* (indicating repair by microhomology-mediated repair of non-complementary DSB ends following resection) or URA+ (precise end-ilation). Like mutations in the MRX complex, rfa1-t11 reduced the recovery of both URA* and URA+ colonies (Figure 5D). Importantly, the xrs2Δ mutation is epistatic with rfa1-t11 in this assay (Iwasaki et al., 2016), consistent with drop assays on Zeocin that place MRX and Rfa1 on the same repair pathway. Given that rfa1-t11 does not block resection, we suggest that RPA acts by recruiting or stabilizing MRX at breaks, allowing it to hold the two break ends together for either precise or imprecise end-joining.

**RFA1 OB Fold Integrity Is Necessary to Allow MRX to Hold the Ends of a DSB Together**

We next tested whether rfa1-t11 directly interferes with the end-tethering activity of MRX by scoring the separation of ends by tagged with different fluorescent protein fusions on either side of an inducible DSB (Kaye et al., 2004; Lobachev et al., 2004). As expected, following cleavage by a galactose-inducible I-SceI endonuclease, the loss of MRX integrity provoked a significant increase in DSB end separation in cells arrested at G2/M by the DNA damage checkpoint (Figure 6A; see also Kaye et al., 2004; Lobachev et al., 2004). Importantly, the level of end separation scored for mre11A and rad50Δ mutants was the same for rfa1-t11 (Figure 6A).

The fact that rfa1-t11 compromised cohesin loading (Figure 5C) led us to test whether this mutation interferes with the tight association of sister chromatids, which we could score in a strain bearing a lacO array adjacent to the HO-induced break at MATα (Figure 6B). Sister cohesion at DSBs is commonly ascribed to cohesin, but on the basis of its architecture and dimensions, MRX should also be able to hold sister chromatids together (Hopfner et al., 2002). To test a potential role for MRX in sister-sister pairing at breaks, we used multiple DSB imaging approaches. First, super-resolution structured illumination microscopy (SIM) was used to analyze small changes in the area occupied by the paired lacO arrays adjacent to a break, in late S/G2 phase cells. Second, we performed high-speed time-lapse imaging of the arrays to measure the kinetics of separation following break induction, in unarrested S phase cells. Finally, we examined the maintenance of sister-sister juxtaposition after efficient DSB induction in cells that are arrested by microtubule depolymerization and fixed, comparing rfa1-t11 with mutants in cohesin and MRX.

We first confirmed that we can resolve two sister chromatids with 3D SIM imaging of the cleaved MATα locus (Figure 6BC). Following projection of the 3D image stack to a 2D plane for a large number of late S phase cells, we found that the volume and shape of the fluorescent lacO signal are significantly larger in the rfa1-t11 mutant, even though the sisters only fully separated in <1% of cells (Figure 6CD). We next confirmed the validity of this spot-size assay by using a strain in which the essential cohesin subunit Scc1 (Mcd1) was cleaved by a galactose-inducible TEV protease (Figure 6D). The efficiency of Scc1 cleavage was documented by western blot (Figures S4A and S4B). In S phase cells, we scored a robust increase in the area occupied by the cut-proximal lacO focus after Scc1 cleavage, presumably reflecting compromised pairing of sister chromatids (Figures 6D, red arrow and S4C). We applied the same analysis to the strain bearing a HO-mediated DSB at the MATα locus adjacent to a lacO array (Figure 6B). In WT cells there is a slight increase in array area as cells progress from G1 to S phase; at 120 min after HO induction, there is again a slight increase in locus size (Figure 6D). In the rfa1-t11 or rad50Δ strains, however, the size of the lacO signal stemming from the two sisters, increased more significantly than was detected upon Scc1 cleavage (Figure 6D; 0.9 versus 0.6 μm²).

Given that chromatin loci show continual movement in living cells, and that fixation can introduce artifacts, we examined the behavior of the lacO arrays on the two tagged sisters using
Figure 5. rfa1-t11 Reduces the Recruitment of MRX to DSBs
(A) Rad50-PK ChIP at an HO-induced DSB at MATα on Chr3 in asynchronous cells (n = 5) (for probes, see van Attikum et al., 2007). HO cut efficiencies for each experiment are in Table S3. We assume that both sisters are cut, given the high rate of cleavage scored for individual loci.
(B) Mre11-YFP foci accumulation after 250 μg/ml Zeocin (n ≥ 65). Details are provided in Table S4.
(C) Scc1-HA ChIP to an HO-induced DSB at 120 min after induction (n = 4) as in (A).
(D) Scheme of the NHEJ repair pathways that yield either URA− (imprecise end-joining) or URA+ (precise end-joining) phenotypes (Matsuzaki et al., 2012). Graph shows the percentage URA− and URA+ survivors in various genotypes (n = 3). Error bars represent SEM except for (B), in which they represent the SD.

a high-speed, high-resolution imaging assay with and without cut induction (Figure 7). In the strains used in Figure 6B, we acquired 2 stacks on a spinning-disk confocal microscope (8×0.2 nm z stacks, 10 ms exposure) continuously over 1 min, yielding 750 stacks per movie at a 3D spatial resolution of ~256 nm. The movies were projected stack by stack on to a 2D plane for analysis by the ImageJ (Fiji) plugin Trackmate (Supplemental Experimental Procedures), and we quantified the percentage of frames in which two spots can be resolved. Again we used the TEV-cleavable Scc1 strain to confirm that we can monitor a loss of sister chromatid cohesion at a tagged ARS607 (Figures S4D and S4E). Spot separation was very low in a normal WT S phase (~2% of frames separated), while after 1 hr TEV induction, separation increased to ~11% (Figure S4E).

Next we induced HO-mediated cleavage at MATα (Figure 7A) and monitored sister chromatid dynamics in WT, rad50Δ, or rfa1-t11 cells. After 2 hr of HO induction in WT S phase cells, 8% of the frames showed resolution of the two sisters into two
Figure 6. RFA1-Mediated Recruitment of MRX to DSBs Is Necessary for Tethering Ends and Sister Chromatids

(A) Scheme of strain used for tracking both sides of a galactose inducible I-SceI DSB on Chr2. LacO/LacI-GFP tags one side and TetO/TetR-CFP the other (Lobachev et al., 2004). MRX can tether ends through Rad50’s hook domain by directly binding to the DSB end or by interaction with RPA. Examples of separation of GFP/CFP signals after I-SceI cut induction. Graph shows the percentage separated GFP/CFP in large budded cells (n = 107). For details and statistics, see Table S4. Cells scored were late G2/M (large bud and SPBs <0.6 μm apart). For uncleaved controls, mid-S and G2/M cells were scored.

(legend continued on next page)
spots, while in either rad50Δ or rfa1-t11 strains, 16% to 19% of the frames had separated sisters (Figure 7B). We ruled out that this is an artifact of galactose addition by expressing HO in a strain that is resistant to cleavage, mataα. In conclusion, sister chromatid juxtaposition at a DSB is compromised by loss of MRX or its recruitment through RPA.

To see if this reflects compromised bridging through MRX itself or a failure to recruit and cohesin at the DSB (Figure 5C; Unal et al., 2007), we tested the effects of destabilizing Scc1 (Mcd1) at the base of the cohesin ring (Figure 7A). Specifically, we scored sister lacO foci pairing at the induced cut at MATα in a temperature-sensitive allele of Scc1 called mcd1-1 (Heidinger-Pauli et al., 2008). Previous studies showed that a 1 hr incubation at the non-permissive temperature (37°C) was sufficient to inactivate cohesin. Our time-lapse imaging showed that without DSB induction, S phase mcd1-1 cells have separated lacO foci in ~25% of frames at 37°C (Figure 7C). Remarkably, after DSB induction following cohesin inactivation (1 hr at 37°C), spot separation was actually reduced to 5%, suggesting that the induction of the break stabilizes sister-sister pairing. Importantly, this effect was lost by combining the mcd1-1 mutant with rfa1-t11 (Figure 7C). The simplest interpretation of this is that MRX holds sister chromatids together at a DSB, even in the absence of functional cohesin. We note that this result is in contrast to a previous report in which a DSB was not sufficient to keep sisters together (Unal et al., 2007), although in that case, the experimental setup involved a 2 hr induction of two adjacent DSBs after 4 hr of Nocodazole arrest. Under that condition, cohesin seemed to contribute to sister cohesion.

To rule out kinetic limitations of our time-lapse assay, which scores unfixed cells immediately after cleavage, we tested an experimental setup much like that used by Unal et al. (2007), and we found that the sensitivity of rfa1-t11 to HU parallels that of mre11Δ (Figure 1). Although the MRX interaction with RPA is not entirely compromised by the rfa1-t11 mutation, in all fork-stalling and recovery assays performed rfa1-t11 acted epistatically with MRX mutations. Consistently, MRX recruitment to HU-stalled forks is compromised by the rfa1-t11 mutation, yet rfa1-t11 does not impair activation of the replication checkpoint on HU. Rad53 is efficiently phosphorylated in both the mre11Δ and rfa1-t11 strains on HU (Kanoh et al., 2006). As expected, rfa1-t11 defects are additive with mec1-100, an S phase-specific allele of the ATR kinase, Mec1, which fails to activate Rad53 in response to replication stress (Cobb et al., 2005; Hustedt et al., 2015). At stalled forks, MRX is thought both to process fold-back structures, preventing ligation or over-resection, and to tether replicated sisters together, prior to the loading of cohesin (Tittel-Elmer et al., 2012).

DISCUSSION

Since their discovery and description, a role of SMC-family protein complexes in the tethering of broken DNA ends or in the maintenance of sister chromatid pairing has been debated (Huang and Kolodner, 2005; Nasmyth and Haering, 2005; Uhlmann, 2016). MRX is closely related to cohesin, condensin, and the SMCS/6 complex, and we document here an “SMC-like” function for the MRX complex at DSBs, where it appears to both hold ends together and contribute to the pairing of broken sisters. In this function, MRX recruitment is compromised by a mutation in the N-terminal domain of Rfa1. This helps answer the long-standing question of how MRX is targeted to sites of damage.

rfα1-t11 and MRX Mutations Work Epistatically to Compromise Fork Integrity under Stress

By EMAP analysis against a panel of 1,311 knockout alleles, we found that the sensitivity of rfa1-t11 to HU parallels that of mre11Δ (Figure 1). Although the MRX interaction with RPA is not entirely compromised by the rfa1-t11 mutation, in all fork-stalling and recovery assays performed rfa1-t11 acted epistatically with MRX mutations. Consistently, MRX recruitment to HU-stalled forks is compromised by the rfa1-t11 mutation, yet rfa1-t11 does not impair activation of the replication checkpoint on HU. Rad53 is efficiently phosphorylated in both the mre11Δ and rfa1-t11 strains on HU (Kanoh et al., 2006). As expected, rfa1-t11 defects are additive with mec1-100, an S phase-specific allele of the ATR kinase, Mec1, which fails to activate Rad53 in response to replication stress (Cobb et al., 2005; Hustedt et al., 2015). At stalled forks, MRX is thought both to process fold-back structures, preventing ligation or over-resection, and to tether replicated sisters together, prior to the loading of cohesin (Tittel-Elmer et al., 2012).

The MRX Complex Has a Structural Role at DSBs

We also document a clear but unanticipated role for Rfa1 in the recruitment and stability of MRX at DSBs (Figures 5, 6, and 7). MRX tethering by RPA at breaks in late S phase contributes both to end-to-end tethering and the juxtaposition of broken sisters (late S/G2). On Zeocin, the rfa1-t11 mutation compromises Mec1-dependent Rad53 activation (Figure 4), which likely reflects a role for the Rfa1 N-terminal OB fold in the recruitment of Mec1-Ddc2 at DSB (Zou and Elledge, 2003; Dubrana et al., 2007). Again, we have tested the effects of rfa1-t11 in a range of yeast backgrounds, generating the mutant allele by de novo mutagenesis. In all cases, rfa1-t11 was epistatic to mre11Δ.

A previous study documented a role for MRX in the recruitment of cohesin at breaks (Unal et al., 2007). We confirmed this, but we found that it is MRX, not cohesin, that holds sisters together at breaks at early time points. Our experiments differ from theirs in two significant ways: first, they induced two sets of DSBs near each other, while we induced only one. Second, Unal
et al. (2007) first treated cells with the microtubule-depolymerizing drug nocodazole for 4 hr before inducing the DSB for a further 2 hr. This extended arrest in G2/M may alter the behavior of the break.

It is unclear how MRX contributes to cohesin loading, as the two proteins do not interact (Tittel-Elmer et al., 2012). It may simply be that MRX holds sisters together to allow cohesin loading. In any case, it appears that through its interaction with Rfa1, MRX serves an additional role at DSBs by stabilizing both end-to-end and sister-sister contacts.

A recent study examined the role of the Rad50 zinc hook in DSB repair by monitoring sister chromatid exchange in mitosis. Those investigators found that strains with mutations in the zinc hook domain that partially impair hook dimerization without...
blocking complex assembly have milder effects on sister chromatin exchange than full RAD50 deletions (Hohl et al., 2015). We propose that these hook mutations reduce, but do not ablate, Rad50 dimerization. At a DSB multiple MRX molecules bind and even with a weakened Rad50 hook, their combined effect may be sufficient to hold both ends and sisters together (Figures 6 and 7). Cohesin may provide further structural support later in repair.

Rfa1 Interaction Sites on MRX Are Relevant to Biological Function and Human Disease
The validated interaction sites between Rfa1 and MRX cluster in two major sites. One is located in the DNA-binding cleft of the Rad50 dimer. In the presence of ATP, Rad50 primarily binds dsDNA and duplexes with extended 3' overhangs (Seifert et al., 2015). Thus, the location of the interacting peptides would be consistent with a side-by-side binding of Rad50 and RPA at ssDNA/dsDNA junctions. The second cluster of interacting peptides maps to a surface on the N-terminal phosphodiesterase domain of Mre11 (peptides 9–12; Table S3), which was recently shown to be mutated in Mre11 hypomorphic alleles that suppress the damage sensitivity of sae2Δ (Seifert et al., 2015). This mutation allows MRX removal from ssDNA during the later stages of HR (Chen et al., 2015).

In addition, the Mre11 peptide 25 (aa 217–234), which binds Rfa1 in an rfa1-t11-sensitive manner in vitro, contains a site that is mutated in patients suffering from ataxia-telangiectasia-like disease (ATLD; Mre11 mutations W210C and W243R) (Fernet et al., 2005; Regal et al., 2013; Schiller et al., 2012). Very close to this interaction site is the mre11-58 mutation (H213Y), which confers a rad50-S-like phenotype (Usui et al., 1998), affecting Mre11’s nuclease activity and/or its interaction to Nbs1/Xrs2 (Schiller et al., 2012). The fact that this domain interacts with Rfa1 in an rfa1-t11-sensitive manner suggests that a loss of Rfa1 binding may also contribute to the ATLD phenotypes. We note that some interactions sites may require switching between open and closed conformational states of MRX (Lim et al., 2011; Möckel et al., 2012) and that some of Rfa1-MRX interactions are insensitive to the rfa1-t11 mutation. In the case of Mre11 peptides 37–39, interaction was enhanced with the mutant Rfa1 domain. Intriguingly, this conserved Mre11 region is deleted in some ATLD patients (Δ340–366) who are predisposed to pulmonary adenocarcinoma (Regal et al., 2013).

High-Speed and Super-Resolution Imaging Allows New Insights into Chromatin Biology
We have been able to analyze sister chromatid pairing with super-resolution microscopy of short fluorescent tags either on the two sisters or both sides of a DSB. Although the resolution achieved here (250 nm and 80 ms 3D stack imaging) is sufficient to document sister separation, the imaging method can be improved to provide even more information about the forces that hold sisters together. Extending these experiments to include other SMC proteins such as condensin or the SMC5/6 complex will surely provide a fuller understanding of long-range chromatin interactions in living cells.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Yeast Growth Conditions, Plasmids, Repair Assays and ChiP
All strains used were derived from W303-1A or JK179 (see Table S1). EMAP, drop assays, and DNA-combing methods are described in Supplemental Experimental Procedures. Cohesin experiments used nocodazole at 15 μg/ml with the yeast culture adjusted to 1% DMSO before nocodazole addition. Imprecise and precise NHEJ assays were as in Matsuzaki et al. (2012). ChiP experiments were performed as described in Cobb et al. (2003). For ChiP-chip and associated bioinformatics analysis, see Tittel-Elmer et al. (2012).

Protein Purification, Structure Studies, Peptide Arrays, and Microscale Thermophoresis
Details are presented in Supplemental Experimental Procedures. The scanning peptide array covered all of MRX except the coiled-coil domains of Rad50, with 18-aa-long peptides with 9 aa overlap spotted onto a glass slide by JPT Peptide Technologies.

Microscopy and Error Calculation
Details for live and fixed fluorescent imaging and quantitative analysis including spot volume and spot separation in time lapse movies are described in Supplemental Experimental Procedures. Structured illumination imaging used a Zeiss Ellyra S.1 microscope with an Andor iXon 885 EMCCD camera. Error bars on graphs represent the SEM unless otherwise stated. Categorical data such as the one versus two-spot cohesin assay was tested for significance using a chi-square test (GraphPad), computing exact p values using the method of summing small p values. The large spot separation movie data set was tested for significance using a chi-square with Yates correction test (GraphPad) against the relevant strain genotype uncut. Continuous data such as LacI-GFP spot size was shown to be normally distributed and then tested for differences using a two-tailed Student’s t test (GraphPad). Significance cutoff was p < 0.05. All p values are listed in Table S4.
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Chapter 5:
Concluding remarks and future prospects

This thesis contributes to our understanding of the initial steps in the DNA damage response.

Specifically, in chapter 2, I reveal a mode of assembly of the DNA damage checkpoint kinase Mec1 at DNA damage sites through the interaction of Mec1 regulatory subunit Ddc2 and the ssDNA binding protein RPA. Four major conclusions based on structural, biochemical and \textit{in vivo} data are discussed below.

1. **Ddc2 N-terminus homodimerizes and binds the N-terminus of the largest RPA subunit Rfa1**
   
   We determined the crystal structure of the Ddc2 N-terminus bound to the Rfa1 N-terminal OB-fold domain (Rfa1 N-OB). The crystal structure showed that the Ddc2 N-terminus includes an Rfa1-binding domain (RBD) and a coiled-coil domain (CCD) connected by a linker. We showed that the acidic-hydrophobic Ddc2 RBD binds the basic-hydrophobic cleft of the Rfa1 N-OB, both \textit{in vitro} as well as \textit{in vivo}, to recruit Mec1-Ddc2 to DNA damage sites. We observed that the Ddc2 CCD is a 103 Å long helix that homodimerizes in a parallel fashion, creating an \textit{A}_2\textit{B}_2 stoichiometry of Ddc2-Rfa1 in the crystallographic asymmetric unit. We also determined the crystal structure of the Ddc2 CCD alone. In immunoprecipitation experiments, the Ddc2 CCD was essential for Mec1-Ddc2 homodimerization \textit{in vivo}.

2. **Ddc2 binds Rfa1-t11**
   
   The Rfa1 N-OB cleft binds multiple DNA damage response proteins including Ddc2, MRX, Sgs1, p53 and Dna2 (Ball et al., 2007; Hegnauer et al., 2012; Lin et al., 1996; Seeber et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2015). It was previously shown that the Rfa1-t11 (K45E) mutant protein is defective for recruiting Ddc2 to DNA double-strand breaks, but not to stalled replication forks (Dubrana et al., 2007; Kanoh et al., 2006; Zou and Elledge, 2003). To investigate Ddc2 binding to Rfa1-t11, we performed the following structural, biochemical and \textit{in vivo} experiments. Using microscale thermophoresis (MST), we showed that Ddc2 binds Rfa1 and Rfa1-t11 with comparable dissociation constants of 0.4 µM and 2.6 µM, respectively. We next determined the co-crystal structure of the Ddc2 N-terminus bound to the Rfa1-t11 N-OB domain and found that the mechanism of binding is identical to that of Ddc2 and wild-type Rfa1. Importantly, Ddc2 still bound Rfa1-t11 \textit{in vivo} in microscopy and immunoprecipitation experiments.

3. **Ddc2 N-terminus is important for survival after damage by UV/4-NQO**
   
   We observed that the Ddc2 N-terminus is important for cell survival when budding yeast \textit{Saccharomyces cerevisiae} is exposed to UV-light or UV-mimetic drug 4-NQO. Notably, both the RBD and the CCD contributed to survival. We also observed that checkpoint pathway induction, monitored by the phosphorylation of Rad53, a major Mec1 target, is dependent on the Ddc2 N-terminus after damage by 4-NQO, but not after replication stress. Expectedly, we observed that without the Ddc2 N-terminus, Mec1-Ddc2 is not recruited to RPA foci at DNA damage sites and cannot homodimerize. Moreover, the
Ddc2 CCD seems to play a role in substrate selectivity e.g. phosphorylation of histone H2A at S129 (γH2A).

4. Homodimeric Mec1-Ddc2 assembles on two adjacent ssDNA-RPA molecules
An important implication of this study was that our Ddc2-Rfa1 crystal structure (PDB ID: 5OMB) was able to link the RPA-ssDNA crystal structure (PDB ID: 4GNX) and the negative stain EM map of Mec1-Ddc2 (EMD-4085) to build a composite structural model showing the assembly of homodimers of Mec1-Ddc2 on two adjacent ssDNA-RPA molecules. The model reinforces our finding that the Ddc2 N-terminus acts not only as a recruitment domain, but also as a structural spacer to allow the Mec1 kinase to phosphorylate several targets while remaining bound to DNA damage sites. The model also supports the notion that Ddc2 recruitment to RPA and Ddc2 CCD homodimerization are linked, probably to ensure timely and local Mec1 activity.

Chapter 3 focuses on the oligomerization of the CCDs of human ATRIP and yeast Ddc2.

An N-terminal trigger helix in the ATRIP CCD is important for CCD homodimerization
Some coiled-coils contain a trigger sequence which initiates coiled-coil assembly and drives oligomerization (Frank et al., 2000; Kammerer et al., 1998; Steinmetz et al., 1998). Whether HsATRIP or ScDdc2 CCD contains such a trigger sequence was unclear. SEC-MALS analysis of HsATRIP and ScDdc2 CCDs with and without the N-terminal predicted helix showed that the N-terminal predicted helix is required for dimerization of HsATRIP but not ScDdc2.

Chapter 4 focuses on how MRX is recruited to stalled replication forks and DNA double-strand breaks by interacting with a domain in RPA that also binds Ddc2. Below, I will discuss the conclusion of my contribution to this study.

MRX does not bind Rfa1-t11
The rfa1-t11 allele renders cells defective in recombination and DNA repair, but proficient in replication (Dubrana et al., 2007; Soustelle et al., 2002; Umezu et al., 1998). This K45E mutation lies in a loop connecting two β-strands of the five-stranded N-OB cleft that binds several proteins in the DNA damage response pathway (see conclusion 2 of chapter 2). How this mutation would affect the binding of Rfa1 to its ligands was unclear. To understand the structural changes provoked by the K45E substitution, we determined the structure of the mutant by X-ray crystallography and observed that the mutation disrupts a basic patch in the binding pocket of the N-OB fold. Next, using MST, we showed that a peptide present in the ATPase domain of Rad50 binds to the Rfa1 N-OB domain with a dissociation constant of 63 µM. Interestingly, the MRX-Rfa1 interaction was sensitive to the rfa1-t11 mutation as observed in a scanning
peptide microarray assay. Therefore, chapter 2 and chapter 4 suggest that the \textit{rfa1-t11} mutation affects binding of Rfa1 to some ligands such as MRX and Dna2, but not others such as Ddc2.

**Future directions**

A key question that remains unanswered is: What is the structure of full length Mec1-Ddc2 complexes bound to the ssDNA-RPA platform? This question has been the focus of several researchers for more than a decade. Given the recent advancement in the field of cryo-EM and the resulting structure determinations of other PIKK complexes, one might expect to see the full length Mec1-Ddc2-RPA structure in the near future. Ddc2 and RPA have long flexible linkers that may result in multiple conformations. This problem could be solved by using a co-activator of Mec1, such as Dpb11. However, Dpb11 itself includes a long and flexible C-terminal tail. Instead, the 9-1-1 checkpoint clamp may be used to stimulate and potentially stabilize Mec1. Moreover, 9-1-1 binds the ds-ssDNA junction and would therefore remain adjacent to the ssDNA that binds RPA. The implications from such a structure might be far-reaching and would possibly help answer other key questions in the field such as: How do the two conserved aromatic amino acid residues in Mec1 co-activators stimulate the Mec1 kinase? What are the homodimerization and heterodimerization motifs in Mec1-Ddc2? Moreover, structural studies on human complexes could be useful for drug design experiments.

A question this thesis raises is: Why is the Ddc2 N-terminus so important for cell survival after DNA damage by UV-light compared to other DNA-damaging agents? One possibility is that the different lesions might activate Mec1 in a different manner and a co-activator of Mec1 that is specific for UV-damage depends on the Ddc2 N-terminus. Another possibility is that the Ddc2 N-terminus interacts with a component of the NER machinery for efficient recruitment, especially to the initial 24-30 nt gap generated during NER. These hypotheses could be tested by analyzing the interactome of the Ddc2 N-terminus using mass spectrometry.

The second question raised by this thesis is: Does the Ddc2 CCD act as a structural spacer to allow Mec1 to phosphorylate several targets while remaining bound to ssDNA? Although, I have partly answered this question by monitoring the phosphorylation of Rad53, Rfa2 and histone H2A in a \textit{ddc2} mutant lacking the CCD, a large scale mass spectrometry-based phosphoproteomics experiment might provide a more complete understanding.

The third question raised by this thesis is: Does the Ddc2 CCD homodimerize only upon recruitment to ssDNA-RPA stretches? Data from chapter 2 suggests that the Ddc2 CCD is not a constitutive dimer and the recruitment domain is important for Ddc2 dimerization in DNA damaging conditions. It is tempting to hypothesize that Ddc2 recruitment to damage sites increases its local concentration and promotes Ddc2 CCD dimerization. Ddc2 CCD dimerization might be a necessary event for Mec1 activation, thus ensuring that Mec1 is activated only at DNA damage sites. This could be tested by performing fluorescence
resonance energy transfer assays. For example, fluorescence of a mixture of donor-tagged Ddc2 N-terminus and acceptor-tagged Ddc2 N-terminus could be measured in the absence or presence of reconstituted ssDNA-RPA.

In conclusion, this thesis describes the assembly of the checkpoint kinase Mec1-Ddc2 on ssDNA-RPA at sites of DNA damage. It focuses on the Ddc2 N-terminus which includes a homodimerization coiled-coil domain and an N-terminal recruitment domain that binds RPA. These two domains function together and promote cell survival after DNA damage by UV-light.
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### List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-NQO</td>
<td>4-nitroquinoline 1-oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BER</td>
<td>Base excision repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCD</td>
<td>Coiled-coil domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDK</td>
<td>Cyclin-dependent kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ddc2&lt;sub&gt;CCD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Coiled-coil domain of Ddc2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ddc2&lt;sup&gt;N&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ddc2 N-terminus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>DNA damage response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>Deoxyribonucleic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dNTP</td>
<td>Deoxyribonucleotide triphosphate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSB</td>
<td>Double-strand break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Electron microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFP</td>
<td>Green fluorescent protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Homologous recombination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Hydroxyurea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Ionizing radiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_d$</td>
<td>Dissociation constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_I$</td>
<td><em>Kluyveromyces lactis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMR</td>
<td>Mismatch repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS</td>
<td>Methyl methanesulfonate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRX</td>
<td>Mre11-Rad50-Xrs2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>Microscale thermophoresis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>Nucleotide excision repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHEJ</td>
<td>Nonhomologous end-joining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMR</td>
<td>Nuclear magnetic resonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-OB</td>
<td>N-terminal oligosaccharide/oligonucleotide binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>Polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDB</td>
<td>Protein data bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIKK</td>
<td>Phosphoinositide 3-kinase related protein kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBD</td>
<td>Rfa1-binding domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rfa1&lt;sup&gt;N&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Rfa1 N-terminus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Red fluorescent protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSD</td>
<td>Root mean-squared deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA</td>
<td>Replication protein A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAD</td>
<td>Single-wavelength anomalous diffraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAXS</td>
<td>Small-angle X-ray scattering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td><em>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>Sodium dodecyl sulfate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC-MALS</td>
<td>Size-exclusion chromatography coupled with multi-angle light scattering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSB</td>
<td>Single-strand break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ssDNA</td>
<td>Single-stranded DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV</td>
<td>Ultraviolet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>Winged helix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wt</td>
<td>Wild-type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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