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Abstract

Genome instability is a hallmark of human cancers. Patients with Bloom’s syndrome, a rare chromosome breakage syndrome caused by inactivation of the RecQ helicase BLM, result in phenotypes associated with accelerated aging and develop cancer at a very young age. Patients with Bloom’s syndrome exhibit hyper-recombination, but the role of BLM and increased genomic instability is not fully characterized. Sgs1, the only member of the RecQ family of DNA helicases in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, is known to act both in early and late stages of homology-dependent repair of DNA damage. Exo1, a 5’–3’ exonuclease, first discovered to play a role in mismatch repair has been shown to participate in parallel to Sgs1 in processing the ends of DNA double-strand breaks, an early step of homology-mediated repair.

Here we have characterized the genetic interaction of *SGS1* and *EXO1* with other repair factors in homology-mediated repair as well as DNA damage checkpoints, and characterize the role of post-translational modifications, and protein-protein interactions in regulating their function in response to DNA damage. In *S. cerevisiae* cells lacking Sgs1, spontaneous translocations arise by homologous recombination in small regions of homology between three non-allelic, but related sequences in the genes *CAN1*, *LYP1*, and *ALP1*. We have found that these translocation events are inhibited if cells lack Mec1/ATR kinase while Tel1/ATM acts as a suppressor, and that they are dependent on Rad59, a protein known to function as one of two sub-pathways of Rad52 homology-directed repair.
Through a candidate screen of other DNA metabolic factors, we identified Exo1 as a strong suppressor of chromosomal rearrangements in the sgs1Δ mutant. The Exo1 enzymatic domain is located in the N-terminus while the C-terminus harbors mismatch repair protein binding sites as well as phosphorylation sites known to modulate its enzymatic function at uncapped telomeres. We have determined that the C-terminus is dispensable for Exo1’s roles in resistance to DNA-damaging agents and suppressing mutations and chromosomal rearrangements. Exo1 has been identified as a component of the error-free DNA damage tolerance pathway of template switching. Exo1 promotes template switching by extending the single strand gap behind stalled replication forks. Here, we show that the dysregulation of the phosphorylation of the C-terminus of Exo1 is detrimental in cells under replication stress whereas loss of Exo1 suppresses under the same conditions, suggesting that Exo1 function is tightly regulated by both phosphorylation and dephosphorylation and is important in properly modulating the DNA damage response at stalled forks.

It has previously been shown that the strand exchange factor Rad51 binds to the C-terminus of Sgs1 although the significance of this physical interaction has yet to be determined. To elucidate the function of the physical interaction of Sgs1 and Rad51, we have generated a separation of function allele of SGS1 with a single amino acid change (sgs1-FD) that ablates the physical interaction with Rad51. Alone, the loss of the interaction of Sgs1 and Rad51 in our sgs1-FD mutant did not cause any of the defects in response to DNA damaging agents or genome rearrangements that are observed in the sgs1Δ mutant. However, when we assessed the sgs1-FD mutant in combination with the loss of Sae2, Mre11, Exo1, Srs2, Rrm3, and Pol32 we observed genetic
interactions that distinguish the sgs1-FD mutant from the sgs1Δ mutant. Negative and positive genetic interactions with SAE2, MRE11, EXO1, SRS2, RRM3, and POL32 suggest the role of the physical interaction of Sgs1 and Rad51 is in promoting homology-mediated repair possibly by competing with single-strand binding protein RPA for single-stranded DNA to promote Rad51 filament formation.

Together, these studies characterize additional roles for domains of Sgs1 and Exo1 that are not entirely understood as well as their roles in combination with DNA damage checkpoints, and repair pathways that are necessary for maintaining genome stability.
Chapter One:

Introduction

Proper repair of DNA damage is essential for maintaining genome integrity and cellular function. Cells can encounter genomic insults via endogenous and exogenous damage caused by replication error, DNA damaging agents, reactive oxygen species, DNA base damage (such as deamination, alkylation), ionizing radiation, and ultraviolet rays [1]. Defects in genes that are involved in preventing genomic instability can lead to cancer, cell death, and premature aging; genomic instability is also a hallmark of cancer. A variety of enzymes contribute to the prevention of disease resulting from genes involved in the prevention of chromosome breakage (see Table 1). Defects in genes that prevent chromosome breakage results in severe phenotypes and an increased predisposition to cancer. In humans, defects in three helicases BLM, WRN, RECQ4 (listed in bold in Table 1) result in genetic disorders that lead to premature aging and early development of cancer. The helicases BLM, WRN, RECQL4, are three of the five helicases in humans that belong to the RecQ family of helicases so named after the first discovered in *E. coli*. The RecQ family of helicases has been implicated in DNA recombination and repair, highlighting their importance in maintaining genomic stability and prevention of disease.
Table 1.1 Chromosome breakage syndromes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syndrome/Disease</th>
<th>Gene in Humans</th>
<th>Cancer Predisposition/ Most common cancer</th>
<th>Defect</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ataxia telangiectasia</td>
<td>ATM</td>
<td>Lymphomas, Leukemias</td>
<td>DNA damage checkpoint</td>
<td>[2-4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen breakage syndrome</td>
<td>NBS1</td>
<td>Lymphomas</td>
<td>Double strand break repair</td>
<td>[5-7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanconi anemia</td>
<td>FANC genes (A,B,C,D1,D2, E,F,G,J,L,M,N,O,P,Q)</td>
<td>Leukemia, squamous cell carcinoma</td>
<td>Genome Monitoring</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner's</td>
<td>WRN</td>
<td>Sarcomas</td>
<td>Recombination</td>
<td>[9-11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloom's</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>Lymphomas, Leukemias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothmund Thomson/ Rapadilino/ Baller- Gerold</td>
<td>RECQL4</td>
<td>Osteosarcoma/Lymphoma</td>
<td>DNA replication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table adapted from a review by Duker (2002).

Human Disease Linked to Defects in the RecQ helicases

Bloom’s Syndrome

Bloom’s syndrome (BS) is a rare autosomal recessive disorder as a result of the loss of function of *BLM*. BS was initially described in 1954 by Dr. David Bloom in a case study of a two-year-old patient presenting telangiectatic erythema resembling lupus erythematosus from hypersensitivity to sun exposure, low birth weight, high-pitched voice, and short stature [12]. By 1965, nineteen individuals with the described syndrome were known. Of these patients, most were of Jewish ancestry, and some patients were siblings or had parents that shared common lineage; this led to the idea that this
syndrome was inherited. It was also observed that chromosomes in Bloom’s patients had increased genomic instability in the form of chromosome breakage, rearrangements, and an observed increase of sister-chromatid exchanges (SCE) something that is still used for diagnosis today [13-15]. Currently, the clinical features of BS are short stature, immune deficiency, insulin resistance, an increased risk for diabetes, low fertility, and an increased risk to develop cancer early in life [11, 16].

Figure 1.1 Clinical presentations of Bloom syndrome in individuals. Patient on the right has facial telangiectasias. The patients in the center are siblings with the person to the left positive for Bloom syndrome. Images are from the Bloom syndrome registry, Weill Cornell Medical College. [17]

BS as a monogenic disorder and only requires the inactivation of the BLM protein as a result of a mutation. The mutation that inactivates BLM in patients varies and is not as a result of a single unique mutation in BLM. Instead, some mutations have been found in BS patients that lead to a premature stop codon, truncated protein, or inactivation of the catalytic function of BLM [17]. BS has been found to be prevalent in the Ashkenazi Jewish population with the blmAsh (6-bp deletion and 7-bp insertion at nucleotide position 2281) mutation being the most common BS causing mutation [18, 19].
In *C. elegans*, the loss of function of the BLM ortholog, Him-6 has adverse effects on lifespan, increased germline apoptosis, mortal germ-line phenotype, IR sensitivity, and low brood size, all linked to genomic instability [20, 21]. In mouse, the BLM\textsuperscript{-/-} mutation is embryonic lethal and has been shown to increase apoptosis during embryogenesis [22]. Mice containing a loss of function mutation in BLM that was not lethal were created and found to have an increased predisposition to cancer. In this study, the mice heterozygous for a loss-of-function mutation in BLM developed more metastatic T-cell lymphomas after injection with murine leukemia virus. The BLM\textsuperscript{+/-} mice were crossed to mice that were heterozygous for the Apc\textsuperscript{Min/+} mutation, a mutation known to mediate intestinal tumorigenesis, and more intestinal tumors were observed in the BLM\textsuperscript{+/-} than the BLM\textsuperscript{+/-} mice. Moreover, the non-mutant allele of BLM allele was found to be functional in these tumors suggesting *BLM* haploinsufficiency [23]. Interestingly, *BLM* haploinsufficieny in the formation of colorectal cancer has also been implicated in humans heterozygous for *blmAsh* [24].

Functionally, BLM is a helicase with 3’-5’ polarity, and it is expressed highly in S/G2 phase of the cell cycle [25-27]. BLM is expressed in the thymus, testis, and spleen and localizes at promyelocytic leukemia (PML) bodies and telomeres [28-30]. BLM is known to function in resection of DNA double-strand breaks (DSB) and has a role in dissolving recombination intermediates and functions in a complex with Top3\textalpha{}, Rmi1, and Rmi2 to dissolve double Holliday junctions (dHJ), as well as the reversal of D-loops coated with Rad51 *in vitro* [31-34]. BLM is a target for the checkpoints ATM and ATR and is phosphorylated at residues T99 and T122 [35-38]. Cells treated with hydroxyurea (HU) have stalled replication. Cells that have a BLM mutant unable to be
phosphorylated fail to recover from HU treatment and stall at the G2/M checkpoint. It was also shown that this BLM mutant had no effect on sister chromatid exchange frequency, leading to the idea that BLM is necessary for replication to restart [35, 37]. Besides, it has been shown *in vitro* that BLM can catalyze replication fork reversal, a mechanism suggested to promote lesion bypass [39, 40].

**Werner Syndrome**

Werner syndrome (WS) is a rare autosomal recessive disorder linked to defects of the RecQ helicase WRN. Werner syndrome is considered adult progeria disorder [41]. Otto Werner first described WS in his doctoral dissertation on the presentation of cataracts with scleroderma observed in four out of five siblings in a single family. The parents of the patients appeared normal, and one sibling (and her three children) did not display the characteristics of premature aging that the other siblings exhibited. Otto Werner compared this case with those described previously by Rothmund in 1868. Between 1934 and 1941 Oppenheimer and Kugel, both internists had assigned Werner syndrome to the described disease, and in 1996 Epstein *et al.* distinguished WS from what was later designated Rothmund-Thompson Syndrome (RTS), another syndrome that results from the dysfunction of another RecQ helicase, RecQL4 [41-44].

WS does not typically present symptoms until after the patient is ten years old and diagnosis must meet the criteria either of all cardinal symptoms or just three of the cardinal symptoms and genetic confirmation. Suspected cases are those that present at least two of the cardinal symptoms and at least two additional symptoms that are not as common in all WS patients.
Cardinal symptoms were categorized in a survey of WS patients as those that appear early and are likely found in >75% of WS patients. Cardinal symptoms include progeroid changes of hair, cataracts, skin ulcers, soft tissue calcification, bird-like face, and abnormal voice (hoarse, high-pitched, squeaky). The list of symptoms that are not as prevalent across all WS patients but are used for diagnosis is abnormal glucose or lipid metabolism, bone deformation or abnormalities, cancer, parental consanguinity, premature atherosclerosis, hypogonadism, and short stature [41, 45]. Genetic testing is now included as part of diagnostic criteria to help distinguish WS from other syndromes caused by defects in other RecQ helicases due to the common symptoms they share. Genetic testing can help distinguish the syndromes based on the defects in BLM (BS), RECQL4 (RTS) [41, 45] as well Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome, which is caused by the mutation of LMNA, a gene that codes for a component of the nuclear envelope, not a RecQ-helicase [46].

Figure 1.2 Accelerated aging of an individual with Werner syndrome. Individual with Werner syndrome at ages thirteen, twenty-one, forty-eight, and fifty-six (from left to right) exhibits signs of accelerated aging. Image from the University of Washington.
Similar to its RecQ family member, BLM, defects in WRN lead to an increased predisposition to cancer, in particular sarcomas, and increased cellular defects associated with genomic instability. WRN structurally shares all the domains in BLM except the strand exchange domain, and instead, the N-terminus contains a 3’-5’ exonuclease domain only found in its homolog in X. laevis, FFA-1 (Figure 1.4) [47].

Over seventy mutations in WRN have been identified in WS patients, a majority resulting in a premature stop codon, insertions/deletions, genomic rearrangements, missense mutations, or splicing defect resulting in a functionally null WRN protein [48].

In mice, the knockout of WRN did not appear to age prematurely, although Lebel et al. reported that two male mice had extensive myocardial fibrosis at ten months and a female developed T cell lymphoma at 13.5 months not observed in the control mice [49-51]. When WRN−/− mice were crossed to have a defect of the RNA in telomerase, age-related defects were observed such as graying hair, alopecia, osteoporosis, type II diabetes, cataracts, and premature death [52, 53].

Functionally, WRN function has been implicated in different DNA repair pathways. WRN physically interacts with the tumor suppressor P53. It is believed in cells under replication stress, the physical interaction of WRN and P53 is vital in regulating WRN exonuclease activity and helicase activity at Holliday junctions [54-57]. WRN deficient cells are sensitive to DNA damaging agents camptothecin (CPT), 4-nitroquinoline 1-oxide (4-NQO), and MMS [58, 59].

In yeast, while human BLM can complement the sgs1Δ defect of the slow growth in cells lacking Top3, WRN was not capable of complementation [60]. In other organisms, WRN homologs have many functional differences. In Xenopus egg extracts,
the WRN homolog FFA-1 accumulates on the chromatin following replication arrest and the induction DNA double-strand breaks while the BLM homolog, xBLM only slightly increased under these conditions [61]. WRN in *Xenopus* also plays a more dominant role than human WRN in DNA break end resection [62, 63]. In humans, WRN appears to play a role in resection with BLM. In mouse, WRN is found only in the nucleoplasm and does not have the NLS found in human WRN that is necessary for nucleolar localization [64], and as *WRN*<sup>−/−</sup> mice appear to develop normally, it is unsurprising that this would not show any defects. In mice, the localization does not seem to play a role in its function whereas in humans mutations that truncate the NLS in WRN are known to cause WS [64, 65]. Together this highlights an important role for WRN in humans and the differences in function in other organisms.

**Rothmund-Thomson Syndrome**

Rothmund-Thomson Syndrome (RTS) is a rare autosomal recessive genetic disorder caused by defects in the RecQ helicase RECQL4. Patients with RTS exhibit a characteristic face rash, Poikiloderma, as well as a combination of features including short stature, alopecia including eyelashes and eyebrows, juvenile cataracts, skeletal abnormalities, a predisposition to osteosarcoma and malignant tumor originating in bone, as well as premature aging (figure 1.3) [66-68]. RTS was first reported by in 1868 by German ophthalmologist Rothmund. In 1936, the English dermatologist Thomson had three similar patients that displayed Poikiloderma, short stature and had skeletal defects, including bilateral thumb aplasia and hypoplastic radii and ulnae, and unlike the previously reported case, these patients did not have cataracts [66]. In 1957, the name 'Rothmund-Thomson syndrome' was adopted after three other patients with the
described clinical features were reported by Taylor [69]. RAPADILINO and Baller-Gerald syndrome (BGS) are also associated with recessive mutations in the RECQL4 gene. Baller-Gerold syndrome is characterized by radial hypoplasia and craniosynostosis. RAPADILINO is mainly observed in Finland, and the name of the syndrome is derived from the clinical features of RAdial hypoplasia, Patella hypoplasia and cleft or Arched palate, Diarrhoea and dislocated joints, Little size and limb malformation, slender Nose and nOrmal intelligence [70-73].

The molecular basis of the defects in RECQL4 that lead to RTS is yet to be elucidated. Over 50 mutations of RECQL4 are known to be associated with the development of RTS, and four are either RTS and RAPADALINO, or RTS and BGS associated [74-77]. These changes result in missense mutations, resulting in premature stop codons, frameshift from insertion/deletion mutations, and mutations that cause mis-splicing alterations.

Knockout mice that disrupted exons 5–8 were embryonic lethal between 3-6 days. When knockout mice were generated by deleting exon 13, a coding exon of the helicase domain, the mice were viable, but only 5% survived two weeks. The survivors exhibited severe growth defects, abnormalities in several tissues including skin and bone defects, as well as impeded cell division [78]. The knock-out mice exhibit RTS phenotypes in seen humans, making them an excellent model to study the molecular defects. In another study, a viable Recql4 mutant mouse was created by replacing a 1075 bp fragment spanning from within exon 9 through exon 13, a mutation located in the helicase domain, with a PGKHprt mini-gene. Fibroblast from this knockout mouse displayed an increase in genomic instability in the form of aneuploidy, premature
chromosome separation, and an increase of spontaneous micronuclei. It was also suggested that a cohesion defect contributes to the chromosomal instability [79]. These mouse studies indicate that function of RECQL4 resulting from specific defects in DNA repair mechanisms and can be explored in mice as they mimic the defects observed in humans.

Figure 1.3 Clinical features of patients with Rothmund-Thomson Syndrome. The individual on the left shows the characteristic facial rash Poikiloderma. The individual in the center panel is 21 years old and has Poikiloderma with alopecia. The right panel illustrates the hand of an individual with RTS that has thumb aplasia. Images are from Larizza 2010 [66].

RecQ family of helicases

RecQ helicases unwind DNA from 3’-5’ and belong to the SF2 family of helicases. In S. cerevisiae, S. pombe, only have a single known RecQ-like helicase Sgs1, and Rcq1, respectively. The number of RecQ-like helicases varies in single and multicellular organisms as is illustrated by the number of different homologs found in humans (BLM, WRN, Recql1, Recql4, Recql5) and C. elegans (HIM-6, WRN-1, RECQ1, and RECQ5) [80, 81]. RecQ helicases are defined by a conserved helicase domain consisting of seven helicase motifs [82, 83]. Outside of the helicase domain both the length and domains of the N and C-terminus vary between species. In the founding member RecQ in E. coli, there are two additional domains the RecQ-carboxy-terminal
(RQC), unique to RecQ family members, and the Helicase and RNase D C-terminal (HRDC). The RQC and HRDC domains are not found in all members of the RecQ helicases in other organisms, and conversely, RecQ helicases have domains not found in the founding member, *E. coli* RecQ for example in humans, WRN also has an exonuclease domain and nuclear localization signal (see Figure 1.1).

**Figure 1.4 RecQ helicase conservation in unicellular and multicellular organisms.** The helicase core is the most conserved domain containing motifs for ATP binding and hydrolysis. Many RecQ family members contain the RecQ C-terminal (RQC) domain, the conserved helicase and RNase D C-terminal (HRDC). WRN, BLM, and RECQL1 contain a nuclear localization sequence. WRN has an exonuclease domain.
Initially discovered in a search for mutants that resist thymine starvation, *E. coli* RecQ was found to be involved in the RecF pathway. The *recq* mutant was described to be defective in recombination and sensitive to UV-induced damage [84]. The crystal structure of *E. coli* RecQ and human BLM and WRN have revealed the structure of the helicase, RQC, and HRDC domains. This revealed two regions that form a cleft containing an ATP-binding site in the helicase core and opposite that, on the cleft, is a ssDNA binding site. After the seven helicase motifs is a zinc-binding domain that contains four conserved cysteine residues, and a winged-helix for DNA binding, helix-hairpin-helix, β motif that forms the RQC domain that together is required for catalytic function [85]. All mutations in BS patients have been described to inactivate in the catalytic function of BLM or lead to premature protein-translation termination [17].

The HRDC domain is found in some members of the RecQ helicases. It is not required for enzymatic function, and exact function of the HRDC has yet to be elucidated. In *S. cerevisiae* (Sgs1) and *E. coli* (RecQ), the HRDC domain was capable of binding ssDNA, but human BLM and WRN were not found to have this capability *in vitro* [86-90]. The function of the HRDC domain may be different in various organisms, as is implicated by the reduced conservation. In human BLM, the HRDC domain has been found to be required for dissolution of Holliday Junctions, recruitment of BLM and WRN to DSBs, and induced DNA damage by methyl methanesulfonate (MMS) and mitomycin C [91, 92].

Sgs1 in *S. cerevisiae* and BLM in humans have a domain in the unstructured N-terminus that has been shown to interact with single strand DNA, has strand exchange
capability in vitro, and the function of which will be discussed with the role of complex
formed by Sgs1 with Top3-Rmi1 [93].

RecQ-like helicase Sgs1 in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*.

Yeast has been utilized as a model organism to study RecQ helicase function in
its role to protect the genome [80]. Sgs1, the only RecQ helicase in *S. cerevisiae*, was
discovered as a suppressor of the slow growth phenotype observed in top3Δ mutants
and subsequently identified as a possible BLM homolog [94, 95]. Sgs1 function in
maintaining genomic stability is diverse and has been shown to work in both
recombinogenic and anti-recombinogenic capacity to promote repair and prevent
illegitimate recombination as well. Thus far, Sgs1 is known to play a role in both early
and late recombination repair of DNA breaks, the start of stalled replication forks,
telomere maintenance, and in meiotic recombination [96-99]. Cells lacking Sgs1 are
sensitive to irradiation (IR) damage, DNA damaging agents, have increased
accumulation of gross chromosomal rearrangements [100-104].

Sgs1 substrates and physical interaction partners.

Sgs1 preferentially binds specific DNA structures and physically interacts with
many DNA repair proteins. Sgs1 has been found to preferentially bind forked DNA,
DNA with 3′ ssDNA overhangs, and G4-quadruplexes; it also binds blunt-ended duplex
DNA with less affinity than the other DNA structures tested in vitro (Figure 1.2). Sgs1
can unwind these structures as well as Holliday junctions and DNA structures that
contain a bubble [97, 105-110]. Sgs1’s ability to unwind these structures in vitro
demonstrates its enzymatic capabilities in both its recombinogenic and anti-
recombinogenic functions.

RecQ helicases in other organisms demonstrate varying capability to unwind
different DNA structures (Table 1.2). In humans, BLM has also been found to bind and
unwind the same structures as Sgs1 and additionally been found to unwind D-loops,
and Rad51-coated strand invasion structures in vitro [106]. The differences in the ability
of different RecQ helicases in different organisms may be due to the differences in
domains. For example, in humans, WRN has an exonuclease domain that appears to
be absent in C. elegans. Wrn-1 in worms seems to have an additional function
especially in the context of unwinding D-loops. Human WRN, in addition to unwinding,
also recognizes the 3′ invading strand and the exonuclease domain can digest it
independently of the helicase function. Much is left to be elucidated about the
recombinogenic, and anti-recombinogenic functions in the RecQs across various
organisms and additional analysis of their enzymatic activities on the same substrates
would assist in the interpretation of phenotypes associated with genomic instability.
Figure 1.5 Sgs1 preferential DNA substrates.
Representative figures of DNA substrates Sgs1 has been shown to unwind. It has been reported that Sgs1 can most efficiently unwind the Holliday junction, followed by the forked and ssDNA overhangs. Sgs1 can also unwind bubble and G4 quadruplex structures. This figure has been adapted from (Larsen and Hickson, 2013).
Table 1.2. RecQ-like Helicases Unwind a Variety of DNA Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>E. coli</th>
<th>S. pombe</th>
<th>S. cerevisiae</th>
<th>D. melanogaster</th>
<th>C. elegans</th>
<th>H. sapiens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dsDNA</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Him-6</td>
<td>- + RPA</td>
<td>- - - n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3' overhang</td>
<td>+ n.d.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
<td>+ n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5' overhang</td>
<td>+ n.d.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holliday Junction</td>
<td>+ n.d.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>+ +++ ++ +</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y structure</td>
<td>+ n.d.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+RPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-loop</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gray cells indicate an ability to bind the DNA structure with increased affinity from lightest to darkest gray.
White cells are structures not tested for binding affinity to that DNA structure.
n.d. – Ability to unwind was not determined.
~/- indicates a partial ability to unwind the DNA structure.
+RPA indicates unwinding was either only observed with the addition of RPA or is stimulated in the presence of RPA.
Table was compiled from supporting data from these sources [25, 32, 33, 40, 97, 105-151]
Sgs1 also interacts with many DNA metabolic factors involved in DNA repair. Mlh1, a factor involved in the repair of base mispairs generated during DNA replication has been found to physically interact with Sgs1, and this interaction is conserved in human BLM [152, 153]. The Mlh1 interaction was shown via yeast-two-hybrid with both human and yeast Mlh1.

The N-terminus of Sgs1 is unstructured and is not required for the catalytic function [242]. The N-terminus of Sgs1 has been implicated in strand exchange and physically interacts with Top3 in a complex with Rmi1. The complex of Sgs1/Top3/Rmi1 is conserved in humans as the BLM-TOP3α-RMI1/RMI2 [94, 154-157]. The Sgs1/Top3/Rmi1 complex is known to function late in homology-mediated repair to dissolve recombination intermediates to result in non-crossover products [97, 114, 158-160]. Sgs1 was initially found to suppress the slow growth phenotype of a top3Δ mutant and as has also been shown Sgs1 to help produce the recombination substrate that requires Top3 [94].

The single strand binding protein, RPA, has been shown to physically interact with Sgs1 in vivo and in vitro in the acidic region of the N-terminus [161]. RPA is known to stimulate BLM and WRN in humans [147] and Sgs1 in yeast in vitro [162] as well as preventing reannealing of ssDNA [163, 164].

Via yeast-two-hybrid and co-immunoprecipitation, it was found that another DNA helicase physically interacts with the N-terminus of Sgs1, the anti-recombinase Srs2 [165]. SGS1 and SRS2 also genetically interact as shown by the severe growth defect of cells lacking them both [166, 167], a defect that is dependent on recombination protein Rad51 [168]. It is thought that in the absence of Sgs1, recombination
intermediates accumulate and Srs2 dismantles the Rad51 filament that generates these recombination intermediates that if left unresolved are toxic [168-173]. Rad51 was also found to interact with the C-terminus of Sgs1 via yeast-two-hybrid, and in humans, this interaction also occurs between Rad51 and BLM at both the N- and C-terminus [174].

**DNA double-strand break repair**

Two pathways are known to repair dsDNA breaks, nonhomologous end-joining (NHEJ) and homologous recombination (HR). Sgs1 is known to function in both early and late steps of HR repair, and its function determines the end repair product. NHEJ repairs a break by ligating the two ends of the break indiscriminate of homology and loss or gain of a few nucleotides in this process together makes this process to be regarded as error-prone [175]. Repair by NHEJ is the preferred method of repair in G1 as there is no sister chromatid to use as a template for HR repair [176-179]; thus, HR repair is the preferred mechanism of repair during S/G2 phases.

**Common early steps of HR repair of DNA double-strand breaks**

In *S. cerevisiae*, once a DNA double-strand break occurs it is believed that there is competition between the non-homologous end joining pathway proteins (Ku70/80 from here on called Ku complex) and the Mre11-Rad50- Xrs2 (MRX) to bind to the break ends [180, 181]. The prevention of repair by NHEJ is achieved by the small range resection of the break by the MRX complex in yeast with the additional help from Sae2 to remove the Ku complex from the DNA ends [182-184]. Phosphorylation of Sae2 by cyclin-dependent kinase Cdc28 to promote MRX function in end resection has been
shown *in vitro* and *in vivo* although the exact mechanism of how Sae2 stimulates MRX function is yet to be elucidated [176, 177]. Resection by MRX/Sae2 leaves ~100-200 nucleotide 3’ overhangs that are then coated by ssDNA binding protein RPA to promote HR repair [185-188]. Stimulation of MRX activity has been suggested to also be necessary for the removal of MRX as it has been shown in the absence of Sae2, Mre11 is persistent at DNA ends and as a result regulation of the DNA damage checkpoint is defective [189, 190]. In humans, the MRX complex is MRN (Mre11-Rad50-Nbs1) and functions similarly to MRX, and defective Nbs1 is associated with the Nijmegen breakage syndrome [5-7].

Following short-range resection by MRX, Sgs1/Dna2, and Exo1 are recruited to the RPA coated 3’ single-strand DNA and redundantly resect leaving 2000-6000 nucleotide 3’ overhangs that will be used in the search for homology [162, 185, 191, 192]. Sgs1 acts a helicase providing the substrate for Dna2 endonuclease activity to cleave the unwound DNA while Exo1, a 5’-3’ exonuclease, redundantly resects the DNA ends without the need of a helicase [185, 193-195]. Sgs1 and Dna2 have also been shown to physically interact *in vitro*. The Sgs1/Dna2 physical interaction has not been mapped to specific domains of the proteins but the function if the interaction has been determined to be preferential degradation of the 5’ strand by Dna2 [196]. Loss of Sgs1 and Exo1 prevent any long-range resection, and the sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutant is hypersensitive to DNA damaging agents and has a high rate of gross chromosomal rearrangements as a result [192]. The long-range resection by Sgs1 and Exo1 produces the ssDNA substrate that allows for Rad51 filament strand invasion to continue homology-directed repair.
In the case of partial or incomplete long-range resection of HO-induced DNA breaks, recombination can still occur but can lead to aberrant repair by \textit{de novo} telomere addition and break-induced replication \cite{197, 198}. Recently, in the case of IR-induced breaks during the G2 cell cycle phase, repair by recombination still occurs in the absence of Sgs1 and Exo1 resection and is not repaired by \textit{de novo} telomere addition \cite{199}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure1.png}
\caption{Early steps of DNA double-strand break repair. Rad9 is bound to DNA in the absence of DNA damage but accumulates at DNA breaks. In the event of a DSB during G1, Ku complex binds the DNA end, committing repair to NHEJ and preventing HR repair. During S/G2 both Ku and the MRX complex competitively bind the end of the DNA break. Sae2 is phosphorylated by Cdc28 (not shown) stimulating end processing by MRX, liberating both Ku and the MRX complex from the DNA ends. This end processing leaves a small 3’ DNA substrate that is quickly coated with single-strand binding protein RPA and is further processed by Sgs1/Dna2 and Exo1 leaving longer 3’ overhangs to be used in the homology search in HR repair. Rad9 accumulates following the DNA break and creates a physical obstacle that regulates Sgs1 mediated end resection.}
\end{figure}
Regulation of Sgs1 and Exo1 resection is still not well understood, but a few mechanisms stimulate and inhibit their role in end resection. Ku complex bound DNA ends have been found to prevent Exo1 mediated end resection \textit{in vitro} and loss of Ku has been found to suppress resection defects in cells lacking resection by MRX/Sae2 [181, 183, 200]. It is also suggested that MRX and Sae2 recruit Exo1 to the break and in humans [201], BLM has been shown stimulates Exo1 activity [192, 202]. RPA is known to stimulate the resection activity of Sgs1 \textit{in vitro} and is required for extensive end resection \textit{in vivo} [196]. More recently in humans a novel protein, DNA helicase B (HELB), has been identified in control of resection during G1 through its physical interaction with RPA although the exact mechanism is yet to be determined [203]. The checkpoint adapter protein Rad9 is known to be bound to DNA even in the absence of DNA damage but in the event of a dsDNA breaks more Rad9 is recruited to the DNA ends and is suggested to create a physical barrier for Sgs1 function [204-206].

**HR directed repair following Sgs1 and Exo1 resection of DNA ends**

Sgs1 plays a role later in HR in promoting noncrossover repair products (Figure 1.4). Following resection, Rad51 displaces RPA on the 3’ single-strand DNA. Rad51 is recruited by Rad52 to form the presynaptic filament [207-209]. The Rad51 filament is then stabilized by Rad55/57 in preparation for strand invasion for the homology search [210, 211], which is assisted by Rad54 in stabilization in forming the D-loop [211, 212]. Srs2 can reverse strand invasion at this point to prevent aberrant repair, and this coincides with the genetic interaction observed in $sgs1^\Delta$ $srs2^\Delta$ mutant since recombination intermediates that are formed are unable to be reversed or dissolved
[166, 168, 213]. Following strand invasion, synthesis-dependent strand annealing can occur that requires Sgs1 to displace the new strand, a function dependent on its helicase function, to allow annealing and the removal of the flap [214]. If a second end is captured a double Holliday junction (dHJ) is formed and as the dHJs converge it forms a hemicatenane that is dissolved by the Sgs1/Top3/Rmi1 complex [114, 160] Dissolution of the HJ requires Top3, and \( \text{top3}\Delta \) mutants are slow growing. Slow growth of \( \text{top3}\Delta \) is suppressed with the loss of Sgs1 as it is involved in the early steps that allow for HJs for form [94]. In \textit{C. elegans}, the loss of Top-3\( \alpha \) in \textit{him-6} worms rather than suppressing chromosomal aberrations resulted in more significant defects, including chromosomes in the gonad that appeared to be clumped together and first filial generation of worms were expectedly sterile. It was found by the same group that Top3-\( \alpha \) and Him-6 physically interact and either the N- or C-terminus of Him-6 is enough for this interaction to occur. These similarities and differences from yeast and worm indicated that while these are conserved interactions, there are differences in how they function [215]. In the absence of Sgs1 endonucleases such as Yen1 can resolve the dHJ and this results in a half of the repair products as non-crossovers and half as crossovers [216, 217].

The role of Sgs1 at stalled replication forks

In \textit{S. cerevisiae}, the \( \text{sgs1}\Delta \) mutant is highly sensitive to the DNA damaging agents HU and MMS that stall replication forks [60]. It has been shown that Sgs1 physically interacts with Rad53 \textit{in vitro} and \textit{in vivo} [161, 218] in cells treated with hydroxyurea and this activates Rad53’s kinase activity, an event independent of Sgs1
helicase function. The activation of the checkpoint in MMS treatment appears to be regulated differently than what is observed in HU-treated cells, as Top3 and Rmi1 were not required for this activation in HU but are necessary for full activation of Rad53 in MMS treated cells [169, 219]. Sgs1 is also implicated in error-free damage bypass at stalled replication forks by template switching and regressed forks as the intermediates resemble those Sgs1 is known to dissolve in the homology-mediated repair of double-strand breaks [220].
Figure 1.7 Role of Sgs1 in late steps of homology-mediated repair.

(A) The Rad51 filament coating the 3’ single-strand DNA ends are stabilized by Rad55 and Rad57 (B) which is then assisted by Rad54 to form the (C) D-loop for the search for homology and DNA synthesis can occur. The D-loop structure that can be reversed by Srs2 (D). (E) Synthesis-dependent strand annealing, Sgs1 can displace the invading strand which then can be annealed, the flap removed and ligated (F) to form a noncrossover repair product (G). If a second DNA end is captured, a double Holliday junction is formed (H). The two branches migrate toward each other (I) and can either be cut by an endonuclease such as Yen1 (J) resulting in half crossover and have noncrossover products or form a hemicatenane that is then dissolved by the Sgs1-Top3-Rmi1 complex.
The role of Sgs1 in meiosis

Sgs1 has a role in meiosis. Diploids homozygous for the deletion of SGS1 can complete meiosis, but it takes a longer amount of time to complete meiosis than in wildtype cells and produces fewer viable tetrads, indicating a role for Sgs1 in meiosis [221, 222]. It was also shown that there is an increase in nondisjunction in this mutant, as was observed in a red/white colony sectoring assay where the color of the colonies formed indicate chromosome loss and nondisjunction [222]. Truncation studies of the C-terminus have indicated that the helicase domain is dispensable for Sgs1 function in meiosis [103]. SGS1 and MLH1, a gene encoding a protein involved in mismatch repair, have a genetic interaction indicating a role in the resolution of joint molecules in meiosis. In a recent study, it was shown that in conjunction with Exo1, Mlh1 promotes joint molecule resolution to produce crossover products with Sgs1 while Sgs1 alone produces non-crossover products. Interestingly, Mlh1 physically interacts with the C-terminus of Sgs1 in the region previously found to be dispensable for Sgs1’s role in meiosis, indicating that the physical interaction of Sgs1 and Mlh1 is not required for its role in meiosis. Even with the loss of the nucleases known to act in joint molecule resolution into crossover and non-crossover products [152], Sgs1 could still carry out some of this function. In the absence of nucleases Yen1, Mus81-Mms4, Slx1-Slx4, crossover products still form but joint molecule resolution is dependent on Sgs1 in this context [223].
DNA repair exonuclease, Exo1

Functions of Exo1 in mismatch repair

Exo1 is a 5′→3′ exonuclease belonging to the Rad2p family of nucleases that are characterized by their N-terminal and Internal nuclease domains, sequence identity, and structure specificity. The Rad2p family is divided into three classes categorized by the amino acid identity and positions of the blocks of homology; EXO1 is in the third class with the most amino acid similarity to the other family members contained in the N-terminal and Internal catalytic domain [224, 225].

Yeast Exo1 was initially discovered in Schizosaccharomyces pombe in a search for recombination proteins induced in cells undergoing meiosis and was subsequently found by the same group to be a protein involved in mismatch repair [225, 226]. While investigating Exo1’s role in meiosis, Szankasi and colleagues observed a mutator phenotype in an exo1Δ mutant generated in an ade6- strain. The ade6- strains, grown on adenine limiting media typically appear as red colonies and the exo1Δ mutant had the frequent appearance of white colonies despite being confirmed as ade6-. The mutator phenotype seen in the exo1Δ mutant in the ade6- background implied mutations in genes upstream of ade6- in the adenine pathway, possibly due to a defect in mutation avoidance. At the time, no eukaryotic exonucleases had been found to play a role in mismatch repair. Following this discovery, the S. cerevisiae homolog of S. pombe, EXO1, was identified. Further identification of Exo1 in mismatch repair was found via Yeast-two-hybrid and co-immunoprecipitation as Exo1 physically interacts with Msh2 and Mlh1. There was also an epistatic relationship of the exo1Δ msh2Δ mutant in the rate of spontaneous mutations observed in the msh2 mutant [152, 227]. Human EXO1
was identified, and the physical interaction of human Exo1 and Msh2 was observed and linked to mismatch repair [228, 229]. Following the discovery of EXO1’s role in mismatch repair, it was further characterized by Tran, Erdeniz, Dudley, and Liskay [194] by identifying phenotypes associated with the enzymatic function of Exo1. Th exo1Δ mutants were found to be sensitive to the DNA alkylating agent MMS, and a mutator phenotype was observed in the exo1Δ mutant as well as the nuclease deficient mutant that was dependent on Exo1’s enzymatic function.

### Regulation of Exo1 in response to DNA damage

Uncapped telomeres appear as a one-sided break, and the MRX complex binds the telomere preventing Ku from binding. MRX in this instance, unlike its role at double-strand breaks, instead of stimulating Exo1 activity it prevents Exo1 activity and recruits telomerase instead [230, 231]. It has been observed in yeast that Exo1 activity is negatively regulated by Mec1-dependent phosphorylation of four serine residues (372, 567, 587, 692) found in the C-terminus [232]. The serine residue 372 was also found in a screen for phosphorylated sites in response to MMS treatment [233]. In humans, nine phosphorylation sites (S376, S422, T581, S598, S623, S639, S660, S674, S746) have been identified in the C-terminus of Exo1 in cells that are untreated, and three (S454, T621, S714) that are suggested to reduce Exo1 protein stability in response to stalled replication forks, IR and CPT-induced DSBs [234, 235]. Phosphorylation of the C-terminus of Exo1 is also associated with regulation of Exo1 resection at stalled replication forks and sites of DNA damage by a physical interaction with 14-3-3 proteins in humans and yeast, and this inhibits the association of Exo1 at the site of damage.
[236, 237]. In humans, it was found that PCNA physically interacts with the C-terminal end of Exo1 and this association contributes to the processivity of Exo1 resection at DNA double-strand breaks [238]. The stimulation of Exo1 mediated resection by RPA has also been proposed as a mechanism to promote repair [195, 199]; however, more recently it has been shown that other single-strand binding proteins regulate Exo1 resection differently. Other groups have looked at regulation of Exo1 resection and found, in humans, the single-strand DNA binding complex SOSS1 helps recruit Exo1 to DNA and RPA removes Exo1 [239, 240]. While both groups used *in vitro* assays one group looked at the cycling of these proteins over time on DNA through single-molecule imaging and found that the removal of Exo1 by RPA occurs with both human RPA and yeast RPA, and the recruitment of Exo1 by SSOS1 was observed only for human Exo1 [239].

In yeast, the loss of replication fork stability in *rad53Δ* mutants when challenged with DNA damaging agent requires Exo1 function for sensitivity. Exo1 resection could be responsible for additional damage from aberrant repair initiated by resection and excess single-strand DNA produced by Exo1 modulates the checkpoint response [241].

**Hypothesis and Aims**

Understanding the underlying mechanisms of proteins involved in protecting genomic integrity is essential in understanding the ability to prevent disease. As the genome is under constant stress from both endogenous and exogenous sources of DNA damage, the capacity to cope relies on DNA repair by many different enzymes that detect and repair the damage. Homology-directed repair is one of two repair pathways
that repair dsDNA breaks and can complete repair through various homology-dependent sub-pathways that share a common step, DNA break end resection. Sgs1 and Exo1 are essential for long-range resection of DNA DSBs and the loss of both leads to substantially increased genome instability. Here we hypothesize that with the loss or dysregulation of Sgs1 or Exo1, additional defects in other repair pathways and interactions will increase genomic instability.

Aim1- We seek to identify the DNA metabolic factors are required for the formation of translocations and characterize the domains of Exo1 in the suppression of GCRs.

Aim2- We seek to identify pathways that promote or suppress genomic instability in cells lacking Sgs1 and Exo1 and identify the role of Exo1 in cells under replication stress.

Aim3-We seek to determine the role of recombination factors in suppressing genomic instability through the physical interaction of Sgs1 and Rad51.

Significance

DNA double-strand breaks are one of the most toxic forms of DNA damage. If they are not repaired accurately this can lead to genome rearrangements, a hallmark of cancer. The exact mechanism of how large genome rearrangements occur and result in disease is not well understood. Determining defects in different repair pathways and the function of DNA metabolic factors in suppressing genomic instability will help
characterize the driving forces of cancer formation, allowing a better understanding of genetic risk factors leading to disease.
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Chapter Two:

Differential genetic interactions between Sgs1, DNA-damage checkpoint components and DNA repair factors in the maintenance of chromosome stability
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ABSTRACT

Background: Genome instability is associated with human cancers and chromosome breakage syndromes, including Bloom’s syndrome, caused by inactivation of BLM helicase. Numerous mutations that lead to genome instability are known, yet how they interact genetically is poorly understood.
Results: We show that spontaneous translocations that arise by nonallelic homologous recombination in DNA-damage-checkpoint-defective yeast lacking the BLM-related Sgs1 helicase (sgs1Δ mec3Δ) are inhibited if cells lack Mec1/ATR kinase. Tel1/ATM, in contrast, acts as a suppressor independently of Mec3 and Sgs1. Translocations are also inhibited in cells lacking Dun1 kinase, but not in cells defective in a parallel checkpoint branch defined by Chk1 kinase. While we had previously shown that RAD51 deletion did not inhibit translocation formation, RAD59 deletion led to inhibition comparable to the rad52Δ mutation. A candidate screen of other DNA metabolic factors identified Exo1 as a strong suppressor of chromosomal rearrangements in the sgs1Δ mutant, becoming even more important for chromosomal stability upon MEC3 deletion. We determined that the C-terminal third of Exo1, harboring mismatch repair protein binding sites and phosphorylation sites, is dispensable for Exo1’s roles in chromosomal rearrangement suppression, mutation avoidance and resistance to DNA-damaging agents.

Conclusions: Our findings suggest that translocations between related genes can form by Rad59-dependent, Rad51-independent homologous recombination, which is independently suppressed by Sgs1, Tel1, Mec3 and Exo1 but promoted by Dun1 and the telomerase-inhibitor Mec1. We propose a model for the functional interaction between mitotic recombination and the DNA-damage checkpoint in the suppression of chromosomal rearrangements in sgs1Δ cells.
INTRODUCTION

Eukaryotic cells have mechanisms at their disposal for the detection and repair of spontaneous and induced DNA lesions, thus preventing them from giving rise to potentially abnormal daughter cells. However, if these mechanisms are defective or overwhelmed by damage, deleterious chromosomal rearrangements can arise. A multitude of genes and genetic pathways for the maintenance of genome stability has been identified mostly using genetic screens in simple model organisms such as the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. They include DNA damage checkpoints, DNA repair factors and proteins for processing of recombination substrates and intermediates [1-10]. The importance of the same mechanisms for maintaining genome stability in human cells is highlighted by the association of mutations in the human homologues of these yeast genes with chromosome breakage syndromes, which are characterized by signs of premature aging and/or cancer development. The syndromes include Nijmegen breakage syndrome associated with mutations in *NBS1*, the homologue of yeast *XRS2* [11-13]; Bloom’s syndrome and Werner syndrome associated with mutations in *BLM* and *WRN*, respectively, both related to yeast *SGS1* [14,15]; and ataxia telangiectasia associated with mutations in *ATM* [16], which is related to yeast *TEL1* [17].

Yeast *SGS1* encodes a 5’ to 3’ DNA helicase that preferentially unwinds three- and four-way junctions typical of replication and recombination intermediates and has recently been shown to collaborate with Exo1 in the long-range processing of double-strand breaks (DBSs) [18-21]. Without Sgs1, cells accumulate gross-chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs), exhibit elevated levels of mitotic recombination, have a reduced replicative lifespan and are sensitive to chemicals that alkylate DNA or slow...
replication forks [2,22-26]. Among DNA- damage checkpoint components, Mec1 kinase, also considered the homolog of mammalian ATR [27-29], has been identified as one of the strongest suppressors of GCRs in yeast [3,4]. Other cellular phenotypes of mec1Δ mutants include increased sensitivity to DNA damaging agents and deficient DNA-damage checkpoint response [30], instability of stalled forks [31], accumulation of DNA breaks [32] and, in addition to these mitotic defects, deficiencies in meiotic checkpoint activation and recombination [33-35]. In contrast to Mec1, cells lacking the Tel1 checkpoint kinase, which is related to mammalian ATM [17,36], are not sensitive to DNA damaging agents [17], do not accumulate GCRs above wildtype levels [3], but show telomere erosion [36]. Synergistic interactions between mec1Δ and tel1Δ mutations have been reported for many phenotypes, suggesting a functional relationship and redundancy between the two kinases [3,17,37,38]. Other checkpoint components, such as those involved in sensing DNA damage (Mec3, Rad24), appear to have only small to moderate roles in suppressing GCRs in yeast [3,4]. In cells lacking the Sgs1 helicase, however, Mec3 and Rad24 strongly suppress overall genome instability [3,4] as well as the formation of spontaneous, recurring translocations between short identical sequences in non-allelic, but related, DNA sequences [10]. Utilizing the high susceptibility of the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant to recurring translocation formation between CAN1, LYP1 and ALP1, we have in the current study conducted a candidate screen to identify two types of DNA metabolic factors those that are required for the formation of recurring translocations in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant and those that act independently of Sgs1 and Mec3 to suppress translocations. For this purpose, mec1Δ, tel1Δ, dun1Δ, chk1Δ and rad59Δ mutations were introduced into the sgs1Δ
mec3Δ mutant and the accumulation of recurring translocations was assessed. We further determined how the lack of other DNA metabolic factors (yen1Δ, lig4Δ, exo1Δ, rad1Δ, pol32Δ) affects the accumulation of genome rearrangements, identifying a strong synergistic interaction between sgs1Δ and exo1Δ. We propose an integrated model for independent, functional interactions between Sgs1, HR subpathways and various DNA damage-checkpoint branches in the suppression of chromosomal rearrangements.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Functional interaction between Sgs1 and DNA-damage checkpoint components Mec3, Mec1, Tel1, Dun1 and Chk1 in the suppression of chromosomal translocations

Chromosomal translocations between short stretches of homology in nonallelic sequences that are naturally present in the yeast genome, such as the highly similar, but diverged CAN1 (on chromosome V), ALP1 and LYP1 genes (on chromosome XIV, 60-65% identity), are normally suppressed in yeast. However, they are recurrent in sgs1Δ mutants with certain additional DNA-metabolic defects, including mec3Δ, rad24Δ, cac1Δ, asf1Δ and rfc5- 1 [10]. One of the mutants most susceptible to recurring translocations between the CAN1, LYP1 and ALP1 loci is the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant, whereas translocations are not found in the sgs1Δ mec1Δ mutant [10]. Here, we wanted to test whether the lack of CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations in the sgs1Δ mec1Δ mutant meant that Mec1 was not a suppressor of translocations and therefore its deletion had
no affect on translocation formation, or that Mec1 was actually required for the formation of viable chromosomal translocations. If the latter was true, we expected that introducing a mec1Δ mutation into the highly susceptible sgs1Δ mec3Δ strain should inhibit the accumulation CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations. Indeed, we found that while deleting MEC1 led to a synergistic increase (~ 7-fold) in the rate of all GCR types compared to the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant (P < 0.0001), screening of GCR clones obtained from 431 individual sgs1Δ mec3Δ mec1Δ cultures failed to reveal a single CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation, signifying a > 7-fold decrease in the translocation rate compared to the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant (Table 1). The synergistic GCR rate increase in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mec1Δ mutant shows that Mec1 can activate its targets through Mec3-independent sensing of DNA damage. This may occur by Mec1-Ddc2 itself recognizing and binding to DNA lesions [39,40] or through DNA-damage sensors other than the Mec3 clamp signaling to Mec1. The synergistic GCR rate increase in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mec1Δ mutant also indicates that the failure to form CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations when MEC1 is deleted is not due to an inability to form viable GCRs, but rather suggests that DNA lesions are channeled into GCR pathways other than homology-driven translocation. Most likely, Mec1 promotes chromosomal translocations by inhibiting de novo telomere synthesis at chromosome breaks [1], for example by phosphorylating the telomerase-inhibitor Pif1 [41] and by phosphorylating Cdc13 and thus preventing its accumulation at DNA breaks [42]. In a haploid wildtype cell, these chromosomal translocations are expected to be rare due to restraints placed on homologous recombination events by the need for relative long regions of sequence identity. However, when the restraints on homologous recombination are relaxed and
spontaneous DNA lesions are not properly detected by the DNA-damage checkpoint, as could be assumed for the *sgs1Δ mec3Δ* mutant, chromosomal translocations are promoted and occur between much shorter regions of sequence identity, such as the 5-41-bp segments present in *CAN1*, *LYP1* and *ALP1*.

Deleting *TEL1*, which encodes another DNA-damage checkpoint kinase that is considered at least partially functionally redundant with Mec1, had the same effect as deleting *MEC1* on the accumulation of all types of GCR (Table 1), as evidenced by the 44-fold increase in the overall GCR rate compared to the *sgs1Δ mec3Δ* mutant (5.7 × 10^{-6} versus 1.3 × 10^{-7}, P < 0.0001). However, deleting *TEL1* had the opposite effect on *CAN1/LYP1/ALP1* translocation formation (Table 1). Instead of inhibiting *CAN1/LYP1/ALP1* translocations like the *mec1Δ* mutation, the *tel1Δ* mutation led to an increase (~15-fold) in *CAN1/LYP1/ALP1* translocations (Table 1). Unlike *mec1Δ* mutants, mutants lacking Tel1 are impaired in their ability to maintain telomeres [36] and may thus be unable to heal DNA breaks by *de novo* telomere addition. Thus, in the absence of Tel1, DNA breaks may be channeled into alternative pathways for repair, such as HR, and more frequently give rise to *CAN1/LYP1/ALP1* rearrangements under conditions that favor aberrant HR such as those in the *sgs1Δ mec3Δ* mutant. That failure to activate either Tel1 or Mec3-checkpoint pathways contributes independently to recurrent *CAN1/LYP1/ALP1* translocation formation suggests that both ssDNA overhangs or gaps, thought to be sensed in a Mec3-dependent manner, and DSBs, thought to be sensed in a Tel1-dependent manner, can lead to *CAN1/LYP1/ALP1* translocations and that they accumulate in unperturbed *sgs1Δ* cells spontaneously. The synergistic increase in overall genome instability in the *sgs1Δ mec3Δ tel1Δ* mutant
might also indicate that in the absence of lesion binding by the Mec3 clamp some lesions are further processed and eventually detected by the Tel1-dependent pathway. For example, a stalled replication fork might eventually be processed into double-stranded ends in an attempt at fork restart by fork regression or template-switching. Thus, both Tel1 and Mec1 act independently of Mec3 and Sgs1 to strongly suppress overall genome instability, but they affect CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation formation in opposite ways. The inhibition of CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations upon MEC1 deletion as opposed to their increase upon TEL1 deletion can most likely be explained by their opposite effects on telomere synthesis, with Mec1 inhibiting it and Tel1 promoting it. This is also consistent with the previous report of different GCR spectra in the tel1Δ and mec1Δ single mutants [1]. Apart from regulating telomere maintenance factors, it is also conceivable that the DNA-damage checkpoint dependent phosphorylation of homologous recombination factors, such as Rad55, Slx4 and Mus81 [43-47] contributes to differential regulation of translocation formation in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant.

The opposing effects of Tel1 and Mec1 on CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation formation led us to investigate other DNA-damage checkpoint components in sgs1Δ and sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutants. We found that deletion of either CHK1 or DUN1 led to a synergistic increase in overall genome instability when combined with an sgs1Δ mutation (P < 0.0001), however only the dun1Δ mutation caused a further significant GCR rate increase in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant (P < 0.0001, Table 1) whereas the chk1Δ mutation did not (P = 0.1615, Table 1). Analysis of the GCR types revealed accumulation of CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations in the Chk1-deficient sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant at a similar rate as in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant, but not in the Dun1-deficient
sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant (Table 1), indicating that Dun1, like Mec1, promotes translocation events between CAN1, LYP1 and ALP1 whereas Chk1 does not. This is likely due to Mec1-mediated activation of Dun1 kinase, which in turn inactivates the transcription repressor Crt1, thus allowing transcription of several DNA-damage inducible genes [48,49]. Chk1 kinase is also activated through Mec1 in response to DNA damage and causes a transient G2/M arrest by blocking anaphase progression [50,51]. However, in contrast to Dun1, Chk1 is not thought to regulate DNA repair pathways, and its deletion did not inhibit translocation formation in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant (Table 1). As expected, deletion of RAD17, which encodes another subunit of the Mec3/Rad17/Ddc1 checkpoint clamp, had a similar effect on CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation formation in the sgs1Δ tel1Δ mutant as deletion of MEC3 (Table 1). The detection of a CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation in two strains that expressed wildtype Sgs1 (mec3Δ tel1Δ (Table 1) and mec3Δ tel1Δ rad17Δ (not shown)) suggests that even in the presence of wildtype Sgs1 cells may accumulate CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations as long as they are deficient in at least two independent suppressors of translocation formation, such as Tel1 and Mec3 identified here.

**Deletion of RAD59 inhibits spontaneous interchromosomal translocations between short repeats**

We previously showed that translocations between CAN1, LYP1 and ALP1 in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant are Rad52-dependent, but translocations still formed when Rad51 was absent [10]. To assess the role of other HR factors in translocation formation we deleted RAD59 in the highly susceptible sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant and measured the rate of
accumulating all types of GCRs as well as CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations. One CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 rearrangement was identified among GCR clones obtained from 158 independent cultures of the sgs1Δ mec3Δ rad59Δ mutant (Table 2), indicating a 10-fold reduction in the CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation rate compared to the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant. Thus, similar to Rad52, Rad59 is required for interchromosomal translocations between short identical sequences in related genes. If Rad59 was indeed required for translocation formation, we predicted that the formation of CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ rad51Δ mutant would also be inhibited by a rad59Δ mutation. Thus, we generated an sgs1Δ mec3Δ rad51Δ rad59Δ mutant and screened for CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations. Among 168 independent GCR clones we identified one CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation, indicative of a 28-fold reduction of the translocation rate compared to the sgs1Δ mec3Δ rad51Δ mutant (Table 2). Thus translocations between CAN1, LYP1 and/or ALP1 can form through Rad52/Rad59-mediated HR that does not require Rad51. Rad59 has recently also been shown to contribute to GCRs mediated by certain Ty-elements and to translocations involving short DNA sequences of limited sequence identity [6,52].

While Rad52 is required for all HR in yeast, some DNA breaks can be repaired by HR pathways that do not require Rad51, including single-strand annealing (SSA), break-induced replication (BIR) and recombination-mediated telomere-lengthening Type II [53-58]. SSA is a mechanism for the repair of a DSB between repeated DNA elements and requires Rad59, but not Rad51 [59]. In order for the interchromosomal CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 rearrangements to arise by SSA, however, at least two DSBs would have to occur in the same cell one DSB within or downstream of CAN1 on chromosome V and
one DSB near ALP1 (or LYP1) on chromosome XIV. Resection would expose the short stretches of homology shared by CAN1 and ALP1 (or LYP1) [60], allowing them to anneal, followed by removal of the nonhomologous overhangs and ligation. Rad59-dependent, Rad51-independent interchromosomal translocation between his3 fragments was recently shown after induction of HO-breaks in the two recombining chromosomes [61]. Such an interchromosomal SSA event could also produce the types of rearrangements we have observed between CAN1, LYP1 and ALP1; however, the ends of chromosomes V and XIV not engaged in the SSA event would be left unrepaired and most likely would be lost after cell division unless the recombination event occurs in G2/M when sister-chromatids are present. Moreover, since we have shown that wildtype copies of LYP1 and ALP1 are still present in recombinants with CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 rearrangements, indicative of a nonreciprocal translocation event [60], and the parts of chromosome XIV that would be lost after SSA contain essential genes, SSA is unlikely to be the main recombination mechanism that gives rise to CAN1/ LYP1/ALP1 rearrangements.

Besides SSA, BIR also matches the genetic requirements for CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation formation. BIR is initiated by invasion of a duplex by a single-stranded 3’end of a one-sided DBS followed by replication to the chromosome end. Although Sgs1 has roles in recombination, specifically sister-chromatid exchange and resolution of recombination intermediates [2,9,62-64], it is not required for Rad51-independent BIR [57]. In contrast to SSA, the nonreciprocal nature of BIR events would maintain an intact copy of chromosome XIV in addition to the chromosome V/XIV translocation, suggesting that it is the more likely mechanism involved in CAN1/LYP1/ALP1
translocation. BIR has been implicated in the repair of one-sided DSBs, such as replication forks that collapsed at a single-strand break. BIR is also thought to allow telomerase-deficient cells (\( tlc1\Delta \)), whose telomeres have shortened to a point where cells can no longer proliferate, to survive by extending what could be considered a one-sided DSB. Survivors can arise either by adding subtelomeric \( Y' \) elements in a Rad51-dependent mechanism (Type I) or by adding telomeric \((G_{1-3}T)_n\) repeats in a Rad51-independent, but Rad59-dependent mechanism (Type II) [53-55]. The differential requirement for Rad51 and Rad59 in these two pathways is thought to result from the differences in length and sequence identity of the recombination substrates for Type I and Type II [53]. The long, nearly identical (~1% variation within the same strain) \( Y' \) elements [65] are thought to be better substrates for Rad51-mediated strand invasion, whereas Rad59 is able to use the shorter stretches of homology likely to be found within the highly variable \((G_{1-3}T)_n\) repeats [53]. Besides BIR, evidence of homology-length dependency is also seen in gene conversion, with Rad59 becoming increasingly important as the length of sequence homology decreases [59]. This length-dependency may also explain our observation that \( CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 \) rearrangements, which show short regions of homology at the breakpoints [10,60], are inhibited by deletion of \( RAD59 \), but not by deletion of \( RAD51 \). Despite this differential effect on chromosome rearrangements between \( CAN1, LYP1 \) and \( ALP1 \), we observed no difference in the rate of overall genome instability between \( sgs1\Delta mec3\Delta rad51\Delta \) and \( sgs1\Delta mec3\Delta rad59\Delta \) mutants (\( P = 0.6892, \) Table 2), suggesting that the DNA lesions that give rise to viable GCRs are accessible to multiple repair pathways.
Candidate screen reveals EXO1 as a strong suppressor of GCR formation in cells lacking Sgs1

To assess the possible role of other DNA metabolic factors in the suppression or formation of GCRs in cells lacking Sgs1, we introduced exo1Δ, pol32Δ, rad1Δ, lig4Δ and yen1Δ mutations into sgs1Δ and sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutants. Screening of the single, double and triple mutants revealed that RAD1, POL32, LIG4 and YEN1 are not strong suppressors of GCRs in wildtype cells, or in sgs1Δ or sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutants (Table 3). However, when we assessed the formation of CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations in sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutants with pol32Δ or rad1Δ mutations we found that in both triple mutants CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations were inhibited, revealing one CAN1/LYP1 translocation among 98 independent GCR clones in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ pol32Δ mutant and none (0/55) in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ rad1Δ mutant. Pol32, a nonessential subunit of polymerase δ that promotes processivity of the polymerase, is not required for SSA, but for DNA repair processes that involve extensive DNA synthesis, such as BIR [66], consistent with BIR being a pathway for CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation formation.

Although Rad1, a subunit of the Rad1-Rad10 nuclease critical for the removal of non-homologous overhangs from annealed single strands in processes such as SSA [67,68], has not been shown to be required for BIR, it has been implicated in the removal of nonhomologous overhangs during GCR formation [69] and in recombination events that combine BIR and SSA processes [70,71].

Deletion of EXO1, coding for a nuclease with 5’ to 3’ exonuclease and flap-endonuclease activities, which has roles in mitotic and meiotic recombination as well as mutation avoidance and is thought to cooperate with Sgs1 in the processing of DSBs
[19,72], induced the largest synergistic GCR rate increase we have observed to date in the sgs1Δ mutant. While sgs1Δ andexo1Δ single mutants exhibited moderately increased GCR rates compared to wildtype, the GCR rate of the sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutant was several hundred-fold higher than the rates of the single mutants (P < 0.0001, Table 3). This GCR rate increased another 26-fold upon deletion of MEC3 (P < 0.0001, Table 3). Screening of GCRs obtained from 66 independent cultures of the sgs1Δ mec3Δ exo1Δ mutant identified two CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations, indicating a ~ 200-fold increase in the CAN1/LYP1/ ALP1 translocation rate compared to the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant (3.5 × 10⁻⁶ versus 1.7 × 10⁻⁸).

Exo1 contains conserved N-terminal N- and I-nuclease domains, apparently separated by a short disordered linker, and binding sites for the mismatch repair (MMR) proteins Mlh1 and Msh2 have been located within the C-terminal half of Exo1 [72-74], which is predicted to be intrinsically disordered (Figure 1A). Four phosphorylation sites (S372, S567, S587, S692) required for the regulation of the DNA-damage response have also been located in the disordered C-terminus [75]. To determine if the C-terminus of Exo1 plays a role in the suppression of genome instability in the sgs1Δ mutant, we constructed a set of C-terminal deletions ranging from 100 to 400 residues (Figure 1A and 1B). We found that the C-terminal 260 residues of Exo1, making up 37% of the protein, play no major role in suppressing the accumulation of GCRs in the sgs1Δ mutant (Table 4). To test the possibility that the C-terminus with its binding sites for MMR proteins might be required for Exo1’s role in mutation avoidance, but not for its role in suppressing GCRs, we utilized a fluctuation assay to determine the rate of accumulating canavanine resistance (Can') mutations in strains expressing the various
C-terminal Exo1 truncations (Table 5). As in the GCR assay, deletion of up to 260 residues had no effect on the Can’ mutation rate (P = 0.3524) whereas deletion of 280 or more residues caused a null phenotype (P = 0.0001). Similarly, only deletion of 280 or more residues caused sensitivity to methyl methanesulfonate (MMS) (Figure 1C). No sensitivity to 200 mM hydroxyurea was observed for any of the exo1 mutants (Figure 1C). Thus, deletion of up to 260 residues caused a phenotype similar to wildtype in all assays tested here, whereas deletion of 280 or more residues caused a null (exo1Δ) phenotype.

In addition to providing MMR protein interaction sites, the C-terminus of Exo1 contains four phosphorylation sites (S372, S567, S587, S692), which were recently shown to be important for the regulation of the DNA damage checkpoint in response to uncapped telomeres in a cdc13-1 mutant [75]. Unlike in a cdc13-1 mutant, we did not detect Exo1 phosphorylation in the sgs1Δ mutant (data not shown), and deletion of the C-terminal third of Exo1 (exo1-ΔC260), which contains three of the four phosphorylation sites (S567, S587, S692), had no effect on Exo1 function in the assays used here (Can’ mutation rate, GCR assay, MMS sensitivity). The fourth phosphorylation site (S372) is present in both the exo1-ΔC260 mutant and the exo1-ΔC280 mutant and, therefore, is not responsible for the different phenotypes associated with the two alleles. Thus, the known phosphorylation sites in Exo1 do not appear to be required for Exo1’s role in mutation avoidance, resistance to MMS or suppression of GCRs in a sgs1Δ mutant. Instead, it is likely that the ΔC280 deletion affects Exo1 nuclease activity directly by disrupting intramolecular interactions with the N-terminus. The loss of yet unknown post-translational modifications in this segment of Exo1 or an indirect effect caused by
the loss of interaction with other cellular factors could also lead to the deficiency of the 

*exo1ΔC280* allele.

Besides the overall increase in genome instability, *CAN1/LYP1/ALP1* rearrangements seen in the *sgs1Δ mec3Δ* mutant were also present in the *sgs1Δ mec3Δ exo1Δ* mutant. Normally, Exo1 and Sgs1 function in independent end resection pathways that cooperate in the processing of DSBs, especially the long-range resection of the 5'-strand [19,20], and Marrero and Symington [21] recently showed that this extensive resection inhibits BIR in a plasmid-based assay. Besides upregulation of BIR, which was also accompanied by chromosome rearrangements, the *exo1Δ sgs1Δ* mutant was also more proficient in *de novo* telomere synthesis at HO- endonuclease-induced chromosome breaks [18,21]. The combination of increased BIR and more efficient *de novo* telomere addition, both of which have been identified as major mechanisms for the healing of chromosome V breaks in the GCR assay [76,77], likely also explains the remarkably strong accumulation of genome rearrangements originating from spontaneous DNA lesions in the *exo1Δ sgs1Δ* mutant studied here. Our study further adds that the *exo1Δ sgs1Δ* mutant has even greater potential for the accumulation of viable genome rearrangements, which is suppressed (~ 26-fold) in the *sgs1Δ exo1Δ* mutant by Mec3-dependent DNA- damage checkpoint functions (P < 0.0001). Nonhomologous end-joining does not appear to be a significant source for these genome rearrangements, as indicated by the lack of any effect of *LIG4* gene deletion in mutants with various combinations of *sgs1Δ, exo1Δ* and *mec3Δ* mutations (e.g., GCR rate of *sgs1Δ mec3Δ exo1Δ* compared to *sgs1Δ mec3Δ exo1Δ lig4Δ*, P =
0.3953, Table 3); however, it is also plausible that in the absence of one repair pathway DNA lesions simply become substrates for various other available repair pathways.

CONCLUSION

Our results indicate that spontaneous, interchromosomal translocations between short regions of sequence identity (5-41 bp), such as those present in the CAN1, LYP1 and ALP1 genes used in our assay, are promoted by Mec1/Dun1/Rad59-dependent pathways whereas Tel1, Mec3 and Sgs1 act as independent suppressors (Figure 2). The requirement for Pol32 and Rad1 in the translocation process further suggests the need for extensive DNA synthesis, such as seen in BIR, and the removal of nonhomologous overhangs from annealed single-strands, critical for SSA and implicated in GCR formation. Exo1 nuclease is a suppressor of overall genome rearrangements as well as CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations when cells lack Sgs1 or both Sgs1 and Mec3. That the disordered, C-terminal third is dispensable for Exo1 function in our assays further indicates that physical interaction with MMR proteins in this region and regulation of Exo1 function in response to DNA-damage are not important for Exo1’s role in the suppression of spontaneous GCRs, mutation avoidance and resistance to MMS.
METHODS

Yeast strains and media

All strains used in this study are derived from KHSY802 (MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3) or the isogenic strain of the opposite mating type. Desired gene deletions were introduced by HR-mediated integration of PCR products containing a selectable marker cassette flanked by 50-nt sequences complementary to the target locus [78]. C-terminal truncations of Exo1 were constructed by replacing the desired DNA sequence at the chromosomal EXO1 locus with a myc-epitope encoding sequence amplified from pFA-13Myc. His3MX6 (a gift from Mark Longtine, Washington University, St. Louis). Expression of Exo1 truncation alleles was confirmed by Western blotting using monoclonal anti-c-myc antibody (Covance). All haploid strains with multiple gene deletions were obtained by sporulating diploids heterozygous for the desired mutations to minimize the risk of obtaining suppressors. This was especially important for combinations of mutations known to cause fitness defects, such as sgs1Δ and pol32Δ. Spore isolation was followed by genotyping of meiotic products by spotting on selective media or by PCR. All strains used in this study are listed in Table 6. Media for propagating yeast strains have been previously described [76,77].

Sensitivity to DNA damaging agents HU and MMS

Cell cultures were grown in yeast extract/peptone/dextrose (YPD) media and adjusted to OD_{600} = 1. Tenfold dilutions were spotted on YPD, YPD supplemented with
0.05% methyl-methanesulfonate (MMS) and YPD supplemented with 200 mM hydroxyurea (HU). Colony growth was documented after incubation at 30°C for 3 days.

**Fluctuation Assays**

Rates of accumulating spontaneous gross-chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs) were determined by fluctuation analysis and the method of the median as previously described [77,79]. Cells with GCRs were detected by their resistance to canavanine and 5-fluoro-orotic acid (Can<sup>+</sup> 5-FOA<sup>−</sup>) due to simultaneous inactivation of the *CAN1* and *URA3* genes, both located within a 12 kb nonessential region on the left arm of chromosome V. The median GCR rate is reported with 95% confidence intervals [80]. GCR clones were screened by PCR to identify clones with rearrangements between *CAN1* on chromosome V and *LYP1* and/or *ALP1* (collectively referred to as *CAN1/LYP1/ALP1* rearrangements in the text), located in opposite orientations on the same arm of chromosome XIV [10]. To determine the rate of accumulating spontaneous mutations that lead to inactivation of the *CAN1* gene, 3-ml YPD cultures expressing wildtype Exo1 or C-terminal truncations of Exo1 were grown overnight and aliquots were plated on synthetic media lacking arginine (US Biological) supplemented with 240 mg ml<sup>−1</sup> canavanine (Sigma), and on YPD to obtain the viable cell count. Colonies were counted after two days of incubation at 30°C. At least twelve independent cultures from three isolates were analyzed per yeast strain. The median Can<sup>+</sup> mutation rate is reported with 95% confidence intervals [80]. Statistical significance of differences in GCR rates was evaluated by using the Mann-Whitney test and programs from Dr. R. Lowry at Vassar College [http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/ VassarStats.html](http://faculty.vassar.edu/lowry/ VassarStats.html)
Protein extraction and Western blot analysis

Cells were grown in YPD until they reached OD$_{600}$ = 0.5. Whole cell extract was prepared from 5 ml of culture using a standard trichloroacetic acid (TCA) extraction. Briefly, cells were pelleted, vortexed with glass beads for 10 minutes in 200 µl of 20% TCA, followed by centrifugation for 2 minutes. The pellet was resuspended in sample buffer and pH was neutralized with 2 M Tris buffer (pH 7.6). Proteins were separated by PAGE, transferred to a PVDF membrane and incubated with monoclonal anti-c-myc antibody (Covance) to detect myc-tagged proteins. Bands were visualized using ECL Plus Chemiluminescence kit (GE Healthcare).
Figure 2.1 Expression of C-terminal truncations of Exo1 and sensitivity to DNA-damaging agents.

(A) Intrinsic disorder prediction of Exo1 using the IUPred algorithm in which values above 0.5 indicate residues predicted to be intrinsically disordered and values below 0.5 to be ordered. The N-terminus, harboring conserved N- and I-nuclease domains, is predicted to be ordered, whereas the C-terminus, which appears devoid of enzymatic activity but contains phosphorylation sites and sites for interaction with mismatch repair proteins, is disordered. The sites at which the Exo1 truncations examined in this study terminate are indicated by vertical dotted lines. The location of conserved domains was adapted from reference [71]: nuclease domains (orange boxes, 16-96 aa, 123-257 aa), Mlh1 interaction domain (green box, 400-702 aa) and the Msh2 interaction domain (blue box, 368-702 aa). Phosphorylation sites at S372, S567, S587 and S692, implicated in checkpoint regulation [74], are indicated by red asterisks. (B) Western blot analysis of expression of myc-epitope tagged exo1 truncations and wildtype Exo1. Molecular weight markers (kD) are indicated on the left. (C) Cells expressing Exo1 truncations lacking 280 or more C-terminal residues are as sensitive to 0.05% MMS as the exo1Δ mutant whereas cells expressing exo1 truncations lacking 260 or fewer C-terminal residues show wildtype levels of resistance to MMS. No sensitivity to 200 mM hydroxyurea was observed for any of the tested yeast strains.
Figure 2.2 Factors affecting the suppression and promotion of chromosomal translocations between short segments of homology in CAN1, LYP1 and ALP1 in cells lacking Sgs1. In the absence of Sgs1, translocations between CAN1, LYP1 and ALP1 (referred to as C/L/A) are independently suppressed by the checkpoint components Mec3 and Tel1 (shown in red font), as suggested by the synergistic increases in the GCR rate and the C/L/A translocation rate of the sgs1Δ mutant upon deletion of MEC3 (sgs1Δ mec3Δ) and subsequently TEL1 (sgs1Δ mec3Δ tel1Δ). If Mec3 is absent (sgs1Δ mec3Δ), C/L/A translocations form through a pathway that requires Mec1, Dun1 and homologous recombination (HR) factors (shown in green font), especially Rad52 and Rad59. Mec1 most likely promotes translocations by inhibiting de novo telomere additions by regulating Pif1 and Cdc13. In addition to mutagenic repair that leads to C/L/A translocations, other types of mutagenic repair (e.g., translocations between other genes, de novo telomere additions, deletions, insertions, inversions) and most likely also nonmutagenic repair products are formed. If, in addition to Mec3, Tel1 is also absent (e.g., sgs1Δ mec3Δ tel1Δ), an even greater number of DNA lesions are channeled through the Mec1-dependent, C/L/A-promoting pathway. In contrast to dun1Δ, the chk1Δ mutation does not lead to a significant GCR rate increase in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ mutant and does not inhibit C/L/A translocation formation. Possibly, the inability to regulate cell cycle progression in the absence of Chk1 leads to increased formation of inviable GCRs. Dotted lines indicate events that occur in the absence of the protein from which the arrow originates; full lines indicate events that occur in the presence of the protein.
Table 2.1 Functional interaction between Sgs1 and components of the DNA-damage checkpoint in the suppression of GCRs and translocations between CAN1, LYP1 and ALP1 genes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Genotyped</th>
<th>All GCR types&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Frequency of CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocation types&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildtype</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>&lt;1-6.2</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>144-276</td>
<td>&lt;7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26-74</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mec3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18-75</td>
<td>&lt;1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mec3 rad17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32-64</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 rad17</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>903-4160</td>
<td>&lt;101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1120-2030</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 rad17</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>1247-2230</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel1 mec3</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>340-638</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel1 rad17</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>72-246</td>
<td>&lt;8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 tel1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>46-418</td>
<td>ND&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 tel1 rad17</td>
<td>27600</td>
<td>22430-4600</td>
<td>4600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 tel1 mec3</td>
<td>57370</td>
<td>47157-76301</td>
<td>2674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 tel1 mec3 rad17</td>
<td>31960</td>
<td>23400-51800</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mec1</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>209-859</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec1</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>960-2452</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec1 mec3</td>
<td>9628</td>
<td>5870-12100</td>
<td>&lt;22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chk1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25-132</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 chk1</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>337-528</td>
<td>&lt;15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 chk1 mec3</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>725-1613</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dun1</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>86-472</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 dun1</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>699-1910</td>
<td>&lt;23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 dun1 mec3</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2270-3570</td>
<td>&lt;21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) GCR rate (Can<sup>+</sup> 5-FOA<sup>-</sup> × 10<sup>-10</sup>). 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for median GCR rates were calculated according to Nair [80], where non-overlapping confidence intervals indicate statistically significant differences between median GCR rates. GCR rates of wildtype [81], sgs1 [82], mec3, sgs1 mec3 [60], tel1 [3] were reported previously.

(b) Rate of accumulating translocations between CAN1, LYP1 and/or ALP1 genes (x 10<sup>-10</sup>). GCR clones from sgs1, mec3, sgs1 mec3, sgs1 tel1 and sgs1 mec1 were previously screened for CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations [10,60].

(c) Types of CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations were determined by sequencing. Of the 20 CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations identified among 150 GCR clones from the sgs1 mec3 mutant, 17 were identified as being either C/A, C/L/A or C/L translocations and 3 clones had a mixture of multiple translocations [60].

(d) All mutants with a mec1 deletion also contain a sml1 deletion.
Table 2.2 Effect of homologous recombination mutations on the ability of the sgs1 mec3 mutant to accumulate GCRs and form rearrangements between the CAN1, LYP 1 and ALP1 genes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant genotype</th>
<th>All GCR types(^a)</th>
<th>CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildtype</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>&lt;1-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad51(^a)</td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>&lt;7-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad52</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>16-267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1(^a)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>144-276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mec3(^a)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 rad59</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>107-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 rad59 rad51</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>49-154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1120-2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 rad51(^a)</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>ND(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 rad52(^a)</td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>ND(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 rad59</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>1595-3187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 rad59 rad51</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>734-1460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Median rate of cells resistant to canavanine and 5-FOA (Can\(^r\) 5-FOA\(^r\) \(\times 10^{-10}\)). 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for median GCR rates were calculated according to Nair [80], where non-overlapping confidence intervals indicate statistically significant differences between median GCR rates. GCR rates for wildtype [81], sgs1 [82], mec3, sgs1 mec3 [60], rad51, sgs1 mec3 rad51 and sgs1 mec3 rad52 mutants [10] were reported previously and are included for comparison.

(b) Rate of accumulating translocations between CAN1, LYP1 and/or ALP1 (Can\(^r\) 5-FOA\(^r\) \(\times 10^{-10}\)). GCR clones from sgs1, mec3, sgs1 mec3, sgs1 mec3 rad51, sgs1 mec3 rad52 were previously screened for CAN1/LYP1/ALP1 translocations [10,60]. ND, not determined.

(c) To determine 95% CIs for sgs1 mec3 rad51 and sgs1 mec3 rad52 mutants, GCR rates were re-measured for the current study. The GCR rate for the sgs1 mec3 rad51 mutant was 1933 \(\times 10^{-10}\) (95% CIs: 601-2240 \(\times 10^{-10}\)) and the GCR rate for the sgs1 mec3 rad52 mutant was 2220 \(\times 10^{-10}\) (951-3470 \(\times 10^{-10}\)). The previously reported rates fall within the 95% CIs determined in the current study.
Table 2.3 Effect of *lig4Δ, exo1Δ, rad1Δ, pol32Δ* and *yen1Δ* mutations on the accumulation of GCRs in checkpoint-proficient and checkpoint-deficient *sgs1Δ* mutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant genotype</th>
<th>GCR rate</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wildtype</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>&lt;1-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>144-276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1120-2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1 sgs1</td>
<td>43800</td>
<td>30400-186000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1 mec3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1 mec3 sgs1</td>
<td>1168498</td>
<td>549530-3251000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 exo1 lig4</td>
<td>895988</td>
<td>701149-1236740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lig4</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 lig4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35-254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 lig4</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>948-2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>yen1</em></td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 yen1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57-265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 yen1</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>254-2540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pol32</em></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 pol32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&lt;24-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 pol32</td>
<td>2317</td>
<td>1800-3110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rad1</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;9-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 rad1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25-356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 mec3 rad1</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>1020-1540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Strains with multiple gene deletions were constructed by sporulation of the appropriate heterozygous diploids. GCR rates with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for wildtype [81], *sgs1* [82], *sgs1 mec3* [60] and *lig4* [1] were reported previously and are included for comparison. Spores with both *sgs1Δ* and *pol32Δ* mutations grew very slowly and exhibited a low viable cell count on YPD in the GCR assay.

(b) The rate of accumulating gross-chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs) is calculated by selecting for cells resistant to canavanine (*Can^r*), and 5-fluoro-orotic acid (*5-FOA^r*) and is expressed as *Can^r* *5-FOA^r* × 10^{-10} [77].

(c) 95% confidence intervals (CI) for median GCR rates were calculated according to Nair [80].
Table 2.4 Effect of exo1 mutations on the accumulation of GCRs in wildtype cells or cells lacking Sgs1 helicase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant genotype</th>
<th>GCR rate (Can^r 5-FOA^r × 10^{-10})</th>
<th>95% CI^a (Can^r 5-FOA^r × 10^{-10})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57-177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ sgs1Δ</td>
<td>40484</td>
<td>31076-49848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXO1.myc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC100.myc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC200.myc</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
<td>&lt; 3.8-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC260.myc</td>
<td>&lt; 11</td>
<td>&lt; 8-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC280.myc</td>
<td>&lt; 11</td>
<td>&lt; 8-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC300.myc</td>
<td>&lt; 18</td>
<td>&lt; 5-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC400.myc</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ EXO1.myc</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ exo1-ΔC100.myc</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>80-186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ exo1-ΔC200.myc</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>94-215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ exo1-ΔC260.myc</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>166-265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ exo1-ΔC280.myc</td>
<td>26840</td>
<td>22925-34036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ exo1-ΔC300.myc</td>
<td>31070</td>
<td>22871-33753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ exo1-ΔC400.myc</td>
<td>48190</td>
<td>39133-54471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) 95% confidence intervals (CI) for median GCR rates were calculated according to Nair [80].
Table 2.5 Effect of C-terminal deletions of Exo1 on the spontaneous mutation rate at the CAN1 locus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant genotype</th>
<th>CAN1 (Can⁺ × 10⁻⁷)</th>
<th>95% CI a (Can⁺ × 10⁻⁷)</th>
<th>Increase over wildtype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wildcard</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.50-5.82</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>10.10-28.52</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC100.myc</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.92-4.70</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC200.myc</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>3.90-5.90</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC260.myc</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.89-5.92</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC280.myc</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>6.94-16.18</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC300.myc</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>8.55-19.88</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1-ΔC400.myc</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>9.06-18.19</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) 95% confidence intervals (CI) for median Canr rates were calculated according to Nair [80].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain ID</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KHSY802</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad59::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDKY 3721a</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad17::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDKY 3739a</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, dun1::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDKY 3745a</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, chk1::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDKY 5209a</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, tel1::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 773</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, smt1::TRP1, mec1::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 884</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad51::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 906</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, mec3::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 1330</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::HIS3, mec1::TRP1, smt1::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 1498</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::HIS3, mec1::TRP1, smt1::G418, mec3::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 1524</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2260</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, chk1::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2265</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, rad17::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2280</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, mec3::HIS3, rad59::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2283</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, mec3::HIS3, rad59::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2317</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, tel1::G418, mec3::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2320</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, mec3::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2331</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, yen1::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2336</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2338</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad59::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2388</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad59::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2402</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, mec3::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2408</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, mec3::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2424</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, mec3::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2434</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, mec3::HIS3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.6 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains used in this study (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2447</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, lig4::loxP-G418-loxP&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2448</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, yen1::loxP-G418-loxP&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2449</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, yen1::loxP-G418-loxP, mec3::HIS3&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2559</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, mec3::G418, rad17::HIS3&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2565</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, mec3::G418, rad17::HIS3&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2579</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, mec3::HIS3&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2585</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, tel1::G418, rad17::HIS3&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2588</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, tel1::G418, rad17::HIS3&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2662</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, mec3::HIS3, chk1::HIS3&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2665</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, mec3::HIS3, dun1::HIS3&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 2786</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, lig4::loxP-G418-loxP, mec3::HIS3&lt;sup&gt;stre&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3086</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, mec3::G418, rad17::HIS3, tel1::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3223</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, mec3::HIS3, tel1::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3231</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad17::HIS3, mec3::HIS3, tel1::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3265</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1ΔC300.MYC.HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3271</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1ΔC400.MYC.HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3274</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1ΔC200.MYC.HIS, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3278</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1ΔC100.MYC.HIS, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3282</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1ΔC100.MYC.HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3287</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, EXO1.YC.HIS, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3395</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, EXO1.MYC.HIS, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3396</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ200.MYC.HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3402</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ300.MYC.HIS, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3635</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, mec3::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3843</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ400.MYC.HIS, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3849</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ280.MYC.HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3857</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ280.MYC.HIS, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 2.6 Saccharomyces cerevisiae strains used in this study (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3860</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ260.MYC.HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3866</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ260.MYC.HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3868</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ260.MYC.HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3869</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ260.MYC.HIS, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 3875</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1Δ260.MYC.HIS, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) RDKY strains were a kind gift from Richard Kolodner (Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research, University of California - San Diego).
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Chapter Three:

Exo1 phosphorylation status controls the hydroxyurea sensitivity of cells lacking the Pol32 subunit of DNA polymerases delta and zeta.
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Abstract

Exo1 belongs to the Rad2 family of structure-specific nucleases and possesses 5′–3′ exonuclease activity on double-stranded DNA substrates. Exo1 interacts physically with the DNA mismatch repair (MMR) proteins Msh2 and Mlh1 and is involved in the excision of the mispaired nucleotide. Independent of its role in MMR, Exo1 contributes to long-range resection of DNA double-strand break (DSB) ends to facilitate their repair by homologous recombination (HR), and was recently identified as a component of error-free DNA damage tolerance pathways. Here, we show that Exo1 activity increases
the hydroxyurea sensitivity of cells lacking Pol32, a subunit of DNA polymerases δ and ζ. Both, phospho-mimicking and dephospho-mimicking exo1 mutants act as hypermorphs, as evidenced by an increase in HU sensitivity of pol32Δ cells, suggesting that they are trapped in an active form and that phosphorylation of Exo1 at residues S372, S567, S587, S692 is necessary, but insufficient, for the accurate regulation of Exo1 activity at stalled replication forks. In contrast, neither phosphorylation status is important for Exo1’s role in MMR or in the suppression of genome instability in cells lacking Sgs1 helicase. This ability of an EXO1 deletion to suppress the HU hypersensitivity of pol32Δ cells is in contrast to the negative genetic interaction between deletions of EXO1 and POL32 in MMS-treated cells as well as the role of EXO1 in DNA-damage treated rad53 and mec1 mutants.

Introduction

Exo1 belongs to the Rad2-family of structure-specific nucleases and possesses 5′–3′ exonuclease activity on double-stranded DNA substrates as well as flap-endonuclease activity [1,2]. Exo1 has a catalytic role during the excision step of DNA mismatch repair (MMR) and has been shown to physically interact with the MMR proteins Msh2 and Mlh1 in yeast and humans [1,3–8]. Although missense mutations in EXO1 from cancer patients have been shown to reduce binding to Msh2 in vitro, and disruption of EXO1 function has been associated with somatic hypermutation and development of cancer in older mice, a causative association between EXO1 mutations and hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer (HNPCC), which is caused by MMR defects, remains unclear [9–15].
Independent of its role in MMR, EXO1 plays a role in the resection of DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs). Formation of long, single-stranded 3’ overhangs is necessary for Rad51 filament formation and non-mutagenic repair of DSBs by homologous recombination (HR) [16]. Resection appears to be a two-step reaction that commits repair of the DSB to the HR pathway. The Mre11/Rad50/Xrs2 complex binds first to the unprocessed DSB and, with help from Sae2 endonuclease, resects a short stretch. In the second step, long-range 5’–3’ resection is accomplished by Sgs1 and Dna2, which, respectively, contribute 3’–5’ helicase and endonuclease activities to the reaction [17,18]. In addition to Sgs1/Dna2, Exo1 can carry out long-range resection by removing nucleotides from the 5’-ended strand [17–19]. Yeast cells that lack both Sgs1 and Exo1 exhibit severely retarded long-range resection and accumulate spontaneous chromosomal rearrangements at an extraordinarily high rate [20,21]. Analysis of rearranged chromosomes in sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutants where a DSB was induced by endonucleolytic cleavage revealed that incompletely processed DNA breaks become substrates for aberrant repair, predominantly de novo telomere addition and, to a lesser extent, break-induced replication [22,23].

Recently, EXO1 was also identified in a genetic screen for components of the error-free DNA damage tolerance (DDT) pathway, which is engaged when the replisome encounters a blocking DNA lesion in the template strand [24]. As opposed to the error-prone pathway where a translesion DNA polymerase is recruited to monoubiquitinated proliferating cell nuclear antigen (PCNA) to replicate across a lesion, in the error-free pathway the replicative DNA polymerase is thought to switch from the damaged template to the undamaged sister chromatid in a HR-dependent reaction, also
referred to as template switching. Exo1 is thought to promote the HR-dependent steps in error-free DDT by extending the ssDNA gap behind the stalled replication fork [24]. Exo1-dependent ssDNA formation may also allow accumulation of enough replication protein A (RPA) at stalled forks to enhance the DNA-damage signal sufficiently for 9-1-1/Mec1-dependent checkpoint activation [25,26]. In addition to bypassing replication blocking lesions in the template strand, error-free DDT can be specifically induced by deleting \textit{POL32}, which encodes a noncatalytic subunit of DNA polymerase [27]. Through physical interaction with the polymerase clamp PCNA, Pol32 increases the processivity of DNA polymerase and the efficiency of DNA synthesis [28]. The DNA polymerase subunits Pol32 and Pol31 also function as subunits of DNA polymerase, whose catalytic core is made up of Rev3 and Rev7 [29–31]. DNA polymerase is conserved in eukaryotes and plays a critical role in translesion DNA synthesis and mutagenesis [32–34]. Although cells that lack Pol32 are viable, they experience replication stress that leads to phosphorylation of the checkpoint kinase Rad53, S phase delay, accumulation in G2/M, and hypersensitivity to DNA damaging agents [24,27,35].

When replication forks stall due to exposure to the DNA damaging agents hydroxyurea (HU) or methyl methanesulfonate (MMS), which deplete the dNTP pool and generate base adducts in the template strand, respectively, activation of the replication checkpoint helps to maintain the activity of the replisome, possibly through phosphorylation, that permits fork restart after withdrawal of the genotoxin [36–38]. Although Exo1 has been found at these stalled forks the presence of the intact replisome is thought to prevent it from acting on the nascent strands [26]. In cells that
lack a functional replication checkpoint, components of the replisome, most notably DNA polymerase and the replicative helicase Mcm2-7, have been found to dissociate from stalled forks, which might make the ends of the nascent strands vulnerable to degradation by nucleases, including Exo1 [39–41]. Nascent strand degradation may contribute to the destabilization of stalled replication forks in checkpoint mutants and, possibly, provide sufficiently long ssDNA regions for recombination [26,42,43]. A recent comparison of the composition of replisomes in checkpoint-deficient cells and wildtype cells also raised the possibility that the inability to restart stalled forks in checkpoint-deficient cells may be due to a lack of phosphorylation of replisome components and accessory factors rather than their loss from the replication fork [44,45]. Exo1 has been found to be phosphorylated in a Mec1-dependent manner upon treatment of cells with HU or MMS [38,46]. In cells with uncapped telomeres (cdc13-1), four phosphorylated serine residues were identified in the C-terminal half of Exo1 [47,48]. Although the effect of mutating these serine residues on the viability of the cdc13-1 mutant was small, it hinted that DNA-damage induced phosphorylation inhibits Exo1 activity.

To better understand Exo1 function in the DNA-damage response and the regulation of these functions by phosphorylation, we have determined the effect of defects in DNA repair and the replication stress response on DNA-damage sensitivity and accumulation of mutations in the exo1Δ mutant and cells harboring alleles that encode phospho-mimicking and dephospho-mimicking mutants of Exo1.
**Materials and Methods**

**Yeast strains and media**

Yeast strains used in DNA-damage sensitivity and mutation assays were all derived from KHSY802 (MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3). Gene deletions were carried out as described [49] using HR-mediated integration of a selectable cassette. Mutants containing more than one gene deletion or mutation were obtained by random spore isolation from diploids heterozygous for the desired mutations [50]. Residues S372, S567, S587, and S692 of Exo1 were changed to alanine (exo1-SA) or aspartic acid (exo1-SD) and residues E150 and D173 to aspartic acid and alanine, respectively (exo1-ND, exo1-ND-SA, exo1-ND-SD) by site-directed mutagenesis of the EXO1 ORF in plasmid pKHS610. pKHS610 was generated by inserting EXO1 into pXP320 [51] by gap-repair using yeast strain KHSY2331 (lig4::kanMX6) to promote HR-mediated insertion. The resulting plasmids with mutant exo1 alleles were pKHS611 (exo1-SD), pKHS612 (exo1-SA), pKHS613 (exo1-ND-SA), and pKHS614 (exo1-ND-SD). The exo1 alleles, including a HIS3MX6 cassette were amplified from the appropriate plasmids and integrated at the chromosomal EXO1 locus in KHSY2338 (exo1::KANMX6) using the lithium acetate method [49]. Yeast strains used in this study are listed in Supplemental Table S1. Yeast was grown at 30°C in yeast extract (10g/l), peptone (20 g/l), dextrose (20 g/l), media (YPD) with or without Bacto agar, or in synthetic complete (SC) media (yeast nitrogen base 6.7 g/l, dextrose 20g/l) supplemented with the appropriate amino acid mix.
Gross-chromosomal rearrangement (GCR) assay

GCR rates were determined by fluctuation analysis by taking the median rate of at least 15 cultures from at least two isolates [52,53] and are shown with 95% confidence intervals [54]. Cells with GCRs were identified by their resistance to canavanine and 5-fluoro-orotic acid (Can' 5-FOA'), which is indicative of simultaneous inactivation of CAN1 and URA3 on chromosome V. Selective media for the GCR assay was prepared as previously described [55].

Fluctuation assays and CAN1 mutation spectrum analysis

Forward mutation rates were determined by fluctuation analysis by method of the median as previously described [53,56] and are shown with 95% confidence intervals [54]. Five cultures from at least two different isolates were grown overnight in 3–5 ml of YPD media. Dilutions were plated on YPD agar plates to determine the viable cell count, and either 500 l or 1000 l were plated on synthetic media supplemented with 60 g/ml canavanine, but lacking arginine (SC-ARG/canavanine) to select for can1 mutants. To select for Thr+ (hom3-10) revertants, 250–4000 l were plated on synthetic media lacking threonine. Semi-quantitative assessment of accumulation of CAN1 mutations was performed by a patch assay. Briefly, three independent colonies of each mutant were spread over approximately 1-inch squares on YPD agar or YPD agar containing 10mM HU. Patches were allowed to grow for five days at 30 °C and replica plated onto SC-ARG/canavanine. Formation of papillae was documented each day for four days of incubation at 30 °C. To determine the CAN1 mutation spectrum, the CAN1 open
reading frame (ORF) and 50 bp upstream as well as 43bp downstream of the ORF were amplified by PCR from canavanine-resistant colonies and sequenced.

**Hydroxyurea (HU) and methylmethanesulfonate (MMS) sensitivity assays**

Cultures of single colonies grown overnight at 30°C in YPD liquid media were adjusted to OD$_{600}$ = 0.2 and grown at 30°C to OD$_{600}$ = 0.5. Ten-fold serial dilutions were spotted on YPD, and YPD supplemented with the indicated concentrations of MMS and HU. Colony formation was documented each day for 5 days of incubation at 30°C

**Results**

**Functional interactions between Exo1, DNA repair and DNA-damage response**

Exo1 and Sgs1/Dna2 act in parallel in long-range 5′ end resection during DSB repair by HR [18]. When both pathways are disrupted (sgs1∆ exo1∆) the accumulation of gross-chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs) increases synergistically to 450-fold over the rate of the sgs1∆ single mutant [20,21]. Here we report that this rapid accumulation of GCRs in the sgs1∆ exo1∆ mutant can be further accelerated by increasing replication stress either by impairing DNA polymerase δ (pol32∆) or by failure to complete repair (apn1∆, rad1∆) or bypass (rev3∆, pol32∆) of spontaneous DNA lesions (Table 1). Disruption of these activities in the exo1∆ single mutant (Table 2), but not in the sgs1∆ single mutant (Table S2), also caused significant increases in genome instability, with the strongest synergistic increases caused by the rev3∆ and pol32∆
mutations. Deletion of TEL1 also caused a significant increase in GCR accumulation in the sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutant, but to a lesser extent than the 28-fold increase observed upon deletion of MEC3 [20], suggesting that the Mec3-Ddc1-Rad17-mediated replication stress response plays a significantly greater role in the suppression of genome instability in the sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutant than the Tel1-mediated checkpoint response to DNA breaks.

The small, but significant, increases in genome instability in the sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutant upon deletion of either TEL1, REV3 or APN1 were accompanied by increases in sensitivity to hydroxyurea (HU), which impedes replisome progression by depleting the dNTP pool, whereas no such increase was observed upon deletion of RAD1 (Fig. 1A–D). Combining sgs1Δ and pol32Δ mutations caused a clear fitness defect on rich media, which was not further exacerbated by deletion of EXO1 (Fig. 1E). However, deletion of EXO1 appeared to slightly suppress the HU hypersensitivity of the sgs1Δ pol32Δ mutant, but not its hypersensitivity to methyl methanesulfonate (MMS), which impairs replisome progression by generating DNA lesions (e.g., base adducts) in the template strand (Fig. 1E). Since insensitivity to HU (200 mM) and sensitivity to MMS (0.05%) are characteristic of an exo1Δ mutant [20], we next evaluated the HU sensitivity of sgs1Δ and pol32Δ single mutants in the presence and the absence of EXO1. We increased the HU concentration from 10 to 55 mM – a level at which sgs1Δ and pol32Δ mutants display significantly higher HU sensitivity than the wildtype strain. We found that the exo1Δ mutation suppressed the HU hypersensitivity of the pol32Δ mutant to a level comparable to the wildtype strain, but had no effect on the sgs1Δ mutant (Fig. 1F). Disrupting the nuclease activity of Exo1 (exo1-ND) achieved the same level of
suppression of HU hypersensitivity in the \textit{pol32}Δ mutant as deletion of EXO1 (Fig. 2A). Disruption of Exo1, however, had no effect on the viability of \textit{pol32}Δ cells treated with high concentrations of HU (200 mM) (Fig. 2B). These findings suggest that under low replication stress Exo1-dependent events, most likely ssDNA formation at stalled replication forks, are the major contributor to the inviability of \textit{pol32}Δ cells, whereas under conditions when DNA synthesis is grossly impeded by high concentrations of HU Exo1-independent lesions, such as DNA breaks, are the major cause of \textit{pol32}Δ inviability.

In contrast to HU, Exo1 was not found to be toxic to MMS-treated \textit{pol32}Δ cells at the tested concentrations. In fact, when the \textit{pol32}Δ mutant was exposed to MMS we observed the opposite response: while \textit{exo1}, \textit{exo1}-\textit{ND} and \textit{pol32}Δ single mutants grew almost like wildtype cells on 0.01% MMS, combining the \textit{pol32}Δ mutation with \textit{exo1}Δ or \textit{exo1}-\textit{ND} mutations increased MMS sensitivity synergistically (Fig. 2A). This is consistent with the recent finding that \textit{EXO1} is required for the bypass of MMS-induced DNA lesions by error-free DNA-damage tolerance pathways [24].

\textbf{Phosphorylation-site mutants of Exo1 are hypermorphic in HU-treated \textit{pol32}Δ cells}

In yeast cells with a defective telomere capping complex (\textit{cdc13-1}), the C-terminal half of Exo1 has been found to be phosphorylated in a Mec1-dependent manner at four dispersed sites (S372, S567, S587, S692) [47]. To determine how phosphorylation contributes to the adverse effect of Exo1 on HU-treated \textit{pol32}Δ cells we crossed \textit{pol32}Δ cells with \textit{exo1} mutants that either mimicked constitutive Exo1
phosphorylation (exo1-SD) or were refractory to phosphorylation at these four sites (exo1-SA). Although we expected that mutating the phosphorylation sites would affect Exo1 activity and therefore affect the viability of pol32Δ cells on HU we were surprised to find that both alleles, exo1-SA and exo1-SD, led to increases in HU hypersensitivity that clearly exceeded that of the pol32 mutant with an EXO1 wildtype allele (Fig. 2A). Since the nuclease activity of Exo1 appears to sensitize pol32Δ cells to HU, the strong synergistic increases in HU sensitivity in the pol32Δ exo1-SA and pol32Δ exo1-SD mutants could indicate that the exo1-SA and exo1-SD alleles code for hyperactive nucleases. To test this, we inactivated the nuclease activity of the exo1-SA and exo1-SD mutants by introducing E150D and D173A mutations. Consistent with our hypothesis we observed suppression of HU hypersensitivity for both alleles (Fig. 2C). To determine if the exo1-SA and the exo1-SD alleles were equally toxic to HU-treated pol32Δ cells we lowered the HU concentration to a level at which the pol32Δ mutant was no more sensitive than wildtype (20 mM) and compared the growth of exo1-SA pol32Δ and exo1-SD pol32Δ cells. We observed that the dephospho-mimicking exo1-SA allele was slightly more damaging than the phospho-mimicking exo1-SD allele (Fig. 2D). This difference disappeared at higher HU concentrations (≥40 mM).

In contrast to the exo1Δ mutation, expression of the exo1-SA and exo1-SD alleles had no effect on the viability of pol32Δ cells exposed to MMS (Fig. 2A). As expected from the phenotype of exo1-ND pol32Δ cells, mutation of the nuclease domain of exo1-SA or exo1-SD alleles in pol32Δ cells caused a synergistic increase in MMS-hypersensitivity (Fig. 2C).
Since Pol32 not only plays a major role as the processivity factor for DNA polymerase δ, but also functions as a subunit of the translesion DNA polymerase ζ, we wanted to determine if the effect of the pol32Δ mutation on HU and MMS sensitivity could be due to disruption of Pol ζ activity. We found that deletion of REV3, which encodes the catalytic subunit of Pol ζ, did not cause an increase in sensitivity to 55 mM HU, a concentration to which the pol32Δ mutant is hypersensitive (Fig. 2E), or 100 mM HU (Supplemental Figure S1). Opposite to the effect in the pol32Δ mutant, deletion of EXO1 had no effect on the HU sensitivity of the rev3Δ mutant at 55 mM HU and increased its sensitivity when exposed to 100 mM HU (Fig. 2E, Supplemental Figure S1). Also in contrast to the pol32Δ mutant, the exo1-SA and exo1-SD alleles had no effect on the HU sensitivity of the rev3Δ mutant, even at 100 mM HU (Supplemental Figure S1). These differences between rev3Δ and pol32Δ mutations suggest that the genetic interactions between pol32Δ and exo1 mutations on HU are largely caused by the role of Pol32 as a subunit of Pol δ. On 0.01% MMS, deletion of REV3 did not increase the sensitivity of the exo1Δ or pol32Δ mutant, but led to a further increase in the sensitivity of the pol32Δ exo1Δ double mutant, suggesting that Pol32, Exo1 and Rev3 play at least partially redundant roles in the response to MMS (Fig. 2A and E).

Similar to the rev3Δ mutant, we observed no difference in the HU sensitivity between sgs1Δ or tel1Δ mutants expressing the exo1-SA or the exo1-SD allele or the EXO1 wildtype allele (Supplemental Figure S1). Using the gross-chromosomal rearrangement (GCR) assay [55,57], which measures the rate of accumulating viable outcomes of chromosome break repair, we found that the loss of Exo1 activity in untreated pol32Δ
cells caused a significant (8-fold) increase in chromosomal instability whereas expression of the exo1-SA or exo1-SD allele had no effect (Table 3). These results mirror the role of EXO1 in MMS-treated pol32Δ cells. Although, EXO1 is the strongest known suppressor of spontaneous chromosome rearrangements in sgs1Δ cells [20,21], the four phospho-sites are also dispensable for this suppressor function (Table 3).

Mismatch repair activity partially contributes to Exo1 toxicity in pol32Δ cells

In addition to its role in DSB processing, Exo1 performs a late step in MMR, most likely degradation of the mismatch-containing nascent strand, and binds to the MMR factors Msh2 and Mlh1 through its C-terminus [1,58]. Thus, one way in which Exo1 could localize to replicating DNA is through interaction with the MMR machinery, whose subunits Msh6 and Msh3 interact with the replication machinery by binding to PCNA [59,60]. Once there, Exo1 is thought to be able to degrade nascent DNA strands by acting on the 5′ ends of Okazaki fragments [61,62]. In addition to these pre-existing 5′ ends, the MMR factor MutLα is thought to make incisions in the nascent strand [63]. Disruption of the MMR pathway by deletion of MSH2 would disrupt one avenue for recruitment of Exo1 to replicating DNA and prevent the formation of MutLα-dependent strand nicks for Exo1 entry and increased ssDNA formation. To test the possibility that MMR factors contribute to Exo1 toxicity in HU-treated pol32Δ cells, we assessed the HU sensitivity of pol32Δ msh2Δ cells expressing either exo1Δ, EXO1, exo1-SA or exo1-SD alleles. We observed that a msh2Δ mutation had no effect on the HU sensitivity of the pol32Δ and pol32Δ exo1-SA mutants, but suppressed the HU sensitivity of the pol32Δ
\textit{exo1-SD} mutant (Fig. 3A). These results show that MMR activity contributes significantly to the hypertoxicity of the phospho-mimicking \textit{exo1-SD} allele in \textit{pol32Δ} cells. It also suggests that MMR-independent functions of Exo1 are mostly responsible for the toxicity of the dephospho-mimicking \textit{exo1-SA} allele in HU-treated \textit{pol32Δ} cells. That the impact of Exo1 activity in the \textit{pol32Δ} mutant exceeds its role in MMR is also suggested by the different responses of the \textit{exo1Δ pol32Δ} and \textit{msh2Δ pol32Δ} mutants to MMS; whereas the \textit{exo1Δ pol32Δ} mutant shows an increase in MMS sensitivity compared to the single mutants, sensitivity of the \textit{msh2Δ pol32Δ} mutant is indistinguishable from that of the \textit{pol32Δ} single mutant (Fig. 3B). Additionally, \textit{exo1Δ}, but not \textit{msh2Δ}, caused a statistically significant increase in the accumulation of GCRs in the \textit{pol32Δ} mutant (Table 2).

Since the four phosphorylation sites are located in the C-terminal half of Exo1 where Mlh1 and Msh2 have been reported to bind we tested if the \textit{exo1-SA} and \textit{exo1-SD} alleles were associated with a mutator phenotype. Three single colonies of wildtype, \textit{pol32Δ}, or \textit{sgs1Δ} cells with either \textit{EXO1}, \textit{exo1Δ}, \textit{exo1-SA} or \textit{exo1-SD} alleles were grown into thick, 1-inch squares on nonselective rich media (YPD) and replica-plated onto synthetic media containing canavanine to select for clones that had spontaneously acquired inactivating mutations in the \textit{CAN1} gene. In contrast to \textit{exo1Δ}, neither the \textit{exo1-SA} nor the \textit{exo1-SD} mutation affected the \textit{CAN1} mutation rate in wildtype, \textit{sgs1Δ} or \textit{pol32Δ} cells (Fig. 4A, Supplemental Figure S2), mirroring the lack of effect of these \textit{exo1} alleles on GCR accumulation (Table 3). A more accurate determination of the \textit{CAN1} mutation rate using a fluctuation assay confirmed the previously reported weak mutator phenotype of the \textit{exo1Δ} cells [1], but did not reveal statistically significant
differences between the \textit{exo1}Δ \textit{pol32}Δ mutant and the single mutants, or the \textit{exo1}-SA \textit{pol32}Δ or \textit{exo1}-SD \textit{pol32}Δ mutants and the single mutants (Fig. 4C). These findings indicate that the phosphorylation site mutations do not affect the function of Exo1 in mutation avoidance at the \textit{CAN1} locus. However, when we determined the mutation rate of the \textit{hom3}-10 allele (Thr−), which detects mutations that revert a +1T insertion in a mononucleotide (T10) run, we observed a synergistic (24-fold) increase in Thr+ reversion events in the \textit{pol32}Δ \textit{exo1}Δ mutant (Fig. 4C), consistent with a previously reported synergistic mutation rate increase in the \textit{lys2}-10A assay, which detects mutations that revert +1A insertions [64]. In the \textit{hom3}-10 assay, we also detected a small (2.8-fold), but significant increase of Thr+ revertants in the \textit{exo1}-SD mutant; but no synergistic interaction when the \textit{exo1}-SD and \textit{pol32}Δ mutations were combined (Fig. 4C). Finally, growing the cells in the presence of 10mM HU before replica-plating onto canavanine media did not lead to noticeable changes in mutation rates, except in the \textit{exo1}-SA \textit{pol32}Δ mutant, which exhibited a markedly reduced number of papillae compared to the single mutants (Fig. 4B). The slow growth of \textit{pol32}Δ \textit{exo1}-SA cells even in the presence of a very low concentration of HU (Fig. 2C) is the most likely cause of the lower number of \textit{Can}′ papillae in this mutant.

When we analyzed the \textit{CAN1} mutation spectrum in \textit{Can}′ clones (Supplemental Table S3) we found that the majority (89.5%) of mutations in the \textit{exo1}Δ mutant were base substitutions and small (≤3 bp) insertions/deletions, whereas larger insertions/deletions ranging from 18 to 72bp dominated (52.6%) in \textit{pol32}Δ mutant. Upon deletion of \textit{EXO1} in the \textit{pol32}Δ mutant these large deletions decreased to 20% whereas small insertions/deletions increased (40%), with a similar fraction of base substitutions
(30%) as in the pol32Δ mutant (36.8%). We also identified rare complex rearrangements that consist of large deletions (8–233 bp) that contain small insertions (2–36 bp).

Discussion

In wildtype cells, the nuclease activity of Exo1 is important for 5’ end resection of DSB ends during HR, for the excision step of MMR and for HR-mediated template switching during error-free bypass of DNA lesions. Exo1 has also been shown to counteract fork reversal in checkpoint-deficient cells and is thought to promote template switching by contributing to the extension of ssDNA behind stalled replication forks [25–27,65–67]. We have shown here that Exo1 nuclease activity is toxic to HU-treated pol32Δ cells and that this toxicity can be further increased by mutating four serine residues in the C-terminal tail of Exo1 that have previously been shown to be phosphorylated in response to telomere uncapping [47]. That the viability of HU-treated pol32Δ cells could be rescued by disruption of the nuclease activity of Exo1 suggests that phosphorylated Exo1, which forms in response to HU [46], is still a potent nuclease, but at a level that is compatible with normal growth of HU-treated wildtype cells. Only when replication fork stalling due to HU treatment is combined with another event that independently impairs DNA synthesis (pol32Δ), do Exo1 nuclease-dependent events, most likely ssDNA formation, reach toxic levels. This could suggest that there is a balance between the speed of ssDNA formation at replication forks and the speed of DNA synthesis, which does not allow ssDNA to accumulate at deleterious levels. If the speed of DNA synthesis is reduced (HU treatment), this balance may be restored by
reducing Exo1 activity through Mec1-dependent phosphorylation of Exo1. However, this reduced level of Exo1 activity might be damaging if DNA synthesis is inhibited further (e.g., HU-treatment of the pol32Δ mutant) and DNA resection exceeds DNA synthesis. That Exo1 phosphorylation also occurs in MMS-treated cells [38], which depend on Exo1 activity for viability, also supports a model in which phosphorylation reduces, rather than deactivates, Exo1 nuclease function. This model is also consistent with the finding that the C-terminal tail of Exo1, where the phosphorylation sites are located, is dispensable for normal function of Exo1 in MMS-treated cells [20] and the finding in this study that expression of exo1-SA and exo1-SD alleles has no effect on the viability of MMS-treated wildtype or pol32Δ cells, leading us to suggest that downregulation of Exo1 activity by phosphorylation is tolerated in MMS-treated cells, but not necessary.

As in HU-treated pol32Δ cells, endogenous Exo1 activity was previously shown to inhibit proliferation of the cdc13-1 mutant [47]. In these cells, which accumulate uncapped telomeres, a phospho-mimicking exo1 allele led to a minor increase in cell viability whereas a dephospho-mimicking allele had no effect. Although the effect was subtle, it suggested that phosphorylation inhibits Exo1 activity. Unlike in the cdc13-1 mutant, however, we did not observe a rescue of cell viability upon expression of the phospho-mimicking exo1-SD allele in HU-treated pol32Δ cells. Instead, exo1-SD and exo1-SA inhibited proliferation more strongly than wildtype EXO1. For both alleles this negative effect was dependent on the nuclease activity, suggesting that exo1-SA and exo1-SD encode functional exonucleases that are trapped in an active state. The hyperactivity of both alleles further suggests that both, phosphorylated and the non-phosphorylated forms of Exo1, and possibly the ability to convert one form into the other, are necessary
for the proper response of \textit{pol32}Δ cells to HU. Although Pol32 functions as a subunit of Pol δ and Pol ζ, the different effects of \textit{pol32}Δ and \textit{rev3}Δ mutations, the latter of which disrupts the catalytic activity of Pol ζ, suggest that the observed genetic interactions between \textit{pol32}Δ and \textit{exo1}Δ mutations on hydroxyurea are dominated by the role of Pol32 as a processivity factor of Pol δ.

The inability to phosphorylate serine residues 372, 567, 587 and 692 could explain the unrestrained activity of the \textit{exo1-SA} mutant, which appears to exceed that of the \textit{exo1-SD} mutant slightly. Whereas hypertoxicity of \textit{exo1-SA} suggests that phosphorylation of the four serine residues is necessary for the proper regulation of Exo1 activity, hypertoxicity of the \textit{exo1-SD} mutant could suggest that it is insufficient. That the aspartic acid substitutions in the \textit{exo1-SD} mutant, which mimic the negative charge of phosphorylated serine residues, do not inactivate, even partially, Exo1, argues that irreversible negative charges at residues 372, 567, 587, and 692 may interfere with additional events that are required for the downregulation of Exo1 activity at stalled replication forks, such as additional phosphorylation events or conformational changes. In addition to phosphorylation, the activity of Exo1 could be affected by binding to proteins that modulate its activity through conformational changes, recruitment to DNA substrates, subcellular relocalization, or sequestration. The proteins that are currently known to bind to yeast Exo1 are the MMR factors Msh2 and Mlh1 [1], the 14-3-3 proteins Bmh1 and Bmh2 [46], and Mec3, a subunit of the Ddc1/Rad17/Mec3 (9-1-1) checkpoint clamp [24]. All could affect Exo1 activity. First, we show here that deletion of \textit{MSH2} significantly suppresses the detrimental effects of the hyperactive \textit{exo1-SD} allele, suggesting that constitutive phosphorylation of the Exo1 C-terminus
might lead to a dysregulation of its physical interaction with Msh2. MMR factors, which travel with the replisome via interaction with PCNA [59,60], could be involved in recruiting Exo1 to replication forks and provide additional 5’ ends for Exo1 to resect, thereby contributing to increased Exo1-dependent ssDNA formation at stalled replication forks. Recent evidence in yeast indeed suggests a role for MMR activity and Exo1 in checkpoint activation through promoting ssDNA formation at stalled replication forks and DNA repair-induced gaps [68,69]. Second, 14-3-3 proteins can modulate protein activity through affecting access to substrates by changing a protein’s subcellular localization, by inducing conformational changes that either increase or decrease activity, or by bridging interaction with another protein [70]. Although the vast majority of 14-3-3 proteins interact with phosphorylated targets, the question whether Bmh1/2 interacts with a phosphorylated or a unphosphorylated form of Exo1 is currently unresolved, as is the molecular mechanism by which Bmh1/2 affects Exo1 activity [46]. Third, as Exo1 phosphorylation occurs in a Mec1-dependent manner in response to HU and MMS [38,46], it is plausible that phosphorylation-dependent binding of Exo1 to the Mec3/Ddc1/Rad17 checkpoint clamp, which loads onto the ds/ssDNA junctions at ssDNA gaps, could control Exo1 activity during the DNA-damage response. Whereas Rad27 activity is strongly stimulated through physical interaction with PCNA [71–73], it is not known if Exo1 activity at replication forks is regulated by another protein. The interaction of Exo1 with the Mec3 checkpoint clamp, however, could provide such regulation during the DNA damage response – analogous to the interaction between Rad27 and PCNA during DNA replication.
The ability of an EXO1 deletion to rescue pol32Δ cells treated with a low dose of HU (55 mM), but not those exposed to a high dose of HU (200mM) might be due to a difference in the types of DNA lesions and their quantity induced by low and high doses of HU. For instance, deletion of EXO1 may have a positive effect on viability by preventing excessive ssDNA formation at slowed or stalled forks, which are likely to dominate in pol32Δ cells exposed to low HU concentrations. In contrast, deletion of EXO1 is unlikely to prevent the formation DNA breaks, which may be more typical in cells exposed to high HU concentrations. Similarly, the different extent by which the dephospho-mimicking and phospho-mimicking exo1 alleles affect the viability of the cdc13-1 mutant [47] and HU-treated pol32Δ cells could indicate that the DNA-damage response is differently regulated for different regions of the genome. Specifically, differences in the sets of proteins and DNA structures found at telomeres versus those found at replicating DNA could cause differences in the regulation of Exo1 activity and the extent of DNA resection at those sites. In an cdc13-1 mutant, for instance, Exo1 is responsible for the majority of new ssDNA formation at the unprotected telomeres and for the initiation of Mec1-dependent checkpoint activation [74,75] reviewed in [76], whereas Exo1 appears to be redundant with other nuclease functions during 5’ end resection elsewhere in the genome, most notably in the processing of DSB ends during HR [18] and degradation of the mismatch-containing strand in MMR [1]. Finally, the differences between the effect of the exo1 phosphorylation mutants in pol32Δ and cdc13-1 mutants could also suggest that phosphorylation is more important for regulating Exo1 activity at slowed and stalled replication forks than at uncapped telomeres.
Although in the absence of Exo1 excessive ssDNA formation and loss of cell viability could be prevented during increased fork stalling, other aberrant structures may still form due to lack of resection by Exo1, leading to genome instability. This is supported by the synergistic increase in the GCR rate in the \textit{exo1Δ pol32Δ} mutant. Lack of resection in the absence of Exo1 could also provide an explanation for the rare complex mutations we observed at the \textit{CAN1} locus, which appear to be a combination of deletion and insertion events. They could, for example, arise if ends of the nascent strands dissociate from their templates, misanneal in a chickenfoot structure and then dissociate after limited DNA synthesis to reanneal with their template strands.

Our findings are consistent with the report in cells with uncapped telomeres that phosphorylation inhibits Exo1 activity, but they do, on their own, not exclude the possibility that phosphorylation upregulates Exo1 activity at stalled replication forks. Upregulation of Exo1 activity by phosphorylation is consistent with our finding that disruption of the nuclease activity of Exo1 rescues the viability of HU-treated \textit{pol32Δ} cells. It would also provide an explanation for the hypertoxicity of the phospho-mimicking exo1-SD mutant in HU-treated \textit{pol32Δ} cells and the normal function of the allele in MMS-treated \textit{pol32Δ} cells, whose viability depends on functional Exo1. The hypertoxicity of the exo1-SA mutant, which is refractory to phosphorylation at the previously identified four serine residues, could be explained if activating phosphorylation events shift to other residues. Since the C-terminal half of Exo1 is predicted to be unstructured [20], other serine residues in this 331-residue region should be easily accessible to phosphorylation. Indeed, Western blot analysis has shown that the exo1-SA mutant can still be phosphorylated in the presence of DNA
damage [47]. Additional analyses of Exo1 post-translational modifications will therefore be needed to determine if Exo1 activity is regulated differently in response to varying DNA damage-inducing agents, genetic mutations, or types of DNA lesions, and how these modifications affect the binding of Exo1 to proteins that might modulate its activity.
Figure 3.1. Effect of DNA repair and checkpoint mutations on DNA-damage sensitivity of sgs1\(\Delta\), exo1\(\Delta\) and sgs1\(\Delta\) exo1\(\Delta\) cells. (A–D) At 10 mM HU, the tel1\(\Delta\), rad1\(\Delta\), rev3\(\Delta\) and apn1\(\Delta\) mutations do not affect the viability of sgs1\(\Delta\) and exo1\(\Delta\) mutants, but inhibit growth of the sgs1\(\Delta\) exo1\(\Delta\) mutant. (E) The exo1\(\Delta\) mutation suppresses the hypersensitivity of the pol32\(\Delta\) sgs1\(\Delta\) mutant to HU, but not to MMS. (F) Hypersensitivity of the pol32\(\Delta\) mutant to higher concentrations of HU (55 mM) is suppressed by exo1\(\Delta\).
Figure 3.2. Sensitivity of pol32Δ cells to HU and MMS is differently affected by nuclease-dead and phosphorylation site mutants of EXO1. (A) Toxicity of Exo1 in...
HU-treated $pol32\Delta$ cells is due to the nuclease activity of Exo1. exo1 mutants with four serine residues substituted with either alanine (exo1-SA, dephospho-mimic) or aspartic acid (exo1-SD, phospho-mimic) are more toxic to HU-treated $pol32\Delta$ cells than wildtype Exo1. In MMS-treated pol32 cells, deletion of Exo1 activity causes a decrease of viability whereas the phospho-site mutants of Exo1 have no effect. (B) Deletion of $EXO1$ does not improve viability of $pol32\Delta$ cells exposed to a high concentration of HU. (C) The hypotoxicity of exo1-SA and exo1-SD in HU-treated $pol32\Delta$ cells depends on the nuclease activity of Exo1. (D) The dephospho-mimicking exo1-SA allele is more toxic to HU-treated $pol32\Delta$ cells than the phospho-mimicking exo1-SD allele. (E) The $rev3\Delta$ mutation does not affect the sensitivity of the exo1\Delta $pol32\Delta$ mutant to 55 mM HU, but increases its sensitivity to 0.01% MMS. Unlike the exo1\Delta mutation, the rev3\Delta mutation is not a major suppressor of the hypersensitivity of the $pol32\Delta$ mutant to 55 mM HU.
Figure 3.3. Effect of DNA mismatch repair on DNA damage sensitivity of *pol32Δ* and *exo1Δ* mutants. (A) Deletion of *MSH2* does not affect the HU hypersensitivity of the *pol32Δ* mutant or the *pol32Δ exo1-1SA* mutant, but suppresses the hypertoxicity of the phospho-mimic *exo1-1SD* allele in HU-treated *pol32Δ* cells. (B) In contrast to inactivation of *EXO1* (*exo1Δ*, *exo1-ND*), deletion of *MSH2* does not increase the sensitivity of the *pol32Δ* mutant to 0.01% MMS.
Figure 4.4. Effect of phosphorylation site mutations on the function of Exo1 in mutation avoidance. Patches were grown from individual colonies of the indicated mutants to allow accumulation of mutations at the CAN1 locus. Patches were then replica-plated onto media supplemented with canavanine to select Can" mutants. The exo1-SA and exo1-SD alleles do not exhibit a mutator phenotype when grown in the absence of HU (A) or presence of 10 mM HU (B) prior to replica-plating onto canavanine media (see Supplemental Figure S4.2. for the exo1-SD allele). (C)
Compared to the single mutants, the \textit{exo1\textDelta pol32\textDelta} mutant exhibits a synergistic (24-fold) increase in Thr$^+$ reversion events (\textit{hom3-10} allele), but no increase in the accumulation of Can$^-$ mutants (\textit{CAN1} locus). Whereas the \textit{exo1-SA} allele exhibits a wildtype mutation rate, the \textit{exo1-SD} allele causes a small (2.8-fold), but significant, increase in the accumulation of Thr$^+$ revertants.
Fig. S3.1. Effects of exo1Δ and exo1 phosphorylation site mutants exo1-SA and exo1-SD on HU sensitivity of sgs1Δ, rev3Δ, and tel1Δ mutants.
Figure S4.2. Effect of the phospho-mimicking exo1-SD allele on the spontaneous mutation rate at the CAN1 locus in the pol32Δ and the sgs1Δ mutant. The mismatch-repair-defective msh2Δ mutant is included as a positive control.
Table 3.1 Gross-chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs) in the sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant genotype</th>
<th>GCR rate (Can’ 5-FOA’ × 10^{-10})</th>
<th>95% CI(^a) (Can’ 5-FOA’ × 10^{-10})</th>
<th>Fold increase over sgs1Δ exo1Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildtype</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>&lt;1-6.2</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7-28</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57-177</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ sgs1Δ</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>31,000-49,800</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ sgs1Δ rev3Δ</td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>148,000-210,000</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ sgs1Δ pol32Δ</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>107,000-166,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ sgs1Δ tel1Δ</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>126,000-174,000</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ sgs1Δ rad1Δ</td>
<td>96,600</td>
<td>74,500-180,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ sgs1Δ apn1Δ</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>57,000-131,000</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated according to Ref. [54].
Table 3.2 *EXO1*-dependent suppression of gross-chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs) in DNA repair and DNA-damage checkpoints mutants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant genotype</th>
<th>GCR rate(^a) (Can(^r) 5-FOA(^r) \times 10(^{-10}))</th>
<th>95% CI(^b) (Can(^r) 5-FOA(^r) \times 10(^{-10}))</th>
<th>Increase over single mutant(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildtype</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>&lt;1-6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;9-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1(^{\Delta}) rad1(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30-66</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apn1(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14-41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1(^{\Delta}) apn1(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42-224</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel1(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8-2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1(^{\Delta}) tel1(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46-180</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pol32(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1(^{\Delta}) pol32(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>94-273</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev3(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1(^{\Delta}) rev3(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>127-304</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msh2(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msh2(^{\Delta}) pol32(^{\Delta})</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25-102</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) GCR rates for *msh2\(^{\Delta}\)* and *tel1\(^{\Delta}\)* are from Refs. [77,78].
(b) 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated according to Ref. [54]. n.d., not determined.
(c) The increase in the GCR rate of the double mutant was calculated by dividing the GCR rate of the double mutant by the higher GCR rate of the two single mutants.
Table 3.3. Effect of nuclease-dead and phosphosite mutations in *EXO1* on the accumulation of gross-chromosomal rearrangements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant genotype</th>
<th>GCR rate (Can^r^ 5-FOA^r^ × 10^{-10})</th>
<th>95% CI^a^ (Can^r^ 5-FOA^r^ × 10^{-10})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildtype</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>&lt;1-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1Δ</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7â€“28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1-ND</em></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1-ND sgs1Δ</em></td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>45,000-79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1Δ sgs1Δ</em></td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>31,000-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pol32Δ</em></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1-ND pol32Δ</em></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>110-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1Δ pol32Δ</em></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>94-270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1-SA</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1-SA sgs1Δ</em></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&lt;12-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1-SD sgs1Δ</em></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&lt;22-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1-SA pol32Δ</em></td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>&lt;17-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1-SD pol32Δ</em></td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>&lt;7-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated according to Ref. [54].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain ID</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 802</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 1338</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 1954</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rev3::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 1957</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, apn1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 2311</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, apn1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 2316</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 2333</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 2402</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 2425</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 2430</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 2437</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 3782</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 4394</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, apn1::TRP1, exon1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 4398</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 4402</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rev3::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 4417</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rev3::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 4421</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exon1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 4430</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 4438</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSHY 4454</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE S3.1.</td>
<td>Saccharomyces cerevisiae strains used in this study (continued).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, tel1::G418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4458</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4460</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-E150D-D173A.HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4701</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4710</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4803</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4836</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4839</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, apn1::TRP1, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4844</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad1::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4847</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-E150D-D173A.HIS3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4852</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rev3::TRP1, sgs1::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4888</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, msh2::TRP1, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4892</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4896</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4897</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3 exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4963</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3, sgs1::TRP1, tel1::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4968</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3, sgs1::TRP1, tel1::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4969</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-E150D-D173A-S392D-S567D-S587D-S692D.HIS3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE S3.1. Saccharomyces cerevisiae strains used in this study (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Genotypes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4986</td>
<td><strong>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3, rev3::TRP1, sgs1::HIS3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4987</td>
<td><strong>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3, rev3::TRP1, sgs1::HIS3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4989</td>
<td><strong>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-E150D-D173A-S392D-S567D-S587D-S692D.HIS3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 4993</td>
<td><strong>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-E150D-D173A-S392D-S567D-S587D-S692D.HIS3, HIS3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 5004</td>
<td><strong>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392D-S567D-S587D-S692D.HIS3, msh2::TRP1, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 5008</td>
<td><strong>MATalpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-S392A, S567A, S587A, S692A.HIS3, msh2::TRP1, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 5014</td>
<td><strong>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1-E150D-D173A-S392D-S567D-S587D-S692D.HIS3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 5037</td>
<td><strong>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, msh2::TRP1, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 5043</td>
<td><strong>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, rev3::TRP1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY 5044</td>
<td><strong>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, rev3::TRP1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE S3.2. SGS1-dependent suppression of gross-chromosomal rearrangements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Genotype</th>
<th>GCR Rate $^i$ (Can'r 5-FOA' x 10$^{-10}$)</th>
<th>95% CI $^ii$ (Can'r 5-FOA' x 10$^{-10}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wildtype</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>&lt; 1 – 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57-177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tel1Δ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8–2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ tel1Δ</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>46-418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev3Δ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ rev3Δ</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>75-279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pol32Δ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ pol32Δ</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&lt;24-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt; 9-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ rad1Δ</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25-356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apn1Δ</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1Δ apn1Δ</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>72-362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) GCR rate for tel1Δ is from reference [75].
(ii) 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated according to reference [51].
Table S3.3. Spontaneous CAN1 mutations identified in exo1Δ, pol32Δ and exo1Δ pol32Δ mutants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Mutation type</th>
<th>Mutation</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wildtype</td>
<td>base substitution</td>
<td>C→T</td>
<td>17/20 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A→T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G→T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T→C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G→A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C→G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T→G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A→C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G→C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C→A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 3 bp insertion/deletion</td>
<td>T3→T2</td>
<td>1/20 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 bp insertion/deletion</td>
<td>148 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/20 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 bp del/ 2 bp ins</td>
<td>1/20 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ</td>
<td>base substitution</td>
<td>A→T</td>
<td>14/19 (73.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G→C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C→A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T→G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T→C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G→T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C→A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G→C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A→T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C→G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C→T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 3 bp insertion/deletion</td>
<td>GCT→GT</td>
<td>3/19 (15.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 bp insertion/deletion</td>
<td>T2→T3</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>233 bp del/36 bp ins</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pol32Δ</td>
<td>Base substitution</td>
<td>G→C</td>
<td>7/19 (36.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C→G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G→A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G→T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T→A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A→C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 3 bp insertion/deletion</td>
<td>ATG→AG</td>
<td>2/19 (5.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 bp insertion/deletion</td>
<td>T4→T2</td>
<td>10/19 (52.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 bp deletion</td>
<td>2/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32 bp deletion</td>
<td>1/19 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complex</td>
<td>0/19 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S3.3. Spontaneous CAN1 mutations identified in exo1Δ, pol32Δ and exo1Δ pol32Δ mutants (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Mutation type</th>
<th>Mutation</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exo1Δ pol32Δ</td>
<td>base substitution</td>
<td>G → A</td>
<td>6/20 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T → C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T → G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C → A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 3 bp insertion/deletion</td>
<td>A₆ → A₅</td>
<td>8/20 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T₃ → T₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T₄ → T₃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T₆ → T₅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G₄ → G₃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T₆ → T₇</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 bp insertion (TC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 3 bp insertion/deletion</td>
<td>8 bp deletion</td>
<td>4/20 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 bp deletion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94 bp deletion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>586 bp deletion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complex</td>
<td>8 bp del/5 bp ins</td>
<td>2/20 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27 bp del/3 bp ins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The CAN1 open reading frame was amplified by PCR from independent canavanine-resistant colonies and sequenced. The identified mutations were divided into four groups: base substitutions, insertions/deletions ≤ 3 bp), insertions/deletions (> 3 bp), and complex mutations. Complex mutations were deletions (8-233 bp) that contained a small insertion (2-36 bp).
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Chapter Four:

Sgs1 binding to Rad51 stimulates homology-dependent DNA repair in Saccharomyces cerevisiae

Note to the reader: This chapter has been submitted for publication in the journal Genetics. The research was designed by K. Schmidt with contributions from Lillian Campos-Doerfler. All genetic analysis was performed by Lillian Doerfler, and biochemical analysis was conducted by Salahuddin Syed. Corresponding author: Kristina Schmidt, Department of Cell Biology, Microbiology and Molecular Biology, University of South Florida, 4202 E. Fowler Avenue, ISA2015, Tampa, FL 33620. Phone: (813) 974-1592. Fax: (813) 974-1614; E-mail: kschmidt@usf.edu

ABSTRACT

Accurate repair of DNA breaks is essential for maintaining genome integrity and cellular fitness. Sgs1, the sole member of the RecQ family of DNA helicases in Saccharomyces cerevisiae, plays important roles in both early and late stages of homology-dependent repair of DNA lesions. Its large number of physical and genetic interactions with cellular factors that play roles in DNA recombination, repair and replication have established Sgs1 as a key player in the maintenance of genome integrity. To determine the significance of Sgs1 binding to the strand exchange factor Rad51 we have identified a single amino acid change in an unstructured linker C-terminal of the helicase core of Sgs1 that disrupts Rad51 binding. In contrast to an SGS1 deletion or a helicase-defective sgs1 allele, this new separation-of-function allele,
sgs1-FD, does not cause DNA damage hypersensitivity or genome instability but exhibits negative and positive genetic interactions with sae2Δ, mre11Δ, exo1Δ, srs2Δ, rrm3Δ, and pol32Δ that are distinct from those of known sgs1 mutants. Our findings suggest a role for the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction in stimulating homologous recombination (HR). However, unlike sgs1 mutations that impair the resection of DNA double-strand ends, negative genetic interactions of the sgs1-FD allele are not suppressed by YKU70 deletion. We, therefore, propose that the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction stimulates HR by facilitating the formation of the presynaptic Rad51 filament, possibly by Sgs1 competing with replication protein A for single-strand DNA binding during resection.

INTRODUCTION

DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) can be induced exogenously by DNA damaging agents or form endogenously if the replisome collapses at a break in the template strand or encounters a physical barrier that blocks progression of the replisome, such as a bound protein, DNA adduct, interstrand crosslink, or unusual DNA structure. Cells can repair such DSBs by homologous recombination (HR) or non-homologous end-joining (NHEJ). In the event of a DSB, the NHEJ proteins Ku70/Ku80 (Ku) and HR proteins Mre11-Rad50-Xrs2 (MRX) initiate the repair process by binding to the DSB ends [1]. NHEJ is preferred in G1 as there is no sister chromatid whereas HR is preferred during S phase and G2 [2-4]. In S phase, Ku and MRX bind to the DSB first and recruitment of Sae2 activates short range resection, removing Ku and MRX and leaving a small 3' single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) overhang [1, 5-9]. These trimmed DNA ends are then more extensively resected by the 5'-3' exonuclease Exo1 or by Dna2
nuclease, which works with the 3’- 5’ helicase Sgs1 [9-11]. Rad52, an essential HR factor in budding yeast, then allows a recombinogenic Rad51 filament to assemble on the replication protein A (RPA) coated 3’-overhang [12, 13]. Regulation of HR at this stage relies on the antirecombinase Srs2, which can disassemble Rad51 filaments [14-16]. If Rad51-mediated homology search is successful, the 3’ end of the invading strand is used as a priming site for DNA synthesis and thus extended. In classic DSB repair (DSBR) the second end of the DNA break is also captured to form a double-Holliday Junction (dHJ), which can either be resolved by endonucleases Mus81/Mms4 or Yen1 to produce both crossovers and noncrossovers, or the HJs are converged and decatenated by the Sgs1/Top3/Rmi1 complex, resulting in only noncrossovers [17-19]. Homology-directed repair of DSBs in mitotic cells often occurs in ways other than by DSBR, such as synthesis-dependent strand annealing (SDSA), single-strand annealing (SSA) and break-induced replication (BIR) [20-22]. In SDSA the invading strand is extended by DNA synthesis, but then displaced before capture and annealed to complementary sequences on the other side of the DSB; since this process does not lead to the formation of HJs, it always results in noncrossover products [23]. In contrast to DSBR and SDSA, SSA and BIR are error-prone. SSA occurs when regions of sequence homology are recognized during resection, annealed and then ligated, resulting in the loss of the DNA sequence between the repeats [24, 25]. BIR is used for homology-directed repair of one-ended DSBs, such as those that arise when a replication fork collapses at a nick in the template strand or when a stalled replication fork is cut [26-30].
Resection of the DSB ends is essential for all HR. After initial trimming by MRX/Sae2, long-range resection by Sgs1/Dna2 and Exo1 is redundant, with loss of both activities resulting in a severe resection defect and mutagenic repair [9, 10, 31]. Exo1 and Dna2 differ in that Exo1 can degrade the 5’ strand in double-strand DNA (dsDNA) whereas Dna2 requires the Sgs1 helicase to unwind the dsDNA to provide ssDNA on which Dna2 can act [11, 32]. In a yeast-two-hybrid assay, Sgs1 was found to interact with Mre11, and it has been proposed that this helps to recruit Sgs1/Dna2 to the DSB after initial resection [33, 34]. Sgs1 is a member of the highly conserved family of RecQ-like DNA helicases, which interact with a large number of proteins with functions in genome maintenance. Sgs1 not only interacts with Dna2, Mre11, Top3/Rmi1 but also contains acidic regions in its long unstructured N-terminal tail that are required for binding the ssDNA binding protein RPA [35-39]. Rad53 kinase, Top2 topoisomerase and the nucleotide excision repair factor Rad16 have also been shown to physically interact with the N-terminal tail of Sgs1, whereas Rad51 and Mlh1 binding has been narrowed down to the region C-terminal of the helicase core [38, 40-44].

Lack of Sgs1 results in increased sensitivity to DNA damaging agents, shortened lifespan, missegregated chromosomes, and moderate accumulation of gross-chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs), including characteristic recurrent translocations between short homologous, but non-allelic, sequences [29, 45-48]. Cells lacking Sgs1 exhibit growth defects or die in the absence of structure-specific endonucleases Mus81/Mms4 and Slx1/4 that resolve recombination intermediates and stalled replication forks, the HR factors MRX or Sae2, the antirecombinase Srs2, or the Rrm3 helicase, which regulates replisome progression [45, 49-54].
This multitude of physical and genetic interactions has established Sgs1 as a key player in the maintenance of genome integrity. The molecular basis and functional significance of some of the physical interactions for HR are increasingly well understood, especially the interaction of Sgs1 with Top3/Rmi1 in dHJ dissolution, with Dna2 in DSB resection, and with mismatch repair factors in the suppression of mitotic and meiotic homeologous recombination [11, 39, 46, 55-57]. Here, to understand the role of the physical interaction of Sgs1 with Rad51 in homology-dependent DNA repair, we set out to identify a separation-of-function allele of SGS1 that disrupts Sgs1-Rad51 binding and to characterize the genetic interactions of this sgs1 allele in cells with replication-dependent DNA lesions.

**Materials and Methods**

**Yeast Strains and Media**

Yeast strains were derived from S288C strain KHSY802 (MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13:: URA3). SGS1 mutant alleles for amino acid changes K706A (sgs1-HD, pKHS787) and F1192D (sgs1-FD, pKHS786) were generated by site-directed mutagenesis (QuikChange, Stratagene) of wildtype SGS1 in pKHS360 (pRS405-SGS1.TRP1) and integrated into the chromosome under control of the endogenous SGS1 promoter by LiAc-mediated transformation as described [58]. Haploid strains with multiple mutant alleles were obtained by sporulating diploids heterozygous for the desired mutations and genotyping spores on selective media or PCR. All yeast strains used in this study are listed in Supplementary Table S1. Yeast were grown at 30° in yeast extract, peptone, and
dextrose (YPD) or synthetic complete (SC) media as previously described [59]. Solid media was supplemented with 20 g/l agar (US Biological).

**DNA-damage sensitivity assays**

Sensitivity of yeast cells in exponential growth phase to HU and MMS was tested by spot assays as previously described [60]. Briefly, cell cultures were grown in liquid YPD medium OD600=0.5 and ten-fold serial dilutions were spotted on YPD containing the indicated concentration of HU (US Biological) or MMS (Sigma-Aldrich). Images of colony growth were acquired every 24 hours for five days of incubation at 30° with a GelCam 315 CCD camera mounted on a Gel-Doc IT Imaging system (UVP) and VisionWorks software.

**Gross-Chromosomal Rearrangement (GCR) Assay**

Cells with GCRs were identified by simultaneous inactivation of CAN1 and URA3 on chromosome V indicated by resistance to canavanine and 5-fluoro-orotic acid (Canfr 5-FOAfr). Cultures were grown for two days in at least 10 ml of YPD media. Viable cell counts were determined by plating dilutions on YPD agar plates, and cells with GCRs were identified by plating 0.25 ml-15 ml on synthetic media lacking arginine and uracil and supplemented with 60 mg/l canavanine (Sigma) and 1 g/l 5-fluoro-orotic acid (US Biological). The rate of accumulating GCRs was calculated as previously described [61].
**Mutator Assays and Mutation Spectrum Analysis**

Rates of accumulating mutations at the CAN1 locus or reversion mutations in the *hom3-10* or *lys2-Bgl* alleles were determined by fluctuation analysis by the method of the median [62] in at least fourteen cultures from at least two different isolates as previously described [63]. Cultures were grown overnight in 3 - 6 ml of YPD media. Viable cell counts were determined by plating dilutions on YPD agar plates and 250 μl - 6 ml were plated on synthetic media lacking arginine and supplemented with 60 μg/ml canavanine for selection of inactivation of CAN1, or on SC media lacking threonine or lysine to select for threonine (*hom3-10*) or lysine (*lys2-Bgl*) revertants, respectively. Median rates are reported with 95% confidence intervals [64]. The spectrum of inactivating mutation at the CAN1 locus was determined by sequence analysis of CAN1 from canavanine-resistant colonies using primer pairs that anneal 50 bp upstream and 43 bp downstream of the CAN1 ORF.

**Tetrad analysis**

Diploid strains for tetrad dissection were derived from S288C strains provided by Richard Kolodner (UC San Diego) and are listed in Supplementary Table S1. To generate the diploid heterozygous for *sgs1Δ*, *rad52Δ*, and *exo1Δ* mutations (KHSY4810) RDKY5290 was crossed to KHSY4805, a spore obtained from a cross between RDKY2614 and RDKY2710. *RAD59* and *RAD51* deletions were obtained by HR-mediated integration of a selectable marker at these loci in RDKY2666 using the LiAc method [58] and diploids heterozygous for *sgs1Δ*, *exo1Δ*, and *rad51Δ* or *rad59Δ* were obtained by crossing as described above. For tetrad dissections, diploids were
grown overnight in YPD at 30° and starved of nitrogen in 0.1% potassium acetate. Asci were briefly incubated with zymolase and dissected on YPD agar plates using a micromanipulator mounted on an Axioscop 40 (Zeiss). YPD plates were incubated for 4 days at 30° and spore germination and colony growth were documented at 24 hour intervals with a CCD camera mounted on a GelDoc-IT Imager (UVP).

**Pull-Down Assay and Western Blotting**

Plasmid pKHS657, expressing GST-Sgs1647-1447, was created by inserting the last 2400 bp of SGS1 into pGEX-6p-2 (GE Healthcare) using BamHI and Xhol restriction sites. Stop codons and F1192A and F1192D mutations were introduced at the indicated positions by site-directed mutagenesis (Quikchange, Agilent Genomics). Sgs1 fragments were expressed in *E. coli* BL21 (DE) in LB media (10 g/l tryptone, 5 g/l NaCl, 5 g/l Yeast extract) supplemented with 1.5 μg/ml ampicillin for 3 hours in the presence of 1 mM IPTG. Cells were resuspended in 100 μl GST buffer (125mM Tris, 150mM NaCl, pH 8.0) plus HALT protease inhibitor cocktail (Pierce), lysed using glass beads with a BeadBeater (Biospec Products, Inc.) at 4° and lysate cleared by centrifugation at 14000 rpm for 10 min at 4°. Lysate was treated with benzonase (Sigma) and 1mg of lysate was added to glutathione magnetic beads (Pierce) and incubated for 1 h at 4°C before beads were washed three times with GST buffer. Similarly, yeast cells expressing endogenous levels of VSV-tagged Rad51 (Open Biosystems) were resuspended in Rad51 buffer (50 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 0.01% NP-40, 5 mM β-glycerol phosphate, 2 mM magnesium acetate, 120 mM NaCl) with HALT protease inhibitor cocktail (Pierce), lysed with glass beads in a BeadBeater and cleared
by centrifugation at 14000 rpm for 20 min at 4°. Lysate was treated with benzonase (Sigma) and 10 mg of lysate were incubated with Sgs1-bound magnetic beads for 120 min at room temperature while rotating. Beads were washed five times with Rad51 buffer plus HALT protease inhibitor cocktail (Pierce) and then boiled in Laemmli buffer (BioRad) for 10 min. The eluate was separated by 10% SDS-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis. Sgs1 fragments and Rad51 were detected by Western blotting using monoclonal antibodies against GST (Covance) and VSV (Sigma) epitopes.

Data and reagent availability: Yeast strains are available upon request. Table S1 contains a list of yeast strains used in this study and detailed genotype descriptions.

RESULTS

Rad51 binds to the loop that connects the helicase core of Sgs1 to the HRDC domain

SGS1 and RAD51 are epistatic and the gene products interact physically [40, 51]. Using a yeast-two-hybrid assay, the physical interaction with Rad51 was mapped to the last 469-residues of Sgs1 (residues 978-1447). This region flanks the ATPase domain and contains the conserved RQC domain, which is essential for the helicase activity of Sgs1, as well as other conserved sites, including the HRDC domain and a Mlh1 binding site [40, 65]. Thus, disrupting Rad51 binding by deleting this 469-residue region disrupts multiple other Sgs1 functions. Therefore, to enable elucidation of the biological importance of the interaction between Sgs1 and Rad51 for HR, we sought to
identify a separation-of-function mutation in Sgs1 that specifically disrupts Rad51 binding but leaves other functional sites intact.

To narrow down the Rad51 binding region we purified fragments of Sgs1 as GST-fusions from \textit{E. coli} and tested their ability to pull-down endogenous VSV-epitope tagged Rad51 from yeast whole cell extract. We determined that deleting up to 240 C-terminal residues of Sgs1 did not impair its ability to bind Rad51, whereas a deletion of 260 residues abolished it (Figure 1A and 1B). This critical 20-residue region maps to residues 1187 to 1207 immediately C-terminal of the WH-domain and contains a phenylalanine at position 1192. Mutating this hydrophobic residue to aspartic acid (F1192D) disrupted Rad51 binding, whereas mutating it to alanine did not have a major effect (F1192A) (Figure 1B).

\textbf{Unlike loss of Sgs1 helicase activity, loss of Sgs1-Rad51 binding does not cause DNA damage sensitivity and genome instability in haploid cells}

To determine how the loss of Rad51 binding affects Sgs1 function in vivo we integrated the \textit{sgs1-F1192D} allele (hereafter \textit{sgs1-FD}) at the chromosomal locus under control of the \textit{SGS1} promoter. Unlike an \textit{SGS1} deletion, the \textit{sgs1-FD} mutation did not lead to an increase in genome instability (Table 1) or an increase in sensitivity to hydroxyurea (HU), which induces replication stress by inhibiting ribonucleotide reductase, or methyl methanesulfonate (MMS), an alkylating agent that directly damages bases (Figure 1C). Since the \textit{sgs1-FD} mutation is disrupting a link between Sgs1 and HR, we also tested its effect on DNA-damage sensitivity in diploids, which depend more strongly on HR for repair of DNA breaks than haploids [66, 67]. Diploids were indeed more sensitive to 0.025\% MMS if they were homozygous for the \textit{sgs1-FD}}
mutation than if they were heterozygous for \textit{sgs1-FD} or homozygous for the wildtype allele (Figure 1D), indicating a mild DNA repair defect in the \textit{sgs1-FD} mutant.

Rad51 binding to Sgs1 is required for normal growth, DNA damage tolerance, and genome stability in the absence of Sae2, but not Mre11: To identify Sgs1 functions that are impacted by its binding to Rad51, we first investigated genetic interactions between \textit{sgs1-FD} and HR genes. In HR, Sgs1 acts in addition to Exo1 in the resection of DSBs after their initial nucleolytic processing by Sae2 and the MRX complex [9]. In cells lacking \textit{SGS1}, deletion of \textit{EXO1} causes a fitness defect and one of the largest known synergistic increases in genomic instability (>500-fold) [31, 68, 69] whereas a deletion of \textit{SAE2} or \textit{MRE11} is synthetically lethal with \textit{sgs1} \textit{\Delta} [53, 70]. These reported phenotypic similarities between Sae2 and Mre11 deficiency, however, did not apply to the \textit{sgs1-FD} mutant. The \textit{sgs1-FD} mutation caused a significant fitness defect in the \textit{sae2} \textit{\Delta} mutant but had no detrimental effect on the growth of the \textit{mre11} \textit{\Delta} mutant (Figure 2A). The \textit{sgs1-FD} allele also increased hypersensitivity of the \textit{sae2} \textit{\Delta} mutant to HU and MMS but exhibited a wildtype phenotype in the \textit{mre11} \textit{\Delta} mutant (Figure 2B-C). Moreover, the \textit{sgs1-FD} allele led to a synergistic (25-fold) increase in the GCR rate in the \textit{sae2} \textit{\Delta} mutant but did not affect the accumulation of genome rearrangements in the \textit{mre11} \textit{\Delta} mutant (Figure 2E).

In the current model of DSB end processing, MRX and Sae2 bind to the unprocessed ends, trimming off a few nucleotides and causing their own release from the DNA [9, 10]. These trimmed ends are poor substrates for Ku binding, but good substrates for extensive nucleolytic processing by Exo1 and Sgs1/Dna2 to produce the
long 3’ terminated overhangs for Rad51-mediated homology search [9, 10]. When initial
trimming and long-range resection are impaired due to absence of Sae2 and Sgs1 cells
die [71, 72]. However, these cells are rescued by deleting YKU70, suggesting that
preventing Ku from binding to the DSB ends makes them accessible to the alternative,
Exo1-mediated pathway for long-range resection, thus bypassing the requirement of
Sae2 for removal of Ku and that of Sgs1 for long-range resection [1]. Based on this
finding, any sgs1 mutation that causes a resection defect and a synthetic growth defect
with sae2Δ should be suppressed by deletion of YKU70. Indeed, the defects of the
sgs1-D664Δ mutant, which include a severe fitness defect with sae2Δ and a resection
defect, are bypassed in cells lacking Ku [73, 74]. However, we observed that neither the
severe fitness defect the sgs1-FD sae2Δ mutant nor its DNA damage sensitivity was
suppressed by deleting YKU70 (Figure 2C), suggesting that the sgs1-FD mutation does
not cause a resection defect.

To test the possibility that the requirement of Sae2 in the sgs1-FD mutant was
related to a MRX-related function of Sae2, we next deleted MRE11 in the sae2Δ sgs1-
FD mutant. We observed that the mre11Δ mutation suppressed the growth defect and
the associated HU/MMS sensitivity of the sgs1-FD sae2Δ mutant to levels observed in
the mre11Δ sae2Δ mutant (Figure 2A and 2C), indicating that unlike in the sgs1Δ mutant
MRX is not required in the sgs1-FD mutant and that, in fact, the inability to remove MRX
from the DSB ends is toxic in the sgs1-FD mutant.
sgs1-FD increases genome instability and DNA damage hypersensitivity in cells lacking Exo1

The need in the sgs1-FD mutant for SAE2 prompted us to further investigate the requirement of EXO1, which cooperates with Sgs1/Dna2 during more extensive resection of DSB after Sae2. The exo1Δ mutant is mildly sensitive to high concentrations of MMS, but not HU [69]. The sgs1-FD allele increased the sensitivity of the exo1Δ mutant to MMS and caused sensitivity to 200 mM HU, but remained far below the effect of an SGS1 deletion (Figure 3A and 3B). The sgs1-FD allele also caused a significant (6-fold) increase in the accumulation of genome rearrangements in the exo1Δ mutant albeit this, too, was much milder than the 500-fold increase in GCR accumulation previously reported for the SGS1 deletion [31, 68].

Suppression of the severe growth defect of the top3Δ mutant by the sgs1-FD mutation

In addition to interacting with Dna2 and RPA during DSB resection, Sgs1 forms a complex with Top3/Rmi1 to dissolve dHJ [35, 37, 75]. In vitro, Top3 also stimulates Sgs1 activity in DSB resection and resolves protein-bound D-loops [76, 77]. Both, deletion of SGS1 or loss of Sgs1 helicase activity, suppress the severe growth defect of the top3Δ mutant, which has been interpreted to mean that Sgs1 produces HR intermediates that then require Top3 for dissolution [37]. We found that the sgs1-FD allele, too, suppressed the severe slow growth phenotype of the top3Δ mutant to a similar extent as the sgs1Δ or sgs1-HD alleles and improved growth during exposure to HU or MMS (Figures 2D and 2E), suggesting that the interaction between Sgs1 and
Rad51 drives the formation of recombination intermediates and thereby significantly contributes to the severe growth defect of the top3Δ mutant.

Opposite effects of the sgs1-FD mutation on the DNA-damage sensitivity of srs2Δ and rrm3Δ mutants: Srs2 acts as an inhibitor of HR through its ability to disrupt the Rad51 presynaptic filament [14, 15]. In the absence of Srs2, cells become hyper-recombinogenic, hypersensitive to exogenous DNA damage and replication stress, as well as dependent on Sgs1 for viability [14, 15, 54]. The negative genetic interactions of the sgs1-FD allele with sae2Δ and exo1Δ mutations, and the positive interaction with top3Δ suggest that sgs1-FD is a hypo-recombination allele of SGS1. To further explore this possibility, we introduced sgs1-FD into the srs2Δ mutant, which we expected to benefit from a reduction in HR. Indeed, in stark contrast to a deletion of SGS1 or loss of Sgs1 helicase activity, which are both lethal to srs2Δ cells, the sgs1-FD allele had no detrimental effect on the growth of srs2Δ cells and in fact suppressed the hypersensitivity of srs2Δ cells to HU and MMS by more than 10-fold (Figure 3B), consistent with sgs1-FD being a hypo-recombination allele.

We also investigated the importance of the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction in the rrm3Δ mutant. Replisomes pause frequently at many sites throughout the genome when the Rrm3 helicase is absent, generating DNA lesions that are substrates for Sgs1 and Rad51-dependent repair [50, 51, 78]. Like a deletion of SRS2, deletion of RRM3 causes a severe growth defect in sgs1Δ cells that can be suppressed by deleting RAD51 [50, 51]. The sgs1-FD mutation did not cause a growth defect in rrm3Δ cells; however, cells
became highly sensitive to both HU and MMS (Figure 3B). Despite the increased DNA damage sensitivity, the \textit{rrm3Δ sgs1-FD} mutant did not accumulate genome rearrangements (Figure 3D, Table 1) in contrast to the \textit{rrm3Δ sgs1Δ} mutant [30]. This genetic interaction between \textit{rrm3Δ} and a hypomorphic allele of \textit{SGS1} further underscores the strong dependence of the repair of the replication-associated DNA lesions in \textit{rrm3Δ} cells on homology-directed replication fork restart and rescue [52].

Sgs1-Rad51 interaction promotes large deletions and contributes to DNA damage hypersensitivity of cells lacking Pol32: In the absence of \textit{POL32}, which codes for the structural subunit of polymerase δ that attaches the polymerase to the processivity factor PCNA, DNA replication is inefficient and prone to pausing and mutations [79-81]. Since an \textit{SGS1} deletion causes a fitness defect and increased HU and MMS sensitivity in the \textit{pol32Δ} mutant, we decided to assess the effect of the \textit{sgs1-FD} allele in this mutant. Surprisingly, we found that the \textit{sgs1-FD} mutation had the opposite effect of the \textit{SGS1} deletion and the helicase-defective \textit{sgs1-HD} allele, suppressing the HU hypersensitivity of the \textit{pol32Δ} mutant (Figure 4A, and 4C). Since the HU hypersensitivity of the \textit{pol32Δ} mutant is also suppressed by deletion of \textit{EXO1} [69], we next tested the combined effect of \textit{exo1Δ} and \textit{sgs1-FD} mutations on HU sensitivity of the \textit{pol32Δ} mutant (Figure 4D). Instead of suppression, however, we observed an increase in HU and MMS sensitivity even at low drug concentrations, suggesting that Exo1 and the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction cooperate in a pathway that is required in the absence of Pol32. Since both Sgs1 and Exo1 act in DSB end processing to initiate HR, we investigated the effect of a \textit{RAD51} deletion on the HU/MMS sensitivity
of the \textit{pol32}\textsuperscript{\textDelta} mutant and observed a strong increase in sensitivity (Figure 4E). This suggests that \textit{pol32}\textsuperscript{\textDelta} cells depend on a Rad51-dependent HR pathway for the survival of replication stress and that Exo1 and the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction independently promote this pathway.

The accumulation of large deletions between short repeats in \textit{CAN1} or other genomic loci is characteristic of \textit{pol32}\textsuperscript{\textDelta} cells and has been explained by an increased propensity of the nascent strands to dissociate from their templates as a result of frequent pausing, followed by error-prone reannealing [80]. When we combined the \textit{pol32}\textsuperscript{\textDelta} mutation with the \textit{sgs1-FD} mutation, there was no significant change in the mutation rate at \textit{CAN1} (Supplemental Table S2), but the rate of large deletions was reduced 4-fold similar to the 6-fold reduction when \textit{SGS1} was deleted, suggesting that the interaction of Sgs1 with Rad51 contributes to the formation of large deletions in the absence of Pol32 (Figure 4B). In contrast, when we deleted \textit{EXO1} in the \textit{pol32}\textsuperscript{\textDelta} mutant, the rate of large deletions increased 4-fold (Figure 4B). These observations indicate that, in contrast to their cooperative roles in DSB end resection, Exo1 and Sgs1 have opposite effects at impaired replication forks. For example, Exo1 could prevent deletions by degrading the mutagenic substrate, whereas Sgs1 and the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction might help generate deletions by facilitating DNA slippage by misannealing at nearby repeats.

Rad52/Rad59-mediated DNA repair, but not Rad51, is essential for cells with compromised DNA resection due to lack of Sgs1 and Exo1: Cells lacking Sgs1 and Exo1 show minimal resection of DSBs and accumulate GCRs at an extreme level [9, 31, 68]. Because of the failure to sufficiently resect DSB ends we expected that DSBs
would not be suitable for repair by HR. Surprisingly, however, we found that deleting \textit{RAD52} was lethal in the \textit{sgs1Δ exo1Δ} mutant, and deletion of \textit{RAD59} caused an extreme growth defect (Figure 5A). In contrast, deleting \textit{RAD51} caused only a mild fitness defect (Figure 5A), consistent with the ability of other groups to readily obtain and characterize the \textit{sgs1Δ exo1Δ rad51Δ} mutant [9, 73, 82].

When we analyzed the effect of HR mutations on chromosome rearrangements in the \textit{sgs1Δ exo1Δ} mutant, we found that deleting \textit{RAD51} significantly suppressed (3.1-fold) their accumulation (Figure 5C, Table 2). We also analyzed GCR formation in the \textit{sgs1Δ exo1Δ rad59Δ} mutant. Because of the severe growth defect of this mutant and the associated risk of obtaining suppressors with prolonged propagation, we set up all cell cultures from colonies immediately after they formed from meiotic products of the heterozygous diploid. In contrast to the decrease upon \textit{RAD51} deletion, \textit{RAD59} deletion doubled (2.4-fold) the GCR rate of \textit{sgs1Δ exo1Δ} cells (Figure 5C, Table 2).

The dramatic decrease in viability of the \textit{sgs1Δ exo1Δ} mutant upon \textit{RAD59} and \textit{RAD52} deletion suggests that a Rad59-dependent HR pathway repairs DNA lesions in this mutant. The decrease in GCR formation upon \textit{RAD51} deletion and the opposite effect of a \textit{RAD59} deletion further suggest that Rad51 and Rad59 compete for repair of these incompletely processed DNA lesions in the \textit{sgs1Δ exo1Δ} mutant and that repair by Rad51, but not Rad59, is mutagenic.

Interestingly, we observed that the effect of \textit{RAD51} and \textit{RAD59} deletions on the accumulation of GCRs is the same in \textit{sgs1Δ} cells with \textit{EXO1} intact as in cells with \textit{EXO1} deleted; that is, a \textit{RAD51} deletion led to a significant (5.1-fold) decrease in the GCR rate of \textit{sgs1Δ} cells (versus 3.1-fold decrease in \textit{sgs1Δ exo1Δ}) and \textit{RAD59} deletion
to a significant (1.8-fold) increase (versus a 2.3-fold increase in \textit{sgs1\Delta exo1\Delta}) (Figure 5B and 5C, Table 2). Essentially, deleting \textit{EXO1} increased all GCR rates by ~ 700-fold, but had no effect on the genetic interactions between \textit{sgs1\Delta, rad51\Delta, and rad59\Delta} (compare the last three columns in Figures 5B with 5C).

**DISCUSSION**

We have identified a novel separation-of-function mutant of Sgs1 (\textit{sgs1-FD}) that fails to bind Rad51 but does not cause the severe sensitivity to DNA-damaging agents seen in cells lacking Sgs1 or expressing helicase-defective Sgs1. Novel positive and negative genetic interactions between this \textit{sgs1-FD} allele and mutations in genes with roles in HR (\textit{mre11\Delta, sae2\Delta, srs2, exo1\Delta, top3\Delta}) or replisome progression (\textit{pol32\Delta, rrm3\Delta}) suggest that the physical interaction between Sgs1 and Rad51 stimulates homology-dependent DNA repair.

We observed the strongest genetic interaction of the \textit{sgs1-FD} allele with a \textit{SAE2} deletion (Figure 2). Sae2 removes MRX from DSB ends and prevents yKu binding, making the DSB accessible to extensive resection by Sgs1/Dna2 and Exo1 [1]. YKU70 deletion suppresses resection defects in cells that lack Sae2 and Sgs1 activities by allowing the alternative Exo1 pathway access to the DSB ends for resection [1, 73, 74, 83]. In addition to suppressing the DNA-damage sensitivity and fitness defect of the \textit{sgs1\Delta sae2\Delta} mutant, the resection-defective \textit{sgs1-D664\Delta} mutant was found to benefit from deleting \textit{YKU70} [73, 74]. In contrast, deleting \textit{YKU70} had no effect on the \textit{sgs1-FD}
sae2Δ mutant identified here, indicating that the sgs1-FD mutant does not benefit from increased Exo1 activity at DSBs and, thus, that sgs1-FD is proficient for resection. Surprisingly, even though Sae2 acts with MRX in the initial processing step and sgs1Δ is synthetically lethal with both sae2Δ and mre11Δ, disruption of the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction was not detrimental to mre11Δ cells. In fact, the MRE11 deletion suppressed the detrimental effects of the sgs1-FD mutation in sae2Δ cells, suggesting that the Sae2 function that is critical in sgs1-FD cells is the removal of MRX from DSB ends. If MRX stays bound, the DNA-damage checkpoint is activated and oligomers of the Rad9 checkpoint adaptor accumulate nearby [84-87]. Disrupting the DNA damage checkpoint alleviates the requirement for Sae2 at DSBs [88]. Although this suggests that Sgs1 can compensate for the lack of initial resection by Sae2, more extensive resection and Rad51 filament formation are still impaired by MRX stuck on the DSB ends [88, 89]. Recent findings have indicated that Sgs1 can eventually remove MRX and analysis of the sgs1-D664Δ mutant linked this ability to long-range resection by Sgs1 [73, 88]. Because of the resection defect of the sgs1-D664Δ mutant, defects of the sgs1-D664Δ sae2Δ mutant could be suppressed by deleting YKU70. That the YKU70 deletion had no effect on the sgs1-FD sae2Δ mutant indicates that the suppression by MRE11 deletion is not related to a resection defect in the sgs1-FD mutant. We propose, therefore, that the disruption of Sgs1-Rad51 interaction by the sgs1-FD mutation reduces the efficiency of Rad51 filament formation, and thus repair by HR. Removing MRE11 from the DSB ends and, consequently, preventing Rad9 accumulation around the DSB ends could compensate for this deficiency in the sae2Δ sgs1-FD mutant by increasing the efficiency.
of long-range resection due to increased access of sgs1-FD/Dna2 to the DSB ends. Thus, when DNA end processing is impaired because of the lack of Sae2, and persistent MRX binding and resulting checkpoint activation inhibit Sgs1/Dna2 function in resection, HR increasingly depends on the stimulation of Rad51 filament formation by Sgs1.

All other genetic interactions of the sgs1-FD allele investigated here are also in agreement with a role of the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction in stimulating HR, such as the positive interactions of the sgs1-FD mutation with top3Δ, pol32Δ and srs2Δ and the negative interaction with rrm3Δ. Especially the suppression of the DNA damage sensitivity of the srs2Δ mutant strengthens our hypothesis that the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction stimulates Rad51 filament formation. Based on the ability of Srs2 to disassemble Rad51 filaments [14], suppression of srs2Δ sgs1Δ synthetic lethality by RAD51 deletion [90] could be interpreted in two ways: either Sgs1 acts like Srs2 by disassembling presynaptic Rad51 filaments, or Sgs1 in complex with Top3/Rmi1 is needed to dissolve the accumulating recombination intermediates that overwhelm the cell because Rad51 filaments are no longer disrupted by Srs2. Our findings suggest the second explanation to be true; if the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction indeed promoted the disassembly of presynaptic Rad51 filaments, then the disruption of the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction by the sgs1-FD mutation would not have suppressed the DNA-damage sensitivity of the srs2Δ mutant (Figure 3B).

Thus, taken together, the genetic interactions of the sgs1-FD allele are distinct from those of the sgs1Δ and helicase-defective sgs1-hd alleles (Figure 6B) and consistent with a model (Figure 6A) whereby Sgs1 is not only responsible for the resection of DSB
ends and the formation of ssDNA overhangs but, through binding Rad51, promotes HR by stimulating formation of the Rad51 presynaptic filament. As DNA ends are resected, RPA binding to the newly formed ssDNA overhangs limits the initiation of the Rad51 filament. Rad52 is essential to overcome this limitation and form a productive Rad51 presynaptic filament on RPA-coated ssDNA. In addition to binding Rad51 C-terminal of the helicase core, Sgs1 binds RPA N-terminal of the helicase core [38]. However, the biological significance of this interaction has remained unclear. We propose that the acidic regions in the N-terminus of Sgs1 to which RPA binds serve as a DNA mimic, and that via this DNA mimic Sgs1 can compete with the ssDNA overhang for RPA binding, thereby freeing up ssDNA locally for Rad51 and stimulating filament initiation (Figure 6A). Such a role for Sgs1 is reminiscent of the function of E. coli RecBCD not only in resection but also in assembling the RecA filament [91]. Moreover, the ability of BRCA2 to load Rad51 onto ssDNA in vitro was recently shown to be aided by interaction with a protein, DSS1, that appears to act as a DNA mimic and targets RPA on ssDNA [92].

We also observed a stimulatory effect of the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction on the formation of the direct-repeat mediated, large deletions characteristic of pol32Δ cells. Unlike in DSB resection, however, Sgs1 had the opposite effect of Exo1: the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction promoted the deletions, and Exo1 suppressed them, both to approximately the same extent (4-fold). The large deletions in pol32Δ cells most likely form during inefficient replisome progression, which makes the nascent DNA strands prone to dissociation, followed by misannealing at a repeated downstream sequence, thus deleting the sequence between the repeats. We propose a model (Figure 6A).
whereby Exo1 prevents large deletions through its ability to degrade the nascent lagging DNA strand at stalled forks [93] and the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction, in contrast, promotes annealing of dissociated nascent strands with downstream repeated sequences on both, the leading and the lagging strand.

Finally, our study also provided new insight into the repair of DSBs in cells where long-range resection by Sgs1/Dna2 and Exo1 is disrupted. It is thought that for HR, the ends need to be resected extensively by Sgs1/Dna2 or Exo1 before the Rad51 filament can form and initiate a homology search. Hence, sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutants should not be able to rely on HR as a major pathway for DNA lesion repair. It was therefore surprising that sgs1Δ exo1Δ cells depend on RAD52 for their survival. That the fitness of these cells was more dependent on Rad59 than Rad51 suggests that the minimally resected DSB ends in sgs1Δ exo1Δ cells are mainly repaired by Rad59/Rad52-dependent HR. This is consistent with a preference of Rad59 for the repair of short substrates, including by Rad51-independent BIR [25, 26, 94]. Interestingly, we also found that Rad59 suppressed genome rearrangements in sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutants whereas Rad51 increased them, suggesting that both Rad51 and Rad59 can act on minimally resected ends, but with Rad59 leading to proper repair, whereas Rad51 is mutagenic. That the genetic interactions between SGS1, RAD51, and RAD59 were the same in the presence or absence of EXO1 – that is, Rad59 suppressed GCRs in the absence of Sgs1 whereas Rad51 generated them – further indicates that sgs1Δ and sgs1Δ exo1Δ cells simply differ in the abundance of the lesions, but the lesions are of the same type and accessed in the same manner by Rad59 and Rad51 whether Exo1 is present or not.
In addition to Rad51, Sgs1 interacts with numerous other DNA repair factors, including Top2, Top3, RPA, Mre11, Rad16, and Mlh1, and the checkpoint kinase Rad53. However, determining the significance of these interactions for Sgs1 function has remained challenging due to the lack of point mutations that disrupt individual interactions. Identifying the binding sites on Sgs1 for these other interacting partners will allow to further dissect the well-characterized, but pleiotropic, effect of an SGS1 deletion on DNA break repair and provide a more precise understanding of the specific roles of Sgs1 in promoting genome integrity.
Figure 4.1. Rad51 binds to Sgs1 downstream of the winged-helix domain. (A) Domain structure of Sgs1. The helicase core of Sgs1 consists of the ATPase domain, which is formed by two RecA-like lobes, and the RecQ-C terminal (RQC) domain, which consists of a zinc-binding (Zinc-BD) and a winged-helix (WH) domain. The helicase- and RNaseD C-terminal (HRDC) domain are separated from the helicase core by a proline/glycine-rich loop. The 645-residue unstructured N-terminal tail is omitted. (B) Pulldown of Rad51-V5-3XVSV with GST-tagged Sgs1 fragments and sgs1-FD and sgs1-FA mutants. (C) Unlike an SGS1 deletion, the sgs1-FD allele does not cause hypersensitivity to MMS or HU in haploid cells. Homozygosity for the sgs1-FD mutation causes mild sensitivity to HU and MMS in diploid cells.
Figure 4.2. Effect of the sgs1-FD mutation on fitness, DNA-damage sensitivity and genome stability of sae2Δ, mre11Δ and yku70Δ mutants. (A) sgs1-FD causes a severe growth defect in the sae2Δ mutant, but not the mre11Δ mutant. Deletion of MRE11 suppresses the growth defect of sgs1-FD sae2Δ. (B) sgs1-FD increases the HU/MMS sensitivity of the sae2Δ mutant, but not the mre11Δ mutant. (C) Unlike mre11Δ, yku70Δ does not suppress growth defect and HU/MMS hypersensitivity of the sgs1-FD sae2Δ mutant. (D) sgs1-FD causes synergistic GCR rate increases in sae2Δ and exo1Δ mutants but has no effect on GCR accumulation in the mre11Δ mutant. Median GCR rate is shown with 95% confidence intervals (see also Table 1).
Figure 4.3. Effect of the sgs1-FD mutation on fitness and DNA-damage sensitivity of exo1Δ, srs2Δ, rrm3Δ and top3Δ mutants. (A) sgs1-FD sensitizes the exo1Δ mutant to MMS and, to a lesser extent, HU. (B) sgs1-FD suppresses HU/MMS sensitivity of the srs2Δ mutant and increases HU/MMS sensitivity of the rrm3Δ mutant. (C) sgs1-FD suppresses top3Δ slow growth nearly as effectively as a deletion of SGS1 or helicase-dead sgs1-HD. (D) Unlike deletion of SGS1, sgs1-FD does not cause a GCR rate...
increase in the \textit{rrm3} mutant. \textit{sgs1-FD} does not affect GCR formation in the \textit{srs2} mutant (see also Table 1). (E) Improved growth of \textit{sgs1-FD top3} in the presence of HU and MMS correlates with partial suppression of the \textit{top3} fitness defect by \textit{sgs1-FD}.
Figure 4.4. Effect of sgs1-FD on DNA-damage sensitivity and large deletion formation in the absence of Pol32. (A) Suppression of hydroxyurea sensitivity of the pol32Δ mutant by sgs1-FD. In contrast, SGS1 deletion or helicase-defective sgs1-HD increase DNA-damage sensitivity of pol32Δ cells. (B) Accumulation of large deletions (> 3 bp) in CAN1, characteristic of cells lacking the Pol32 subunit of polymerase δ, is suppressed by sgs1-FD or by deletion of SGS1 but stimulated by deletion of EXO1. (C)
Whereas exo1\(\Delta\) and sgs1-FD suppress HU sensitivity of the pol32\(\Delta\) mutant, the combination of both exo1\(\Delta\) and sgs1-FD mutations increases DNA damage sensitivity of the pol32\(\Delta\) mutant. (D) Deletion of RAD51 in the pol32\(\Delta\) mutant causes severe hypersensitivity to HU and MMS.
Figure 4.5. Effect of $\text{RAD52}$, $\text{RAD51}$ and $\text{RAD59}$ deletions on viability and genome stability of the $\text{sgs1}^\Delta \text{exo1}^\Delta$ mutant. (A) As shown by tetrad dissections, deletion of $\text{RAD52}$ in the $\text{sgs1}^\Delta \text{exo1}^\Delta$ mutant is lethal, and deletion of $\text{RAD59}$ causes a severe growth defect. In contrast, deletion of $\text{RAD51}$ causes only a mild growth defect. Triple mutant spores are indicated by a white circle. (B) Deletion of $\text{RAD51}$ suppresses gross-chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs) in the $\text{sgs1}^\Delta$ mutant whereas deletion of $\text{RAD59}$ stimulates GCR formation in the $\text{sgs1}^\Delta$ mutant. (C) Deletion of $\text{EXO1}$ increases GCR formation in the $\text{sgs1}^\Delta$ mutant ~700-fold, but does not affect the genetic interactions of $\text{sgs1}^\Delta$ with $\text{rad51}^\Delta$ and $\text{rad59}^\Delta$. 

- **Figure 4.5.** - Figure showing tetrad dissections and GCR rates for different deletion combinations.
Figure 4.6. Model for a stimulatory role of the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction in homology-dependent repair of spontaneous DNA lesions. (A) Replication stress, exogenous DNA damage, or disruption of factors with roles in replisome progression (e.g., \textit{rrm3Δ}, \textit{pol32Δ}) can impair replication forks and give rise to mutations (left) and DSBs (right). Right panel: Unprocessed DNA breaks can be bound by Ku and MRX. The nuclease activity of MRX/Sae2 trims the ends, which are then extensively resected by Exo1 and Sgs1/Dna2. Bound Ku and MRX inhibit long-range resection by Exo1 and Sgs1/Dna2, respectively. As the \textit{sgs1-FD} mutant does not benefit from \textit{YKU70} deletion, suggesting it does not have a significant resection defect, we propose that the Sgs1-Rad51 interaction could instead stimulate HR by linking Sgs1’s role in long-range resection to Rad51 filament formation. Specifically, the acidic regions (AR) in the unstructured N-terminal tail of Sgs1, through their capacity to bind RPA, could act as a DNA mimic, allowing Sgs1 to compete with ssDNA for RPA binding, thereby facilitating deposition of Sgs1-bound Rad51 onto ssDNA during resection. Note: Ku, MRX, Exo1 and Sgs1/Dna2 can act on the same DSB end; two ends are shown to separate their activities for clarity only. Left panel: In the absence of Pol32, cells are known to accumulate large deletions of sequences flanked by direct short repeats. We propose a model whereby Sgs1, through its interaction with Rad51, stimulates the formation of these deletions (Figure 4B) by mediating misannealing of the nascent strands with...
downstream repeated sequences, whereas the 5'-3' exonuclease Exo1 reduces deletion formation (Figure 4B) by degrading nascent DNA on the lagging strand from its accessible 5' end. (B) Summary of differential genetic interactions of the sgs1-FD allele and the SGS1 deletion with mutations in DNA recombination and replication factors (n.a., not available; n.d., not determined).
Table 4.1. Effect of the *sgs1-FD* mutation on the rate of accumulation of gross-chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant genotype</th>
<th>GCR rate(^1) (Can(^r) 5-FOA(^r) x 10(^{-10}))</th>
<th>95% CI(^2) (Can(^r) 5-FOA(^r) x 10(^{-10}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wildtype</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>&lt; 1 – 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1</em></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1-FD</em></td>
<td>&lt;9</td>
<td>&lt;7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>exo1</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1 exo1</em></td>
<td>40500</td>
<td>31000-49900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1-FD exo1</em></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>49-124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sae2</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt;7-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1-FD sae2</em></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>(124-424)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mre11</em></td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mre11 sgs1-FD</em></td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1170-2480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>top3</em></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>top3 sgs1-FD</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rad24</em></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1 rad24</em></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>117-216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1-FD rad24</em></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pol32</em></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1 pol32</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>&lt;24-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1-FD pol32</em></td>
<td>&lt;8</td>
<td>&lt;7-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rrm3</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1 rrm3</em></td>
<td>656</td>
<td>311-1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1-FD rrm3</em></td>
<td>&lt;6</td>
<td>&lt;5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>srs2</em></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>&lt;2-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sgs1-FD srs2</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;7-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Gross-chromosomal rearrangement (GCR) rates for *mre11* and *top3* mutants are from (48); for *sgs1 rrm3* from Schmidt and Kolodner (30); for *sgs1 exo1* and *exo1* from Doerfler, 2014 (69); and for *srs2* from Schmidt et al. 2010 (61).

\(^2\) 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated according to Nair et al. 1940 (64).
Table 4.2. Differential effects of RAD51 and RAD59 deletions on gross-chromosomal rearrangement (GCR) formation in sgs1 and sgs1 exo1 mutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>GCR Rate$^i$ (Can$r^5$-FOA$^r$ x 10$^{-10}$)</th>
<th>95% CI$^i$ (Can$r^5$-FOA$^r$ x 10$^{-10}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wildtype</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>&lt; 1 – 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exo1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad51</td>
<td>&lt; 8</td>
<td>&lt; 7-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad52</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>16-267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 exo1</td>
<td>40500</td>
<td>31000-49900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 rad51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 rad59</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>107-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 rad52</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>140-452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 rad51 exo1</td>
<td>13100</td>
<td>8520-21900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1 rad59 exo1</td>
<td>94900</td>
<td>67400-185000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^i$Gross-chromosomal rearrangement (GCR) rate for sgs1 rad59 is from DOERFLER et al. 2011 (31).

$^i$95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated according to NAIR et al. 1940 (64).
Table S4.1. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain ID</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSHY802</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY978</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, srs2::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY1256</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY1338</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad59::G418, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY2295</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY2333</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY2338</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY2402</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY2437</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY4458</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY4484</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, rad59::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY4716</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, top3::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY4800</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, hisΔ200/hisΔ200, EXO1/exo1::HIS3, RAD52/rad52::URA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY4805</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, exo1::HIS3, rad52::URA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY4810</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, hisΔ200/hisΔ200, EXO1/exo1::HIS3, RAD52/rad52::URA, SGS1/sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5049</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, rad59::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5051</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, exo1::HIS3, rad59::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5052</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, hisΔ200/hisΔ200, EXO1/exo1::HIS3, RAD59/rad59::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5055</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, rad51::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5056</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, hisΔ200/hisΔ200, EXO1/exo1::HIS3, RAD51/rad51::HIS3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S4.1. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains used in this study (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain Code</th>
<th>Genome Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5057</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, exo1::HIS3, rad51::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5059</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, hisΔ200/hisΔ200, EXO1/exo1::HIS3, RAD51/rad51::HIS3, SGS1/sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5060</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, hisΔ200/hisΔ200, EXO1/exo1::HIS3, RAD59/rad59::HIS3, SGS1/sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5067</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad59::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5068</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad51::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5095</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rad51::HIS3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5098</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad59::HIS3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5099</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad51::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5099</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad51::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5102</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, rad51::HIS3, sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5109</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5132</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5222</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, rm3::G418, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5225</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1, srs2::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5229</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, leu2Δ1/leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, his3Δ200/his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl/lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10/hom3-10, ade2Δ1/ade2Δ1, ade8/ade8, YEL069C::URA3/YEL069C::URA3, sgs1::TRP1/sgs1-F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5233</td>
<td>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5253</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, leu2Δ1/leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, his3Δ200/his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl/lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10/hom3-10, ade2Δ1/ade2Δ1, ade8/ade8, YEL069C::URA3/YEL069C::URA3, sgs1::TRP1/sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| KHSY5255    | ura3-52/ura3-52, leu2Δ1/leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, his3Δ200/his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl/lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10/
Table S4.1. Saccharomyces cerevisiae strains used in this study (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain Code</th>
<th>Genotype Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5257</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sae2::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5262</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, leu2Δ1/leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, his3Δ200/his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl/lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10/hom3-10, ade2Δ1/ade2Δ1, ade8/ade8, YEL069C::URA3/YEL069C::URA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5265</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, leu2Δ1/leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, his3Δ200/his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl/lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10/hom3-10, ade2Δ1/ade2Δ1, ade8/ade8, YEL069C::URA3/YEL069C::URA3, SGS1/sgs1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5274</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, mre11::HIS3, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5289</td>
<td>ura3-52/ura3-52, leu2Δ1/leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63/trp1Δ63, his3Δ200/his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl/lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10/hom3-10, ade2Δ1/ade2Δ1, ade8/ade8, YEL069C::URA3/YEL069C::URA3, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5304</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sae2::TRP1, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5312</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1, top3::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5315</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, exo1::loxP-G418-loxP, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1-F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5320</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1-K706A, F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5321</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1-K706A.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5335</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, rad51::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5345</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, mre11::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5356</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sgs1::TRP1, top3::G418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5363</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1-K706A, F1192D.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5365</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, pol32::loxP-G418-loxP, sgs1-K706A.TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5373</td>
<td>mat alpha, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, mre11::HIS3, sae2::TRP1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S4.1. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains used in this study (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5377</td>
<td><em>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2Bgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, mre11::HIS3::sae2::TRP1, sgs1::F1192D.TRP1</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDKY2614</td>
<td><em>MATα, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, exo1::HIS3</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDKY2666</td>
<td><em>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDKY2710</td>
<td><em>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, rad52::URA</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDKY5290</td>
<td><em>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, hisΔ200, sgs1::TRP1</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* RDKY strains are a gift from Richard Kolodner (University of California, San Diego).
Table S4.2. Rates of accumulating spontaneous mutations at CAN1, hom3-10, and lys2-Bgl loci

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Mutation rate</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can(^f) (\times 10^{-7})</td>
<td>Hom(^+) (\times 10^{-9})</td>
<td>Lys(^+) (\times 10^{-9})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildtype</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.3-6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.6-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgs1-FD</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6-11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pol32</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.5-8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pol32 sgs1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0-14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^i\) 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated according to Nair et al. 1940 (64).
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CHAPTER FIVE: IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Proper repair of DNA lesions is essential for cell survival and prevention of disease. Defects in a variety of proteins involved in DNA repair have been shown to directly impact humans as illustrated by the increased predisposition to develop cancer. While only a small portion of cancers are hereditary, accounting only for ~10% of all cancers, the ability of the cell to respond to DNA damage plays a major role in all tumorigenesis and late-stage tumors that have become chemoresistant [1-4]. Hereditary defects in DNA repair proteins can lead to severe syndromes where patients have a higher propensity to develop cancer at an early age. Such is seen in defects in RecQ-helicases (Bloom’s syndrome, Werner’s syndrome, Rothmund-Thompson syndrome), mismatch repair (Lynch syndrome), and nucleotide excision repair (xeroderma pigmentosum) [5]. Increased prevalence of cancer is not exclusively linked to defects that result in syndromes, defects in some homologous recombination factors increase the risk of development of breast and ovarian cancer (BRCA1, BRCA2, BARD1, ATM, CDH1, CHEK2, PALB2, PTEN, STK11, and TP53) [1].

Understanding the role of components of the DNA damage response in maintaining genomic integrity is essential to understanding cancer risk, development, and in the advancement of drugs to treat cancer. We have, in these studies, used yeast as a model to study the role SGS1 and EXO1 in maintaining genomic stability. We have characterized their genetic interactions with other repair pathways and checkpoints, and
identified the domains of Exo1 required for these genetic interactions. We have also described the importance of a physical interaction site of Sgs1 with the homologous recombination factor Rad51 [6, 7]. Understanding SGS1 and EXO1 function is informative as both have human homologs, BLM and EXO1, respectively that have been shown to have similar functions [8, 9].

Chromosomal translocations in cells lacking Sgs1 are dependent on Rad52 paralog, Rad59.

In chapter two of this dissertation we have identified, through a candidate screen, checkpoint and DNA metabolic factors that suppress the formation of gross chromosomal rearrangements. We assessed the candidate’s ability to promote or suppress a chromosomal translocation event between CAN1, LYP1, and ALP1 (C/L/A) that is observed in the absence of the Sgs1 helicase and the DNA damage checkpoint sensor, Mec3. It was previously found that the translocations between C/L/A in the sgs1Δ mec3Δ depend on the presence of the homologous recombination factor Rad52 [10]. We additionally found that these translocations that use short regions of homology rely on the Rad52 paralog Rad59 and checkpoint components Mec1 and Dun1. Rad51, the homologous recombination component that searches for homology in this study has been identified to be dispensable for translocations in the absence of Sgs1, the only RecQ helicase in S. cerevisiae. A defect in BLM in humans is associated with the genomic instability that is also observed in yeast lacking the BLM homolog Sgs1 [10]. Although the rate of GCRs did not differ between sgs1Δ mec3Δ rad51Δ and sgs1Δ mec3Δ rad59Δ, this has distinguished the role of Rad59 in the formation of the types of
GCRs as opposed to the rate of accumulation. The absence of Rad59 preventing the formation C/L/A translocations but not change the accumulation of GCRs leaves other repair mechanisms that must generate other forms of GCRs. The other types of repair in the absence of Rad59 leave the open questions, what pathways contribute the genome instability rate and what kind of GCR is formed to understand better what other mechanisms contribute to genome instability.

In chapter four we investigated further the role of Rad51 and Rad59 in the suppression of genome rearrangements. We found that Exo1 is a strong suppressor of genome rearrangements in cells lacking Sgs1 and that both of these proteins are required for long-range resection of DNA double-strand break ends. Through a candidate screen of DNA metabolic factors, we found that Rad52 is essential in resection deficient sgs1Δ exo1Δ mutants. The synthetic lethality of the sgs1Δ exo1Δ rad52Δ mutant indicates that homology-mediated repair is necessary for cells that are lacking Sgs1 and Exo1 resection. When we assessed the role of two sub-pathways of Rad52 mediated repair we found that Rad59 rather than Rad51 was required for the fitness of cells defective in the resection. We found that this role of Rad59 in preventing mutagenic Rad51 mediated HR repair is also important in cells that just lack Sgs1, indicating a larger role than previously thought for Rad59 in the prevention of genome rearrangements. Determining what type of repair Rad59 engages in to prevent illegitimate recombination by Rad51 still needs to be resolved. Assessing the rearrangement type by mapping the breakpoint that is assessed in the GCR assay would help determine how repair by Rad51 or Rad59 prevent these rearrangements from occurring and will help elucidate the mechanism by which Rad59 prevents
genomic instability. Mutant alleles of \( \text{RAD59} \) have been identified that reduce Rad52 association with double-strand breaks (\text{rad59-K166A}), have an effect on homologous recombination (\text{rad59-K174A} and \text{rad59-F180A}), and affect homologous recombination without diminishing Rad52 association to DNA breaks (\text{rad59-Y92A}) [11]. To help identify the role of Rad59 in preventing aberrant recombination the mutant alleles of \( \text{RAD59} \) in the \( \text{sgs1} \Delta \) mutants could combined and assessed for types of genome rearrangements.

**Characterization of the Exo1 C-terminus in the prevention of genome instability**

Sgs1 and Exo1 are known to redundantly resect DNA double-strand breaks to generate 3′-overhangs used for the homology search in homology-driven repair [12, 13]. We have shown that the loss of both Sgs1 and Exo1 substantially increase the accumulation of GCRs. Exo1 contains an N-terminal and enzymatic domain, and the C-terminus (predicted to unstructured) has been characterized to harbor physical interaction sites with mismatch repair proteins Msh2 and Mhl1. There are four phosphorylation sites implicated in the inhibition of its enzymatic function [14-16]. The role of the C-terminus of Exo1 in the formation of GCRs had not yet been determined. To better characterize the genetic interaction of \( \text{SGS1} \) and \( \text{EXO1} \), we investigated what domains of Exo1 are required for the suppression of GCRs. We created systematic truncations from the C-terminus of Exo1 to determine what was necessary to maintain genome stability and challenged these cells with DNA damaging agents and measured the accumulation of GCRs. We show that the loss of phosphorylation sites and domains
required for the physical interaction of mismatch repair proteins of Exo1 is dispensable for its function in the suppression of GCRs in the absence of Sgs1 and only its enzymatic function is essential. The loss of Exo1 function occurs from the loss of 260 to 280 amino acids of the C-terminus, where three of the known phosphorylation sites are lost, and the fourth remains intact in both truncations. The loss of the phosphorylation sites that were found to modulate Exo1 function did not affect the formation of GCRs. These phosphorylation sites were found to be important in the context of uncapped telomeres where regulation single strand DNA produced by Exo1 is important for modulating the checkpoint response [16]. The inhibition of Exo1 nuclease function is not required in suppressing spontaneous mutations or GCRs. The enzymatic domain of the exo1ΔC280 allele is still intact, although this truncation still impacts the enzymatic function of Exo1 [7]; this could be due to the loss of another post-translational modification that occurs in this region or protein interaction site not yet identified. The structure prediction program IUPRED has shown this domain may not be structured, but a single amino acid changes the prediction drastically to a more structured prediction [7]. While testing this change would not explain the significance of this region it could be used to determine if the structure of that region is enough to challenge its enzymatic function. Additionally, upon analysis of the amino acid sequence, there is a motif that resembles a nuclear localization signal, which could be verified by mutating the motif and determining the effect on Exo1 subcellular localization. Purified wildtype Exo1 and exo1 truncation mutants could be analyzed by mass spectrometry for additional physical interactions with unknown factors that may play a role in regulating Exo1 function. For example, in humans, RPA may play a role in displacing Exo1 as a form of regulation,
but a physical interaction with RPA has not been identified in yeast or humans [17].
Also, PCNA was found to interact at a PCNA interaction motif (PIP box) located at the end of the C-terminus of human Exo1 and is thought to contribute to Exo1’s resection processivity [18].

In chapter three we identify a role for the Exo1 phosphorylation sites in the cellular response to replication stress. Phosphorylation of Exo1 was found to play a role in inhibiting its enzymatic function at uncapped telomeres where it has been shown to be the principle exonuclease responsible for generating ssDNA at these sites [16, 19]. Here, we find a new role for the previously described phosphorylation sites at stalled replication forks where Exo1 is also known to generate ssDNA preventing fork reversal in Rad53 checkpoint-deficient cells to promote error-free repair by template switching [20]. We show by using Exo1 mutants that mimic constitutive phosphorylation and a mutant that is not able to be phosphorylated, that this post-translational modification does not necessarily inhibit Exo1 activity but may be in an active state, which is detrimental at stalled forks. It has not yet been determined if just a single phosphorylation site out of the four identified is required rather than in combination; testing this could reveal the cause for the difference in Exo1 regulation at replication intermediates versus uncapped telomeres. The possibility of additional post-translational modifications of Exo1 and these exo1 mutants, both in the presence and absence of HU, could be assessed by mass-spectrometry.

Moreover, measuring the amount of single-strand DNA in the phospho-mutants of Exo1 in a pol32Δ mutant challenged with HU using electron-micrographs would help
determine if there is more Exo1 mediated resection, whereas 2D gel analysis could reveal the accumulation of replication-dependent recombination intermediates.

**A new separation of function allele of Sgs1 reveals a role in stimulating HR repair**

In chapter four we have described a new function of Sgs1 dependent on the physical interaction with HR repair factor Rad51. We previously determined that the loss of the C-terminal 260 amino acids of Sgs1 causes defects similar to that of the complete loss of Sgs1 with regard to sensitivity to DNA damaging agents and the accumulation of genome rearrangements [21]. It was also shown that Rad51 physically interacts with Sgs1 in that region although the significance of this physical interaction had not been determined [22]. We hypothesized that loss of the physical interaction of Sgs1 and Rad51 might be contributing to the defects seen in the sgs1 truncation mutant, as this truncation did not impinge on the enzymatic domain. We identified a single amino acid change (F1192D) that disrupts the physical interaction of Sgs1 and Rad51 (sgs1-FD allele). Unexpectedly we found that the sgs1-FD mutant did not exhibit any of the defects seen in the sgs1ΔC260 truncation mutant. However, when combined with the loss of DNA repair factors known to have a genetic interaction with SGS1 we observed phenotypes unique to recombination defects. We found a separation of function allele where we propose the physical interaction of Sgs1 and Rad51 promotes homology-mediated repair, possibly by helping mediate the exchange of RPA and Rad51 at DNA breaks. Assessing association of Rad51 with an HO-induced DSB in wildtype cells and in the sgs1-FD mutant by chromatin-immunoprecipitation could test
whether Sgs1 promotes HR by helping Rad51 load on the ssDNA. The difference in RPA affinity for single-strand DNA in the presence of the Sgs1/Rad51 complex could also be assessed to determine Sgs1 does help remove RPA and help promote Rad51 filament formation.

Together, these findings add to the functions of Sgs1 and Exo1 in protecting the genome.
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ABSTRACT

The Mec1/Tel1 kinases (human ATR/ATM) play numerous roles in the DNA replication stress response. Despite the multi-functionality of these kinases, studies of their in vivo action have mostly relied on a few well-established substrates. Here we employed a combined genetic-phosphoproteomic approach to monitor Mec1/Tel1 signaling in a systematic, unbiased, and quantitative manner. Unexpectedly, we find that Mec1 is highly active during normal DNA replication, at levels comparable or higher than Mec1’s activation state induced by replication stress. This “replication-correlated”
mode of Mec1 action requires the 9-1-1 clamp and the Dna2 lagging-strand factor and is distinguishable from Mec1’s action in activating the downstream kinase Rad53. We propose that Mec1/ATR performs key functions during ongoing DNA synthesis that are distinct from their canonical checkpoint role during replication stress.

INTRODUCTION

During DNA replication, cells are prone to accumulate genomic instabilities. Progression of the replication machinery is often impeded by barriers such as DNA adducts, DNA-RNA hybrids, and protein-DNA complexes (Lambert and Carr, 2013). Replication forks often stall upon encountering these hard-to-replicate regions, leading to exposure of single-stranded DNA (ssDNA), which, in turn, is a major signal for the activation of the evolutionarily conserved PI3K-like sensor kinase ATR (yeast Mec1) (MacDougall et al., 2007). Once activated, ATR and Mec1 initiate a signaling response that induces key effects such as cell-cycle arrest, inhibition of origin firing, and stabilization of stalled replication forks (Branzei and Foiani, 2010; Santocanale and Diffley, 1998). The importance of ATR is highlighted by the fact that deletion or mutations that affect its activity are associated with embryonic lethality, chromosomal fragmentation, and increasing sensitivity to genotoxic drugs (Brown and Baltimore, 2000; Wright et al., 1998). In budding yeast, strains with mec1 mutations were shown to accumulate gross chromosomal rearrangements (GCRs) (Myung et al., 2001) and be exquisitely sensitive to genotoxic drugs that induce replication stress (Weinert et al., 1994). Like ATR, the PI3K-like sensor kinase ATM (yeast Tel1) is also important during DNA damage responses. Cells lacking ATM show sensitivity to DNA-damaging agents
and elevated levels of mitotic recombination (Meyn, 1993), but differently from ATR, which is a sensor for ssDNA accumulation, ATM responds mainly to DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) (Shiloh and Ziv, 2013). In yeast, \textit{tel1}\Delta mutants are viable and show no significant sensitivity to DNA-damaging agents. However, \textit{mec1}\Delta \textit{tel1}\Delta double mutants are more sensitive to replication stress and display a more severe growth defect than the single deletion mutants, revealing functionally redundant roles for these kinases (Morrow et al., 1995).

Over the last decade, others and we have identified many candidate substrates of Mec1/Tel1 and ATR/ATM using large-scale mass spectrometry (MS)-based approaches (Chen et al., 2010; Matsuoka et al., 2007; Smolka et al., 2007). However, our understanding of how these kinases promote a systemic cellular response that safeguards genomic integrity and allows cells to better cope with the effects of replication stress is still limited. A major limitation toward a more comprehensive characterization of Mec1/Tel1 and ATR/ATM action is posed by the difficulty of reproducibly and quantitatively monitoring the many substrates identified by MS. Consequently, the use of anti-body-based approaches to monitor well-established substrates remains the method of choice. Substrates commonly monitored using western blotting techniques include the histone variant H2AX (yeast H2A) and the downstream checkpoint kinases CHK1 and CHK2 (yeast Rad53). Despite the biological relevance of these substrates, the use of their phosphorylation as readouts for the checkpoint response has introduced a marked bias in studies aiming at characterizing Mec1/Tel1 action. To address this problem, here we employed a combined genetic-proteomic approach (which we refer to as quantitative mass-spectrometry analysis of phospho-substrates [QMAPS]) for
identifying and monitoring multiple in vivo kinase substrates in a systematic, unbiased, and quantitative manner. Using QMAPS, we show that Mec1 is robustly activated during unperturbed DNA replication, in a manner that correlates with the extent of DNA replication and that is distinct from a canonical checkpoint. Collectively, our results demonstrate the importance of unbiased and quantitative analysis of kinase substrates to comprehensively characterize the in vivo action of multi-functional kinases.

RESULTS

Unbiased Delineation of Mec1 and Tel1 Action Using a Genetic-Proteomic Approach

Our current understanding of Mec1 and Tel1 action is biased toward the use of a few established substrates as reporters of the in vivo activity of these kinases. In particular, the activation state of the major downstream kinase Rad53 has been extensively used as a key indicator of Mec1 and Tel1 activation status. To circumvent this bias and be able to comprehensively characterize the action of Mec1 and Tel1, we used quantitative MS analysis of kinase mutant strains to identify and monitor as many candidate substrates of these kinases as possible. First, we performed a proteomic screen to globally define the set of Mec1 and Tel1 candidate targets. Building on our previously published work (Smolka et al., 2007), we used quantitative MS to compare the phosphoproteome of wild-type (WT) and mec1Δ tel1Δ cells treated with methyl methanesulfonate (MMS) or hydroxyurea (HU) to induce replication stress. To facilitate the classification of Mec1/Tel1-dependent phosphorylation sites into direct or indirect Mec1/Tel1 phosphorylation events, we also quantified the relative abundance of the
phosphopeptides in cells lacking Rad53, the major kinase downstream of Mec1/ Tel1. We were able to identify and quantify more than 6,000 phosphopeptides over distinct biological replicates (Figure 1A; Table S1). Of interest, the abundance of 232 of the identified phosphopeptides was significantly reduced in cells lacking Mec1 and Tel1, and we refer to them as Mec1/Tel1-dependent events. Among the 232 Mec1/Tel1-dependent targets, 115 were found to be dependent on Rad53, and thus considered as indirect Mec1/Tel1-dependent events (Figure 1B). In our strategy, direct targets of Mec1/Tel1 should be present in the group of phosphopeptides carrying a Mec1/Tel1-dependent and Rad53-independent phospho-site. As shown in Figure 1C (Table S1), analysis of the amino acid in the +1 position of Mec1/Tel1-dependent and Rad53-independent phospho-sites revealed a strong enrichment of the S/T-Q motif, consistent with previous work indicating this preferential motif for Mec1 and Tel1 (Kim et al., 1999; Smolka et al., 2007). Of the 117 Mec1/Tel1-dependent and Rad53-independent phosphorylation events, 97 are in the preferred S/T-Q motif, and we considered them as directly targeted by Mec1 or Tel1. On the other hand, Rad53 showed a bias toward the S/T-bulky amino acid (c) motif (Figure 1B; Table S1). For more than 60% of the proteins found to have a Mec1/Tel1-dependent phosphorylation, we were able to also detect at least one Mec1/Tel1-independent phosphorylation event, supporting that most of the observed changes are not due to changes in protein abundance (Figure S1; Table S1). To sort out the relative contribution of Mec1 or Tel1 in the response, we performed similar analyses as described above, but comparing WT cells to cells lacking either Mec1 or Tel1 (Figure 1D). Of the Mec1 and Tel1 direct phospho-events identified above, 67% were found to heavily depend mostly on Mec1 (Figure 1E; Table S1). Only
four phospho-sites were found to heavily depend exclusively on Tel1, consistent with the fact that cells lacking Tel1 don’t exhibit significant sensitivity to replication stress-inducing agents (Morrow et al., 1995). Importantly, about 29% of Mec1/Tel1-dependent sites were found to remain robustly phosphorylated in cells lacking either Mec1 or Tel1 and represent a set of common candidate substrates of these kinases (Figures 1D–1F; Table S1). These results establish a large set of Mec1 and Tel1 targets and define their relative level of dependency for each of these kinases. This defined set of phosphorylation sites targeted by Mec1 and/or Tel1 forms the basis of our unbiased strategy to characterize the action of these kinases in different growth conditions and genetic backgrounds. The output of this analysis of substrates is a quantitative map, herein named QMAPS, revealing the relative levels of phosphorylation of identified phosphopeptides in two different conditions being tested (see Figure 2A).

**QMAPS Reveals Robust Activation of Mec1 during Normal DNA Replication**

It is currently accepted that activation of Mec1 is strongly induced by replication stress. This notion is mainly based on the fact that HU-induced replication fork stalling leads to a robust activation of Rad53 (Tercero et al., 2003). To test if our unbiased QMAPS approach could reveal new insights into the action of Mec1 or Tel1, we compared the phosphorylation level of Mec1/Tel1 candidate substrates in cells undergoing normal S-phase with cells treated with HU. In both cases, cells were arrested in G1 with α-factor and then released from the arrest in media containing HU or not for 45 min. As shown in Figure 2A and Table S2, nearly all phosphopeptides
carrying a Rad53-dependent phosphorylation site were induced by HU. Unexpectedly, only a minor fraction of Mec1 and/or Tel1 candidate substrates was induced by HU treatment. This fraction included a phosphorylation site in Rad53 (serine 24) and a phosphorylation in the Mrc1 protein (serine 189), the adaptor known to transduce signals from Mec1 to Rad53 in response to HU. Most phosphorylation events in Mec1 and/or Tel1 targets were either only slightly induced by HU or did not change at all when comparing cells going through normal replication with cells experiencing HU-induced replication stress. Remarkably, a Mec1 autophosphorylation site (serine 38) and phosphorylation of Rfa1 and Rfa2 (serines 178 and 122, respectively), which are highly dependent on Mec1, were in fact inhibited by HU. Targeted analysis of purified Mec1 complexes further confirmed that the Mec1 auto-phosphorylation site and phosphorylation of Rfa1 are indeed induced during normal S-phase and accumulate as more DNA is replicated, following a similar trend observed for the acetylation of H3K56, which is a well-established replication mark (Figure 2B) (Masumoto et al., 2005). To test if Mec1 activation in normal S-phase is dependent on DNA replication, we used QMAPS to compare the phosphorylation levels of its targets in WT cells as well as in cells lacking the S-phase cyclins Clb5 and Clb6, which display delayed replication initiation due to delayed CDK activation but undergo normal budding dynamics as they progress through S-phase (Figures 2C and 2D) (Donaldson et al., 1998). As shown in Figure 2D, several Mec1 candidate substrates are highly induced during S-phase in WT cells but are not induced in clb5Δ clb6Δ cells at the 35 min time point, when only limited DNA replication had occurred in the mutant (Figures 2C and 2D; Table S2). Taken together, these results show that Mec1 action in normal S-phase depends, at least
partially, on DNA replication. While the MS analysis could detect many Mec1/Tel1-dependent phosphopeptides in G1 in clb5Δ clb6Δ cells (Figure 2D), we attributed this basal phosphorylation level to the potential accumulation of these phospho-events in the extended and deregulated S-phase from the previous cell cycle. Very few Rad53-dependent phosphopeptides were detected in the absence of drug-induced replication stress (data not shown). Even in cells lacking three phosphatases known to act on Rad53, namely Ptc2, Ptc3, and Pph3 (Heideker et al., 2007), we were not able to detect robust Rad53 action during a normal S-phase as we still identified a very limited set of targets (Figure S2). Nonetheless, we were able to observe an increase in the level of phosphorylation of the detected Rad53 targets in ptc2Δ ptc3Δ pph3Δ triple mutant cells compared to WT cells, suggesting that phosphatases play a role in counteracting Rad53 activation during normal DNA replication.

Collectively, the QMAPS results shown in Figure 2 reveal that Mec1 is robustly activated during normal DNA replication and that this mode of Mec1 signaling is partially uncoupled from Rad53 activation. On the other hand, HU-induced replication stress leads to an increase in the phosphorylation of most Rad53 targets but to minor changes in the phosphorylation of a large fraction of Mec1 targets, or even inhibition of some of them. We therefore propose that Mec1 can operate in two distinct modes of signaling during DNA replication, one correlated with ongoing DNA synthesis (“replication-correlated”) and another correlated with the extent of replication stress that involves strong Rad53 activation (canonical checkpoint response).
The 9-1-1 Clamp and the Lagging-Strand Factor Dna2 Are Important for “Replication-Correlated” Mec1 Activation

Recent work revealed that activation of the Mec1 kinase in response to replication stress or DNA damage requires the action of factors such as Ddc1, Dna2, and Dpb11, all of which possess an unstructured region that can tether Mec1 for activation (Kumar and Burgers, 2013; Navadgi-Patil and Burgers, 2009; Puddu et al., 2008). To test if the replication-correlated mode of Mec1 action also requires these factors for activation, we used QMAPS to compare phosphorylation of substrates in WT and mutants of Mec1-activating factors. As shown in Figure 3A and Table S3, mutation of two residues (W128A and Y130A) in Dna2 previously shown to be required for the ability of Dna2 to activate Mec1 has mild effects on the ability of Mec1 to target some of its specific targets, such as Rfa1, Spt7, and Dad1. Deletion of DDC1 had almost no effect in most targets (Figure 3A; Table S3), suggesting that Dna2 has a more prominent role in activating Mec1 during normal DNA replication. Importantly, deletion of DDC1 also prevents the recruitment of Dpb11 and its ability to activate Mec1 (Navadgi-Patil and Burgers, 2009). Finally, combination of the dna2 WY-AA mutation (herein referred as dna2-AA) with DDC1 deletion had a significant impact on the phosphorylation levels of targets that highly depend on Mec1, suggesting that Dna2 and Ddc1 function redundantly to activate Mec1 during normal DNA replication (Figure 3A; Table S3). This is consistent with the fact that these proteins are known to localize and function on the lagging strand of the replication fork. These results suggest that Mec1 may be activated mostly at the lagging strand of a moving replication fork during normal DNA replication.
Tel1 Phosphorylates a Specific Group of Mec1 Targets to Prevent GCR and Support Robust DNA Replication in the Absence of Mec1

Analysis of GCRs revealed that activation of Mec1 via Dna2 or Ddc1 during replication becomes particularly important in the absence of Tel1, as shown by the dramatic increase in GCR in \textit{tel1}Δ \textit{ddc1}Δ \textit{dna2}−AA cells (Figure 3B). This result highlights the key role of Tel1 in compensating for the loss of Mec1 during normal DNA replication. Consistent with this data, while \textit{ddc1}Δ \textit{dna2}−AA cells exhibit a major loss of phosphorylation of most Mec1-specific phosphorylation, we could still observe robust phosphorylation of targets common to Mec1 and Tel1 during an unchallenged S-phase (Figure 3A). We interpret this result as Tel1 acting in the absence of Mec1 activation during a normal S-phase. Similar to Mec1’s “replication-correlated” mode, the action of Tel1 during normal S-phase (and in the absence of Mec1 activation) does not result in higher phosphorylation of Rad53 targets (Figure S3). Of importance, while \textit{ddc1}Δ \textit{dna2}−AA cells can still replicate DNA and progress through S-phase at WT rates (data not shown), \textit{ddc1}Δ \textit{dna2}−AA cells lacking \textit{TEL1} display severe replication defects (Kumar and Burgers, 2013). These results suggest that phosphorylation events in one, or several, common Mec1 and Tel1 targets play an important role in promoting robust DNA replication and preventing the accumulation of GCRs. As shown in Table S3, most of these targets are proteins involved in transcription, RNA processing, and chromatin regulation, and several of them are either essential or required for efficient S-phase progression. These results reveal that Tel1 also plays a role during replication-correlated signaling, in a manner that is uncoupled from Rad53 activation. But
differently from Mec1, Tel1 does not rely on Ddc1 and Dna2 for activation during replication, so it remains unclear how Tel1 engages and becomes active at sites of ongoing DNA replication. Taken together, this analysis uncovers a subset of Mec1 targets (common to Tel1) whose phosphorylations are correlated with the ability of cells to suppress GCRs and maintain robust DNA replication.

**Dna2 and Ddc1 Are Not Essential for Activation of the Canonical Mec1-Rad53 Signaling Response Following Replication Stress**

To determine the extent in which Dna2 and Ddc1 are necessary for activation of the canonical Mec1-Rad53 response during replication stress, we performed QMAPS analysis comparing WT cells versus *ddc1*Δ dna2-AA cells treated with MMS, which leads to robust Rad53 activation. As shown in Figure 4A (Table S4), *ddc1*Δ dna2-AA cells exhibit strong defects in Mec1 activation during MMS treatment, but unexpectedly, activation of Rad53 under this condition does not seem to be greatly affected. On the other hand, similar QMAPS analysis comparing WT and *mec1*Δ cells revealed a strong impact in the phosphorylation of Rad53 targets in the absence of Mec1. These results show that *ddc1*Δ dna2-AA cells do not phenocopy *mec1*Δ cells regarding Rad53 activation and suggest the existence of additional factors that may activate Mec1 to specifically activate Rad53, consistent with a recent paper (Bandhu et al., 2014). In support of the idea of additional Mec1 activator(s), *ddc1*Δdna2-AA cells are not as sensitive to MMS or HU as *mec1*Δ cells (Figure 4B). Also, while *mec1*Δ and *rad53*Δ cells are well known to require deletion of the ribonucleotide reductase inhibitor SML1 for viability (Zhao et al., 1998), we found that *ddc1*Δ dna2-AA cells do not require SML1 for viability.
deletion for viability (Figure 4C). Of note, even *tel1Δ ddc1Δ dna2-AA* cells do not require *SML1* deletion for viability, despite these cells showing the dramatic increase in GCR rates that is characteristic of *mec1Δ tel1Δ* cells. We could exclude the possibility of a Ddc1- independent role for Dpb11 in the activation of Mec1 under MMS in *ddc1Δ dna2-AA* cells as removal of the C-terminal region of Dpb11, which is required for its ability to activate Mec1 (Navadgi-Patil and Burgers, 2008), did not cause loss of viability or major growth defect (Figure 4D). As shown in the working model in Figure 4E, we propose two distinct modes of Mec1 action during DNA replication, one correlated with DNA replication and another correlated with the extent of replication stress as part of a canonical checkpoint signaling. In our model, the replication-correlated mode of Mec1 action functions redundantly with Tel1 to ensure robust DNA replication and prevent GCR. On the other hand, the canonical checkpoint mode leads to the well-established effects of inhibition of DNA replication and increased production of dNTPs.

**DISCUSSION**

The ATR and ATM kinases, and their yeast orthologs, regulate hundreds of substrates, but our ability to fully capture their multi-functional action *in vivo* has been hampered by the common use of one or a few classical substrates as readouts of their activity. Here we used a quantitative MS approach to monitor *in vivo* Mec1/Tel1 kinase action in a systematic, unbiased, and quantitative manner. Our analysis revealed surprising insights into how Mec1 functions during DNA replication and provided evidence of a non-canonical mode of Mec1 action, which we propose is distinct from Mec1’s established role in the checkpoint response (see model in Figure 4E).
By quantitatively monitoring the phospho-status of dozens of Mec1 candidate substrates, we found that Mec1 is highly active during normal DNA replication. In fact, genetic data support the idea that Mec1 functions during normal DNA replication. For example, cells lacking \textit{MEC1} and \textit{TEL1} exhibit high rates of GCR in an assay performed in the absence of any exogenously-induced DNA damage (Myung et al., 2001). But the prevailing hypothesis has been that the ability of Mec1 to suppress spontaneous GCR accumulation is attributed to a residual action of Mec1 in response to spontaneous DNA damage generated during DNA replication. Distinct from the notion of residual Mec1 activation during normal replication, our work supports a model in which Mec1 is highly engaged onto sites of ongoing DNA synthesis to become activated in a “replication-correlated” manner. Also, distinct from the established role of Mec1 in checkpoint signaling, our results reveal that the action of Mec1 during normal DNA replication is partially uncoupled from the action of the downstream kinase Rad53. Our results are consistent with the idea that Mec1 is either continuously activated during ongoing DNA synthesis or is activated at many sites in the genome that pose moderate level of difficulty for replication forks to pass. At these sites, forks would only dynamically pause, allowing sufficient ssDNA exposure for Mec1 recruitment and activation but not for robust Rad53 activation, which requires further recruitment and/or phosphorylation of mediator proteins to mount a full checkpoint response. Nonetheless, it is important to mention that Rad53 also needs to be activated during normal DNA replication. Cells lacking Rad53 are not viable, unless the RNR inhibitor \textit{SML1} is also deleted (Zhao et al., 1998). But contrary to Mec1’s action, our quantitative analysis reveals that the activity of Rad53 in normal DNA replication is significantly lower than...
drug-induced Rad53 activity (Figure 2A). We speculate that during normal DNA replication, Rad53 becomes preferentially activated at specific genomic sites that pose major challenges for replication, such as hard-to-replicate transcriptional barriers. Interestingly, our results suggest that phosphatases such as Pph3, Ptc2, and Ptc3 may also function during normal S-phase to prevent excess Rad53 activation, consistent with a recent report showing a constitutive Mec1-Pph3 interaction (Hustedt et al., 2015).

The identification of a replication-correlated mode of Mec1 action leads to a paradox, as Rad53 has established roles in inhibiting DNA synthesis as part of a canonical checkpoint response to replication stress (Santocanale and Diffley, 1998). We hypothesize that Mec1 positively regulates DNA replication when functioning uncoupled from Rad53 activation in the replication-correlated mode (Figure 4E). Consistent with this hypothesis, the Bell lab has shown that Mec1 phosphorylates the MCM complex to prime it for activation (Randell et al., 2010). We further speculate that the replication-correlated mode of Mec1 signaling plays a major role in facilitating the movement of replication forks by preemptively opening chromatin and/or removing RNA and transcriptional machineries from DNA.

Consistent with this notion, we found that Mec1 targets several proteins involved in transcription, RNA processing, and chromatin remodeling during unchallenged DNA replication. Also, we showed that during normal DNA replication Tel1 partially compensates for the lack of Mec1 by targeting substrates involved in transcription and chromatin regulation. The fact that cells lacking both Mec1 and Tel1 are extremely slow growing further strengthens the idea that the set of Mec1 substrates that can also be phosphorylated by Tel1 comprise a critical set of proteins involved in promoting robust
DNA replication. Previous reports have functionally connected Mec1 to chromatin and transcription regulation (Rodriguez and Tsukiyama, 2013; Seeber et al., 2013). Our work suggests that regulation of these processes by Mec1 is actually part of the normal replication program that positively controls ongoing DNA synthesis. The delineation of which substrates are common to Mec1 and Tel1 should provide the framework of targets that will help better understand the mechanisms by which Mec1 and Tel1 positively impact DNA synthesis. Finally, the observation that replication- correlated mode of Mec1 and Tel1 action does not efficiently relay signaling to Rad53 activation is consistent with these ideas, as it is well known that Rad53 activation leads to outputs that would antagonize the potential role of Mec1 as a positive regulator of DNA replication.

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

**Cell Culture**

Yeast strains used in this study are listed in Table S5. For stable isotope labeling of amino acids in cell culture (SILAC), auxotrophic yeast strains for lysine and arginine were grown in -Arg -Lys synthetic dropout media supplemented with either normal L-arginine and L-lysine (light culture) or L-lysine $^{13}$C$_6$, $^{15}$N$_2$ and L-arginine $^{13}$C$_6$, $^{15}$N$_4$ (heavy culture) as describe in Ohouo et al. (2013).
ACCESSION NUMBERS

The MS proteomics data have been deposited to the Peptide Atlas database (http://www.peptideatlas.org/) with the data set identifier PASS00651 and PASS00652.

Plasmid

DNA2 sequence was amplified from genomic DNA and cloned into pFA6a plasmid (pMBS 538) followed by site-directed mutagenesis reactions for W128A and Y130A mutations. The plasmid generated contains a 50bp upstream region of DNA2 (from positions -50bp to -1bp of start codon), the DNA2-AA ORF and a 214bp downstream region of DNA2 (from positions +1bp to +214bp of stop codon) cloned with PacI and Ascl. Plasmid pMBS 538 also contains a 500bp downstream region of DNA2 (from positions +215bp to +715bp of stop codon) (cloned with Pmel and EcoRI) for subsequent integration into the endogenous DNA2 locus. DNA2-AA was integrated into the endogenous DNA2 locus in a diploid strain preserving the DNA2 promoter and 3’ UTR sequences. After sporulation, haploid strains containing DNA2-AA mutant were isolated by tetrad dissection and genotyped based on PCR and analysis of auxotrophic markers. Plasmid pMBS 538 is available upon request.

Cell Synchronization

For synchronization, yeast cells were arrested in G1 with α-factor and released in α-factor-free media for allowing cells to progress into S-phase. Efficiency of cell cycle arrest and release was monitored by FACS analysis.
**FACS analysis**

Cells sample were collected at appropriate time points, fixed in 70% ethanol and stored at -20°C. Yeast cells were harvested by centrifugation, ethanol was removed, cell pellet was resuspended in 50mM sodium citrate followed by treatment with 200μg/ml of RNase A (Qiagen) for 1h at 37°C and 500μg/ml of proteinase K (Invitrogen) for 1h at 42°C. Finally, cells were incubated in the presence of Sytox Green (Molecular Probes) for 2h at 4°C. FACS profiles were analyzed using a BD Accuri C6 - Flow cytometer and CFlow® software.

**Gross Chromosomal Rearrangements (GCR) assay**

Rates of accumulating GCRs were determined by fluctuation analysis by taking the median rate of at least 15 cultures from at least two isolates (Lea and Coulson, 1949; Schmidt et al., 2006) and 95% confidence intervals were calculated according to (Nair, 1940). Cells with GCRs were identified by their resistance to canavanine and 5-fluoro-orotic acid (Canr 5-FOAr), which is indicative of simultaneous inactivation of the CAN1 and URA3 genes on the modified chromosome V. Selective media for the GCR assay was prepared as previously described (Schmidt et al., 2006).

**Protein Extraction and Sample Preparation**

"Light" and "heavy"-labeled cultures were combined, harvested by centrifugation in TE buffer pH 8.0 containing protease inhibitors and stored frozen at -80°C until cell lysis. Approximately 0.4 g of yeast cell pellet was lysed by bead beating at 4°C in 4 mL of lysis buffer containing 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 0.2% Tergitol, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM
EDTA, complete EDTA-free protease inhibitor cocktail (Roche), 5 mM sodium fluoride and 10 mM β-glycerophosphate. Protein lysates were denatured in 1% SDS, reduced with DTT, alkylated with iodoacetamide and then precipitated with three volumes of a solution containing 50% acetone and 50% ethanol. Proteins were solubilized in a solution of 2 M urea, 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, and 150 mM NaCl, and then TPCK-treated trypsin was added. Digestion was performed overnight at 37°C, and then trifluoroacetic acid and formic acid were added to a final concentration of 0.2%. Peptides were desalted with Sep-Pak C18 column (Waters). C18 column was conditioned with 5 column volumes of 80% acetonitrile and 0.1% acetic acid and washed with 5 column volumes of 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid. After samples were loaded, column was washed with 5 column volumes of 0.1% acetic acid followed by elution with 4 column volumes of 80% acetonitrile and 0.1% acetic acid. Elution was dried in a SpeedVac evaporator and resuspended in 1% acetic acid.

**Phosphopeptide Enrichment**

Phosphopeptide enrichment was performed as described in (Ohouo et al., 2013). After protein extraction and trypsin digestion, desalted peptides were resuspended in 1% acetic acid and loaded in a tip column containing 30μl of immobilized metal affinity chromatography (IMAC) resin prepared as previously described (Albuquerque et al., 2008). After loading, the IMAC resin was washed with 1 column volume of 25% acetonitrile, 100 mM NaCl, and 0.1% acetic acid solution followed by 2 column volumes of 1% acetic acid, 1 column volume of deionized water and finally, eluted with 3 column volumes of 12% ammonia and 10% acetonitrile solution.
**HILIC Fractionation**

After phosphopeptide enrichment, samples were dried in a SpeedVac, reconstituted in 80% acetonitrile and 1% formic acid and fractionated by hydrophilic interaction liquid chromatography (HILIC) with TSK gel Amide-80 column (2 mm x 150 mm, 5 μm; Tosoh Bioscience). One-minute fractions were collected between 10 and 22 min of the gradient. Three solvents were used for the gradient: buffer D (90% acetonitrile); buffer E (80% acetonitrile and 0.005% trifluoroacetic acid) and buffer F (0.025% trifluoroacetic acid). The gradient used consists of a 100% buffer D at time = 0 min; 98 % of buffer E and 2 % of buffer F at time = 5 min; 82 % of buffer E and 18 % of buffer F at time = 15 min; and 5 % of buffer E and 95 % of buffer F from time = 25 to 27 min in a flow of 150 μl/min.

**MS Analysis**

Phosphopeptides were subjected to LC-MS/MS analysis using a Q-Exactive Orbitrap or an Orbitrap XL mass spectrometer.

**Mass Spectrometry Analysis and Data Acquisition**

HILIC fractions were dried in a SpeedVac, reconstituted in 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid and subjected to LC-MS/MS analysis using a 20-cm-long 125-μm inner- diameter column packed in-house with 3 μm C18 reversed-phase particles (Magic C18 AQ beads, Bruker). Separated peptides were electrosprayed into a Q- Exactive Orbitrap
mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Xcalibur 2.2 software (Thermo Fischer Scientific) was used for the data acquisition and the Q Exactive was operated in the data-dependent mode. Survey scans were acquired in the Orbitrap mass analyzer over the range of 380 to 2000 m/z with a mass resolution of 70,000 (at m/z 200). MS/MS spectra was performed selecting up to the 10 most abundant isotopes with a charge state $\geq 2$ within an isolation window of 2.0 m/z. Selected isotopes were fragmented by Higher-energy Collisional Dissociation (HCD) with normalized collision energies of 27 and the tandem mass spectra was acquired in the Orbitrap mass analyzer with a mass resolution of 17,500 (at m/z 200). Repeat sequencing of peptides was kept to a minimum by dynamic exclusion of the sequenced peptides for 30 seconds. Some analyses were performed in an Orbitrap XL mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) as previously described (Ohouo et al. 2013).

Peptide Identification and Quantitation

Raw MS/MS spectra were searched in a SORCERER (Sage N Research, Inc.) system using SEQUEST software and a composite yeast protein database, consisting of both the normal yeast protein sequences and their reversed protein sequences as a decoy to estimate the false discovery rate (FDR) in the search results. To increase the confidence of phosphopeptide identification, we performed a parallel search on Proteome Discoverer 1.4 software (Thermo Fisher Scientific) running SEQUEST and Percolator. Only phosphopeptides identified with high confidence in both SORCERER and Proteome discoverer/percolator searches were considered, which resulted in the complete elimination of any hits from the decoy database (FDR <
0.02%). Searching parameters included a semi-tryptic requirement, a mass accuracy of 15 ppm for the precursor ions, differential modification of 8.0142 daltons for lysine, 10.00827 daltons for arginine, 79.966331 daltons for phosphorylation of serine, threonine and tyrosine and a static mass modification of 57.021465 daltons for alkylated cysteine residues. XPRESS software, part of the Trans-Proteomic Pipeline (Seattle Proteome Center), was used to quantify all the identified peptides. The phosphorylation localization probabilities were determined using PhosphoRS within Proteome Discoverer (version 1.4.1.14, Thermo Fisher Scientific). All checkpoint-dependent phosphopeptides were manually inspected for phospho site assignment and quantitation. The mass spectrometry data have been deposited to the Peptide Atlas.

**Criteria for establishing kinase-dependency**

As we were interested in defining phospho-events that are highly-dependent on MEC1 and TEL1, we began by arbitrarily assigning a high cutoff value (> or = to 6-fold WT/mec1Δtel1Δ) to establish Mec1/Tel1-dependent events. This helped eliminate phospho events whose regulation is partially affected by the lack of MEC1 and TEL1 and that are more likely to reflect indirect events. In addition, by establishing a high cutoff for defining MEC1/TEL1-dependent events, we were able to employ a low cutoff for defining Rad53-dependent events (which are already highly pre-filtered by the high cutoff in MEC1/TEL1). Furthermore, as the high cutoff was previously used to stringently assign Mec1/Tel1-dependent events, we were also able to apply a rather lower cutoff of > or = to 2.5 fold to
establish which phosphopeptides were highly dependent on either Mec1 or Tel1. Briefly, the following criteria was used for assigning Mec1/Tel1-dependent phosphopeptides: (1) At least 6-fold increase in phosphopeptide abundance in WT relative to mec1Δtel1Δ cells. (2) For Mec1 or Tel1 we established a threshold of 2.5-fold increase in WT relative to mec1Δ or tel1Δ cells. (3) For Rad53- dependent phosphopeptides, we established a threshold of 2-fold increase in abundance in WT relative to rad53Δ cells. (4) Moreover, to be considered a Mec1/Tel1-dependent substrate, each phosphopeptide must be Mec1/Tel1- dependent but not Rad53-dependent and to be considered a Rad53- dependent substrate, each phosphopeptide has to be Mec1/Tel1-dependent and Rad53- dependent substrate. (4) Finally, we considered only phosphopeptides identified in at least 2 biological replicates.

**Fold change calculation and QMAPS generation**

Fold change calculation and QMAPS generation were done using custom-designed web tool. The web tool allowed upload of data files generated by the SORCERER software. Using this data, it calculated the normalized protein/peptide abundances and appropriate abundance ratios. These fold changes were used to generate QMAPS using Matlab (Mathworks). To generate the QMAPS, results of the phosphoproteome analysis were filtered using a list of kinase checkpoint-dependent phosphopeptides identified in this study. For each QMAPS, we considered phosphopeptides that were identified at least 3 times in 2 biological replicates. Phosphopeptides plotted on the QMAPS were manually inspected for phospho site assignment and quantitation.
**Immunoprecipitation (IP) followed by IMAC**

For immunoprecipitation (IP), cell cultures were collected at 25, 30, 35 and 45 minutes after release from alpha factor-arrested into S-phase. Cells collected at 25, 30 and 35 minutes were cultured in “light” media while cells collected at 45 minutes were cultured in “heavy” media. Cell pellet was lysed by bead beating at 4°C in lysis buffer containing 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 0.2% Tergitol, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM EDTA, 1 mM PMSF, Complete, EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Roche), 5 mM sodium fluoride and 10 mM β-glycerophosphate. After adjusting protein concentrations to about 5 mg/ml, lysates were incubated with either EZviewTM Red Anti-FLAG M2 agarose (Sigma) or acetyl lysine antibody agarose (Immunechem) for 2–3 h at 4°C. After three washes in lysis buffer, bound proteins were eluted with three resin volumes of elution buffer containing 100 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 1% SDS. Eluted proteins from “light” or “heavy” medium were combined accordingly, reduced, alkylated and precipitated with three volumes of a solution containing 50% acetone and 50% ethanol. Proteins were solubilized in a solution of 2 M urea and 12 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0 and then trypsinized O.N. at 37°C with 1μg of Trypsin Gold (Promega). For acetylation analysis of histone H3, samples were desalted with a Sep-Pak C18 column (Waters), dried in a SpeedVac evaporator and resuspended in 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid. For phosphorylation analysis of Mec1 and Rfa1, samples were loaded in a tip column containing 15μl of immobilized metal affinity chromatography (IMAC) resin. After loading, the IMAC resin was washed with 1 column volume of 25% acetonitrile, 100mM NaCl, and 0.1% acetic acid solution followed by 1 column volume of deionized water and finally, eluted with 3 column
volumes of 12% ammonia and 10% acetonitrile solution. Samples were dried in a SpeedVac, and resuspended in 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid. Samples were subjected to LC-MS/MS quantitation analysis.
Figure A.1. Proteome-Wide Identification of Mec1/Tel1-Dependent Phosphorylation Events Using Quantitative MS (A) Identification of Mec1/Tel1-dependent phosphopeptides (cells treated with 0.2M HU or 0.04% MMS). Orange dots correspond to 238 Mec1/Tel1-dependent phosphopeptides. See text for details. (B) Mec1/Tel1- and Rad53-dependent phosphorylation events (light orange shade) are biased toward the S/T-c (red) and S/T-X-c (purple) motifs. (C) Mec1/Tel1-dependent and Rad53-independent phosphorylation events (light orange shade) are biased toward the S/T-Q motif (blue). (D and E) The phosphoproteome of WT cells was compared to the phosphoproteome of mec1Δ or tel1Δ cells (all cells treated with 0.04% MMS) and phosphopeptides carrying phosphorylation in the S/T-Q motif were categorized according to the observed change in abundance. Dotted red lines represent the established cutoff of 3-fold increase in WT relative to mec1Δ or tel1Δ cells. (F) Examples of phosphopeptides of each of the indicated groups. Data are represented as fold change in phosphopeptide abundance; log2 ± SEM (n R 2). See also Table S1.
Figure A.2. Quantitative Analysis of Mec1/Tel1-Dependent Phosphorylation during Normal DNA Replication (A) QMAPS showing the relative abundance of phosphopeptides categorized according to results from Figure 1. Phosphopeptides carrying Mec1 autophosphorylation or Mec1-dependent Rad53 phosphorylation are indicated in gray. a-factor arrested cells were released from arrest in normal SILAC media or SILAC media containing 0.1 M HU for 45 min. Abscissa indicates fold change in phosphopeptide abundance (linear scale) between S-phase cells treated with 0.1 M HU and untreated. (B) Protein extracts were prepared from WT cells at indicated times after release from a-factor-arrest into fresh media. Mec1 (and Mec1-associated Rfa1) was pulled down, and phosphopeptides containing Mec1 autophosphorylation at S38 and Rfa1 phosphorylation at S178 were monitored by quantitative MS analysis. FACS analysis and H3K56 acetylation were used as positive controls for DNA replication progression while acetylation of H3K19 was used as a constitutive control. Data are represented as mean ± SEM (n R 2). (C) FACS analysis and budding index of WT and clb5Δ clb6Δ mutant cells following a-factor arrest and release in drug-free SILAC media. (D) QMAPS showing the relative abundance of phosphopeptides carrying
Mec1/Tel1-dependent S/T-Q motifs. Indicated cells were released from α-factor arrest in drug-free SILAC media for 35 min. For all the QMAPS in Figure 2, each dot corresponds to a different phosphopeptide identified at least three times in two independent biological replicates. See also Table S2.
Figure A.3. Importance of Dna2 and Ddc1 for Replication-Correlated Mode of Mec1 Activation

(A) QMAPS showing the relative abundance of phosphopeptides carrying Mec1/Tel1-dependent S/T Q motifs. WT, dna2-AA, ddc1Δ, and dna2-AA ddc1Δ cells were released from α-factor arrest in SILAC media for 45 min. See also Table S3.
(B) Effects of the dna2-AA mutation on accumulation of gross-chromosomal rearrangements in Ddc1 and Tel1 defective mutants. All strains are sml1Δ. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals (CI).
Figure A.4. Dna2 and Ddc1 Are Not Essential for Mec1 Activation during Replication Stress

(A) QMAPS analysis comparing WT and indicated mutant cells. Cells were arrested with a-factor and released from arrest in SILAC media containing 0.04% MMS for 45 min. See also Table S4.

(B) 5-fold serial dilutions of indicated cells with smlΔ background were plated on YPD plates containing indicated drugs and incubated at 30 C for 48 hr.

(C) Meiotic tetrads from a DNA2/dna-AA DDC1/ddc1Δ TEL1/te1Δ SML1/smlΔ diploid strain were dissected on YPD plates and incubated at 30 C for 72 hr.

(D) 4-fold serial dilutions of indicated cells were plated on YPD plates and incubated at 30 C for 36 hr.

(E) Model depicting distinct modes of Mec1 action during DNA replication. See text in the discussion. Blue arrows correspond to newly synthesized DNA strands.
Figure A.S1, Related to Figure 1.
(A) Diagram comparing abundance changes between Mec1/Tel1-dependent and Mec1/Tel1-independent phosphopeptides. From 142 proteins found to have a Mec1/Tel1-dependent phosphorylation we found 92 representative Mec1/Tel1-independent phosphopeptides. Red and blue bars correspond to Mec1/Tel1-dependent phosphopeptides containing S/T-Q or S/T-ψ motifs, respectively. Black bars correspond to Mec1/Tel1-independent phosphopeptides. Dotted line represents the 6-fold threshold to establish Mec1/Tel1-dependent events. For detailed information see Supplemental Table S1. Dotted rectangles highlight Rad9 and Rtt107 phosphopeptides. (B) Representative examples for Rad9 and Rtt107 showing the abundance changes of theirs Mec1/Tel1-dependent and independent phosphopeptides.
Figure A.S2, Related to Figure 2: QMAPS comparing wild-type vs pph3Δptc2Δptc3Δ mutant cells. Cells were released from α-factor arrest in SILAC media for 45 minutes. Abscissa shows relative fold change in phosphopeptide abundance (linear scale). Each dot corresponds to a different phosphopeptide identified at least 2 times out of 3 independent biological replicates.
Figure A.S3, Related to Figure 3: QMAPS comparing wild-type vs dna2-AA ddc1Δ mutant cells. Cells were released from α-factor arrest in SILAC media for 45 minutes. Abscissa shows relative fold change in phosphopeptide abundance (linear scale). Each dot corresponds to a different phosphopeptide identified at least 2 times out of 3 independent biological replicates.
Table A.S1. All Quantified Phosphopeptides Related to Figure 1 Separate Excel file
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2015.01.043.

Table A.S2. QMAPS Related to Figure 2 Separate Excel file
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2015.01.043.

Table A.S3. QMAPS Related to Figure 3 Separate Excel file
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2015.01.043.

Table A.S4. QMAPS Related to Figure 4 Separate Excel file
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2015.01.043.
Table A.S5: Yeast strains used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain ID</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KHSY4729</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, ddc1::HIS3, sml1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY4732</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, ddc1::HIS3, sml1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5024</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sml1::TRP1, tel1::natMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5025</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sml1::TRP1, tel1::natMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5027</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sml1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5028</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, dna2-WY-AAA::kanMX6, sml1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY5035</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, dna2-WY-AAA::kanMX6, sml1::TRP1, tel1::natMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHSY4726</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, leu2Δ1, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, hxt13::URA3, sml1::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS164</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1-63, his3-200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRP1, bar1::HIS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS188</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1-63, his3-200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRP1, bar1::HIS3, rad53::URA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS189</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1-63, his3-200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRP1, bar1::HIS3, mec1::URA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS1964</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRP1, bar1::HIS3, ddc1::kanMX6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS2035</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1-63, his3-200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRP1, bar1::HIS3, ddc1::kanMX6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS2042</td>
<td>ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRIP1, bar1::HIS3, ura3::URA3, ddc1::kanMX6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS2220</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRIP1, ddc1::HIS3, bar1::URA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS2223</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1Δ63, his3Δ200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRIP1, DNA2 WY-AAA::kanMX6, ddc1::HIS3, bar1::URA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS2411</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1-63, his3-200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRIP1, bar1::HIS3, mec1::URA3, pph3::kanMX6, ptc2::URA3, ptc3::natMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS2653</td>
<td>ura3-52, trp1-63, his3-200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, YEL069C::URA3, DNA2 WY-AAA::kanMX6, ddc1::HIS3, DPB11(aa1-600)::TRP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS2564</td>
<td>MATa, ura3-52, leu2Δ1, trp1-63, his3-200, lys2ΔBgl, hom3-10, ade2Δ1, ade8, arg4Δ, sml1::TRP1, bar1::HIS3, clb5::URA3, clb6::kanMX6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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