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Nearly half of the human genome consists of repetitive DNA, and these sequences are a threat to genome stability because of their potential to recombine. The work presented here centers on two pathways that contribute to genome stability by ensuring the efficiency and fidelity of homologous recombination processes: 3’ nonhomologous tail removal by the Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 endonuclease complex, and heteroduplex rejection by the Msh2-Msh6 mismatch recognition complex and the Sgs1 helicase.

To study the coordination of checkpoint signaling and enzymatic repair functions during repair of a single chromosomal break, mating type switching was monitored in *S. cerevisiae* strains defective for the Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 3’ endonuclease complex. Mutant strains displayed *RAD9* and *MAD2*-dependent cell cycle delays and decreased viability during mating type switching. In particular, these mutants defective for Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 exhibited a unique pattern of dead and switched daughter cells arising from the same DSB-containing cell. Thus, Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 promotes efficient repair during gene conversion events involving a single 3’ nonhomologous tail, and it is proposed that the *rad1Δ* and *slx4Δ* mutant phenotypes result from inefficient repair of a lesion at the *MAT* locus that is bypassed by replication-mediated repair.

DNA mismatch repair proteins actively inhibit recombination between divergent sequences while allowing recombination between identical substrates. This
process, known as heteroduplex rejection, is thought to occur when the Msh2-Msh6 DNA mismatch recognition complex recognizes and binds to mismatches in heteroduplex DNA, and either recruits or stimulates the Sgs1 helicase to unwind inappropriate recombination intermediates. Purification of the Msh2-Msh6 complex and a soluble fragment of Sgs1, Sgs1_{400-1268}, in this study allowed characterization of their physical and functional interactions \textit{in vitro}. Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1_{400-1268} physically interact as demonstrated in coimmunoprecipitation experiments, and Msh2-Msh6 appears to inhibit Sgs1-dependent unwinding of short 3’ overhang substrates. Studies of the effect of Msh2-Msh6 on Sgs1 helicase activity are ongoing.

Together, this work contributes to our molecular understanding of how recombination events are both regulated and carried out, as well as how defects in these DNA repair genes contribute to a variety of disease states in humans.
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CHAPTER 1

A tale of tails: Insights into the coordination of 3’ end processing during homologous recombination

Amy M. Lyndaker and Eric Alani
Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-2703

This chapter is in press for publication in for the March 2009 issue of Bioessays:

Abstract

Eukaryotic genomes harbor a large number of homologous repeat sequences that are capable of recombining. Their potential to disrupt genome stability highlights the need to understand how homologous recombination processes are coordinated. The *S. cerevisiae* Rad1-Rad10 endonuclease performs an essential role in recombination between repeated sequences by processing 3’ single-stranded intermediates formed during single-strand annealing and gene conversion events. Several recent studies have focused on factors involved in Rad1-Rad10-dependent removal of 3’ nonhomologous tails during homologous recombination, including Msh2-Msh3, Slx4, and the newly identified Saw1 protein (Surtees and Alani 2006; Flott *et al.* 2007; Li *et al.* 2008; Lyndaker *et al.* 2008). Together, this new work provides a model for how Rad1-Rad10-dependent end processing is coordinated: Msh2-Msh3 stabilizes and prepares double-strand/single-strand junctions for Rad1-Rad10 cleavage, Saw1 recruits Rad1-Rad10 to 3’ tails, and Slx4 mediates crosstalk between the DNA damage checkpoint machinery and Rad1-Rad10.
Introduction

Homologous stretches of DNA sequence scattered throughout the genome are a threat to genome stability because of their potential to recombine. It is estimated that nearly half of the human genome consists of repetitive DNA (Lander et al. 2001; Li et al. 2001), and genome rearrangements caused by recombination between repeats are known to contribute to a variety of human diseases, including many cancers (Strout et al. 1998; Deininger and Batzer 1999; Stenger et al. 2001; Kolomietz et al. 2002; Hedges and Deininger 2007; Mattarucchi et al. 2008). Repetitive sequences such as Alu elements are particularly susceptible to non-conservative homologous recombination via single-strand annealing (SSA), which results in the deletion of sequences located between the repeats and can mediate large-scale genome rearrangements (Pâques and Haber 1999; Symington 2002; Elliott et al. 2005; Hedges and Deininger 2007; VanHulle et al. 2007; Mattarucchi et al. 2008; Wang and Baumann 2008). The abundance of such repeated sequences in the human genome that are prone to mutagenic recombination underscores the need for a comprehensive understanding of the homologous recombination mechanisms that act on them.

SSA is a major recombination pathway for repairing spontaneous and induced double-strand breaks (DSBs) that arise between repeated sequences (Liang et al. 1998; Pâques and Haber 1999; Elliott et al. 2005). Recent work suggests that SSA not only creates deletions between flanking direct repeats, but also contributes to inverted repeat recombination, gene targeting, translocation formation, and chromosome fusions (VanHulle et al. 2007; Gao et al. 2008; Pannunzio et al. 2008; Wang and Baumann 2008). During SSA in S. cerevisiae, DSBs are resected 5’ to 3’ to reveal single-stranded homologous sequences (Figure 1.1). Following Rad52- and Rad59-dependent annealing of the homologous sequences, the 3’ single-stranded DNA ends
are nonhomologous to the new flanking regions, and must be cleaved in order to complete repair of the broken strands. The Rad1-Rad10 endonuclease and Msh2-Msh3 mismatch recognition complex are required for cleaving 3’ single-stranded nonhomologous tails on either side of the annealed region (Fishman-Lobell and Haber 1992; Bardwell et al. 1994; Ivanov and Haber 1995; Sugawara et al. 1997; Ciccia et al. 2008) and Rad59 and Srs2 have also been implicated in the 3’ nonhomologous tail removal step (Pâques and Haber 1997; Sugawara et al. 2000). Once both 3’ tails have been removed, SSA is completed by DNA synthesis initiated off of the newly cleaved 3’ ends, followed by ligation (reviewed in Pâques and Haber 1999). It should be noted that if a DSB is formed within a repeated sequence, SSA may involve removal of only one 3’ tail.

Rad1-Rad10 and its mammalian homolog, XPF-ERCC1, are structure-specific endonucleases that function in both nucleotide excision repair (NER) and homologous recombination (Pâques and Haber 1999; Prakash and Prakash 2000; Symington 2002; Niedernhofer et al. 2004; Al-Minawi et al. 2008; Ciccia et al. 2008). The significance of the role of these complexes in recombination is demonstrated by the severe developmental abnormalities in mice lacking ERCC1, which, unlike NER mutant phenotypes, include severe running, reduced liver function, and death before weaning (McWhir et al. 1993; Weeda et al. 1997). A recently described human patient with ERCC1 deficiency also exhibited severe fetal development defects that are clearly distinct from NER-related phenotypes (Jaspers et al. 2007). In yeast, the absence of Rad1-Rad10 leads to cell death or plasmid loss (depending on the assay) during recombination by SSA due to lack of repair, since 3’ nonhomologous tail removal is an essential step in SSA (Fishman-Lobell and Haber 1992; Sugawara et al. 1997). Several recent papers have highlighted factors involved in Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during homologous recombination in S. cerevisiae
Figure 1.1. Single-strand annealing mechanism of double-strand break (DSB) repair between repeated sequences. DSBs that arise between repeated sequences are resected by 5’ to 3’ exonuclease activity, and the single-stranded DNA is annealed at regions of homology. Pairing of these sequences reveals 3’ nonhomologous tails on either side of the intermediate that are cleaved off in a Rad1-Rad10- and Msh2-Msh3-dependent manner. Removal of the 3’ nonhomologous ends allows initiation of repair synthesis to produce final recombinant products.
(Surtees and Alani 2006; Flott et al. 2007; Li et al. 2008; Lyndaker et al. 2008), and it is these non-NER functions of Rad1-Rad10 that are reviewed here. The role of Rad1-Rad10 in nucleotide excision repair has been reviewed elsewhere (Prakash and Prakash 2000; Ciccia et al. 2008).

Homologous recombination by gene conversion also involves the removal of 3’ nonhomologous tails. Most mitotic gene conversion events are thought to occur by a synthesis-dependent strand annealing mechanism (Figure 1.2; Pâques and Haber 1999; Symington 2002; Ira et al. 2006). During such gene conversion events, the DSB is resected 5’ to 3’, and one of the 3’ ends undergoes Rad51-mediated strand invasion into a duplex region of DNA containing a homologous sequence (Figure 1.2A). DNA synthesis initiating from the 3’ invading strand allows for copying of DNA sequence from the donor template, and unwinding of the invading strand from the donor template allows it to anneal back to its native locus. The non-invading strand is then able to be repaired using the invading strand as a template (reviewed in Pâques and Haber 1999; Symington 2002).

Rad1-Rad10-dependent nonhomologous tail removal during gene conversion can occur during the strand invasion step as well as after annealing, depending on whether one or both 3’ ends contain nonhomology with respect to the donor locus. If both sides of a DSB are nonhomologous to the donor (Figure 1.2B), the invading strand contains a 3’ nonhomologous tail that must be removed in order to prime repair synthesis off of the donor. When nonhomologous sequence resides on only one side of a DSB (Figure 1.2A), the 3’ end of the break that shares homology with the donor sequence performs the strand invasion step, and there is thus no barrier to initiate new DNA synthesis on the invading strand.
Figure 1.2. Synthesis-dependent strand annealing mechanism of gene conversion involving the removal of either one (A) or two (B) 3’ nonhomologous tails. A. After DSB formation and 5’ to 3’ resection, one 3’ end invades a donor locus containing a homologous sequence. DNA synthesis is primed from this invading 3’ end and copies the donor sequence, and unwinding of this strand allows it to reanneal to its native locus. When the newly repaired strand differs in sequence from the original sequence, a 3’ nonhomologous tail remains at the non-invading strand. Removal of this 3’ tail involves Rad1-Rad10 and Slx4, but not Msh2-Msh3. 3’ nonhomologous tail removal allows for completion of repair by gene conversion. B. If nonhomologous sequence flanks both sides of a DSB, the 3’ invading strand must also be processed in order for strand invasion to be productive. 3’ nonhomologous tail removal on the invading strand requires both the Rad1-Rad10 and Msh2-Msh3 complexes, and presumably Slx4. After 3’ tail removal, gene conversion proceeds via synthesis-dependent strand annealing as described in A.
Differential requirements for Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during gene conversion

The requirement for Rad1-Rad10 during gene conversion depends on both the number and length of nonhomologous tails. Rad1-Rad10 is critical for gene conversion when both ends of a DSB contain 30 or more nucleotides of nonhomologous sequence (Pâques and Haber 1997; Sugawara et al. 1997; Colaiácovo et al. 1999; Lyndaker et al. 2008), but DSB repair is more subtly reduced in rad1Δ mutants when only one nonhomologous tail is present (Colaiácovo et al. 1999; Holmes and Haber 1999; Lyndaker et al. 2008). The differential requirement for Rad1-Rad10 during gene conversion when one or two ends of a DSB contain nonhomology has been ascribed to the structural nature of the DNA junctions. The initial invasion of 3’ single-stranded DNA into a homologous duplex is proposed to create an unstable paranemic joint, which might be a better substrate for Rad1-Rad10 (Sugawara et al. 1997). In contrast, when nonhomologous sequence is only on one side of a DSB, the homologous 3’ end can perform strand invasion, leaving the nonhomologous tail on the second, non-invading end (Figure 1.2A). The sequence adjacent to this nonhomologous 3’ end would likely form a stable plectonemic joint, since the rest of the strand can fully base pair. It is possible that Rad1-Rad10 is minimally required when only one nonhomologous tail is present because plectonemic joints are not ideal substrates for Rad1-Rad10, and/or Rad1-Rad10 is only one of a host of other factors that process these types of structures.

When 3’ nonhomologous tails are only 10 nucleotides in length, gene conversion remains efficient in the absence of RAD1, MSH2, or MSH3, and the short 3’ tails are removed by the proofreading 3’ to 5’ exonuclease activity of Polymerase δ (Pâques and Haber 1997). A second Rad1-Rad10- and Msh2-Msh3-independent
pathway of 3’ nonhomologous tail removal is proposed to exist (Ivanov and Haber 1995; Pâques and Haber 1997; Holmes and Haber 1999; Lyndaker et al. 2008), though the inefficiency of this proposed pathway suggests that Rad1-Rad10-dependent end processing is preferred. There is no evidence that known factors play a role in this backup pathway of nonhomologous tail removal, as neither Mus81-Mms4 nor the proofreading activities of Pol δ and Pol ε appear to contribute (Pâques and Haber 1997; Lyndaker et al. 2008). Replication of partially repaired recombination intermediates might also bypass the requirement for 3’ nonhomologous tail removal (Kang and Symington 2000; Lyndaker et al. 2008).

**Msh2-Msh3 facilitates Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal**

The Msh2-Msh3 DNA mismatch recognition complex functions in Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ end processing during homologous recombination (Figures 1.1, 1.2B; (Saparbaev et al. 1996; Pâques and Haber 1997; Sugawara et al. 1997; Colaiácovo et al. 1999; Evans et al. 2000). Msh2-Msh3 specifically recognizes insertion/deletion loops of up to 17 base pairs in DNA mismatch repair (Habraken et al. 1996; Sia et al. 1997; Jensen et al. 2005). During homologous recombination, Msh2-Msh3 is proposed to act in the recognition and stabilization of 3’ tails at the junction of double-stranded and single-stranded DNA to aid in either the recruitment or cleavage activity of Rad1-Rad10 (Sugawara et al. 1997; Bertrand et al. 1998; Studamire et al. 1999; Langston and Symington 2005). A similar mechanism involving Msh2-Msh3 and Rad1-Rad10 also functions to remove large loops during meiosis (Kirkpatrick and Petes 1997; Kearney et al. 2001; Jensen et al. 2005). Consistent with its role in 3’ tail removal, an *in vitro* DNA binding study showed that purified Msh2-Msh3 binds specifically to branched DNA substrates containing 3’
single-stranded ends, with an affinity comparable to that of its binding to +8 mismatch loops (Surtees and Alani 2006). Msh2-Msh3 appears to bind asymmetrically around double-strand/single-strand junctions, and binding opens the conformation of the junction slightly, potentially to facilitate Rad1-Rad10-dependent cleavage of 3’ tails (Surtees and Alani 2006).

Msh2 physically interacts with both Rad1 and Rad10 independently of other mismatch repair factors (Bertrand et al. 1998), and no other mismatch repair factors are required for Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ end processing besides Msh2-Msh3 (Saparbaev et al. 1996; Sugawara et al. 1997; Langston and Symington 2005). The role of Msh2-Msh3 in nonhomologous tail removal during recombination can be distinguished from its role in DNA mismatch repair, since mutations have been isolated in MSH2 that disrupt mismatch repair but are functional for recombination (Studamire et al. 1999). Msh2 localizes rapidly to DSBs flanked by nonhomologous sequence on chromosomal and plasmid substrates (Evans et al. 2000; Goldfarb and Alani 2004; Lyndaker et al. 2008), and Msh2 and Msh3 have been reported to physically interact with subunits of the single-strand binding protein RPA (Gavin et al. 2002; Gavin et al. 2006; Krogan et al. 2006). Together these data support a very early role for the Msh2-Msh3 complex in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal that might aid in 3’ tail recognition.

Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ end processing does not always require Msh2-Msh3. During SSA, the requirement for Msh2-Msh3 depends upon the length of the annealed region. Strains lacking MSH2 or MSH3 are defective in SSA when the annealed region is only 205 bp, but show only a small reduction in repair relative to wild-type when the annealed region is more than 1 kb (Sugawara et al. 1997). Decreased dependence on Msh2-Msh3 is also observed with larger loop sizes during Rad1-Rad10-dependent meiotic loop repair (Kearney et al. 2001). Despite a predicted
role and clear localization of Msh2 to DSBs, Msh2-Msh3 is also dispensable for gene conversion during mating type switching, where Rad1-Rad10 plays a significant role (Lyndaker et al. 2008). Only when nonhomologous sequence is inserted on the invading strand does the role of Msh2-Msh3 in Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal become apparent (Lyndaker et al. 2008). Altogether, these results support the idea that Msh2-Msh3 plays a role in stabilizing 3’ tail intermediates in preparation for Rad1-Rad10-dependent cleavage. Recent work has shown differential roles, with respect to repeat size, for the Rad59 and Rad52 strand annealing factors in SSA. More specifically, Rad59 plays a greater role in SSA involving short repeats (Pannunzio et al. 2008). It will be interesting to see whether the requirement for Msh2-Msh3 in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal correlates with Rad59 dependence, or whether its role depends only on the stability of the annealed DNA intermediate.

**Slx4 is a critical component of the Rad1-Rad10 3’ tail removal pathway**

Recent work by Flott et al. (2007) identified Slx4 as an essential component of the Rad1-Rad10 3’ nonhomologous tail removal pathway. Slx4 was initially characterized as a subunit of the Slx1-Slx4 endonuclease, deletion of which is synthetically lethal with sgs1Δ (Mullen et al. 2001). Slx1-Slx4 is a 5’ flap endonuclease, of which Slx1 is thought to be the catalytic subunit (Fricke and Brill 2003). In addition to its function as a heterodimer with Slx1, Slx4 appears to have at least two other separate functions, one involving Rad1-Rad10, and another that is independent of both Slx1 and Rad1-Rad10 and promotes cellular resistance to MMS (Ito et al. 2001; Roberts et al. 2006; Flott et al. 2007; Li et al. 2008). A screen for mutants defective in SSA recently found that slx4Δ mutants are blocked at the 3’ tail
removal step of SSA (Li et al. 2008), and Slx4 was found to play an important role during mating type switching in the same pathway as the Rad1-Rad10 complex (Lyndaker et al. 2008). Additionally, the Flott et al. study found that at least three residues on Slx4 are directly phosphorylated by the Mec1 and Tel1 checkpoint kinases, and that this phosphorylation is essential for the SSA functions of Slx4 but not for resistance to MMS or viability in sgs1Δ mutants (Flott and Rouse 2005; Flott et al. 2007).

These new findings support a model in which Slx4 is acted upon directly by the checkpoint machinery in response to DSBs to recruit or activate Rad1-Rad10 and promote 3’ nonhomologous tail removal. The DNA damage response is thought to be activated during SSA because of the relatively slow kinetics of repair and the extensive resection required. Since phosphorylation of Slx4 is absolutely essential for 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during SSA but is dispensable for its other functions (Flott et al. 2007), this phosphorylation is likely to provide the specificity to channel Slx4 to its recombination function.

While gene conversion involving a single 3’ nonhomologous tail does not require checkpoint activation, recent work has shown that rad1Δ and slx4Δ mutants exhibit RAD9- and MAD2-dependent checkpoint activation during mating type switching, a single-nonhomology gene conversion event (Lyndaker et al. 2008). It is possible that the recruitment or activity of Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 is required to turn off the DNA damage checkpoint by signaling that repair is proceeding normally.

Slx4 is not required for checkpoint activation, but provides a crucial link between DNA damage sensing and activation of DNA repair. Slx4, but not its endonuclease partner Slx1, is required for the repair of alkylation damage (Flott and Rouse 2005). In addition to SSA, Slx4 is phosphorylated in a Mec1/Tel1-dependent manner in response to a variety of DNA-damaging agents, including MMS,
camptothecin, hydroxyurea, ionizing radiation, and the UV mimetic 4-NQO, and is required for efficient DNA repair throughout the cell cycle (Flott and Rouse 2005). Thus, it appears that Slx4 plays a critical role in the response to many types of DNA damage, and the strict requirement for its checkpoint-dependent phosphorylation in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal provides a beautiful example of how DNA damage sensed by the checkpoint machinery directly promotes DNA repair.

**Saw1 is a component of the Rad1-Rad10 end-processing machinery**

The _SAW1_ (_YAL027W_) gene was recently identified in a microarray-based screen for mutants defective in SSA (Li _et al._ 2008). Saw1, for single-strand annealing weakened 1, physically interacts with Rad1-Rad10, Msh2-Msh3, and Rad52 (Gavin _et al._ 2002; Krogan _et al._ 2006; Li _et al._ 2008), all of which function in SSA, and like slx4Δ mutants, saw1Δ mutants are defective specifically in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal (Li _et al._ 2008). Li _et al._ found that the Rad1 protein fails to localize to SSA intermediates in saw1Δ mutants, and _saw1Δ18-24_ mutants, whose mutant Saw1 protein fails interact with Rad1 but still interacts with Msh2 and Rad52, are completely defective in SSA (2008). These new findings provide strong evidence that Saw1 recruits Rad1-Rad10 to recombination intermediates containing Rad52.

Rad14 is thought to target Rad1-Rad10 to its substrates during NER (Guzder _et al._ 1996; Prakash and Prakash 2000; Guzder _et al._ 2006), but it has been unclear how Rad1-Rad10 is targeted to 3’ tails during recombination, especially since Msh2-Msh3 is dispensable for some gene conversion and SSA events. In human cell-free extracts, Rad52 and the Rad1-Rad10 homolog XPF-ERCC1 stably associate through interaction of XPF with the N-terminus of Rad52 (Motycka _et al._ 2004). This physical interaction stimulates the endonuclease activity of XPF-ERCC1 and attenuates the
strand annealing activity of Rad52, both of which promote the removal of 3’ tails from recombination intermediates (Motycka et al. 2004). Though an equivalent interaction between Rad1-Rad10 and Rad52 has not been observed, it appears that Saw1 provides this physical interaction in *S. cerevisiae* (Li et al. 2008). These new findings reveal how Saw1, and potentially Slx4, may recruit and regulate Rad1-Rad10 and 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during homologous recombination.

**Conclusions: A comprehensive model for Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during SSA**

The new findings reviewed here provide a more comprehensive understanding of how Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ end processing is coordinated during homologous recombination. As shown in Figure 1.3, resection of DSBs during SSA creates 3’ single-stranded tails that are coated by the RPA single-stranded DNA binding protein. The extensive single-stranded DNA activates the DNA damage response, which promotes phosphorylation of Slx4 by the Mec1 and Tel1 checkpoint kinases. Once resection has revealed regions of homology, the Rad52 strand annealing protein anneals the homologous sequences, creating 3’ nonhomologous tails on either side of the intermediate. When the length of homology is limited and creates an unstable paranemic intermediate, Msh2-Msh3 stabilizes the junction and slightly opens it to create a more suitable substrate for Rad1-Rad10 cleavage. Saw1 recruits Rad1-Rad10 to Rad52-containing annealed sequences at double-strand/single-strand junctions bound by Msh2-Msh3. Phosphorylated Slx4 binds to Rad1-Rad10, but does not appear to interact with Rad52, Saw1, or Msh2-Msh3. The result of these physical interactions is the positioning of Rad1-Rad10 at the double-strand/single-strand
Figure 1.3. Model for coordination of 3’ nonhomologous tail removal factors during single-strand annealing. Following DSB formation, 5’ to 3’ resection creates single-stranded DNA that is coated by RPA. This process also signals to the Mec1 and Tel1 checkpoint kinases which, once activated, phosphorylate Slx4. The Rad52 strand annealing protein facilitates pairing of the homologous sequences, displacing RPA from the annealed regions. The Msh2-Msh3 complex recognizes the junction of double-stranded and 3’ single-stranded DNA, potentially interacting with RPA, and opens the DNA junction slightly to create a better substrate for Rad1-Rad10 cleavage. The Saw1 protein recruits Rad1-Rad10 endonuclease to the junction of Rad52- and Msh2-Msh3-containing DNA, and association of Rad1-Rad10 with phosphorylated Slx4 allows it to cleave the DNA near the double-strand/single-strand junction, freeing the 3’ nonhomologous tail.
junction between Saw1 and Slx4. Rad1-Rad10 cleaves the strand near the junction, removing the 3’ nonhomologous tail and providing a free 3’ hydroxyl for extension by DNA polymerases. Though this model is drawn for SSA, it is also applicable to gene conversion, with the differences being the additional presence of Rad51 and differential requirements for Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 and Msh2-Msh3 for one versus two 3’ nonhomologous tails.

It is not clear whether these physically interacting factors arrive at recombination intermediates in a sequential fashion, or whether a stable complex of Saw1-Msh2-Msh3-Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 exists in vivo and is simply recruited to Rad52-containing DNA, perhaps in response to Slx4 phosphorylation by Mec1/Tel1. It is striking that saw1Δ and slx4Δ mutants exhibit opposing phenotypes with regard to rDNA stability (Li et al. 2008), so additional work is needed to understand the distinct functions of Slx4 and Saw1 in recombination and how they relate to coordination of Rad1-Rad10 3’ tail cleavage. It will be interesting to identify the critical function of Slx4 in this process, whether it is primarily to transmit a repair signal from the DNA damage checkpoint or whether there are additional roles in recruiting, positioning, or activating the endonuclease activity of Rad1-Rad10. While the findings reviewed here provide a clearer picture of how Rad1-Rad10 identifies and cleaves its substrates during recombination, many questions still remain. What is the physical activity of Saw1? How does Slx4 arrive at junctions containing 3’ tails? What is the function of phosphorylated Slx4? Why is Msh2-Msh3 essential in some cases and dispensable for others? Addressing these questions will edge us closer to understanding the link between DNA damage recognition, checkpoint signaling, and efficient DNA repair.
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Abstract

Efficient repair of DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) requires the coordination of checkpoint signaling and enzymatic repair functions. To study these processes during gene conversion at a single chromosomal break, we monitored mating type switching in *S. cerevisiae* strains defective in the Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 complex. Rad1-Rad10 is a structure-specific endonuclease that removes 3’ nonhomologous single-stranded ends that are generated during many recombination events. Slx4 is a known target of the DNA damage response that forms a complex with Rad1-Rad10 and is critical for 3’ end processing during repair of DSBs by single-strand annealing. We found that mutants lacking an intact Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 complex displayed RAD9- and MAD2-dependent cell cycle delays and decreased viability during mating type switching. In particular, these mutants exhibited a unique pattern of dead and switched daughter cells arising from the same DSB-containing cell. Furthermore, we observed that mutations in post-replicative lesion bypass factors (*mms2Δ, mph1Δ*) resulted in decreased viability during mating type switching, and conferred shorter cell cycle delays in *rad1Δ* mutants. We conclude that Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 promotes efficient repair during gene conversion events involving a single 3’ nonhomologous tail, and propose that the *rad1Δ* and *slx4Δ* mutant phenotypes result from inefficient repair of a lesion at the *MAT* locus that is bypassed by replication-mediated repair.
In the baker’s yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, spontaneous and induced DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) are primarily repaired by homologous recombination (reviewed in Pâques and Haber 1999). In the initial steps of repair, DSBs are acted upon by a 5’ to 3’ exonuclease activity to yield two 3’ single-stranded ends. These ends interact with RPA, Rad51, Rad52, Rad54, Rad55, and Rad57 to allow strand invasion into a homologous double-stranded donor sequence. DNA synthesis initiating from the 3’ invading end results in copying of DNA sequence from the donor locus, and recombination is completed either by resolution of a Holliday junction intermediate or by synthesis-dependent strand annealing (SDSA).

Homologous recombination can also occur by non-conservative mechanisms including single-strand annealing (SSA) and break-induced replication (BIR). During SSA, a DSB located between repeated sequences is processed by 5’ to 3’ exonuclease activity and the 3’ single-stranded ends anneal at homologous sequences, resulting in deletion of the intervening sequence. In BIR, strand invasion of one 3’ end into a homologous sequence is followed by replication that continues along the chromosome arm (reviewed in Pâques and Haber 1999).

Mating type switching in *S. cerevisiae* is a unidirectional gene conversion event in which a DSB created at the *MAT* locus is repaired using one of two silent mating type cassettes, *HMRα* or *HMLα* (reviewed in Haber 1998). This programmed recombination event is initiated by HO endonuclease cleavage within *MAT*, and donor preference is such that cells preferentially repair the DSB using the donor sequence of the opposite mating type (Wu and Haber 1995; Wu and Haber 1996; Wu et al. 1997; Haber 1998). Crossovers, which would lead to intrachromosomal deletions, are rarely associated with mating type switching (Klar and Strathern 1984), and mating type
switching is thought to occur by a SDSA mechanism (McGill et al. 1989; Haber 1998; Pâques and Haber 1999; Ira et al. 2006).

The HO cleavage site at the \textit{MAT} locus is located at the junction between homologous and nonhomologous sequence with respect to the donor cassette. Strand invasion is thought to be initiated by the 3' tail that is homologous to the donor sequence, leaving the second 3’ end as a nonhomologous tail following annealing of the repaired invading strand (Figure 2.1A). Thus, a single 3’ nonhomologous tail must be removed to complete repair. Previous genetic studies have shown that 3’ nonhomologous tail removal depends on the activity of the Rad1-Rad10 endonuclease, as well as the Msh2-Msh3 DNA mismatch recognition complex (Fishman-Lobell and Haber 1992; Ivanov and Haber 1995; Saparbaev et al. 1996; Kirkpatrick and Petes 1997; Sugawara et al. 1997).

Rad1-Rad10 is a structure-specific endonuclease that cleaves DNA at the junction of double-stranded and 3’ single-stranded DNA, and has been characterized in its role during nucleotide excision repair (NER) as well as in the removal of 3’ nonhomologous tails and blocked 3’ termini, including Top1-associated DNA (Sung et al. 1993; Bardwell et al. 1994; Vance and Wilson 2002; Guzder et al. 2004). The importance of Rad1-Rad10 for its non-NER DNA processing functions is highlighted by the fact that mice lacking the mammalian homolog of Rad1-Rad10, ERCC1-XPF, exhibit features of premature aging including very reduced lifespan (20-38 days), severe runting, and abnormalities of the liver, skin, kidney, and spleen, while mice lacking other NER factors develop normally and have a normal lifespan (McWhir et al. 1993; Weeda et al. 1997).

In plasmid-based studies, both Rad1-Rad10 and Msh2-Msh3 are required for recombinational repair when two 3’ nonhomologous tails are present (Sugawara et al. 1997; Colaiácovo et al. 1999). Repair events involving only one nonhomologous end
Figure 2.1. Synthesis-dependent strand annealing model for mating type switching in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (adapted from Pâques and Haber 1999). A. Only the *MATa* and *HMLα* loci are shown. Mating type switching is initiated by a DSB formed by HO endonuclease at the *MATa* locus near the Y/Z1 junction. This is followed by 5’ to 3’ resection to create 3’ single-stranded ends, and the 3’ end with homology to the *HMLα* donor sequence initiates strand invasion and primes DNA synthesis off of the donor template. Strand displacement from the donor sequence followed by annealing onto the broken chromosome results in the formation of a 3’ nonhomologous tail that must be excised prior to the subsequent DNA synthesis and ligation steps. Rad13Rad10-Slx4 is hypothesized to act in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal at this step. B. Mating type switching involving two nonhomologous ends due to insertion of *KANMX* sequence on the distal side of the break. A 3’ nonhomologous tail removal step is required to allow priming of DNA synthesis off of the invading strand. Repair then proceeds as above.
are also hypothesized to require Rad1-Rad10 and Msh2-Msh3, though a second, less efficient pathway involving the 3’ to 5’ proofreading activity of DNA Polymerase δ has been shown to remove 3’ ssDNA less than 30 nucleotides long (Pâques and Haber 1997; Colaiácovo et al. 1999). The Haber lab previously reported that mating type switching in G1-arrested cells is significantly less efficient in rad1Δ mutants, but stated no further defects (Holmes and Haber 1999).

Rad1-Rad10 and Msh2-Msh3 are also required during SSA, which involves two nonhomologous tails. The requirement for Msh2-Msh3 depends on the length of the annealed region; annealed regions greater than 1 kb in length are repaired independently of Msh2-Msh3. Thus, Msh2-Msh3 is thought act by binding and stabilizing the double-strand/single-strand junctions to promote Rad1-Rad10-dependent cleavage of 3’ ends (Sugawara et al. 1997; Pâques and Haber 1999). Consistent with this, in vitro biochemical studies have shown that purified Msh2-Msh3 binds specifically to double-strand/single-strand junctions and opens up the junction, possibly providing a more suitable substrate for Rad1-Rad10 cleavage (Surtees and Alani 2006). Recent work from Flott et al. (2007) has also implicated the Slx4 protein in Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal. The authors found that Slx4 forms a complex with Rad1-Rad10 that is mutually exclusive of the interaction with its endonuclease partner, Slx1. Slx4 was found to be required for Rad1-dependent DSB repair by single-strand annealing, presumably at the 3’ nonhomologous tail removal step (Flott et al. 2007).

A single unrepaired DSB is sufficient to trigger G2/M cell cycle arrest in S. cerevisiae (Sandell and Zakian 1993). Arrest at the G2/M transition can be elicited by the DNA damage or spindle checkpoints. While cell cycle checkpoints are not normally activated during mating type switching, the DNA damage response is activated in strains lacking both donor sequences which are thus unable to repair the
DSB by gene conversion (Pellicioli et al. 1999; Pellicioli et al. 2001; Lee et al. 2003). Activation of the DNA damage checkpoint has also been shown to occur during DSB repair at MAT when the donor locus is on a separate chromosome, most likely because the repair process takes longer to occur (Vaze et al. 2002). A role for the spindle checkpoint during mating type switching has not been reported.

In this study, we used a variety of techniques to examine the importance of the Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 complex in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during mating type switching. We show that mutants defective in the Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 complex exhibited a RAD9-dependent, partially MAD2-dependent cell cycle arrest and decreased cell survival during mating type switching. A third of rad1Δ and slx4Δ cells induced for mating type switching showed a unique viability profile during pedigree analysis, with one switched and one dead daughter cell arising from the same DSB-induced cell. We hypothesize that this phenotype arises from replication bypass of an inefficiently repaired DNA lesion at MAT. This work indicates that the Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 complex promotes the efficient repair of DSBs involving a single 3’ nonhomologous tail intermediate.

Materials and Methods

Strains and plasmids. All strains used in this study are shown in Table 2.1. Parental strains EAY745 (MATa to MATα), EAY 744 (MATa to MATa), and EAY742 (donorless) were created by single-step gene replacement with SphI- and PvuII-digested pEA1118 to integrate MSH2-HA4::LEU2 at the endogenous MSH2 locus in JKM161, JKM160, or JKM139, respectively, kindly provided by J. Haber. Insertion of the HA4 epitope into Msh2 did not disrupt gene function (Goldfarb and Alani 2004). All strains contain HO endonuclease gene under control of the galactose-
inducible *GAL10* promoter to allow for inducible mating type switching. To create the parental strain EAY1042 used in the double non-homology experiments (Figure 2.1; Appendix, Supplementary Figure 2.6; Table 2.1), EAY745 was transformed with a PCR-generated fragment containing 57 bp of *Ya* sequence proximal to the *MAT HO* cut site, 1428 bp of *KANMX* sequence (Wach *et al.* 1994), and 52 bp of sequence distal to the HO cut site. Integration of the *KANMX*-containing fragment (*MATa::KANMX4*) was confirmed by both PCR and Southern blot analysis. Yeast were transformed with the appropriate DNA fragments using the lithium acetate method (Gietz and Schiestl 1991), and integrations were confirmed by PCR followed by phenotype testing.

**Media and culture conditions.** For time course experiments, dilutions of stationary phase cultures were made in yeast-peptone (Difco) medium pH 6.8 containing 2% (w/v) lactate and grown at 30°C until mid-log phase (1-2 x 10^7 cells/ml). Cultures were induced with galactose (US Biological) to 2% (w/v) final concentration and samples were collected at relevant time points. *HO* expression was suppressed after 30 minutes by the addition of glucose (US Biological) to 2% (w/v) final concentration. To maintain a consistent number of cells at each time point throughout the time course, individual samples were diluted to the same cell density as the time zero sample.

**Cell survival assays.** Asynchronous cultures were grown to mid-log phase and induced with galactose for 30 minutes. Uninduced controls were diluted similarly with water. Both induced and uninduced cultures were diluted 2,500-fold and plated in triplicate on YPD plates immediately following the addition of glucose to the media. After growth for 3 days at 30°C, percent survival was calculated as the
Table 2.1. **Strains used in this study.** All strains used in this study are derived from JKM161, JKM160, and JKM139, kindly provided by J. Haber. Gene disruptions and mutant alleles were made by transforming *S. cerevisiae* strains with restriction-digested plasmids for rad1Δ, msh2Δ, msh3Δ, rad51Δ, and pol3-01 as listed above. All other disruptions were made by integrative transformation of PCR products generated by amplification of *KANMX* sequences either from plasmid pFA6-KanMX4 (Wach et al. 1994) or genomic DNA from the *Saccharomyces* Genome Deletion Project knockout strains (http://www-sequence.stanford.edu/group/yeast_deletion_project/deletions3.html). See Materials and Methods for details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Strain notes and deletion constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATa to MATα</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY745</td>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td>Derived from JKM161 (Δho, HMLα, MATa, Δhmr::ADE1, ade1-100, leu2-3,112, lys5, trp1::hisG, ura3-52, ade3::GAL10::HO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY853</td>
<td>rad1Δ</td>
<td>pWS1510 (rad1Δ::URA3, E. Friedberg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY969</td>
<td>msh2Δ</td>
<td>pEA199 (msh2Δ::TRP1, this lab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY854</td>
<td>msh3Δ</td>
<td>pEA188 (msh3Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG, this lab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY2087</td>
<td>slx4Δ</td>
<td>slx4Δ::KANMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1788</td>
<td>pol3-01</td>
<td>YIpAM26 (pol3-01::URA3, from A. Sugino)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1332</td>
<td>msh81Δ</td>
<td>msh81Δ::KANMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1730</td>
<td>rad9Δ</td>
<td>rad9Δ::KANMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1968</td>
<td>mad2Δ</td>
<td>mad2Δ::KANMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1562</td>
<td>mms2Δ</td>
<td>mms2Δ::KANMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1778</td>
<td>mph1Δ</td>
<td>mph1Δ::KANMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY2125</td>
<td>rad1Δrad10Δ</td>
<td>rad10Δ::KANMX, see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY2090</td>
<td>rad1Δslx4Δ</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1803</td>
<td>rad1Δpol3-01</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY797</td>
<td>rad1Δmus81Δ</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1726</td>
<td>rad1Δrad9Δ</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1973</td>
<td>rad1Δmad2Δ</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1725</td>
<td>rad1Δmms2Δ</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1776</td>
<td>rad1Δmph1Δ</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATα::KANMX to MATα</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY744</td>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td>Derived from JKM161, see Materials and Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY1356</td>
<td>rad1Δ</td>
<td>pWS1510 (rad1Δ::URA3, E. Friedberg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY2084</td>
<td>slx4Δ</td>
<td>slx4Δ::KANMX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>donorless</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAY742</td>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td>Derived from JKM139 (Δho, HMLα::ADE1, MATa, Δhmr::ADE1, ade1-100, leu2-3,112, lys5, trp1::hisG, ura3-52, ade3::GAL10::HO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
number of colonies arising from induced relative to uninduced cultures. At least four independent cultures were used for each strain (Table 2.2). Results are shown as the mean ± SEM, and were statistically analyzed using an unpaired two-tailed Student’s T-test (http://www.physics.csbsju.edu/stats/t-test_bulk_form.html; see Results).

**Mating type switching assay.** To determine mating types, individual colonies from cell survival assays (20-40 per replicate) were crossed with *arg4 MATα* and *MATα* tester strains (EAY759 and EAY760; from N. Sugawara, Haber laboratory) and replica plated onto synthetic complete plates (Rose *et al*. 1990) lacking both arginine and lysine to select for diploids. The percentage of switched cells was determined for each cell survival experiment, and is shown in Table 2.2 as the mean ± SEM.

**Southern blot analysis.** Chromosomal DNA was isolated during time course experiments as described (Holmes and Haber 1999; Goldfarb and Alani 2004) following a 30-minute galactose induction. DNA was then digested with *Sty*I (New England Biolabs) for single nonhomology strains or *Ava*II, *Ban*I, and *Bsp*I (New England Biolabs) for double nonhomology strains, and electrophoresed on 1% TAE-agarose gels with 1x TAE buffer. Southern blot transfer and hybridizations were performed essentially as described by the manufacturer (Amersham) using the Church and Gilbert method (1984).

All probes used for Southern blot analysis were amplified by PCR using EAY745 yeast genomic DNA and [*32P*-labeled using the NEBlot kit (New England Biolabs) according to the manufacturer’s description. To probe *MAT*-specific bands, we radiolabeled a 638 bp PCR product beginning 67 bp downstream of the *MAT Z2* region using pJH364 forward and reverse primers (5’ACGAATTGGCTATACGGGAC and 5’GTCCAATCTGTGCACAATGAAG,
respectively, from the Haber lab). Efficient DSB formation was detected 30 minutes after galactose induction by Southern blot analysis (Figure 2.2). To visualize mating type switching in double nonhomology strains, probes were produced from a 277 bp PCR product amplified using primers AO585 (5’CTTAGCATCATTCTTTGTTCTTAT) and AO586 (5’CAAGAAGGCGAATAAGATAAAGA). Loading control probes for blots of the double nonhomology strains were created by amplifying a 235 bp PCR product with primers AO583 (5’CTCGTATTGGAGAAATAAGTTTTCGT) and AO584 (5’GGTAGAGTCTTATTGGCAAGATAG) (Appendix, Supplementary Fig. 2.6). Yα-specific probes (Appendix, Supplementary Fig. 2.7) were created by labeling a 539 bp PCR fragment made using primers AO1425 (5’GGACAACATGGATGATATTTGTAGTATGGCGG) and AO1049 (5’CTGTTGCGGAAAGCTGAAAC), both located within Yα. Blots were visualized using the Phosphor Imaging system and quantified using the ImageQuant program (Molecular Dynamics). Quantification of repair efficiency in Figure 2.2C was done as described previously (Wang et al. 2004), with product bands set relative to the first HO cut band and normalized relative to the \( \text{MAT} \) distal band in each lane. Yα loss was quantified by setting the Yα proximal band in each lane relative to the value at \( t = 0 \) (Appendix, Supplementary Fig. 2.7).

**Chromatin immunoprecipitation.** Samples from time course experiments were chromatin immunoprecipitated as described previously (Goldfarb and Alani 2004). Msh2-HA\(_4\) was immunoprecipitated from yeast cell extracts using the 12CA5 monoclonal antibody, and expression of Msh2p-HA\(_4\) was confirmed by Western blot (Goldfarb and Alani 2004; 2005). All strains used in the ChIP experiments contain a deletion of the \( \text{HMR} \alpha \) donor so that the \( \text{MAT} \alpha \) locus could be specifically amplified by
PCR reactions, electrophoresis conditions, and quantification were similar to those described in Evans et al. (2000), but with different primer sets. To detect sequences proximal to the DSB, a 267 bp fragment containing the Yα sequence was amplified from immunoprecipitated and input chromosomal DNA using AO1048 (5’TACCCCCAACGACGGGCATT) and AO1049 (5'CTGTTGCGAAAGCTGAAAC), which are adjacent to the HO recognition site (Figure 2.3). Samples were run on 1.5% TAE-agarose gels and bands were quantified relative to the maximal signal using Scion Image (Scion Corporation). Since the input signal decreases during mating type switching as the Yα sequence is removed, the data are presented as the amount of chromatin immunoprecipitated Yα PCR product detected after HO induction relative to that at t = 0. A 163 bp CRY1 control band was also amplified from the chromosomal input DNA using primers AO1106 (5’CGCCAGAGTTACTGGTGGTATGAAGG) and AO1107 (5’GGAGTCTTTGGTTCTAGTACCACCGG). The PCR signal was quantified within the linear range of detection, and ChIP was specific to both the epitope tag and formaldehyde crosslinking (Goldfarb and Alani 2004).

**FACS analysis.** Cells were collected at various times after HO induction as described above. Aliquots of cells were pelleted at the relevant time points, fixed in 70% ethanol, and stored at 4°C for up to 7 days. Cell samples were resuspended in 50 mM NaCitrate pH 7.4, sonicated briefly, and treated 1 hr with RNase A at 37°C, followed by a 1 hr treatment with Proteinase K at 37°C. DNA was stained with 1 nM final concentration of Sytox Green (Invitrogen), and samples were analyzed at the Cornell University Biomedical Sciences Flow Cytometry Core Laboratory (Ithaca, NY). Percentage of cells in G1, S, or G2/M phases was determined by gating according to 1n and 2*1n DNA content. A representative FACS profile for wild-type cells at t = 0
is shown in Figure 2.4B, with vertical gates for G1, S, and G2/M phases. Values shown in Figure 2.4A reflect the mean of three or more samples per time point ± SEM.

**Pedigree analysis.** Cells were induced for HO cleavage at *MAT* as described above. Following addition of glucose to the medium at $t = 0.5$ hrs, 15 µl of culture was dropped down the center of a YPD plate and single, unbudded cells were separated at one cm intervals under the light microscope using a microdissection needle. Cells were visualized beginning at $t = 0.5$ hrs, incubated at 30° C between manipulations, and monitored every 20-30 minutes until daughter cells were able to be separated from each other ($t = \sim 4-10$ hrs). Cells that did not complete cell division within 10 hours were not scored. The length of time required for completion of cell division is reported in Table 2.4 as the mean of all cells in each category ± SEM. Plates were incubated for 3 days at 30° C, and colonies were tested for mating type as described above. Cells were categorized by viability and mating type as shown in Table 2.3. Pairs of daughter cells scored as both unswitched were not included because we cannot rule out the failure to form a DSB in these cells. The number of cells present in dead cell clusters was also recorded, and is visualized in Supplementary Figure 2.8B (See Appendix). Photographs of representative cells (Appendix, Supplementary Figure 2.8) were taken under the light microscope using a Fuji FinePix S5000 digital camera.
Results

Decreased mating type switching in the absence of the Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 complex. Rad1-Rad10 and Msh2-Msh3 are proposed to act during mating type switching in steps involving the removal of a single 3’ nonhomologous tail on the non-invading strand as depicted in Figure 2.1 (Holmes and Haber 1999; Pâques and Haber 1999, Figure 1). Previous work examining the role of Rad1-Rad10 during gene conversion primarily utilized plasmid-based assays in which DNA sequence on one or both sides of a DSB site contained nonhomologous sequence with respect to a donor sequence, also present on the plasmid (Sugawara et al. 1997; Colaiácovo et al. 1999).

To examine the coordination of repair and checkpoint signaling factors during gene conversion on the chromosome, we analyzed roles for Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 and Msh2-Msh3 in mating type switching in *S. cerevisiae*, which is hypothesized to involve removal of a single 3’ nonhomologous tail following the annealing step of SDSA (Figure 2.1A; Haber 1998; Pâques and Haber 1999; Ira et al. 2006).

Mating type switching was induced in *MATa* strains expressing HO endonuclease from the galactose-inducible *GAL10* promoter (Materials and Methods). As shown in Table 2.2, cell viability following DSB induction was high in wild-type (76% ± 3) but reduced in *rad1Δ* (59% ± 2; p < 0.01, Student's T-test) and *rad1Δrad10Δ* double mutants (63% ± 1; data not shown). The decrease in cell viability was specific to strains induced for *MATa* to *MATα* switching; no significant decrease was observed in strains induced for completely homologous switching (*MATa* to *MATa*) that does not involve 3’ nonhomologous tails (Table 2.2). In addition, the percentage of surviving cells that had switched mating type was reduced in *rad1Δ* strains relative to wild-type (71% ± 3 vs. 86% ± 3, p < 0.01). This decrease in gene conversion may be due to an increase in repair of the break by nonhomologous
end joining to yield MATa cells, or could be indicative of aberrant repair or more disruptive NHEJ that disrupts the MAT locus and yields an “a-like faker” phenotype, since cells lacking a functional MAT locus phenocopy MATa by default (Strathern et al. 1981).

Recently, Flott et al. (2007) reported that the Slx4 protein forms a complex with Rad1-Rad10, and is critical for its 3’ nonhomologous tail removal activity during repair by single-strand annealing (SSA). As predicted from this work, Slx4 also functions with Rad1-Rad10 in mating type switching. slx4Δ and rad1Δslx4Δ mutants showed viability (57% ± 3 and 54% ± 2, respectively) and switching phenotypes (68% ± 4 and 69% ± 4, respectively) similar to rad1Δ strains (Table 2.2). In contrast, msh2Δ and msh3Δ strains displayed only a subtle decrease in viability (68% ± 4), and the percentage of switched cells was similar to wild-type (Table 2.2). Thus, Msh2-Msh3 appears nearly dispensable for nonhomologous tail removal during mating type switching, where the 3’ tail is on the non-invading strand.

We hypothesized that the gene conversion observed in the absence of Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 could be facilitated by the action of redundant nucleases that remove the 3’ Ya nonhomologous tail. However, disruption of Mus81-Mms4 or the Polymerase δ 3’ to 5’ proofreading activity did not have a significant effect on the viability of rad1Δ mutants following mating type switching (Table 2.2). Since mating type switching can occur in rad1Δ mutants, albeit less efficiently, it is likely that unknown nucleases or multiple redundant nucleases are able to remove 3’ nonhomologous tails when Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 is absent. A recent study identified Saw1, a protein that interacts with Rad1-Rad10 and is thought to recruit Rad1-Rad10 to recombination intermediates (Li et al. 2008). It is possible that Saw1 may recruit other nucleases as well, allowing for completion of mating type switching in the absence of Rad1-Rad10-Slx4.
Table 2.2. Viability and mating type switching efficiency of wild-type and mutant strains. Percent cell survival (induced/uninduced) was determined by examining the viability of cells plated after a 30 minute induction of $HO$ expression. Surviving cells were assayed to determine the percentage that had switched mating type from $MAT_a$ to $MAT_a$ as described in the Materials and Methods. Data are presented as the mean ± SEM of at least 4 independent experiments. Asterisks indicate values significantly different from wild-type with $p < 0.01$, Students T-test. For one nonhomologous end (standard mating type switching), nonhomologous sequence ($Ya$) is present on only the proximal side of the DSB. For two homologous ends, strains were induced for $MAT_a$ to $MAT_a$ switching; thus, % switched is not applicable (n/a). For two nonhomologous ends, the indicated strains contain nonhomologous sequences on both sides of the DSB due to insertion of $KANMX$ on the distal side of the break (see Figure 2.1B).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Survival</th>
<th>% Switched</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One nonhomologous end</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>MATα to MATα</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td>76.1 ± 3.1</td>
<td>85.7 ± 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δ</td>
<td>58.6 ± 2.1*</td>
<td>70.6 ± 2.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slx4Δ</td>
<td>57.1 ± 2.5*</td>
<td>67.6 ± 3.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δslx4Δ</td>
<td>54.4 ± 2.2*</td>
<td>69.3 ± 4.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msh2Δ</td>
<td>67.6 ± 4.0</td>
<td>80.6 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msh3Δ</td>
<td>67.9 ± 2.0</td>
<td>81.5 ± 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mus81Δ</td>
<td>72.6 ± 1.7</td>
<td>88.7 ± 5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pol3-01</td>
<td>65.1 ± 5.1</td>
<td>83.2 ± 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δmus81Δ</td>
<td>56.1 ± 3.8*</td>
<td>74.5 ± 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δpol3-01</td>
<td>55.6 ± 5.2*</td>
<td>70.6 ± 3.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad9Δ</td>
<td>75.1 ± 3.1</td>
<td>82.5 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δrad9Δ</td>
<td>56.3 ± 2.7*</td>
<td>74.7 ± 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two homologous ends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>MATα to MATα</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td>99.7 ± 2.2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δ</td>
<td>95.3 ± 4.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slx4Δ</td>
<td>93.8 ± 4.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two nonhomologous ends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<em>MATα::KANMX to MATα</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td>62.7 ± 3.7</td>
<td>72.8 ± 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δ</td>
<td>26.8 ± 1.2*</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msh2Δ</td>
<td>23.5 ± 2.9*</td>
<td>9.8 ± 2.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msh3Δ</td>
<td>29.9 ± 1.7*</td>
<td>10.0 ± 3.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad51Δ</td>
<td>25.2 ± 2.7*</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southern blot analysis was used to examine product formation in wild-type and rad1Δ strains during mating type switching (Figure 2.2). Efficient DSB formation was observed at the MAT locus within 30 minutes of induction in all strains and products were detectable by one hour post-induction in wild-type, consistent with previous studies (White and Haber 1990; Colaiácovo et al. 1999). rad1Δ mutants displayed a ~10% reduction in product formation relative to wild-type. This result is much more subtle than that seen in an analysis of MATα to MATa switching in G1-arrested rad1Δ cells (Holmes and Haber 1999), but is consistent with the viability data presented above. The defects exhibited by mutants lacking Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 are more apparent in the pedigree, FACS, and chromatin immunoprecipitation studies described below, and may indicate that, while MATα product formation appears to be only mildly reduced in rad1Δ mutants, the gene conversion at MAT might be associated with BIR, aberrant recombination, or disrupted signaling.

Previous studies have shown a strict requirement for both Rad1-Rad10 and Msh2-Msh3 when both sides of a DSB contain nonhomologous sequence (Sugawara et al. 1997; Colaiácovo et al. 1999). In repair of such breaks, a 3’ nonhomologous tail must be removed during the strand invasion step in order for repair DNA synthesis to proceed, in addition to 3’ nonhomologous removal at the later synthesis-dependent annealing step (Figure 2.1B). To confirm that Rad1-Rad10 and Msh2-Msh3 are required for removing 3’ nonhomologous tails on the invading strand during chromosomal mating type switching, we inserted the KANMX sequence on the distal side of the HO cut site at the MAT locus (Figure 2.1B). In wild-type strains containing the KANMX insertion, gene conversion was delayed but completed with little loss of viability (Table 2.2; Appendix, Supplemental Fig. 2.6). Consistent with previous studies, we found that both Rad1-Rad10 and Msh2-Msh3 complexes were required for gene conversion involving two 3’ nonhomologous tails. No gene conversion product
Figure 2.2. Southern blot analysis of mating type switching in wild-type and \textit{rad1}\Delta strains. A. Diagram of the \textit{MAT} locus showing the restriction sites used for Southern blot analysis, expected fragment lengths, and location of the probes used for detection of mating type switching. B. Analysis of digested DNA for wild-type and \textit{rad1}\Delta mutants induced for mating type switching. Experiments were performed at least three times, with representative time courses shown. C. Quantification of repair efficiency as described in Materials and Methods. Experiments in this figure were performed by both A. M. Lyndaker and T. Goldfarb.
was detected by Southern blot in rad1Δ and msh3Δ mutants (Appendix, Supplementary Fig. 2.6), and the viability and switching efficiency of rad1Δ mutants was comparable to that of rad51Δ mutants completely defective in gene conversion, as shown in Table 2.2 (Sugawara et al. 1995). While the viability of msh2Δ and msh3Δ strains was equivalent to that of rad1Δ mutants, both msh mutants exhibited a greater percentage of switched cells (10%; Table 2.2), consistent with the idea that Msh2-Msh3 plays a supporting role that may be less critical than the role of Rad1-Rad10. The residual viability in rad1Δ, msh2Δ, msh3Δ, and rad51Δ strains is likely due to nonhomologous end-joining, as seen in strains completely lacking donor sequences (Moore and Haber 1996).

**Prolonged Msh2 localization to the DSB in rad1Δ mutants.** Because Rad1-Rad10 is predicted to remove 3’ nonhomologous tails on the non-invading strand following the annealing step (Fig. 2.1), we reasoned that rad1Δ mutants would exhibit a delay in removal of the 3’ Ya sequence. Using Ya-specific probes, we were unable to detect a difference in the loss of Ya between wild-type and rad1Δ strains (Supplementary Fig. 2.7). Detection of any delay is confounded by the fact that the initial resection of the break should lead to loss of the 5’ strand of Ya with similar kinetics in both strains. Thus, we additionally performed chromatin immunoprecipitation using HA-tagged Msh2, α-HA antibody, and PCR primers located within the Ya sequence as described previously (Goldfarb and Alani 2004). Our lab previously showed that the Msh2 protein localizes rapidly to DSBs (Evans et al. 2000).

As shown in Fig. 2.3, Msh2 localized immediately to the MAT locus following DSB formation, peaked at one hour post-induction, and then decreased, consistent with the kinetics of product formation shown in Figure 2.2 and a role for Msh2-Msh3 in DSB repair. A similar pattern was seen using primers specific to the X-Ya
junction; however, peak levels were achieved at a slightly later time point (1.5 hrs, data not shown). While the input signal is lost over time due to conversion to MAT\(\alpha\), the input signal at the unrelated CRY1 locus was constant throughout the time course.

In rad1\(\Delta\) mutants, Msh2 localized to MAT following DSB formation, but in contrast to wild-type, Msh2 remained near the break for approximately 3 hours (Fig. 2.3). We observed a similar Msh2 localization pattern for donorless mutants unable to complete mating type switching, where the 3' ends are thought to be stable despite a complete inability to perform homologous repair (Vaze et al. 2002; Aylon et al. 2003). Msh2 localization was also prolonged at the X-Y\(\alpha\) junction in rad1\(\Delta\) compared to wild-type (data not shown). Thus, while we were unable to detect a delay in loss of the Y\(\alpha\) sequence in rad1\(\Delta\) mutants, the prolonged presence of Msh2 at the break during mating type switching suggests that at least a subset of rad1\(\Delta\) mutants contain recombination intermediates at later time points.

**rad1\(\Delta\) mutants induced for mating type switching exhibit G2/M arrest.** The above observations encouraged us to examine the cell cycle progression of rad1\(\Delta\) mutants during mating type switching. Mutants lacking both donor sequences have previously been shown to exhibit a prolonged G2/M cell cycle delay due to an inability to repair the DSB by homologous recombination (Toczyski et al. 1997; Lee et al. 1998). We used FACS analysis to measure the DNA content of wild-type, rad1\(\Delta\), and donorless mutants following DSB induction. As shown in Figure 2.4, wild-type strains showed little variation in the percentage of cells in G1, S, or G2/M phase during the course of mating type switching. Consistent with the known arrest phenotype, the majority of cells from a strain lacking both HML\(\alpha\) and HMR\(\alpha\) sequences (donorless) were present in G2/M phase at 4 hrs (83.5% ± 1.5) and 6 hrs post-induction (71.8% ± 3.9). rad1\(\Delta\) strains showed a significant increase in the percentage of G2/M cells at 2 hrs (58.3%
Figure 2.3. Msh2 localization to the DSB in wild-type, rad1Δ, and donorless mutants. A. Location of primers used for semi-quantitative PCR following Msh2 chromatin immunoprecipitation. B. Chromatin immunoprecipitation and PCR detection of Msh2 localization to MAT during mating type switching in wild-type, rad1Δ, and donorless mutants. Since the Ya sequence is removed during mating type switching, the input signal is also shown using primers to an unrelated locus (CRY1). C. For each time point, the Msh2 ChIP signal was set relative to the t = 0 signal, with the maximum signal for each time course set as 1.0 to compare relative the timing of Msh2 localization. Each data point represents the mean of 3-4 experiments ± SEM. This experiment was performed by T. Goldfarb.
± 4.0) and 4 hrs post-induction (65.1% ± 1.6) relative to wild-type (41.9% ± 1.5 and 30.1% ± 3.3, respectively; p < 0.01), but returned to wild-type levels by 6 hrs, suggesting that the absence of Rad1-Rad10 leads to a G2/M arrest that is both shorter and earlier than observed in donorless mutants. This is consistent with gene conversion occurring in rad1∆ mutants, though inefficiently, in contrast to donorless mutants which can only survive by nonhomologous end joining (Moore and Haber 1996).

**Mutants lacking Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 show unique viability profiles in pedigree analysis following mating type switching.** To further analyze the viability and cell cycle phenotypes seen in rad1∆ and slx4∆ mutants during mating type switching, we performed pedigree experiments in which single, unbudded (G1) cells were isolated after DSB formation and monitored through the cell cycle. Daughter cells were separated following the first cell division (Materials and Methods). Cells that grew into colonies were subsequently assayed for mating type. As shown in Table 2.3, 96% of wild-type cells yielded two viable daughter cells that had both switched mating type. In contrast, only 38% of rad1∆ mutants formed two switched colonies, and of the remaining cells, 32% formed one switched colony and one dead cell cluster and 28% formed two dead cell clusters. slx4∆ and rad1∆slx4∆ strains exhibited phenotypes similar to rad1∆ mutants (Table 2.3). No such decrease in viability was seen in these strains in the absence of the DSB, nor in rad1∆ strains induced for completely homologous MATa to MATa switching (Table 2.3B; data not shown). The “one switched, one dead” category is particularly intriguing, since repair and death arise from the same induced cell, and it is unique to cells undergoing gene conversion. Thus, the effect of the rad1∆ and slx4∆ mutations on mating type switching is much
Figure 2.4. FACS analysis of cells undergoing mating type switching. A. Bar graphs of the percentage of cells in either G1, S, or G2/M phases of the cell cycle at 0, 2, 4, and 6 hours following induction of mating type switching in wild-type, rad1∆, and donorless strains (average of at least three experiments ± SEM). See Materials and Methods for details. The increase in the percentage of G2/M cells in rad1∆ mutants relative to wild-type is statistically significant (p < 0.01 at t =2 and t = 4 hrs, Student’s T-test). B. Representative FACS profile for wild-type cells at t = 0, with vertical gates separating the 1n (G1) and 2n (G2/M) DNA content.
Table 2.3. Pedigree analysis of wild-type and mutants (A) induced for mating type switching or (B) mock-induced. Following induction of mating type switching in liquid culture, single cells were separated on YPD medium under the light microscope using a microdissection needle. Cells were monitored at regular intervals, and daughter cells were separated apart after completion of the first cell division. Cells that formed colonies were tested for mating type as described in Materials and Methods. The number of cells (N) tested for each strain is shown. For cells induced for mating type switching, “% other” includes pairs of daughter cells scored as “one unswitched and one dead” or “one unswitched and one switched.” Pairs of daughter cells scored as both unswitched were not included because we cannot rule out the failure to form a DSB in these cells. For the uninduced experiments, viability is shown for cells mock-induced with water.
### A. Induced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 switched</th>
<th>1 switched, 1 dead</th>
<th>2 dead</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donorless</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δ</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slx4Δ</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δslx4Δ</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msh2Δ</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad9Δ</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mad2Δ</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δrad9Δ</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δmad2Δ</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mms2Δ</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mph1Δ</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δmms2Δ</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δmph1Δ</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Uninduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 alive</th>
<th>1 alive, 1 dead</th>
<th>2 dead</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donorless</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δ</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slx4Δ</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δslx4Δ</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msh2Δ</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad9Δ</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mad2Δ</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δrad9Δ</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δmad2Δ</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mms2Δ</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mph1Δ</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δmms2Δ</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rad1Δmph1Δ</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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more severe than was apparent in liquid culture assays, where asynchronous cells were induced for mating type switching and the fate of daughter cells could not be assessed. We also measured the length of the first cell division following DSB induction during the pedigree experiments. As shown in Table 2.4, completion of cell division was delayed by three hours in \( \text{rad1}\Delta \) mutants compared to wild-type (\( p < 0.01 \), Student’s T-test), consistent with the FACS analysis presented above (Figure 2.4). Strains lacking donor sequences exhibited an even longer delay (10 ± 0.2 hours to complete division compared to 4.5 ± 0.1 hours in wild-type; Table 2.4). During this extended period, \( \text{rad1}\Delta \) and donorless cells displayed a large-budded morphology suggestive of G2/M arrest (Appendix, Supplementary Fig. 2.8A).

After completion of the first cell division, approximately 45% of \( \text{rad1}\Delta \) cells failed to form colonies in the pedigree analysis (the dead cells from both the “two dead” and “one switched, one dead” categories), but divided several times before forming dead cell clusters (average of 8 ± 1 cells; Appendix, Supplementary Fig. 2.8B). This phenotype is consistent with the phenomenon of break adaptation, in which cells exit the cell cycle arrest despite the continued presence of unrepaired DNA, and differs from the death seen in cells undergoing DSB repair that fail to exit a G2/M arrest (Toczyski et al. 1997; Lee et al. 1998; Pellicioli et al. 2001; Lee et al. 2003). This adaptation phenotype is consistent with a significant proportion of \( \text{rad1}\Delta \) cells induced for mating type switching being unable to complete repair of the break. Inviable cells from donorless strains exhibited a more severe phenotype following checkpoint exit and died with one large-budded cell or two cells (adaptation for only one cycle) as documented previously (Lee et al. 1998), most likely due to the presence of more extensive DNA damage due to prolonged 5’ to 3’ resection.

Consistent with the cell survival assays described above, \( \text{msh2}\Delta \) and \( \text{msh3}\Delta \) mutations had little effect on viability during mating type switching in pedigree
experiments. Viability was reduced equally in both the induced and uninduced states, with ~80% of \textit{msh2Δ} cells forming two viable colonies, ~10% forming one alive and one dead cell cluster, and ~10% with two inviable cells (Table 2.3). Thus, the absence of \textit{MSH2} confers a general decrease in viability that appears unrelated to the formation of an HO-induced DSB. A more subtle decrease in viability (5%) was observed for strains lacking \textit{SLX4}.

**G2/M delay in \textit{rad1Δ} mutants is dependent upon both the DNA damage response and the spindle checkpoint.** To test whether the cell division delay observed in \textit{rad1Δ} mutants was mediated by the DNA damage checkpoint, we measured cell viability and cell cycle duration in \textit{rad1Δ} mutants defective for the Rad9-dependent DNA damage response. \textit{rad1Δrad9Δ} double mutants exhibited cell cycle lengths comparable to wild-type and \textit{rad9Δ} mutant cells (~5 hours, Table 2.4), in contrast to ~8 hours for \textit{rad1Δ} mutants. Thus, the G2/M cell cycle arrest exhibited by \textit{rad1Δ} mutants is dependent upon \textit{RAD9}, presumably via Rad9-mediated activation of the DNA damage response (Harrison and Haber 2006). Elimination of the arrest had very little effect on the viability of \textit{rad1Δ} mutants (Tables 2.2 and 2.3), pointing to an inability of the DNA damage response to promote repair.

Slx4 forms a complex with Rad1-Rad10 that is critical for 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during repair by single-strand annealing (Flott \textit{et al.} 2007). As shown in Table 2.3, \textit{slx4Δ} and \textit{rad1Δslx4Δ} mutants exhibited significantly shorter cell cycle delays than \textit{rad1Δ} single mutants (1 hr vs. 2 hrs for “two switched,” and 2 hrs vs. 3.5 hrs for “one switched, one dead”). It is not surprising that the absence of Slx4 reduces the delay, since Slx4 is a known target of the Mec1 and Tel1 checkpoint kinases, requires checkpoint-dependent phosphorylation for Rad1-dependent SSA, and has
Table 2.4. Average length of cell cycle in cells undergoing mating type switching. Cell cycle duration was determined during pedigree analysis (see Table 2.3 and Materials and Methods), and is shown as the mean length of time required for division (hrs) ± SEM. “n/a” denotes categories containing less than 10% of cells, and thus cell cycle lengths are not reported. * Denotes statistical significance from wild-type with p < 0.01; values were compared to wild-type “uninduced” or “two switched” as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uninduced</th>
<th>Two Switched</th>
<th>One Switched, One Dead</th>
<th>Two Dead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wild-type</strong></td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.2</td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donorless</strong></td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10 ± 0.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rad1Δ</strong></td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>7.0 ± 0.3*</td>
<td>8.4 ± 0.3*</td>
<td>8.2 ± 0.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slx4Δ</strong></td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5.8 ± 0.2*</td>
<td>7.0 ± 0.4*</td>
<td>8.6 ± 0.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rad1ΔSlx4Δ</strong></td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.4*</td>
<td>6.8 ± 0.4*</td>
<td>9.0 ± 0.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Msh2Δ</strong></td>
<td>4.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5.6 ± 0.1*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6.5 ± 0.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rad9Δ</strong></td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.1</td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mad2Δ</strong></td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.2</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.2</td>
<td>4.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rad1ΔRad9Δ</strong></td>
<td>5.2 ± 0.1*</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5.3 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rad1ΔMad2Δ</strong></td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.2*</td>
<td>5.6 ± 0.3*</td>
<td>6.7 ± 0.3*</td>
<td>6.3 ± 0.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mms2Δ</strong></td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5.1 ± 0.1*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6.1 ± 0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mph1Δ</strong></td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5.9 ± 0.6*</td>
<td>6.5 ± 0.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rad1ΔMms2Δ</strong></td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>5.8 ± 0.3*</td>
<td>6.4 ± 0.1*</td>
<td>6.3 ± 0.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rad1ΔMph1Δ</strong></td>
<td>5.3 ± 0.1*</td>
<td>6.2 ± 0.3*</td>
<td>8.1 ± 0.3*</td>
<td>8.3 ± 0.3*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
been shown to regulate checkpoint-dependent processes (Flott and Rouse 2005; Roberts et al. 2006; Flott et al. 2007). The fact that slx4Δ mutants exhibit rad1Δ-like phenotypes, but with shorter cell cycle delays, is additional evidence that Slx4 provides a link between the 3’ end-processing machinery and the DNA damage checkpoint.

Several studies have suggested a link between the DNA damage response and the spindle checkpoint (Aylon and Kupiec 2003; Kim and Burke 2008). We hypothesized that the cell death in rad1Δ mutants was due to aberrant repair involving gross chromosomal changes which might activate the spindle checkpoint, and thus tested whether the G2/M arrest in these mutants required MAD2. As shown in Tables 2.3 and 2.4, mad2Δ mutants induced for mating type switching had only slightly decreased viability and displayed cell cycle lengths similar to wild-type. However, rad1Δmad2Δ double mutants exhibited reduced cell cycle delays relative to rad1Δ mutants (Table 2.4). Cells in the “two dead” and “one switched, one dead” pedigree categories took ~6.5 hours to divide in rad1Δmad2Δ mutants, compared to ~8 hours in rad1Δ single mutants (p < 0.015). Interestingly, rad1Δ mutants that formed two switched colonies exhibited arrests that appeared fully MAD2-dependent, unlike the partially MAD2-dependent arrests described above (Table 2.4). These results suggest that although gene conversion occurs without loss of viability for cells in the “two switched” class, repair is inefficient and disruptive to the assembly or function of the mitotic spindle. The variety of arrest phenotypes in rad1Δ mutants further distinguishes the pedigree viability categories from each other, and suggests that different defects or modes of repair operate in these subsets of cells.

Unique viability pattern in pedigree analysis is consistent with replication-mediated repair. Approximately one third of rad1Δ mutant cells divided to form
both one switched and one dead colony in the pedigree analysis (Table 2.3). We hypothesized that these cells may complete gene conversion by replicating partially-repaired intermediates containing one intact switched strand, and one unrepaired strand (Figure 2.5; Kang and Symington 2000). To test such a model, we examined whether post-replicative lesion bypass repair pathways were involved in completing gene conversion during mating type switching. We focused on \textit{MMS2}- and \textit{MPH1}-dependent repair pathways, mutations in which cause defects in the error-free bypass pathways involving fork reversal and recombinational replication restart, respectively (Torres-Ramos \textit{et al.} 2002; Schürer \textit{et al.} 2004; Watts 2006). Both \textit{mms2\Delta} and \textit{mph1\Delta} mutants displayed decreased viability in the wild-type background during mating type switching. As shown in Table 2.3, the percentage of cells in the “two switched” category for pedigree analysis was reduced to 79\% in \textit{mms2\Delta} and 69\% in \textit{mph1\Delta} mutants compared to 96\% in wild-type. \textit{mms2\Delta} mutants also displayed a slight reduction in viability in the absence of the DSB (Table 2.3), but viability was further decreased for cells induced for switching. Both of these mutants had an increased proportion of cells in both the “one switched, one dead” and “two dead” categories, indicating that replicative lesion bypass pathways play a role in the completion of gene conversion during mating type switching.

To test whether the error-free lesion bypass pathways are responsible for repair in the absence of Rad1-Rad10-Slx4, we analyzed both \textit{rad1\Delta mms2\Delta} and \textit{rad1\Delta mph1\Delta} double mutants in pedigree experiments. \textit{rad1\Delta mms2\Delta} double mutants exhibited a decrease in the percentage of “two switched” cells from 38\% to 19\%, and this decrease was directly correlated with an increase in the “one switched, one dead” category; however, no change in the percentage of “two dead” cells was seen for either \textit{rad1\Delta mms2\Delta} or \textit{rad1\Delta mph1\Delta} relative to \textit{rad1\Delta} single mutants, suggesting that death
Figure 2.5. Model for mating type switching facilitated by DNA replication. We propose that mating type switching can be mediated by ongoing DNA replication. DSB formation, 5’ to 3’ resection, strand invasion, synthesis, and repair of the invading strand occur as shown in Figure 2.1 and predicted by SDSA models. The partially-repaired recombination intermediate shown at the top of the figure containing a single-stranded break can then be acted on by either the DNA replication machinery or the Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 complex. In the presence of Rad1-Rad10-Slx4, the 3’ Ya nonhomologous tail is removed efficiently, either prior to, during, or following DNA replication, and once DNA replication has been completed, the cell can divide to produce two viable cells of the switched mating type. In the absence of Rad1-Rad10-Slx4, mating type switching products are produced largely by replication of the partially-repaired recombination intermediate to yield either one switched and one dead daughter cell, or, after the action of inefficient nucleases, two viable switched daughters.
of these cells occurs by a separate mechanism. The mph1Δ mutation appeared roughly epistatic to rad1Δ in this assay, with very little decrease in viability relative to rad1Δ.

The mms2Δ mutation reduced the length of cell cycle delay in rad1Δ mutants, from 2 hrs to 1 hr for the “two switched” cells and from 3.5 to 2 hrs for the “one switched, one dead” and “two dead” categories (Table 2.4). rad1Δmph1Δ double mutants exhibited a similar decrease in length of arrest for “two switched” cells, but not for dying cells. Thus, it is tempting to speculate that checkpoint signaling in rad1Δ mutants might be initiated or enhanced by the collision of a replication fork with recombination intermediates (see Discussion). Together, the above phenotypes suggest a role for post-replicative lesion bypass repair in the completion of gene conversion during mating type switching.

Discussion

In this study, we investigated the requirements for the Rad1-Rad10, Slx4, and Msh2-Msh3 factors in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during gene conversion at the chromosomal MAT locus. Rad1-Rad10 and Msh2-Msh3 have been proposed to act during mating type switching in steps involving the removal of a single 3’ nonhomologous tail on the non-invading strand, primarily based on their roles in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during single-strand annealing and in plasmid-based assays (Haber 1998; Pâques and Haber 1999; Figure 2.1). As described above, mating type switching in rad1Δ mutants led to a checkpoint-dependent G2/M cell cycle delay and decreased viability. In the absence of functional Rad1-Rad10-Slx4, cells displayed a unique viability profile consistent with a model in which gene conversion can be facilitated by replication of partially-repaired recombination intermediates.
Msh2-Msh3, however, played only a subtle role in such repair, in contrast to its critical role in DSB repair involving two 3’ nonhomologous tails.

Previous work in the Symington lab proposed that replication of partially-repaired recombination intermediates might bypass the requirement for Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal in a plasmid retention assay (Kang and Symington 2000). We extend this model to explain the unique viability pattern observed in rad1Δ and slx4Δ mutants in pedigree experiments, where a third of cells divide to produce both repaired (switched) and dead daughter cells (Table 2.3, Figure 2.5). In this model, mutants lacking Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 initiate repair normally, but encounter difficulty after annealing of the repaired invading strand back to the MAT locus. In the absence of 3’ nonhomologous tail removal activity, the remaining broken strand is unable to prime repair DNA synthesis to complete gene conversion. If, instead, DNA replication occurs prior to 3’ nonhomologous tail removal, template switching could produce both an intact chromosome of the switched mating type and a broken chromosome. Segregation of these chromosomes to daughter cells could then lead to the “one switched, one dead” phenotype (Table 2.3), whereas repair of the broken chromosome by an inefficient nuclease could yield two viable, switched cells as is seen in wild-type (Figure 2.5). In further support of replication-mediated repair, another study found that mating type switching in G1-arrested cells led to a much more severe reduction in product formation (37% product formation at 5 hrs) in rad1Δ mutants than is seen in this study in cycling cells, with product formation in rad1Δ mutants only reduced to ~90% of wild-type at 4 hrs (Holmes and Haber 1999). Additional evidence for this model of replication-mediated recombination is discussed below.

We show that mating type switching in mutants lacking Rad1-Rad10 or Slx4 induces a G2/M cell cycle delay involving both the DNA damage and spindle
checkpoints (Table 2.4). Interestingly, the arrest phenotypes correlated with the viability phenotypes observed by pedigree analysis. Those cells that produced two viable, switched daughter cells exhibited shorter cell cycle delays (~2 hours) that were completely dependent upon the spindle checkpoint, whereas cells that produced two dead cell clusters or one switched colony and one dead cell cluster exhibited longer arrests (~3.5 hours) and were only partially dependent on the spindle checkpoint (Table 2.4).

Several studies have indicated potential links between the DNA damage and spindle checkpoints (Garber and Rine 2002; Kim and Burke 2008). It is not surprising that DNA damage that triggers the damage checkpoint might also impede the correct attachment and formation of tension between the chromosomes and the mitotic spindle. It was recently demonstrated that the spindle assembly checkpoint arrests cells in response to MMS-induced DNA damage in a Mec1- and Tel1-dependent manner, independent of a functional kinetochore (Kim and Burke 2008). We show here that in response to a single DSB at the \textit{MAT} locus, the DNA damage response factor Rad9 appears to be required for both the DNA damage and spindle checkpoints, as \textit{rad1Δrad9Δ} mutants exhibit no G2/M arrest and \textit{rad1Δmad2Δ} mutants exhibit shorter arrests than \textit{rad1Δ} single mutants (1 hr vs. ~3.5 hrs; Table 2.5). In contrast to other studies, we do not see residual G2/M arrest in \textit{rad9Δ} mutants in these experiments (Aylon and Kupiec 2003; Kim and Burke 2008).

Previous work has shown that the length of G2/M arrest in response to DNA damage correlates with the amount of single-stranded DNA present (Lee \textit{et al.} 1998). Our results are consistent with this, as \textit{rad1Δ} mutants exhibit shorter arrests relative to \textit{donorless} strains; \textit{rad1Δ} mutants are able to initiate strand invasion, whereas \textit{donorless} mutants accumulate ssDNA because they cannot initiate repair (Lee \textit{et al.} 1998). We also observed distinct adaptation phenotypes in the \textit{rad1Δ} and \textit{donorless}
strains. *donorless* strains adapted for one cell cycle only and died at the next G2/M transition, whereas rad1Δ mutants exhibited a classical break adaptation phenotype and died as 8-cell clusters (See appendix, Supplementary Fig. 2.8). Since dying rad1Δ mutants exhibit a cell cycle delay followed by adaptation, it is possible that repair in this subset of the population occurs by break-induced replication (BIR) or by crossing over. BIR initiated from the MAT locus by strand invasion into HMLα would lead to loss of half of Chromosome III including the centromere, and crossing over would similarly create an intrachromosomal deletion. Such repair would be expected to be associated with delayed product formation as well as a DNA damage checkpoint- and spindle checkpoint-dependent G2/M arrest, as seen in our pedigree analysis (McEachern and Haber 2006).

The fact that Msh2 localization to the MAT locus is prolonged in rad1Δ and *donorless* mutants implies the presence of unrepaired recombination intermediates several hours after DSB formation. While this is expected in *donorless* mutants that lack homologous donor sequences, the fact that rad1Δ mutants exhibit *donorless*-like Msh2 localization highlights that repair occurs aberrantly in these cells. The prolonged presence of Msh2 in both mutants is also consistent with the fact that these mutants have an activated DNA damage response, and may indicate a role for Msh2 in this checkpoint.

In contrast to proposed models of mating type switching and to gene conversion involving a 3’ nonhomologous tail on the invading strand, Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal on the second, non-invading strand appears to be independent of Msh2-Msh3. Viability was only slightly reduced in msh2Δ mutants undergoing mating type switching, and msh2Δ mutants did not exhibit the unique viability pattern characteristic of rad1Δ and slx4Δ mutants in pedigree analysis. In this way, Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during mating
type switching is analogous to its role in cleavage of 3’ DNA-bound Top1 lesions, which is also Msh2-Msh3-independent (Vance and Wilson 2002).

There are at least two separate error-free lesion bypass pathways in *S. cerevisiae*, one pathway involving the homologous recombination machinery and the Mph1 helicase, and the Rad5-Mms2-Ubc13 branch of the Rad6-Rad18 pathway that is thought to regress replication forks and promote bypass of lesions by template switching (Torres-Ramos *et al.* 2002; Schürer *et al.* 2004; Watts 2006; Blastyák *et al.* 2007). We observed that both of these pathways contributed to the viability and cell cycle phenotypes of cells undergoing mating type switching. Mph1 is a helicase that is known to be in the Rad52 epistasis group, but it is thought to function in recombinational restart of stalled replication forks (Schürer *et al.* 2004; Prakash *et al.* 2005). The fact that the *rad1∆* and *mph1∆* mutations were mostly epistatic suggests that Mph1-dependent fork restart is hindered by the presence of the nonhomologous 3’ end that remains in *rad1∆* mutants, though it is unclear why this might be. We cannot rule out that the role of the Mph1 helicase during gene conversion is separate from its role in replication fork restart.

Replicative lesion bypass pathway choice depends on whether the lesion (in this case, a 3’ nonhomologous tail followed by a significant single-stranded gap) is on the leading strand versus the lagging strand. Presumably, priming of the next Okazaki fragment on the lagging strand could bypass such a lesion and allow replication to proceed without employing specialized fork restart machinery, which may explain why the decreased viability in *mms2∆* and *mph1∆* mutants is relatively subtle. In addition, there is *in vitro* evidence using bacterial proteins that re-priming of DNA synthesis can occur on the leading strand (Heller and Marians 2006). The nearest replication origin to the *MAT* locus is located on the centromere-proximal side, approximately 2.5 kb from the Y region at *MAT* ([www.oridb.org](http://www.oridb.org),
www.yeastgenome.org), so it may be more likely that the 3’ Yα tail is replicated by lagging rather than leading strand synthesis.

Mating type switching does not require progression through S-phase, since efficient gene conversion is detected in G2-arrested cells, though MAT switching in G1-arrested cells is severely reduced due to the absence of CDK1 (Cdc28) activation (Holmes and Haber 1999; Ira et al. 2004; Wang et al. 2004). However, DNA replication may contribute to mating type switching by priming DNA synthesis across the top strand of the partially-repaired intermediate pictured in Figure 2.5, bypassing the need to use the cleaved 3’ end as a primer for repair synthesis and relaxing the dependence on Rad1-Rad10-Slx4. Indeed, mutations in the genes encoding Polymerase α-primase or Rad27 were shown to greatly reduce mating type switching in G1-arrested cells (Holmes and Haber 1999). While it was later shown that these lagging-strand synthesis factors were dispensable for mating type switching in G2-arrested cells (Wang et al. 2004), it is possible that cycling cells might utilize lagging-strand synthesis in addition to specialized lesion bypass pathways to promote efficient completion of gene conversion. Moreover, recent work has shown that endonuclease-induced DSBs formed during G1 are recognized by the RPA subunit Rfa1 only after cells have entered S-phase, and that formation of Rad52 foci following IR treatment required release of G1-arrested cells into S-phase (Barlow et al. 2008). Further studies will be necessary in order to parse out the interplay between DNA replication and repair of DSBs by homologous recombination.

In summary, we conclude that gene conversion intermediates containing 3’ nonhomologous tails are principally processed by Rad1-Rad10-Slx4, even on the non-invading strand, and we propose that repair is aided by concurrent DNA replication and its associated post-replicative lesion bypass pathways.
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CHAPTER 3

Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal: Unpublished results and future directions

Introduction

As described in the previous chapters, the Rad1-Rad10 endonuclease plays an important role in removing 3’ nonhomologous tails during many homologous recombination events. It is still unclear whether other nucleases are redundant with Rad1-Rad10 for this function during gene conversion involving 3’ tails longer than 30 nt, since the most likely candidates, Mus81-Mms4 and the Polymerase δ proofreading activity, do not appear to play a role. It also remains to be seen which factors besides Mms2 and Mph1 might be involved in replication-mediated gene conversion, as proposed in the model in Chapter 2 (Figure 2.5; Lyndaker et al. 2008), and whether such a mechanism involves the S-phase checkpoint machinery. The experiments reported in this chapter attempt to address these issues, and the resulting findings both support and extend those in Chapter 2 regarding the roles of Rad1-Rad10 and associated factors in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal. Lingering questions and future avenues to pursue are discussed.

Materials and methods

Strains. For tdp1Δ, sae2Δ, and mrc1Δ experiments, the KANMX gene deletion was amplified from the Yeast Deletion Collection strain by PCR and transformed into
parent strain EAY745 (wild-type) or EAY853 \((rad1Δ)\) to create EAY2138 \((tdp1Δ)\), EAY2140 \((rad1Δtdp1Δ)\), EAY2127 \((sae2Δ)\), EAY2128 \((rad1Δsae2Δ)\), and EAY1781 \((mrc1Δ)\). All other yeast strains are described in Chapter 2 (Lyndaker et al. 2008).

**Media and culture conditions.** Yeast were grown under the conditions described in Lyndaker et al. (2008).

**Cell survival assays.** Cell survival following galactose-induced mating-type switching was determined as follows. Log-phase asynchronous cultures grown in YP-lactate media (2% w/v lactate) were induced with galactose (US Biological, 2% w/v final concentration) or mock induced with water. After a 30 minute induction, glucose (US Biological, 2% w/v) was added to suppress \(HO\) expression. Both induced and uninduced cultures were diluted 10,000-fold and plated in triplicate onto YPD plates before and 2 hours after induction. [*It was later realized that some strains \((rad1Δ\) mutants single nonhomology strains, all the double nonhomology strains, and \(donorless\) mutant) exhibit cell cycle delays, and that waiting to plate cells at two hours post-induction in cell viability experiments was misleading given the differences in cell cycle progression. Thus, unlike these experiments, cell survival experiments reported in Chapter 2 (Lyndaker et al. 2008) were plated immediately after the 30-minute galactose induction and more accurately reflect the cell viability.*] Survival was determined by taking a ratio of the number of colonies growing on plates containing induced cells compared to those from uninduced cells (Table 3.1).

**Mating type switching assay.** Mating types were determined both before and after galactose-induced mating type switching as described in Lyndaker et al. (2008) by crossing to tester strains FY23/EAY235 \((MATa ura3-52 leu2Δ1 trp1Δ63)\) and
FY86/EAY236 (MATα ura3-52 leu2Δ1 his3Δ200) and selecting for diploids. The percentage of switched cells was determined for each experiment and is shown in Table 3.1 as the mean ± SEM.

**Western blotting.** Cell samples (10 mls) were collected during a timecourse of galactose-inducible mating type switching and lysed by glass bead lysis in Hepes-based buffer. Lysates were boiled for 10 minutes in 1x sample buffer containing β-mercaptoethanol and SDS and run on 8% SDS-PAGE gels in 1x Tris glycine electrode buffer with SDS at 30 mA after stacking in 5% SDS-PAGE stacking gel at 15 mA. Gels were transferred to nitrocellulose membranes (BioRad Trans-blot transfer medium) in transfer buffer (25 mM Tris pH 7.5, 192 mM glycine, 20% methanol) for one hour at 42 mA using a BioRad Trans-blot SD semi-dry transfer cell (BioRad Laboratories, Inc.). Membranes were blocked overnight in TBST (1x Tris-buffered saline with 0.1% Tween 80, (Sigma)) plus 4% dry milk or 4% ECL Advance blocking agent (Amersham, GE Healthcare). Blocked membranes were incubated with γC-19 goat polyclonal anti-Rad53 antibody (1:2000 dilution; Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Inc.) in TBST + 2% blocking agent for one hour, washed with TBST, and incubated 1-2 hours with donkey anti-goat IgG-HRP secondary antibody (1:5000 dilution; Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Inc.) in TBST + 1% blocking agent. Detection was carried out using either ECL Plus or ECL Advance (Amersham, GE Healthcare).

**Preparation of genomic DNA by spheroplasting.** For most PCR-based assays and previous Southern blots, genomic DNA was prepared by glass bead lysis as described in Lyndaker et al. 2008. In some preliminary PCR-based experiments, DNA was prepared by spheroplasting to potentially preserve any intact single-stranded DNA. Spheroplasting was carried out essentially as described in the Lichten lab protocol (T.
Goldfarb, personal communication) and Allers and Lichten (2000). 30 mls of mid-log phase cells were harvested at the relevant time point before or after induction of mating type switching and treated with 8 mls of 50% glycerol, 0.5% sodium azide on ice. Cells were pelleted, washed with 10 mls of ice cold spheroplasting buffer pH 7.5 (1 M sorbitol, 50 mM Potassium phosphate pH 7.0, 10 mM EDTA pH 8.0) plus 20% glycerol, resuspended in 1 ml of the same buffer, and frozen. Cells were thawed on ice, pelleted, resuspended in 500 µl of spheroplasting buffer containing zymolase, 1% (v/v) β-mercaptoethanol, and 20% glycerol, and incubated at 37° C for 5 minutes. Samples were pelleted and resuspended in 500 µl stop solution (100 mM NaCl, 50 mM Tris pH 8.0, 50 mM EDTA pH 8.0), followed by the addition of 1 volume of equilibrated phenol. Samples were rocked for 15 minutes, spun, treated with 24:1 chloroform:isoamyl alcohol, and spun down. Nucleic acids were precipitated by addition of 1/10 volume of 5 M NaCl and 1 volume of isopropanol and pellets dried overnight. Pellets were resuspended in 300 µl TE containing 0.05 µg/ml RNase A and incubated 30 minutes at 37° C. DNA was precipitated by adding 30 µl of 3 M NaAcetate and 200 µl isopropanol, and pellets were washed with 70% ethanol. Before use, DNA was resuspended in 50 µl TE.

**BND-cellulose enrichment for ssDNA.** The protocol for enrichment of ssDNA from genomic DNA preparations using BND-cellulose was obtained from Dr. Joel Huberman (Roswell Park Cancer Institute, SUNY Buffalo, Buffalo, NY) and is adapted from Gamper et al. (1985). Benzoylated napthoylated DEAE (BND)-cellulose beads (Sigma) were suspended in 10 mls of 5 M NaCl, pelleted gently at 2000 rpm, and washed 4 times in 10 mls 5 M NaCl. The bead pellet was washed once in 3 volumes of water, then washed twice with 10 mls 1.0 M NET (1.0 M NaCl, 10
mM Tris pH 8.0, 1 mM EDTA pH 8.0), resuspended in 10 mls of the same buffer, and stored at 4°C until use.

Genomic DNA (prepared by glass bead lysis or spheroplasting, resuspended in TE) was brought up to 1.0 M NaCl using 5 M NaCl in twice the volume of the BND-cellulose packed volume. DNA samples were added to BND-cellulose, mixed gently for 30 seconds, and centrifuged gently for 20 seconds. Beads were washed 5 times with one volume of 1.0 M NET and 6 times with 1.0 M NET + 1.6% caffeine. Caffeine wash fractions were pooled and centrifuged at 10,000 rpm in Eppendorf tubes for 10 minutes to pellet the BND-cellulose. An equal volume of isopropanol was added to each tube, and samples were incubated at -20°C for at least 30 minutes. Chilled samples were then spun at 10,000 rpm for 90 minutes at 4°C. Pellets were dried in the fume hood and resuspended in 150 µl TE. DNA was treated with 1/9 volume 4 M NaAcetate and 2.2 volumes of ethanol and incubated at -20°C for at least 30 minutes. Samples were spun 30 minutes at 4°C, rinsed with 70% ethanol, and when dry, resuspended in 20 µl TE.

The resulting genomic DNA enriched for ssDNA was used as a template in PCR reactions with primer sets (AO1048 + AO1049) and (AO1042 + AO1044), and samples were run on 1.5% agarose gels, stained with EtBr (Figure 3.2), and quantified using ImageJ.

**PCR detection of strand invasion intermediates.** Genomic DNA samples prepared for Southern blot experiments (Lyndaker et al. 2008) were used as substrates in a PCR-based strand invasion assay (White and Haber 1990). PCR reactions were performed as described previously in 50 µl reactions each containing 0.1 µl of genomic DNA and primers pA (AO1056) and pB (AO1057) (White and Haber 1990).
All PCR samples were electrophoresed in 1.5% TAE-agarose gels and bands were quantified relative to the CRY1 control product using Image J (see Figure 3.3).

**Chromatin immunoprecipitation and semi-quantitative PCR.** Samples from mating type switching time course experiments were chromatin immunoprecipitated as described previously (Goldfarb and Alani 2004). Msh2-HA₄ was immunoprecipitated from yeast cell extracts using the α-HA 12CA5 monoclonal antibody. All strains used in ChIP experiments contained a deletion of the HMRa donor so that the MATa locus could be specifically amplified by PCR. This deletion still allows mating type switching from MATa to MATa since intact HMLa is available. PCR reactions, electrophoresis conditions, and quantification were similar to those described in Evans et al. (2000), but with different primers. To detect sequences adjacent to the DSB, a 267 bp fragment containing Ya sequence was amplified with primers AO1048 (5’TCACCCCAAGCACCAGGCATT) and AO1049 (5’CTGTTGCGGAAAGCTGAAAC). The loading control CRY1 locus is situated far from the MAT locus on Chromosome III. Samples were run on 1.5% TAE-agarose gels and bands were quantified relative to the zero time point using Scion Image (Figure 3.4).

**Results and Discussion**

**Rad53 is not appreciably phosphorylated in rad1Δ mutants during mating type switching.** Yeast lacking the Rad1-Rad10 endonuclease exhibit a G2/M cell cycle delay in response to a single DSB at the mating type locus, as described in Chapter 2 (Lyndaker et al. 2008). This checkpoint response is dependent upon both RAD9 and MAD2, factors critical for the DNA damage checkpoint and spindle checkpoint,
respectively, suggesting that the cell cycle is delayed due to unrepairred or aberrantly repaired DNA. To test whether this cell cycle arrest is associated with activation of the Rad53 branch of the DNA damage checkpoint, we analyzed the phosphorylation status of Rad53 by Western blotting. In donorless mutant strains, which arrest in G2/M due to an inability to repair the DSB at the mating type locus by gene conversion, several higher mobility Rad53 species were observed (see Figure 3.1), indicative of multiply-phosphorylated Rad53 and consistent with previous studies (Pellicioli et al. 2001). In rad1Δ mutants, higher mobility Rad53 bands were not detected (Figure 3.1). While these results are not conclusive, they are consistent with rad1Δ mutant strains lacking Rad53 phosphorylation despite an ongoing RAD9-dependent cell cycle arrest.

There are two plausible explanations for the lack of Rad53 phosphorylation in rad1Δ mutants: 1) The DNA damage-responsive checkpoint response in rad1Δ mutants induced for mating type switching may proceed via a Rad9-dependent, Rad53-independent pathway. There is evidence that a Rad53-independent DNA damage response exists in S. cerevisiae, which might depend on the type or extent of DNA damage, and such responses are instead dependent upon Chk1 (Sun and Fasullo 2007; Segurado and Diffley 2008). 2) The extent of checkpoint activation in rad1Δ mutants during mating type switching may be sufficiently lower than in donorless cells, and the amount of Rad53 phosphorylation may be low enough that we cannot detect it by Western blots. This is consistent both with the incomplete arrest in rad1Δ cells, as observed by FACS analysis, and with the amount of detectable gene conversion product formation in rad1Δ mutants, which is nearly wild-type despite activation of the G2/M DNA damage checkpoint (Lyndaker et al. 2008). The latter interpretation of the data seems more likely given the mixture of both wild-type and repair-defective phenotypes exhibited by rad1Δ mutants undergoing double-strand
Figure 3.1. Western blot analysis of Rad53 during mating type switching in wild-type, rad1Δ, and donorless strains. Cultures of wild-type, rad1Δ, and donorless mutants were induced for mating type switching and cell samples were taken at relevant time points. Cell lysates were run on 8% SDS-PAGE gels and blotted with α-Rad53 antibody. Arrows indicate the higher mobility phosphorylated forms of Rad53 that appear in response to DNA damage.
break repair during mating type switching.

**The Ya 3’ tail is removed in rad1Δ mutants during mating type switching.** The proposed role of Rad1-Rad10 during mating type switching is cleavage of the 3’ Ya nonhomologous tail to allow completion of gene conversion. In order to detect whether the 3’ Ya sequence remains attached in rad1Δ mutants, genomic DNA prepared during mating type switching was enriched for ssDNA using BND-cellulose prior to PCR detection of Ya. As shown in Figure 3.2, Ya signal was equal to control signal prior to mating type switching (t = 0) and decreased in intensity by 3 hours post-DSB induction. The ratio of Ya/control signal was not consistently significantly different in rad1Δ mutants relative to wild-type cells, despite a trend towards more Ya in rad1Δ mutants at 2 and 3 hours post-induction. Southern blots of the Ya sequence suggest that there is no significant difference in loss of the Ya sequence between wild-type and rad1Δ strains (Appendix, Supplementary Figure 2.7; Lyndaker et al. 2008). Thus, it appears that even in the absence of Rad1-Rad10, the 3’ nonhomologous Ya tail is removed.

In earlier studies, we found that completion of gene conversion was more strictly dependent upon Msh2-Msh3 and Rad1-Rad10 when nonhomologous sequence was present on both sides of the break (two 3’ nonhomologous tails) compared to “normal” mating type switching involving only one 3’ nonhomologous tail (Chapter 2; Lyndaker et al. 2008). Since product formation is severely limited in these cells, we wanted to test whether product formation was inhibited at the early step of strand invasion, when a 3’ nonhomologous tail sits on the very 3’ end of the invading strand, or whether the cumulative delay in having to remove two 3’ tails was sufficient to impair repair (See Chapter 1, Figure 1.2 for diagram of gene conversion involving two 3’ nonhomologous tails). Previously, White and Haber (1990) developed a PCR assay
Figure 3.2. PCR detection of the Ya 3’ tail in wild-type and rad1Δ mutants undergoing mating type switching following BND-cellulose enrichment for ssDNA. A. Primer sets AO1048 + AO1049 (3’ Ya) and AO1042 + AO1044 (Ya base) used for detection of Ya by semi-quantitative PCR. B. PCR detection of Ya and CRY control DNA sequences in BND-cellulose-treated genomic DNA isolated from wild-type and rad1Δ mutants prior to (t = 0) or during (t = 3) mating type switching.
to monitor the formation of a strand invasion intermediate containing new DNA synthesis off the invading 3’ end (Figure 3.3B). To test whether such an intermediate can form in double nonhomology strains, genomic DNA isolated during mating type switching was PCR-amplified using primers specific for DNA distal to $MAT$ (pB) and the $Y\alpha$ (pA) sequence (Figure 3.3A; White and Haber 1990).

For “normal” (single nonhomology) mating type switching, the timing of invasion product formation was similar in wild-type, $rad1\Delta$, and $msh3\Delta$ strains (Figure 3.3C), and was similar to that of final product formation as detected previously (Lyndaker et al. 2008). A delay was seen in the formation of the strand invasion intermediate in the wild-type double nonhomology strains compared to the single nonhomology strains; this is in agreement with previous studies indicating that recombination is delayed when nonhomologous sequence must be removed from the invading strand (Colaiácovo et al. 1999). Very little PCR product was detected in the $rad1\Delta$ and $msh3\Delta$ double nonhomology strains (Figure 3.3C), consistent with the physical and genetic analyses of product formation and viability presented earlier (Chapter 2; Lyndaker et al. 2008). Thus, mating type switching in wild-type double nonhomology strains appears to be inhibited at the strand invasion step rather than at later time points during repair, and both Rad1 and Msh3 are critical for processing the 3’ tail on the invading strand.

**Msh2 localization to $MAT$ is prolonged in wild-type double nonhomology strains.**

While Msh2-Msh3 is dispensable for 3' nonhomologous tail removal during mating type switching when only one side of the DSB is nonhomologous to the donor sequence, Msh2 localizes to the DSB region following DSB formation and leaves with kinetics consistent with product formation (Chapter 2; Lyndaker et al. 2008).
Figure 3.3. PCR detection of synthesis off the invading 3’ end in single nonhomology and double nonhomology wild-type, \textit{rad1Δ}, and \textit{msh3Δ} strains induced for mating type switching. A. Location of primers pA and pB for detection of invasion PCR products following invasion of the distal 3’ end at \textit{MAT} into the \textit{HMLα} donor sequence. Adapted from White and Haber (1990). B. Predicted intermediate capable of being detected by this PCR assay. Synthesis off the 3’ end must reach the site of primer pA in order to be detected. C. Semi-quantitative PCR of genomic DNA extracted at the shown time points following induction of mating type switching from wild-type, \textit{rad1Δ}, and \textit{msh3Δ} strains harboring nonhomologous sequence on one or both sides of the DSB.
Previous studies of DSB repair on plasmids found that Msh2 localizes rapidly to DSBs containing nonhomologous sequence on both sides of the break (Evans et al. 2000). Thus, we analyzed localization of Msh2 to the mating type locus when the DSB is flanked by two nonhomologous sequences. Using Msh2-HA₄ and α-HA antibody as described in Chapter 2, Msh2 was found to be similarly recruited to the DSB in double nonhomology strains (Figure 3.4), though slightly later, and exhibited prolonged localization in these strains relative to single nonhomology strains. It remains unclear whether the localization is extended in rad1Δ or msh3Δ double nonhomology strains relative to wild-type in these strains as in the single nonhomology strains, despite the narrow localization peaks shown in this representative experiment (Figure 3.4; Chapter 2; Lyndaker et al. 2008). ChIP to these sequences near the DSB is complicated by the fact that repair does not occur appreciably in rad1Δ or msh3Δ double nonhomology mutants, and the DNA at the MAT locus is degraded at later time points.

_rad1Δ mutant phenotypes are not due to defective removal of Topoisomerase I during mating type switching._ rad1Δ mutants exhibit a mixture of near-wild-type and repair-defective phenotypes during mating type switching in *S. cerevisiae* (Lyndaker et al. 2008). Product formation in rad1Δ mutants appears wild-type in both PCR-based assays and Southern blots, as do the kinetics and extent of 3’ Ya nonhomologous tail loss. On the other hand, rad1Δ mutants exhibit a RAD9-dependent G2/M cell delay during mating type switching similar to that of donorless strains that are unable to complete gene conversion. Pedigree experiments following single cells induced for mating type switching previously revealed a unique phenotype in which a single cell induced for a DSB divide to produce one switched cell and one dead cell (Lyndaker et al. 2008). While we favored the idea that the dying cells
Figure 3.4. Msh2 ChIP to the mating type locus during mating type switching in double nonhomology strains. Representative experiment of Msh2 ChIP localization to MAT as detected by semi-quantitative PCR with primers adjacent to the DSB in wild-type, rad1Δ, and msh3Δ double nonhomology strains.
contained uncleaved 3’ Ya tails and the surviving cells completed gene conversion by replicating partially repaired gene conversion intermediates, it seemed plausible that cells could be dying from a Rad1-dependent defect on one DNA strand that is independent of the 3’ nonhomologous tail.

One potential candidate for this defect concerns the role of Rad1-Rad10 in removing Topoisomerase I that is covalently attached to DNA. TopI relieves topological stress in DNA during replication and repair processes, and it is possible that the process of gene conversion creates enough supercoiling to require TopI function. Following relief of supercoiling, TopI remains covalently attached to a 3’ single-stranded DNA end at its site of action and must be removed. There are several mechanisms by which TopI is removed from DNA: 1) TopI can remove itself, 2) Rad1-Rad10 can cleave the 3’ flap of DNA that TopI is attached to, or 3) the Tdp1 protein, Tyrosyl-DNA Phosphodiesterase I, can hydrolyze the 3’ phosphor-tyrosyl bond attaching TopI to the DNA (Raymond and Burgin 2006). The Tdp1- and Rad1-Rad10-dependent TopI removal mechanisms are redundant with each other, as evidenced by the increased sensitivity of tdp1∆rad1∆ double mutants to camptothecin, which requires TopI function to repair DNA damage (Deng et al. 2005). I therefore tested whether the rad1∆ mating type switching phenotypes changed in mutants lacking TDP1.

In cell survival experiments, tdp1∆ mutants exhibited decreased viability when induced for mating type switching (47% ± 4 vs. 65% ± 4 in wild-type), whereas tdp1∆rad1∆ double mutant viability was comparable to that of rad1∆ mutants (32% ± 3 vs. 34% ± 3; Table 3.1). The percentage of surviving cells that switched mating type was similar for all genotypes (Table 3.1). Thus, the defect in rad1∆ mutants appears to be unrelated to removal of TopI from DNA. However, it might be interesting to follow up on why cell survival is reduced in tdp1∆ single mutants during mating type
switching. Perhaps the cell cycle arrest in \textit{rad1}\Delta mutants is sufficient for resolving whatever defect the \textit{tdp1}\Delta mutants have in completing efficient repair.

\textbf{S-phase checkpoint signaling may be important for efficient completion of mating type switching.} Given the hypothesis presented in Chapter 2 that both wild-type cells and \textit{rad1}\Delta mutants complete mating type switching with the aid of replication, and the fact that \textit{rad1}\Delta mutants exhibit a Rad9-dependent cell cycle arrest (Lyndaker \textit{et al.} 2008), it seemed likely that damage signaling might occur at or associated with replication forks. To test this hypothesis, mutants lacking Mrc1, the yeast Claspin homolog and S-phase counterpart of Rad9 in the DNA damage response (Pasero \textit{et al.} 2003), were assayed for cell survival and mating type switching efficiency. As shown in Table 3.1, \textit{mrc1}\Delta mutants exhibited a decrease in cell viability in comparison to wild-type strains yet efficient switching in surviving cells, indicating a potential role for Mrc1 in either completion of repair or in efficient cell cycle signaling during mating type switching. Attempts to create \textit{rad1}\Delta\textit{mrc1}\Delta double mutants were unsuccessful and resulted in gene duplications during homologous integration. Further studies are necessary in order to understand the intriguing potential role of Mrc1 in the DNA damage response during gene conversion.

\textbf{Loss of Sae2 reduces mating type switching.} Since \textit{rad1}\Delta mutants form gene conversion products with near-wild-type kinetics, it was of interest to look for other nucleases that might be redundant with Rad1-Rad10 during mating type switching. Mus81-Mms4 and the proofreading activity of Polymerase \delta were tested previously and found to have little effect on mating type switching in the \textit{rad1}\Delta mutant background (Lyndaker \textit{et al.} 2008). The Sae2 endonuclease, which cleaves DNA with a preference for single-stranded DNA near ssDNA/dsDNA junctions
Table 3.1. **Cell survival and mating type switching efficiency of wild-type and mutant strains.** The indicated strains were induced for mating type switching from \( \text{MAT}a \) to \( \text{MAT}u \) and assayed for mating type as described in Materials and Methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>% Survival</th>
<th>% Switched</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wild-type</td>
<td>65 ± 4</td>
<td>93 ± 1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{tdp1}\Delta )</td>
<td>47 ± 4</td>
<td>94 ± 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{mrc1}\Delta )</td>
<td>43 ± 6</td>
<td>100 ± 0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{sae2}\Delta )</td>
<td>43 ± 4</td>
<td>90 ± 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{rad1}\Delta )</td>
<td>34 ± 3</td>
<td>91 ± 1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{rad1}\Delta \text{tdp1}\Delta )</td>
<td>32 ± 3</td>
<td>84 ± 4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{rad1}\Delta \text{sae2}\Delta )</td>
<td>22 ± 2</td>
<td>76 ± 3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Lengsfeld et al. 2007), was tested for its potential to act during mating type switching. $sae2\Delta$ (43% ± 4) and $rad1\Delta sae2\Delta$ mutants (22% ± 2) exhibited decreased viability relative to wild-type (65% ± 4) and $rad1\Delta$ mutants strains (34% ± 3), respectively (Table 3.1). $rad1\Delta sae2\Delta$ double mutants also showed a defect in the percentage of surviving cells that switched mating type (76% ± 3 vs. 91% ± 1 in $rad1\Delta$ mutants). While these results might suggest that Sae2 aids in the removal of 3’ tails during mating type switching, recent work has shown that Sae2 plays a critical role in the 5’ to 3’ resection of DSBs (Mimitou and Symington 2008; Zhu et al. 2008). Slowed resection in the absence of Sae2 may cause a delay in mating type switching or in cell cycle progression during switching that is unrelated to 3’ nonhomologous tail removal. Detection of the 3’ Y$a$ tail by Southern blot or PCR-based assay in wild-type vs. $sae2\Delta$ mutants could aid in discerning between these possibilities and lead to a better understanding the role of Sae2 in mating type switching.

Together, the results presented here extend the findings of previous studies on the role of the Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 complex and Msh2-Msh3 in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal, and shed new light on potential roles for TdpI, Sae2, and Mrc1 in the completion of gene conversion during mating type switching. Aside from further work on these factors, future avenues of interest with regard to Rad1-Rad10-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal are discussed below.

**Future directions**

Mutation of the Mec1/Tel1 phosphorylation sites on Slx4 abolishes the ability of Slx4 to function in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal during single-strand annealing (Flott et al. 2007). Presumably, this checkpoint-regulated function of Slx4 in SSA is the Rad1-Rad10-dependent removal of 3’ nonhomologous tails, given that the
phosphorylation-defective mutants of Slx4 are just as deficient as slx4Δ, rad1Δ, or saw1Δ null mutants (Flott et al. 2007; Li et al. 2008). Consistent with this, we previously found that slx4Δ deletion mutants are as defective as rad1Δ mutants in mating type switching (Lyndaker et al. 2008). Since DSB repair by SSA normally involves activation of the DNA damage checkpoint and mating type switching does not, it would interesting to test the phosphorylation-deficient mutants of Slx4 in mating type switching assays. Like rad1Δ mutants, slx4Δ mutants exhibit cell cycle delays (though shorter) following initiation of mating type switching (Lyndaker et al. 2008), indicating that the DNA damage checkpoint response to DSBs is at least partly independent of both RAD1 and SLX4.

In order to further study the checkpoint response in cells undergoing mating type switching, future experiments should be performed in synchronized cells. To do this, strains can be deleted for the BAR1 gene to sensitize them to α-factor, and cultures can be synchronized in α-factor and released prior to DSB induction. Since a significant fraction of rad1Δ mutants do not arrest when induced for mating type switching during asynchronous growth (Chapter 2, Figure 2.4; Lyndaker et al. 2008), the molecular analysis in our previous studies reflects repair occurring at various stages of the cell cycle. The extent of gene conversion defects in rad1Δ, msh2Δ, and other mutants could be clarified by repeating the Southern blots and ChIP experiments in cells synchronized in α-factor prior to DSB formation.

It would be interesting to run pulsed-field gels of rad1Δ mutants that had undergone mating type switching to see if there is any indication for break-induced replication that initiates by invasion of the MAT 3’ end into HMLα and continues to the end of the chromosome. Such an event would be expected to create a switched Yα product, but could potentially delete the centromere and more than half of Chromosome III (See Figure 3.5). A BIR mechanism could explain the involvement
Figure 3.5. Mating type switching from MATα to MATα: Poised for break-induced replication? A. Initiation of mating type switching by HO-mediated DSB formation at the MAT locus. Following 3’ to 5’ resection of the DSB, the distal 3’ end performs strand invasion into the homologous sequence at HMLα. DNA synthesis initiates from the invading 3’ end to begin gene conversion. B. Diagram of Chromosome III including the mating type locus (MATα), centromere, and donor locus (HMLα).
A.

B.
of the spindle checkpoint in the G2/M arrest in rad1Δ mutants, though cells of the “two switched” pedigree category with presumably wild-type-like gene conversion products also undergo MAD2-dependent cell cycle arrest. While the products of BIR may not be stable, they might be visible on a pulsed-field gel, especially if the gel is probed for MAT-specific sequences. BIR initiating from MAT invasion into HMLα might also be followed by single-strand annealing or other repeat-mediated recombination events to create unique products that we detect by Southern blot as gene conversions, and might better explain the G2/M DNA damage checkpoint response observed in rad1Δ mutants.

A recent study showed that Rad54 controls access to the 3’ OH after Rad51-mediated strand invasion (Li and Heyer 2008). Rad54 dissociates Rad51 from double-stranded DNA at the end of the Rad51-dsDNA filament after strand invasion in order to allow DNA polymerase to access the free 3’ hydroxyl and prime DNA synthesis. Rad54 is also thought to act at earlier steps in stimulating Rad51-dependent strand invasion, perhaps to convert unstable paranemic structures formed upon strand invasion into more stable plectonemic joints (Sugawara et al. 2003; Li and Heyer 2008). 3’ nonhomologous tail removal may be intimately linked with this process, since cleavage of nonhomologous tails frees the 3’ end for priming of DNA synthesis. It has been proposed that the role of Msh2-Msh3 in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal may be to stabilize paranemic joints, such as those formed upon strand invasion, to prepare them for Rad1-Rad10-dependent cleavage, and also that the requirement for Rad1-Rad10 in 3’ end processing may vary for paranemic vs. plectonemic joints (reviewed in Lyndaker and Alani 2009). It will be interesting to see how Rad54-dependent removal of Rad51 and Rad1-Rad10-Slx4- and Msh2-Msh3-dependent 3’ nonhomologous tail removal are intertwined.
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CHAPTER 4

Insights into the roles of the Sgs1 helicase and Msh2-Msh6 mismatch recognition complex in heteroduplex rejection during homologous recombination

Abstract

Recombination between slightly divergent sequences in the genome can lead to chromosomal rearrangements such as insertions, deletions, inversions, and translocations. DNA mismatch repair proteins are known to actively inhibit recombination between homeologous sequences while allowing recombination between completely homologous substrates. Mismatch repair-dependent prevention of homeologous recombination is thought to occur via heteroduplex rejection, which is hypothesized to entail mismatch recognition and binding by the Msh2-Msh6 complex within heteroduplex DNA and either recruitment or stimulation of the Sgs1 helicase leading to unwinding of inappropriate recombination intermediates. This chapter describes the biochemical purification of Msh2-Msh6 and a helicase-proficient soluble fragment of Sgs1, Sgs1_{400-1268}, and demonstrates that Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1 physically interact in coimmunoprecipitation experiments. When added to helicase assays, Msh2-Msh6 appears to inhibit Sgs1-dependent unwinding of short 3’ overhang substrates. Studies of the effect of Msh2-Msh6 on Sgs1 helicase activity are ongoing.
Introduction

Although homologous recombination often serves as a DNA repair mechanism, recombination between slightly divergent or so-called homeologous sequences in the genome can lead to chromosomal rearrangements, including deletions, duplications, inversions, and translocations. This is especially true for higher eukaryote genomes that contain many repeated sequences. Chromosomal rearrangement and instability is observed in cancerous cells, so understanding how recombination fidelity is regulated may also aid in our understanding of cancer progression and susceptibility. Aside from maintaining genome stability, inhibition of homeologous recombination also preserves species diversity and isolation by preventing recombination between different species (Radman and Wagner 1993).

DNA mismatch repair. DNA mismatch repair factors play a role in maintaining the fidelity of recombination by inhibiting recombination between somewhat divergent homologous sequences. The DNA mismatch repair (MMR) system primarily functions to repair errors incurred during DNA replication. In *E. coli* MMR, multimers of the MutS protein recognize and bind to mismatched bases. Subsequent binding of the MutL proteins to MutS activates the nuclease activity of MutH at a downstream hemimethylated GATC site, allowing for strand discrimination and excision of the newly-synthesized strand. DNA resynthesis and ligation follow to form the final repaired product (Modrich and Lahue 1996; Harfe and Jinks-Robertson 2000; Schofield and Hsieh 2003).

In the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, there are 6 *MutS* homologs, Msh1-Msh6, as well as 4 *MutL* homologs, Mlh1-Mlh3 and Pms1. The major components of post-replicative DNA mismatch repair are Msh2, Msh3, Msh6, Mlh1, and Pms1. As
shown in Figure 4.1, mismatch recognition is carried out by either the Msh2-Msh6 (MutSα) or Msh2-Msh3 (MutSβ) heterodimer; Msh2-Msh6 has binding specificity for single base-base mismatches and single nucleotide insertion/deletions, whereas Msh2-Msh3 recognizes insertion/deletion loops of one to 16 nucleotides. Recent work suggests that Msh2-Msh3 also binds specifically to base-base mismatches (Harrington and Kolodner 2007). Mismatch recognition is followed by binding of the Mlh1-Pms1 “matchmaker” heterodimer to the Msh heterodimer, which, through an unknown mechanism, allows recruitment of downstream factors for completion of excision, resynthesis, and ligation (see Figure 4.1).

Downstream factors in mismatch repair include the ExoI exonuclease, the PCNA processivity clamp, replication factor C (RFC), DNA polymerases δ and ε, and the RPA single-strand binding protein, though the mechanism of these downstream steps in eukaryotic MMR remains unclear (reviewed in Harfe and Jinks-Robertson 2000; Harfe and Jinks-Robertson 2000; Schofield and Hsieh 2003). Eukaryotes lack both the post-replicative GATC hemimethylation and the MutH endonuclease that direct nascent strand recognition and the downstream excision steps in the bacterial MMR system. Recent work has shown that Mlh1-Pms1 exhibits nuclease activity in vitro, and the conserved metal-binding motif present in Pms1 is also conserved in Mlh3, though it is unclear what the exact function of this activity is in vivo (Kadyrov et al. 2007; Nishant et al. 2008). It is striking that this endonuclease motif is conserved in MutL homologs from organisms that lack the MutH strand-discrimination system, though it is unclear how this Mlh1-Pms1 nicking activity might provide a strand discrimination signal.

MMR in higher eukaryotes is thought to occur in a similar manner to that in S. cerevisiae, with high conservation of the Msh2, Msh6, Msh3, Mlh1, and Pms1 (hPms2) proteins throughout evolution. Human Pms2 is the homolog of S. cerevisiae...
Figure 4.1. Post-replicative DNA mismatch repair in *S. cerevisiae*. Adapted from a figure obtained from Dr. Julie Heck. The MutS homolog heterodimers Msh2-Msh6 and Msh2-Msh3 recognize mismatches resulting from misincorporation errors at replication forks. Msh2-Msh6 primarily recognizes base-base mismatches and single nucleotide insertion/deletions, whereas Msh2-Msh3 recognizes larger insertion/deletion mismatches. Binding of the MutL homolog heterodimer Mlh1-Pms1 to MutS homologs bound at mismatches promotes subsequent steps in mismatch repair including strand excision, repair synthesis, and ligation. Downstream factors in mismatch repair include the ExoI exonuclease, the PCNA processivity clamp, Rfc, DNA polymerases δ and ε, and the RPA single-strand binding protein.
Pms1, and the hMlh1-Pms2 complex (MutLα) is thought to be the major MutL complex in post-replicative MMR. Germline mutations in the human MSH2, MSH6, MSH3, MLH1, PMS2, MLH3 and EXO1 mismatch repair genes are associated with Lynch syndrome, an autosomal dominant condition characterized primarily by microsatellite instability and early-onset colon and endometrial cancers (Peltomaki 2003; Boland et al. 2008). Mutations in MSH2, MLH1, MSH6, and PMS2 are found in up to 80% of hereditary non-polyposis colorectal cancer (HNPCC) families, and MSH2 and MLH1 mutations confer consistently higher levels of microsatellite instability than the remaining MMR mutations (Peltomaki 2003). Biallelic inheritance of MMR mutations can also lead to Constitutional Mismatch Repair-Deficiency (CMMR-D) syndrome, characterized by childhood cancers, brain tumors, early-onset colon cancers, and neurofibromatosis type 1 phenotypes (Wimmer and Etzler 2008). Mutations and aberrant epigenetic regulation of MMR genes have also been identified in a variety of sporadic cancers (Lynch and de la Chapelle 2003; Peltomaki 2003; Chaksangchaichot et al. 2006).

Mismatch repair factors have a variety of roles outside the canonical post-replicative MMR functions at the replication fork. Msh2-Msh6, Msh2-Msh3, and Mlh1-Pms1 also correct mismatches in heteroduplexes during homologous recombination. Msh2-Msh3 is important for Rad1-Rad10-dependent processing of 3’ nonhomologous tail intermediates during homologous recombination (see Chapters 1 and 2), while Msh4-Msh5 and Mlh1-Mlh3 are critical players in meiotic crossover recombination. At least in higher eukaryotes, Msh2 interacts with DNA damage checkpoint factors and is involved in promoting apoptosis in response to DNA damaging agents (Seifert and Reichrath 2006). Msh2-Msh6 is also important for somatic hypermutation and class switch recombination during antibody generation.
(Slean et al. 2008). As discussed below, both Msh2-Msh6 and Mlh1-Pms1 act to prevent recombination between homeologous substrates.

**Double-strand break repair via homologous recombination.** Like post-replicative mismatch repair, double-strand break (DSB) repair pathways help to maintain the integrity of the genome. Repair of DSBs is primarily carried out by either homologous recombination (HR) or non-homologous end-joining (NHEJ). These repair pathways are crucial, since unrepaired DSBs can lead to chromosome rearrangements, chromosome loss, and cell death. DSB repair via homologous recombination can occur through a variety of mechanisms, including gene conversion, crossing over, break-induced replication (BIR), and single-strand annealing (SSA) (reviewed in Pâques and Haber 1999; Symington 2002). These mechanisms each involve some degree of pairing between two homologous sequences, and can involve nucleolytic and helicase activities, Holliday junction formation, migration, and resolution, DNA synthesis, and ligation. All HR mechanisms are largely dependent on Rad52, which binds to ssDNA and mediates strand annealing. Of the Rad52-dependent HR pathways, gene conversion pathways are highly dependent upon Rad51, a RecA homolog that forms nucleoprotein filaments that perform strand invasion into duplex DNA, and others, like SSA, are Rad51-independent. In addition, many HR mechanisms require Rad59, which anneals complementary DNA strands in a similar manner to Rad52. Requirements for Rad51 and Rad59 are not mutually exclusive (Pâques and Haber 1999; Symington 2002; Spell and Jinks-Robertson 2003).

Homologous recombination repair of DSBs is often considered to be an error-free DNA repair mechanism, and this is true for the majority of gene conversion events. Gene conversion results in a non-reciprocal transfer of DNA sequence from
one region of the genome to another that can result in either noncrossover or crossover products. Noncrossovers are thought to occur via a synthesis-dependent strand annealing (SDSA) mechanism as discussed in Chapter 2, where strand invasion into a homologous donor sequence and DNA synthesis off of the donor template are followed by annealing back to the native locus. This is in contrast to earlier predicted models of noncrossover formation by alternative resolution of double Holliday junctions (reviewed in Pâques and Haber 1999). Crossovers entail the reciprocal exchange of DNA strands, and are hypothesized to form when strand invasion into a donor sequence and second end capture form a double Holliday junction intermediate that is then resolved by nucleolytic cleavage. Crossovers can be associated with varying extents of gene conversion depending both on the extent of Holliday junction migration and the degree of homology between the two recombining regions.

Some HR pathways are less conservative and, while they serve their purpose in repairing lethal DSBs, can lead to deletions and gross chromosomal rearrangements, especially when DSBs are located within repetitive DNA sequences (Argueso et al. 2008). Single-strand annealing (SSA) occurs when a DSB is formed between repeated sequences, and results in deletion of the intervening sequence (which can be up to 15 kb) and one copy of the repeat (see Figure 4.2; reviewed in Pâques and Haber 1999). Break-induced replication (BIR) begins with strand invasion similarly to simple gene conversion, but is followed by extensive replication that can span the full arm of a chromosome. Repeated cycles of template switching are likely to play a role, and can lead to complex chromosomal rearrangements. BIR includes both Rad51-dependent and -independent pathways (Pâques and Haber 1999; McEachern and Haber 2006).

**Mismatch repair factors in recombination.** Given the complexity of HR and the importance of repairing breaks in the genome, it is critical that this recombination be
Figure 4.2. **Single-strand annealing (SSA) mechanism of DSB repair.** Gray boxes indicate a repeated sequence. DSBs can be repaired by SSA when homologous DNA sequences reside on both sides of the break. Following DSB formation, the ends are resected 5’ to 3’ until homologous sequences are revealed. Annealing of these repeats deletes the intervening sequence and leaves 3’ nonhomologous tails on either side of the annealed intermediate. 3’ nonhomologous tail removal, repair synthesis, and ligation allow for completion of repair.
regulated. Aside from their roles in post-replicative MMR, mismatch repair proteins have been implicated in the regulation of homologous and homeologous recombination events, and it is clear that the effect of MMR on HR is directly related to the level of sequence divergence (Chambers et al. 1996; Datta et al. 1996; Hunter et al. 1996; Porter et al. 1996). In bacterial systems, mutation of mutS or mutL leads to a 1,000-fold increase in recombination between the E. coli and S. typhimurium genomes, which are approximately 20% divergent (Rayssiguier et al. 1989). In addition, recombination between 9% divergent phage and plasmid DNA in E. coli occurs 15-fold more often in mutS mutants than in wild-type cells (Shen and Huang 1989), and duplications are formed by homeologous recombination 10-fold more frequently in mutS and mutL mutant E. coli strains than in wild-type (Petit et al. 1991).

Similar MMR-dependent effects have been observed in yeast, where msh2Δ and msh3Δ mutations increase recombination between 25% divergent substrates by 17- and 10-fold, respectively, and msh2Δmsh3Δ double mutants exhibit a 43-fold increase (Selva et al. 1995). Work in the Jinks-Robertson lab has shown that mutation of yeast MSH2 causes the greatest defect in anti-recombination activity of all the MMR proteins tested (Datta et al. 1996; Nicholson et al. 2000). Msh2 also plays an important role in mammalian recombination, as msh2 mutant mouse ES cells show a 10-fold increase compared to wild-type cells in DSB-induced recombination between substrates with 1.5% sequence divergence (Elliott and Jasin 2001). msh2Δ homozygous mutant mouse ES cells also have approximately equivalent frequencies of homologous and homeologous (0.6% divergent) recombination (de Wind et al. 1995). msh3Δ mutants have some defect in anti-recombination, but to a lesser extent than msh2Δ mutants (Selva et al. 1995; Datta et al. 1996; Nicholson et al. 2000). Mutation of the MutL homologs has less of an effect on anti-recombination than the MutS homologs in a variety of assays (Selva et al. 1995; Chambers et al. 1996; Datta

Though Msh2 may play an integral role in regulation of HR, studies of its anti-recombination role are complicated by the fact that Msh2 also acts in recombination along with Msh3, Rad1, and Rad10 to remove non-homologous 3’ single-stranded tails that can form as HR intermediates, as described in Chapters 1 and 2 (Pâques and Haber 1997; Sugawara et al. 1997; Studamire et al. 1999; Goldfarb 2005; Goldfarb and Alani 2005; Lyndaker et al. 2008). Many studies of Msh2 in anti-recombination were initiated prior to the discovery of Msh6. The anti-recombination effect of mutation of MSH6 was first shown by Nicholson et al. (2000), and has since been confirmed (Sugawara et al. 2004; Goldfarb and Alani 2005). Unlike Msh2 and Msh3, the specific effect of Msh6 on anti-recombination is easier to study because it is not involved in 3’ non-homologous tail removal (Pâques and Haber 1999; Harfe and Jinks-Robertson 2000).

**DNA sequence requirements for homologous recombination.** There is a direct correlation of both the percentage and length of DNA sequence homology with the frequency of HR events (Singer et al. 1982; Liskay et al. 1987; Ahn et al. 1988; Deng and Capecchi 1992; Mezard et al. 1992; Sugawara and Haber 1992; Radman and Wagner 1993; Zawadzki et al. 1995; Datta et al. 1996; Datta et al. 1997; Vulic et al. 1997; Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1999; Fujitani and Kobayashi 1999). This seems intuitive, since the longer a stretch of homology, the more likely it is that stable strand invasion or annealing intermediates can be formed. The idea of a requirement during recombination for a minimum length of homology was first proposed by Shen and Huang (1986), and this region was referred to as the MEPS, or minimal efficient processing segment. In their work, the MEPS for initiation of RecBC- and RecF-
dependent recombination in *E. coli* was found to be 23-27 bp and 44-90 bp, respectively (Shen and Huang 1986). Consistent with this, the frequency of recombination between plasmids and phage in *E. coli* switched from exponential to linear dependence on the length of homology at 74 bp (Watt *et al.* 1985). Thus, the minimal efficient length of homology in *E. coli* is less than 100 bp. In mammalian cells, the MEPS is estimated at approximately 200 bp (Rubnitz and Subramani 1984; Liskay *et al.* 1987; Waldman and Liskay 1988).

Work in the yeast system assessing recombination between both interchromosomal repeats and intrachromosomal direct and inverted repeats has estimated the MEPS for these events to be 248, 271, and 280 bp, respectively (Jinks-Robertson *et al.* 1993). For the process of single-strand annealing, which does not involve strand invasion into duplex DNA as other HR events do, the MEPS is estimated to be between 63 and 89 bp (Sugawara and Haber 1992). While this value is the minimum length of homology for efficient recombination, HR can occur between sequences with as little as 13 bp of homology (Ahn *et al.* 1988). Similarly, work by Datta and colleagues suggests that 20 bp of homology is sufficient for initiation of heteroduplex formation (Datta *et al.* 1997).

**Requirements for anti-recombination.** Presumably the MEPS allows for stable pairing during strand invasion and/or annealing, and it is likely that active anti-recombination activities occur after formation of a stable heteroduplex; If stable pairing cannot be accomplished (i.e., the two sequences are too divergent), recombination will not be initiated, as depicted in Figure 4.3. Mismatches present within a stable heteroduplex present yet another barrier to completion of HR events (Figure 4.3). Studies in bacteria have supported the idea that mismatches in a heteroduplex intermediate lead to decreased recombination frequencies (Zh
Maloy 1997). Further support has come from fine-resolution analysis of intrachromosomal conversion tract lengths in mammals, where rearrangements caused by homeologous recombination are regulated by the amount of sequence divergence at the site of recombination initiation (Yang and Waldman 1997).

One mismatch within 53 bp of homology (1.9% divergence) decreases recombination 4-fold in *E. coli* (Watt *et al.* 1985). Similarly, Shen and Huang found that a single mismatch in 31 bp (3.2% divergence) is sufficient to inhibit recombination between phage and plasmid DNA in *E. coli*, and recombination frequency is reduced 240-fold when substrates differ in homology by 9% (Shen and Huang 1989). In a different assay, these authors saw a 40-fold reduction in recombination with 10% divergent substrates (Shen and Huang 1986). In yeast, one mismatch present in 350 bp of an inverted repeat (effectively 0.29% divergence) is sufficient for anti-recombination to take effect (Datta *et al.* 1997; Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1999). There is also a 6-fold reduction in single-strand annealing when repeats are 3% divergent compared to identical sequences (7 mismatches within 205 bp; Sugawara *et al.* 2004). The effect of a small number of mismatches on mitotic recombination is also slightly higher than on meiotic recombination events (Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1999), indicating that mitotic recombination may be a more effective system for studying the mechanistic details of heteroduplex rejection.

Work in mammalian cells has found that the rate of intrachromosomal recombination depends on the amount uninterrupted homology rather than the number of mismatches (Waldman and Liskay 1988). This distinction between the length of perfect identity and the absolute number of mismatches within a given region may allow us to better understand the molecular mechanism of heteroduplex rejection. A region of homology as long as the MEPS should allow initiation, and it is likely that the recombination frequency may increase as stretches of homology increase in length.
above the size of the MEPS, since more initiation of HR can occur when there are more MEPS. However, it is not clear how the length of sequence identity affects HR efficiency after stable initiation has occurred. Anti-recombination can be triggered by a single mismatch in 350 bp (Datta et al. 1997), but it is not known whether the location of the mismatch within the 350 bp has a significant effect. It has been estimated that approximately 610 bp of homology is required in order to bypass the MMR-dependent anti-recombination effect (Datta et al. 1997), which suggests that homology plays a further role in regulation of HR aside from the MEPS.

In *E. coli*, different locations of single mismatches within a 31 bp substrate (3.2% divergence) were shown to decrease recombination frequencies anywhere from 2- to 12-fold (Shen and Huang 1989). In yeast, studies using different locations of one mismatch within a HR substrate (Datta et al. 1997; Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1999) have not been systematic, and have effectively only tested two locations: one mismatch at position 137/140 and one at position 193/194 out of ~350 bp. Both substrates yielded similar recombination frequencies and MMR-dependence (Datta et al. 1997). The effect of one mismatch and its location in single-strand annealing has not been systematically studied. Given the immense number of repeat sequences and regions of homology in the human genome, more studies are needed to determine the sequence requirements for anti-recombination and to further our understanding of how cells maintain the fidelity of homologous recombination events. Future experiments to address these questions are discussed at the end of this chapter.

The mechanism of anti-recombination by MMR factors has been suggested to occur in various ways, shown in Figure 4.3, including limitation of branch migration or Holliday junction resolution to limit heteroduplex extension, or rejection of intermediates by nucleolytic destruction or unwinding of the heteroduplex DNA (Sugawara et al. 2004; Surtees et al. 2004; Goldfarb and Alani 2005; Waldman 2008).
Figure 4.3. Potential mechanisms of mismatch-dependent anti-recombination.
Sequence divergence can limit initiation of recombination when there is insufficient homology to create a stable strand invasion (during gene conversion) or annealed (during SSA) intermediate. Anti-recombination by mismatch repair factors is proposed to occur via nucleolytic or helicase-driven heteroduplex rejection and/or by limiting Holliday junction migration or resolution.
Support for an effect of MMR factors on Holliday junctions includes the fact that MutS can block RecA-mediated strand exchange \textit{in vitro} (Worth \textit{et al.} 1994). Mitotic and meiotic gene conversion tract lengths are 50-65\% longer in MMR mutants compared to wild-type, suggesting that at least part of the MMR anti-recombination activity entails blockage of Holliday junction migration or resolution (Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1998; Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1999). \textit{S. cerevisiae} Msh2 binds to Holliday junctions \textit{in vitro} (Alani \textit{et al.} 1997), and the Msh2-Msh6 complex has an affinity for Holliday junctions that is comparable to its affinity for mismatched bases (Marsischky \textit{et al.} 1999). However, recent evidence has provided strong support for a helicase-dependent heteroduplex rejection model (see below) (Sugawara \textit{et al.} 2004; Goldfarb and Alani 2005). Heteroduplex rejection and blockage of branch migration are not mutually exclusive, as blockage of migration could serve as a signal for helicase recruitment, though processes such as single-strand annealing could solely utilize an unwinding mechanism of anti-recombination since no Holliday junctions are formed.

\textbf{Roles for Sgs1 in anti-recombination.} Within the past 12 years it has become evident that the Sgs1 helicase is crucial for the maintenance of genome stability (Lu \textit{et al.} 1996; Watt \textit{et al.} 1996; Myung \textit{et al.} 2001; Cobb \textit{et al.} 2002). Sgs1 is a 3’ to 5’ helicase of the RecQ family that was identified both as a suppressor of the slow growth phenotype of \textit{S. cerevisiae} Topoisomerase III (\textit{TOP3}) mutants (Gangloff \textit{et al.} 1994; Lu \textit{et al.} 1996), and as a protein that interacts with Topoisomerase II (Watt \textit{et al.} 1995). Sgs1 is the only RecQ homolog in \textit{S. cerevisiae}, and homologs in other species include \textit{E. coli} RecQ, \textit{S. pombe} Rqh1, and the human homologs Blm, Wrn, RecQL4, RecQL5, RecQL1 (Bennett and Keck 2004). Blm, Wrn, and RecQL4 are mutated in Bloom’s Syndrome, Werner’s Syndrome, and Rothmund-Thomson Syndrome,
respectively, which are characterized by genomic instability and cancer susceptibility (reviewed in Chakraverty and Hickson 1999; Bennett and Keck 2004). Although there are 5 RecQ homologs in humans, Blm appears to be the closest functional homolog of Sgs1 (Watt et al. 1996).

The 164 kDa Sgs1 protein consists of 1447 amino acids and contains 7 conserved helicase motifs, a C-terminal conserved region (Ct domain), and an HRD (Helicase and RNase D) C-terminal domain, as well as a serine-rich, highly acidic region located more towards the N-terminal region (see Fig. 4.4). The seven conserved motifs are found in variety of RNA and DNA helicases, and are designated I, Ia, II, III, IV, V, and VI. Sgs1 also contains an additional motif located N-terminal to motif I that is designated as motif 0. Motifs I and II house the Walker A and B motifs, and these are important, along with motif 0, in ATP binding and hydrolysis (reviewed in Bennett and Keck 2004). The HRD domain is found in all RecQ homologs as well as in RNase D homologs, and is thought to play a role in nucleic acid binding (Morozov et al. 1997). Interestingly, this domain is not required for helicase or ATPase activity, but does seem to be required for suppression of some mutant phenotypes (Bennett and Keck 2004). The Ct domain contains both a Zn^{++} binding region and a winged-helix domain, which may play a role in DNA binding and protein-protein interactions (Figure 4.3; Bennett and Keck 2004).

Sgs1 has been implicated in the intra-S phase checkpoint, the replication checkpoint, DNA replication, and telomere maintenance, as well as in various meiotic and mitotic recombination processes (Cobb et al. 2002; Bachrati and Hickson 2003). sgs1 mutants show elevated mitotic HR (Watt et al. 1996) and an increase in gross chromosomal rearrangements comparable to that in a msh2Δ mutant (Myung et al. 2001). In addition, yeast sgs1Δ mutants exhibit premature aging and shorter life span (Sinclair et al. 1997), not unlike homozygous mutations in WRN that lead to Werner’s
**Figure 4.4. Domain structure of the Sgs1 protein.** The N-terminus of Sgs1 contains the Top3 interaction domain and a serine-rich acidic domain. The central portion of the protein contains the conserved helicase motifs, the first few of which are critical for ATP binding and hydrolysis. The Ct domain contains both a Zn$^{++}$ binding region and a winged-helix domain, which may play a role in DNA binding and protein-protein interactions. The C-terminal HRD domain is conserved in RecQ helicases and RNase D homologs, but is not required for helicase or ATPase activity. The structure and function of Sgs1 are reviewed in Bennett and Keck (2004). The Sgs1$_{400-1268}$ recombinant protein purified in this study lacks the first 399 amino acids and the last 179 amino acids, thus retaining all of these domains except for the Top3-interacting region.
syndrome in humans (Bachrati and Hickson 2003). Homozygous sgs1∆ diploids are highly sensitive to ionizing radiation, which is suggestive of defective recombinational repair (Gangloff et al. 2000). sgs1 mutants are also sensitive to the alkylating agent methyl methane sulfonate (MMS) and to hydroxyurea (HU), which causes replication fork collapse (Yamagata et al. 1998; Mullen et al. 2000; Bennett and Wang 2001). When an sgs1∆ mutation is combined with that of another helicase, Srs2, sgs1∆srs2∆ double mutants have low viability that is dependent upon functional recombination pathways (Gangloff et al. 2000).

The full-length Sgs1 protein has not been purified because it is insoluble when overexpressed (Bennett et al. 1998). Initial experiments thus employed an in vitro rabbit reticulocyte coupled transcription/translation system to obtain the full-length protein (Lu et al. 1996). More recent experiments have shown that fragments of the Sgs1 protein can be overexpressed successfully and purified from yeast (Bennett et al. 1998). Bennett et al. purified amino acids 400-1268 from yeast and found that the resulting protein exhibited DNA-dependent ATPase activity and ATP-dependent 3’ to 5’ helicase activity on dsDNA and DNA-RNA heteroduplexes (Bennett et al. 1998). The recombinant Sgs1 protein binds in vitro to ds/ssDNA junctions with 3’ overhangs and forms DNaseI- and hydroxyl radical-protected regions on both strands (Bennett et al. 1999).

**Heteroduplex rejection via an unwinding mechanism.** Genetic studies in several labs have implicated Sgs1 in anti-recombination during HR (Myung et al. 2001; Spell and Jinks-Robertson 2004; Sugawara et al. 2004; Goldfarb and Alani 2005), and the helicase activity of Sgs1 is required for this anti-recombination role (Spell and Jinks-Robertson 2004; Goldfarb and Alani 2005). Consistent with these findings, a study by Sugawara et al. using a 3-repeat SSA competition assay showed that heteroduplex
rejection is likely to occur through an unwinding mechanism rather than by nucleolytic degradation (Sugawara et al. 2004). In their system, a DSB could be repaired by SSA with a choice of two different repeats on one side of the break. While wild-type cells completed SSA using both repeats at equal frequencies when all three repeats were completely homologous, insertion of mismatches into one repeat led to an increase in SSA events using the completely identical repeat and disfavoring the divergent repeat. If heteroduplex rejection were to occur via nucleolytic degradation of inappropriate intermediates, one would expect that abortion of recombination between the mismatched repeats would destroy the intermediate, precluding any further chances at SSA. Instead, it appears that recombination initiated between the mismatched repeats followed by rejection does not inhibit a further homology search and later SSA at an identical repeat sequence.

The bias in repeat choice in the above assay in the presence of one divergent and one identical repeat was also dependent upon the Sgs1 helicase and Msh6 (Sugawara et al. 2004). Further genetic studies using a standard two-repeat SSA assay found that mismatch binding (msh2-K564E, msh6-F337A) and ATP binding and hydrolysis mutants (msh2-S656P, msh2-R730W, msh6-G987D) of Msh2-Msh6 were defective in heteroduplex rejection during SSA between repeats with 3% sequence divergence, suggesting that both of these functions are required for rejection (Goldfarb and Alani 2005). Deletion of domain I of Msh2 (msh2ΔI), which is important for DNA binding during Msh2-Msh3-dependent repair, had no effect on rejection (Goldfarb and Alani 2005; Lee et al. 2007). Consistent with these genetic studies, a physical interaction between the Sgs1 helicase and Msh6 has been detected in a large-scale TAP-tagging screen (Gavin et al. 2002). Based on this mounting evidence, Goldfarb and Alani (2005) proposed that heteroduplex rejection during single-strand annealing in S. cerevisiae entails mismatch recognition and binding by Msh2-Msh6
and either recruitment of the Sgs1 helicase to improper recombination intermediates or stimulation of its unwinding activity to facilitate their dissolution, as depicted in Figure 4.5.

Studies in the human system support this unwinding model of heteroduplex rejection. Three of the five known human Sgs1 homologs have been shown to interact with the mismatch repair machinery: Blm and hMsh6 physically interact both in vivo and in vitro (Pedrazzi et al. 2003), RecQ1 interacts with ExoI, Mlh1, and Msh2-Msh6 in coIP and ELISA assays (Doherty et al. 2005), and Wrn physically interacts with Msh2-Msh6, Msh2-Msh3, and Mlh1-Pms2 through distinct protein domains (Saydam et al. 2007). The hMsh2-Msh6 complex is reported to stimulate the helicase activity of Blm on Holliday junctions (Yang et al. 2004) and also stimulates the helicase activity of RecQ1 (RecQL1) on flapped DNA substrates containing both double-stranded and single-stranded arms (Doherty et al. 2005). Perhaps most convincingly, hMsh2-Msh6 stimulates the helicase activity of Wrn on DNA substrates containing 3’ single-stranded flaps, and this stimulation is enhanced in the presence of a single G/T mismatch (Saydam et al. 2007). Comparable studies with the yeast proteins have not been reported. The goal of the work explained below is to test the unwinding model of heteroduplex rejection proposed in Figure 4.5 in vitro using purified S. cerevisiae Sgs1 and Msh2-Msh6 proteins by assessing physical interactions, DNA binding, and helicase activity.

**Materials and Methods**

**Purification of Sgs1**<sub>400-1268</sub>. The expression plasmid and strain for the 6-His-tagged, HA-tagged soluble fragment of Sgs1 containing amino acids 400-1268 of 1447 was created in the Wang lab at Harvard University (Bennett et al. 1998) and
Figure 4.5. Model for heteroduplex rejection during single-strand annealing. This figure is adapted from Goldfarb and Alani (2005). The top figure represents a single-strand annealing intermediate that contains five mismatches. It is proposed that Msh2-Msh6 recognizes and binds to DNA mismatches revealed in the heteroduplex upon annealing of homologous sequences. Msh2-Msh6 may recruit and/or stimulate the Sgs1 helicase to facilitate unwinding of mismatched recombination intermediates.
obtained from the Lahue lab (University of Nebraska Medical Center). The expression plasmid (pRB222; pEAE265) was later put into the Alani lab expression strain, EAY33. The resulting EAY2339 Sgs1 expression strain was grown to saturation at 30° C in synthetic complete medium lacking uracil. Six liters of yeast-peptone medium containing 2% lactate, 3% (v/v) glycerol were inoculated with approximately 20 ml saturated culture per liter of growth medium to an OD$_{600nm}$ of 0.1 and grown in a 30° C shaker. At OD$_{600nm}$ of 0.3 - 0.4, protein expression was induced by the addition of galactose to a 2% (w/v) final concentration. Following a six-hour induction, cells were pelleted by centrifugation at 4,000 rpm for 30 minutes at 4° C in a Beckman J6B rotor. Pellets were washed and combined using 10 mls Lysis buffer (20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 200 mM KCl, 2% (v/v) glycerol) and pelleted in a 250 ml plastic centrifuge bottle at 13,000 rpm for 30 minutes in a GSA rotor in a 4° C Sorvall centrifuge. The cell pellet was resuspended in 10 mls Lysis buffer and dropped drip-by-drip into liquid nitrogen to form popcorn-like beads. Beads of frozen cells were stored at -80° C in a freezer box lined with plastic wrap until lysis.

All biochemical solutions were made and stored in acid-washed glassware, and all purification buffers contained 1 mM PMSF and 10 mM β-mercaptoethanol (Sigma-Aldrich). Cell beads were ground with dry ice in a coffee grinder for one minute with constant agitation. Lysate/dry ice powder was stored in 50 ml conical tubes with loosened caps at -20° C for 1-2 days until no dry ice remained. Lysed cell powder was thawed on ice, resuspended and combined in 10 ml Lysis buffer + 1 mM PMSF and spun in 40 ml glass centrifuge tubes for 30 minutes at 19,000 rpm at 4° C in a SS-34 rotor in the Sorvall centrifuge to clear the lysate. 1 M imidazole was added to bring the lysate to 20 mM imidazole for subsequent column chromatography steps. Ni-NTA beads (Qiagen) resuspended in 1 ml of 20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 200 mM NaCl, 20 mM imidazole were added to the cleared lysate in a 50 ml conical tube and incubated at 4°
C on an orbital rocker for 1 hour. The lysate/bead suspension was added to a disposable 0.8 x 4 cm Poly-Prep column (BioRad) previously washed with 5 mls of 20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 200 mM NaCl, 20 mM imidazole. The Ni-NTA column was then washed with 10 mls of 20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 200 mM NaCl, 40 mM imidazole, and the Sgs1 protein was eluted off the column using 5 mls of 20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 200 mM NaCl, 80 mM imidazole and collected in 0.5 ml fractions in 1.5 ml Eppendorf tubes. 8 µl samples of each fraction were boiled 10 minutes in SDS loading dye and loaded on an 8% SDS-PAGE gel alongside appropriate amounts of the pre- and post-induction whole-cell lysates, cleared lysate, column flowthrough, and washes.

Fractions containing high amounts of Sgs1 and relatively few contaminants were pooled, concentrated using Centricon 30 kDa-, 50 kDa-, or 100 kDa-cutoff spin concentrators (Amicon, Inc.) and dialyzed using Spectra/Por 12,14,000 Da-cutoff 25 mm dialysis tubing (Spectrum Laboratories/VWR Scientific) overnight in 1 L of 20 mM Tris pH 8.0, 50 mM NaCl, 25% (v/v) glycerol, 1 mM β-mercaptoethanol. Protein aliquots were snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80° C until use. Protein concentrations were determined by incubating protein samples for 5 minutes in BioRad Protein Assay reagent (BioRad) and water, taking absorbance readings at 595 nm, and comparing to a BSA (BioRad Protein Assay Standard II) standard curve created using Excel. Use of a second column, PBE94 Polybuffer Exchanger (Amersham Biosciences), and elution on a 0.2 – 1.0 M NaCl gradient did not significantly improve Sgs1 protein purity as judged by SDS-PAGE and Coomassie staining, and thus was not done for later preparations. Representative gels from purification of Sgs1 are shown in Figure 4.6. Pre-stained broad range protein ladder (New England Biolabs, Inc.) was used to assess protein size. Sgs1 protein purified from a single Nickel column in this manner exhibits ATP-
dependent 3’ to 5’-specific DNA helicase activity with as little as 1 nM helicase (see below).

A helicase-dead (Sgs1-hd; Sgs1-K706A; Lu et al. 1996) version of the Sgs1 expression construct was made by creation of a single lysine to alanine change at position 706 in the Sgs1 protein in the wild-type expression vector to yield pEAE276, which was then expressed in the EAY33 protease-deficient strain to allow purification of the mutant protein as described above (mutagenesis and protein purification by Eric Alani). The helicase-dead protein exhibited no helicase activity with up to 20 nM helicase per reaction as shown in Figure 4.8, consistent with the lack of helicase activity exhibited by the Sgs1-hd full-length protein synthesized in vitro using a rabbit reticulocyte transcription/translation system (Lu et al. 1996).

**Purification of Msh2-Msh6.** MSH2 and MSH6 were co-overexpressed from GAL10 promoters on 2 µm plasmids pEAE9 and pEAE218 in the protease-deficient yeast strain EAY960 (EAY33 derivative; same genotype as Sgs1 expression strain). Four liters of ura-trp- synthetic dropout medium + 2% lactate and 3% (v/v) glycerol were inoculated with 20 ml of saturated overnight cultures grown in 2% (w/v) glucose. At OD$_{600nm}$ = 0.7 – 0.8, protein expression was induced with galactose (2% (w/v) final concentration) for 7 hours. Cells were harvested by centrifugation in 1 L plastic bottles at 4,000 rpm in a J6-B rotor for 30 minutes at 4° C. Pellets were washed in 25 mM Tris pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA, 0.3 M NaCl, frozen as beads in liquid nitrogen, and stored at -80° C.

Beads were lysed with dry ice in a coffee grinder and stored in 50 ml conical tubes in the -20° C freezer for 2 days. Lysates were thawed on ice and cleared by centrifugation at 19,000 rpm for 40 minutes in an SS-34 rotor in the Sorvall centrifuge at 4° C. Subsequent chromatography steps were similar to those in Alani (1996).
supernatant was loaded on an equilibrated PBE94 anion exchange column (resin from Amersham Biosciences) and washed with 5 volumes of 25 mM Tris pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA, 0.3 M NaCl. Protein was eluted from the column on a 0.3 – 1.0 M NaCl gradient and collected in 3 ml fractions. Fractions containing the majority of Msh2-Msh6 and lacking the main contaminant (which runs just below Msh2 on an 8% SDS-PAGE gel) were pooled. NaCl concentration of the pooled sample was determined by measuring the conductivity (Wilson laboratory conductivity meter) and comparing to known NaCl concentrations on a standard curve. The pooled sample was gently diluted down to 0.2 M NaCl in 25 mM Tris pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA.

Pooled protein was loaded onto an equilibrated single-stranded DNA-cellulose column (single-stranded deoxyribonucleic acid-cellulose from calf thymus DNA; Sigma), washed with 0.2 M NaCl, eluted with 0.5 M NaCl, and collected in 0.75 ml fractions at 20 ml/hr. Fractions containing the most protein were pooled and diluted to 0.3 M NaCl prior to loading on a second PBE94 column. After washing with 0.3 M NaCl, protein was eluted using 0.5 M NaCl and collected in 0.75 ml fractions. Fractions containing concentrated protein were pooled and concentrated using a Centricon 50 kDa- or 100 kDa-cutoff spin concentrator (Amicon, Inc.) before snap-freezing aliquots in liquid nitrogen and storing at -80°C. The Msh2 and Msh6 proteins have been purified in our lab previously (Alani 1996). A representative gel showing the purity of Msh2-Msh6 following each chromatography step is shown in Figure 4.10.

**DNA substrates.** DNA oligonucleotides used in this study are listed in Table 4.1. HPLC-purified synthetic DNA oligo substrates (Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc.) were 5’ end-labeled with $^{32}$P using T4 Polynucleotide kinase (New England Biolabs) and $\gamma^{32}$P-ATP (Perkin Elmer). 250 pmol of oligo resuspended in 10 mM Tris pH 7.6,
50 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA was labeled in a 50 µl reaction at 37° C for at least 30 minutes followed by 20 minutes at 60° C to kill the kinase. Excess nucleotide and storage dye was removed from oligo-labeling reactions using Micro Bio-Spin P-30 Tris chromatography columns (BioRad). To make double-stranded and partially double-stranded substrates for helicase and gel shift experiments, labeled oligos were annealed to the relevant unlabeled oligos or φX174 virion DNA (New England Biolabs) in 1x oligo buffer (10 mM Tris pH 7.6, 50 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA) by heating for 5 minutes at 95° C in an oil heat block and letting cool slowly to room temperature. Substrates used in this study are listed in Table 4.2. Substrates were diluted appropriately in 1x oligo buffer prior to use.

**Gel shifts.** Electrophoretic gel mobility shift assays were performed using up to 200 nM purified Msh2-Msh6 and/or Sgs1 proteins incubated 5 minutes at room temperature in 1x binding buffer (200 mM Tris pH 7.5, 40 µg/ml BSA, 1 mM DTT, 50 mM NaCl), 100 nM radiolabeled DNA substrate, and 8% sucrose. Samples were run on 4% native acrylamide/0.5x TBE gels at 130 volts for 45 minutes and dried on 3mm Whatman paper using a BioRad Model 583 gel dryer at 80º C for 1 hour. Following overnight exposure to a phosphor storage screen (Molecular Dynamics), gels were visualized using a Storm 280 phosphorimager (Molecular Dynamics/GE Healthcare) and bands were quantified using ImageQuant (GE Healthcare).

**Helicase assays.** Helicase assays were performed in 20 µl reactions in 20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 2 mM ATP, 2 mM MgCl2, 2 mM DTT, 100µg/ml BSA (New England Biolabs, Inc.), 50-150 mM NaCl, 1 nM DNA substrate, and 10 nM unlabeled single-stranded DNA competitor identical to the labeled strand (unless otherwise noted) at 30° C for 30 minutes and stopped by the addition of 5 µl stop buffer (100 mM Tris, 50 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA) at room temperature. Excess nucleotide and storage dye was removed from helicase assay reactions using Micro Bio-Spin P-30 Tris chromatography columns (BioRad). To make double-stranded substrates for helicase experiments, labeled oligos were annealed to the relevant unlabeled oligos or φX174 virion DNA (New England Biolabs) in 1x oligo buffer (10 mM Tris pH 7.6, 50 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA) by heating for 5 minutes at 95° C in an oil heat block and letting cool slowly to room temperature. Substrates used in this study are listed in Table 4.2. Substrates were diluted appropriately in 1x oligo buffer prior to use.
Table 4.1. DNA Oligos used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sequence (5’ to 3’)</th>
<th># bases</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>ACCGAATCTCTGACCTTGGCAGATCCTTTGCCCCACGTTGA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>From Suttees and Alani 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>TCAACGTCGGCGCAAAAGATGTCTGAGCTCAATGCAATTTCCGT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>From Suttees and Alani 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>ATGTCTACTCAGCAAATCAATCGGCTAGTACATCTCTGTAT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>From Suttees, Alani lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>ATGTCTCTAGCCAATGCAATTTCCGT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>From Suttees, Alani lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>TCAACGTCGGCGCAAAAGATGTCTGAGCTCAATGCAATTTCCGT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>From Suttees, Alani lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2177</td>
<td>ATGTCTCTAGCAAATCAATCGGCTAGTACATCTCTGTAT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>This study; S4 with a C to T change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2181</td>
<td>ATGTCTCTAGCAAATCAATCGGCTAGTACATCTCTGTAT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>This study; S11 with a C to T change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2353</td>
<td>ATGTCTCTAGCCAATGCAATTTCCGT</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>This study; S11 with a central +1 G insertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2167</td>
<td>GCAATCAACGCTACCCGAAATTCCTGACCTTGCGTAAGGACATCTTTGCCCACGTTGACCCCGAACCG</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>From Aaron Plya, Alani lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2168</td>
<td>CGTGGCGGGGTCAACGCTGCGCAAAAGATGTCTGAGCTCAATGCAATTTCCGTAGCTGACGTGACGTGAGCTGC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>From Aaron Plya, Alani lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2183</td>
<td>GACATCTTTTCCCCACGTTGACCCCCACCCGCACC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>From Aaron Plya, Alani lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2385</td>
<td>GACTTCCTAGGACAATCTTTTGGCCACGGTTGACCCCCAAGCCG</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2273</td>
<td>GTCGGCAAAAGATGTCTGAGCTCAATGCAATTTCCGTAGCTGACGTGAGCTGC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>This study; AO2273 with a central A to G change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2274</td>
<td>GTCGGCAAAAGATGTCTGAGCTCAATGCAATTTCCGTAGCTGACGTGAGCTGC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>This study; AO2273 with a central +G insertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2349</td>
<td>GTGCCAAAGATGTCTGAGCTCAATGCAATTTCCGTAGCTGACGTGAGCTGC</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>This study; AO2273 with a central +G insertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2387</td>
<td>CAAAGTAAAAGCTTCTCAGACTGCCG</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Catgo 9 in Whitney et al. 1994 EMBO J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2388</td>
<td>CAAAGTAAAAGCTTCTCAGACTGCCG</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>This study; AO2387 with a central +T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2389</td>
<td>CAAAGTAAAAGCTTCTCAGACTGCCG</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Catgo 4 in Whitney et al. 1994 EMBO J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2390</td>
<td>CAAAGTAAAAGCTTCTCAGACTGCCG</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>This study; AO2389 with a central +C insertion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2. DNA substrates used for helicase and gel shift assays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Nucleotides</th>
<th>Mismatches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1/S2</td>
<td>duplex</td>
<td>40/40</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1/S3</td>
<td>forked</td>
<td>40/40</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1/S4</td>
<td>two 3' overhangs</td>
<td>40/40</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1/AO2177</td>
<td>two 3' overhangs</td>
<td>40/40</td>
<td>central G/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1/S11</td>
<td>3' overhang</td>
<td>40/25</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1/AO2181</td>
<td>3' overhang</td>
<td>40/25</td>
<td>central G/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1/AO2353</td>
<td>3' overhang</td>
<td>40/26</td>
<td>central +1 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1/S12</td>
<td>5' overhang</td>
<td>40/25</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2167/AO2168</td>
<td>duplex</td>
<td>60/60</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2168/AO2188</td>
<td>3' overhang</td>
<td>60/30</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2168/AO2385</td>
<td>3' overhang</td>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2167/AO2273</td>
<td>3' overhang</td>
<td>60/45</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2167/AO2274</td>
<td>3' overhang</td>
<td>60/45</td>
<td>central G/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2167/AO2349</td>
<td>3' overhang</td>
<td>60/46</td>
<td>central +1 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2387/φX174</td>
<td>oligo + circle</td>
<td>26/5386</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2388/φX174</td>
<td>oligo + circle</td>
<td>27/5386</td>
<td>central +1 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2389/φX174</td>
<td>oligo + circle</td>
<td>52/5386</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2390/φX174</td>
<td>oligo + circle</td>
<td>53/5386</td>
<td>central +1 C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
200 mM EDTA, 0.5% (w/v) Proteinase K (New England Biolabs), 2.5% (w/v) SDS) and incubation at 37° C for 15 to 30 minutes (derived from Bennett et al. 1998; Bennett et al. 1999). Samples were run on 6%, 8%, or 10% native polyacrylamide/1x TBE gels in DNA loading dye (Bromophenol blue, Xylene cyanol, glycerol) and run for 45 minutes to 3 hours depending on substrate size. Gels were dried on 3 mm Whatman paper using a BioRad Model 583 gel dryer at 80° C for 1 – 2 hours, exposed to a phosphor storage screen for several days, and scanned and quantified as described above.

Coimmunoprecipitation of purified proteins. Equimolar amounts of purified Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1400-1268 proteins were incubated with 20 U of DNase I in 20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 100 mM NaCl, 3 mM MgCl$_2$ for 30 minutes at room temperature. DNase I activity was confirmed by digestion of 1 µg of control DNA and agarose gel analysis. 1 µl of 12CA5 mouse monoclonal anti-HA antibody (Roche) or 0.5 µl of anti-Msh2 polyclonal antibody were added per reaction and incubated 1 hour at 4° C. Protein A agarose beads were suspended 1:1 (v/v) in 50 mM Tris pH 7.5, 100 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA and 20 µl of the suspension were incubated with each sample for 1 hour. Beads were washed three times with 200 µl of 50 mM Tris pH 7.5, 100 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 0.1% NP-40 and twice with 200 µl of 50 mM Tris pH 7.5, 50 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 0.1% NP-40. Beads were boiled in SDS-PAGE loading dye for ten minutes, and samples were run on 8% SDS-PAGE gels followed by staining with Coomassie blue.

Gel filtration. Gel filtration was carried out at the Cornell Core facility for Protein Purification and Characterization with the help of Dr. Cynthia Kinsland. The apparatus used was an AKTA FPLC with a 24 ml Superdex 200 10/300 GL gel
filtration column (GE Healthcare). Experiments were performed in 20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl (200 mM NaCl for runs containing Msh2-Msh6) and run at a flow rate of 0.5 ml/min. Pressure and conductivity readings remained constant at approximately 1.1 MPa and 15 mS/cm, respectively. Standard proteins Ferritin (440 kDa), Catalase (250 kDa), and Aldolase (158 kDa) obtained from GE Healthcare were resuspended in 20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl. All samples were injected at 50 µg or 100 µg in a 0.5 ml injection volume using a 2 ml injection loop. Peak elution volumes for standard proteins were plotted over the log of the protein molecular weight (kDa) to form a standard curve and linear trend lines were calculated in Excel.

Aliquots of Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} protein were thawed on ice, pooled, and concentrated using a Centricon 30 kDa-cutoff spin concentrator (60 µg input for minimum of 29 µg needed for sample) to a final volume of approximately 300 µl. 200 µl (71 µg) of Msh2-Msh6 were added to the concentrated Sgs1 protein and incubated on ice overnight prior to gel filtration. Following injection into the FPLC, 250 µl fractions were collected in 96-well plates in serpentine rows along the entire 24 ml elution volume of the column. In order to analyze the contents of the fractions, samples were precipitated with \(\frac{1}{4}\) volume 100% (w/v) TCA at 4° C, washed twice with cold acetone, boiled in SDS loading dye, and run on 8% SDS-PAGE followed by Coomassie blue staining.

**Results**

**Purification of Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268}**  HA-tagged, 6xHis-tagged Sgs1 protein bearing amino acids 400 to 1268 of the full-length 1447 was overexpressed in yeast and purified over a Nickel resin as described in Materials and Methods and shown in Figure 4.6. Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} eluted primarily in the first few fractions with 80 mM imidazole. In
further chromatography steps, Sgs1 eluted off of a PBE94 column at approximately 0.6 M NaCl, and fractions 12-14 out of 19 were pooled for dialysis (Figure 4.6). A helicase-dead version of the soluble Sgs1 fragment, Sgs1-hd\textsubscript{400-1268}, was purified similarly by E. Alani. The yield from 6 L of induced culture ranged from 39 to 164 µg of Sgs\textsubscript{1,400-1268} protein in three separate preparations. The purified recombinant proteins, with predicted molecular weights of 102 kDa (calculated using [www.biopeptide.com/PepCalc](http://www.biopeptide.com/PepCalc)), run at approximately 125 kDa on 8% SDS-PAGE (see Figure 4.6), consistent with previous studies (Bennett \textit{et al.} 1998).

**Purified Sgs\textsubscript{1,400-1268} protein exhibits 3’ to 5’ helicase activity.** Femtomole quantities of purified Sgs\textsubscript{1,400-1268} protein were added to helicase reactions containing 2 mM ATP, 2 mM MgCl\textsubscript{2}, and 1 nM double-stranded duplex (S1/S2), 3’ overhang (S1/S11), or 5’ overhang (S1/S12) annealed 40mer oligo DNA substrates in the presence of 10 nM unlabeled ssDNA competitor identical to the labeled strand. Purified Sgs\textsubscript{1,400-1268} exhibits helicase activity specifically on substrates containing 3’ single-stranded DNA as shown in Figure 4.7, consistent with its published 3’ to 5’ helicase activity. No significant helicase activity was observed on double-stranded duplex or 5’ overhang substrates (Figure 4.7). Similarly purified Sgs\textsubscript{1,400-1268–K706A} (Sgs1-hd) helicase-dead protein exhibited no significant helicase activity on the 3’ overhang substrate (S1/S11) with up to 20 nM protein, compared to detectable helicase activity at as little as 1 nM Sgs\textsubscript{1-400-1268} wild-type protein (Figure 4.8).

Helicase activity on forked DNA substrates was comparable to that on 3’ overhang Detection of helicase activity was particularly sensitive to the presence of unlabeled ssDNA competitor; in its absence, the unwound DNA strands can readily re-anneal, masking any helicase activity.
Figure 4.6. Purification of Sgs1_{400-1268} following overexpression in yeast.
Representative 8% SDS-PAGE gels following purification of Sgs1_{400-1268} from 6 L of yeast strain EAY2339 induced for overexpression for 6 hours. A. Cleared lysate was incubated with Ni-NTA resin and Sgs1_{400-1268} eluted with 80 mM imidazole. B. Pooled fractions from the Ni-NTA column were run over a PBE94 anion exchange resin and eluted on a 0.2 – 1.0 M NaCl gradient. C. Summary of Sgs1 purification showing pooled fractions from Ni-NTA and PBE94 columns, sample concentrated by Centricon spin column, and sample dialyzed overnight into storage buffer as described in Materials and Methods. Proteins were visualized on the gel by staining with Coomassie blue. Molecular weight standards are from pre-stained broad range protein marker (New England Biolabs, Inc.).
Figure 4.7. Substrate specificity of Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} helicase. 1 nM radiolabeled double-stranded duplex (S1/S2), 3’ overhang (S1/S11), and 5’ overhang substrates (S1/S12) were incubated with 0 to 10 nM purified Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} in 2 mM ATP, 2 mM MgCl\textsubscript{2} in the presence of 10 nM unlabeled competitor ssDNA for 30 min at 30° C. Samples were run on a 10% native polyacrylamide/1x TBE gel, dried, and exposed to a phosphor storage screen.
On 1 nM S1/S11 3’ overhang substrate, which contains 25 bp of homoduplex DNA plus a 15 nucleotide 3’ overhang, Sgs1 helicase activity peaks at 5 nM protein (See Figures 4.7 and 4.8). While helicase activity is detectable on 3’ overhang substrates of various lengths, only those with short (25 bp) duplexes are efficiently unwound under these conditions, as shown graphically in Figure 4.9. 3’ overhang substrates containing duplex regions of 30 bp (AO2168/AO2188) and 45 bp (AO2167/2273) exhibited very little unwinding in the presence of up to 10 nM Sgs1 helicase (Figure 4.9), in contrast to published studies of Sgs1 efficiently unwinding substrates with duplexes as long as 140 bp (Bennett et al. 1998). These difficulties in detecting helicase activity using substrates with longer than 25 bp duplexes hold true for annealed oligo substrates as well as oligos annealed to φX174 virion DNA, with detectable but inefficient (~3% of total substrate) observable helicase activity (data not shown).

**Sgs1**<sub>400-1268</sub> **helicase activity is dependent upon NaCl concentration.** Previous studies using the Sgs1<sub>400-1268</sub> soluble fragment did not report the effect of NaCl concentration helicase activity. By titrating in NaCl in standard helicase reactions containing unlabeled competitor ssDNA, Sgs1 helicase activity on 3’ overhang substrates (S1/S11; 25 bp duplex) was found to be optimal between 75 and 200 mM NaCl (Figure 4.10). For this reason, most helicase experiments were performed at 100 mM NaCl unless otherwise specified. Increasing the MgCl₂ concentration was found to have an inhibitory effect on Sgs1 helicase activity (data not shown). Other salts have not been tested in this study.

**Purification of Msh2-Msh6.** The Msh2-Msh6 complex was overexpressed and purified from yeast as described in Materials and Methods and shown in Figure 4.11.
Figure 4.8. Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} vs. Sgs1-hd\textsubscript{400-1268} helicase activity on 3’ overhang substrates. Helicase reactions containing 0 to 20 nM of Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} or Sgs1-hd\textsubscript{400-1268}, 1 nM 3’ overhang substrate (S1/S11), and 10 nM cold competitor DNA were run on a 10% native polyacrylamide/1x TBE gel, dried, and exposed to a phosphor storage screen. Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} exhibits efficient helicase activity on 3’ overhang DNA substrates that peaks at 5 nM protein. Similarly purified Sgs1-hd\textsubscript{400-1268} helicase-dead protein exhibits no significant helicase activity with up to 20 nM protein per reaction.
Figure 4.9. *Sgs1*$_{400-1268}$ helicase activity on 3’ overhang substrates of various lengths. S1/S11 has a 25 bp duplex plus 15 nt overhang, 2168/2188 has a 30 bp duplex plus 30 nt overhang, and 2167/2273 has a 45 bp duplex plus 15 nt overhang. All three substrates are detectably unwound by Sgs1, but only S1/S11 shows unwinding of a significant fraction of the input DNA.
Figure 4.10. Salt dependence of Sgs1_{400-1268} helicase activity on short 3' overhang substrates. Helicase assays containing 0 to 2.5 nM Sgs1_{400-1268}, 1 nM S1/S11 substrate, unlabeled competitor DNA, and increasing concentrations of NaCl.
Msh2-Msh6 eluted off of the first PBE94 column at approximately 0.5 M NaCl, and fractions were chosen based on SDS-PAGE of individual fractions. Pooled fractions were loaded on subsequent ssDNA and PBE94 columns, and fractions off of these columns containing the most protein were pooled and concentrated. As shown in Figure 4.11, the majority of contaminating bands visible by SDS-PAGE after the first column were removed in subsequent chromatography steps. Total protein yield ranged from 63 µg from 2 L of culture to 670 µg from 4 L of culture in 3 separate protein preparations.

**Purified Msh2-Msh6 protein binds to DNA with a preference for mismatches.**

Purified Msh2-Msh6 protein was analyzed by electrophoretic gel mobility shift assay using annealed oligo substrates S1/S4 and S1/AO2177 that are identical except for one central mismatch in S1/AO2177. Increasing amounts of Msh2-Msh6 protein exhibited increased DNA binding as determined by an increase in shifted DNA, as shown in Figure 4.12. The preference for binding to mismatched DNA is consistent with previous observations (Alani 1996; Alani *et al.* 1997; Habraken *et al.* 1998).

**Sgs1 and Msh2-Msh6 purified proteins physically interact.** In order to test whether there is a direct physical interaction between the Msh2-Msh6 heterodimer and the Sgs1 helicase, purified Msh2-Msh6 and HA-tagged Sgs1_{400-1268} were used for Msh2-Msh6 eluted off of the first PBE94 column at approximately 0.5 M NaCl, and

To further show that Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1 form a stable complex, gel filtration was performed using a Superdex 200 10/300 GL 24 ml gel filtration column run at 0.5 ml/min by FPLC. Injection of Msh2-Msh6 resulted in two distinct elution peaks, shown in Figure 4.14. The late-eluting peak at 11.4 mls is consistent with the 249 kDa molecular weight of the Msh2-Msh6 heterodimer (predicted molecular
Figure 4.11. Purification of Msh2-Msh6. Msh2 and Msh6 were co-overexpressed in yeast and purified over a PBE94 anion exchange column on a 0.3 to 1.0 M NaCl gradient followed by a ssDNA-cellulose column and concentration on a third PBE94 column as described in Materials and Methods.

![Image of gel electrophoresis showing protein bands labeled Msh2 and Msh6]
Figure 4.12. Gel mobility shift assay of Msh2-Msh6 binding to matched and mismatched DNA oligo substrates. Increasing amounts of purified Msh2-Msh6 protein were incubated with radiolabeled DNA substrates for 5 minutes at room temperature and run on a 4% native polyacrylamide/0.5x TBE gel for 45 minutes at 130 volts.
weight of this peak assuming one globular protein is 332 kDa, based the elution volumes of known protein standards). An earlier eluting peak at 8.4 mls may be a higher-order complex or simply an aggregate of protein, with a predicted molecular weight 4 times that of the earlier peak, and elutes relatively close to the predicted void volume of this column.

Consistent with the coIP experiments, preliminary gel filtration experiments using Msh2-Msh6 plus Sgs1<sub>400-1268</sub> show two distinct peaks similar to those observed with Msh2-Msh6 alone, but both peaks are shifted to earlier elution volumes (11.2 and 7.9 mls compared to 11.4 and 8.4 mls with Msh2-Msh6 alone; Figure 4.14). The earlier eluting peak at 7.9 mls has a predicted molecular weight 4 times that of the later peak at 11.2 mls (1518 kDa vs. 371 kDa). This result may be evidence against the elution volume of the first peak in the Msh2-Msh6 runs being equal to the void volume. In very preliminary experiments, the proteins appear to co-elute at least in earlier fractions containing potentially higher-order complexes of Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1<sub>400-1268</sub> when gel filtration fractions are TCA-precipitated and analyzed by SDS-PAGE (data not shown). Further gel filtration studies are required to confirm this result.

For future experiments, Blue dextran 2000 should be used as a standard to determine whether the early-eluting peak in the Msh2-Msh6 and Msh2-Msh6-Sgs1<sub>400-1268</sub> samples is the void volume, as the elution volume of Blue dextran 200 is equal to the void volume. The void volume of this column is predicted to be approximately 8 mls, or 30% of the 24 ml bed volume (GE Healthcare). Changing the salt concentration of the sample may also allow analysis of more Msh2-Msh6 heterodimers in solution, since it appears that an aggregate is formed under these buffer conditions (20 mM Tris pH 7.5, 200 mM NaCl). Cleaner protein preparations
Figure 4.13. Coimmunoprecipitation of purified Sgs1_{400-1268} and Msh2-Msh6. 24 pmol each of purified Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1_{400-1268} were incubated with either α-HA antibody or α-Msh2 antibody and Protein A-Sepharose beads following treatment with DNaseI and analyzed by 8% SDS-PAGE and Coomassie blue stain.
Figure 4.14. Preliminary gel filtration of Msh2-Msh6 with and without Sgs1<sub>400-1268</sub>. Samples consisting of 71 µg of Msh2-Msh6 or 100 µg of Msh2-Msh6 plus Sgs1<sub>400-1268</sub> were injected into a Superdex 200 10/300 GL gel filtration column via FPLC at 0.5ml/min. Two distinct peaks are detected in both samples: 8.4 mls and 11.4 mls for Msh2-Msh6 and 7.9 and 11.2 for Msh2-Msh6 plus Sgs1<sub>400-1268</sub>. Elution volumes of standard proteins of known molecular weights are indicated with dotted lines.
might also help. Aggregation appeared to be enhanced by the addition of Sgs1 (Figure 4.14).

**Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1 do not simultaneously bind to 25 bp duplex, 15 nt 3’ overhang substrates.** Since Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1 physically interact, it was of interest to test whether the two proteins together can also bind DNA. Both Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1 are known to bind to DNA on their own (Alani 1996; Bennett et al. 1999). Electrophoretic gel mobility shift assays were performed using 100 nM each of purified Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1 proteins in the absence of ATP. Using DNA substrates S1/AO2818 and S1/AO2353, which have 25 bp duplex regions containing either a G/T mismatch or a +1 G insertion in addition to 15 nt 3’ single-stranded tails, Sgs1 and Msh2-Msh6 both bound to DNA singly, but did not form a super-shifted complex suggestive of a DNA-Msh2-Msh6- Sgs1 complex (Figure 4.15). A subtle, higher-migrating band visible in the Msh2-Msh6 + Sgs1 lane was also present in the Sgs1 alone lane. In the presence of Sgs1, less Msh2-Msh6 bound to the DNA substrate, but the presence of Msh2-Msh6 did not affect the amount of Sgs1 bound (Figure 4.15). Larger DNA substrates, addition of non-specific competitor DNA, or different binding conditions may allow for future analysis of ternary complex formation on DNA. ATP may be required for stable association of Msh2-Msh6 with Sgs1, as is true for Msh2-Msh6 ternary complex formation with Mlh1-Pms1 on mismatched DNA (Habraken et al. 1998). Order-of-addition experiments may also be crucial for this analysis, since Msh2-Msh6 binds a variety of DNA structures quite well and might prevent Sgs1 loading onto DNA. Sgs1 footprints on DNA primarily on 3’ ssDNA adjacent to the junction with dsDNA (Bennett et al. 1999), and it may need to bind the DNA substrate first before Msh2-
Figure 4.15. Gel mobility shift assay of Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} on 3’ overhang mismatched substrates. Both Sgs1 and Msh2-Msh6 are able to bind to the 3’ overhang substrates (S1/AO2181 and S1/AO2353) alone. The amount of Msh2-Msh6 bound to DNA is reduced in the presence of Sgs1, and no supershift was observed in the presence of both proteins, suggesting that Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} cannot both bind to this DNA substrate under these conditions. Order-of-addition experiments, longer DNA substrates, or ATP may be necessary for ternary complex formation.
Msh6 is added. It would also be interesting to see whether pre-bound Msh2-Msh6-Sgs1 protein complexes can bind to DNA.

**Msh2-Msh6 inhibits Sgs1 helicase activity on short DNA substrates.** To assess whether Msh2-Msh6 can stimulate the helicase activity of Sgs1 *in vitro*, increasing amounts of purified Msh2-Msh6 protein were added to helicase reactions on various DNA substrates with or without mismatches. As exemplified in Figure 4.16, increasing Msh2-Msh6 led to a decrease in unwinding of a homoduplex 3’ overhang substrate by Sgs1 at 60 mM NaCl. Similar results have been obtained at salt concentrations ranging from 50 mM to 150 mM NaCl, with and without mismatches in the DNA substrate (S1/S11, S1/AO2181, S1/2353), with and without 10-fold molar excess of unlabeled competitor DNA, and with Sgs1 concentrations ranging from 1 nM to 10 nM. In some experiments, subtle inhibition was detectable at 2:1 ratios of Sgs1:Msh2-Msh6, while others showed little effect up to 2-fold excess of Msh2-Msh6 over Sgs1, and drastic inhibition was observed at 10-12-fold excess of Msh2-Msh6 over Sgs1, which is in stark contrast to studies with the human proteins. These effects were observed with several different preparations of purified Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1 proteins. It is unclear whether this inhibitory effect holds true for longer substrates as well. These substrates may be too short to allow efficient loading of Sgs1 and DNA binding (mismatch or otherwise) by Msh2-Msh6. Alternatively, the aggregation of Sgs1 and Msh2-Msh6 suggested by the gel filtration results (Figure 4.14) could be responsible for the inhibition of Sgs1 activity in the presence of increasing Msh2-Msh6 (Figure 4.16).

Subtle stimulation of unwinding was detected in some experiments with approximately equimolar quantities of Sgs1 and Msh2-Msh6, followed by inhibition of unwinding at higher amounts of Msh2-Msh6. One example of such an experiment
Figure 4.16. Increasing amounts of Msh2-Msh6 inhibit unwinding on short substrates. Helicase assays were performed in 60 mM NaCl at 30°C for 30 minutes as described in Materials and Methods and run on a 10% native acrylamide gel. Increasing amounts of Msh2-Msh6 protein inhibited Sgs1 helicase activity on this homoduplex DNA substrate (S1/S11).
is shown in Figure 4.17, and was carried out in 137 mM NaCl with no unlabeled competitor DNA and 1 nM Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} by first pre-binding the proteins to the DNA substrate in the absence of ATP and MgCl\textsubscript{2} for 5 minutes at room temperature, then incubating for 20 minutes at 30° C following the addition of ATP and MgCl\textsubscript{2}. A subtle increase in unwinding at 0.25 and 0.5 nM Msh2-Msh6 was observed, followed by decreased unwinding at higher concentrations (Figure 4.17). Unwinding also appeared to increase between 1 nM and 4 nM Msh2-Msh6. Similar results have been obtained under various conditions without clear conclusion. Order-of-addition experiments pre-binding the DNA with either Sgs1 or Msh2-Msh6 have also been inconclusive, but could be a promising avenue for future experiments.

Studies with human Msh2-Msh6 and RecQ homologs detected stimulation of unwinding using less than 1 nM up to 8 nM Msh2-Msh6 with 1 nM Wrn (8-fold excess; 1 nM substrate), 2.5 nM up to 40 nM Msh2-Msh6 with 6 nM Blm (6.7-fold excess; 10 nM substrate), and 3 nM to 25 nM Msh2-Msh6 with 1 nM RecQ1 (25-fold excess; 0.5 nM substrate) (Yang \textit{et al.} 2004; Doherty \textit{et al.} 2005; Saydam \textit{et al.} 2007). It seems most likely that substrates containing duplex regions of longer than 25 bp would be more useful for these studies; however, as described above and below, little helicase activity has been detected with these substrates using Sgs1 alone. Preliminary experiments with longer substrates and increasing Msh2-Msh6 have shown no effect.

**Discussion and future directions**

The experimental results reported here reveal a direct physical interaction between Sgs1 and Msh2-Msh6 for which amino acids 400 to 1268 of Sgs1 are sufficient. These findings are consistent with previous reports of interactions between the human Msh2-Msh6 complex and three human homologs of Sgs1, Blm, Wrn, and
Figure 4.17. Subtle stimulation of Sgs1_{400-1268}-dependent unwinding by Msh2-Msh6. In this experiment, both proteins were pre-incubated with the DNA substrate (S1/AO2181) in the absence of ATP and MgCl$_2$, then incubated for 20 minutes at 30ºC following addition of ATP and MgCl$_2$. These reactions contain 137 mM NaCl and no unlabeled ssDNA competitor.
RecQ1 (Yang et al. 2004; Doherty et al. 2005; Saydam et al. 2007). In particular, the interaction between hMsh2-Msh6 and Wrn was localized to the central conserved DExH helicase domain of Wrn that is also well conserved in Sgs1 (Saydam et al. 2007). Considering that an interaction between \textit{S. cerevisiae} Msh6 and Sgs1 was also reported in a large-scale TAP-tagging screen (Gavin et al. 2002), the interaction between Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1 may be mediated via Msh6. This would give specificity to the interaction, since interaction with Msh2 could facilitate both Msh2-Msh3 and Msh2-Msh6 functions. Given the conservation of the Msh2-Msh6-RecQ helicase interaction from \textit{S. cerevisiae} to humans, there is likely to be significant functional relevance for the action of these proteins during DNA repair and recombination.

To date, studies with three distinct human RecQ homologs have shown stimulation of helicase activity in the presence of hMsh2-Msh6 (Yang et al. 2004; Doherty et al. 2005; Saydam et al. 2007). Only the Saydam et al. work employs a DNA substrate containing a mismatch, and Msh2-Msh6-dependent stimulation of helicase activity is enhanced in the presence of a mismatch (Saydam et al. 2007). The other two studies are also relevant, since Msh2-Msh6 would presumably be recruited to DNA substrates containing mismatches to begin with, and it might not be necessary for mismatches to be present in the particular sequence that the helicase is unwinding. One caveat to these studies is that no trapping oligo or “competitor” DNA is used in the helicase reactions, and as the DNA substrates are unwound, free single-stranded DNA is added to the reaction mixture. This free single-stranded DNA can anneal back to its homologous strand, masking detection of helicase activity, or in the presence of Msh2-Msh6, Msh2-Msh6 might bind and sequester the ssDNA and prevent its re-annealing. In standard helicase reactions, a 10-fold molar excess of unlabeled competitor DNA identical to the labeled strand is often added in order to detect the
labeled, unwound DNA (Bennett et al. 1999). In the absence of such competitor, Msh2-Msh6 may appear to stimulate unwinding by simply binding to unwound single-stranded DNA and allowing more of the unwound product to be detected.

The reaction conditions tested here are quite similar to those in Saydam et al. (2007), which are performed at 37° C with the human proteins and at 50 mM NaCl. Aside from the temperature difference, the two exceptions are that hMsh2-Msh6 was pre-incubated with the DNA before adding Wrn, and also that the DNA substrates contain a 30 bp duplex region, a 20 bp double-stranded flap, and a 19 nucleotide 3’ single-stranded flap (Saydam et al. 2007). With this substrate, three distinct unwound products are possible depending on which strand is unwound first. In the work reported in this chapter, very little unwinding was detected using 3’ overhang substrates with 30 bp duplexes. Further studies should try using forked substrates containing both double-stranded and single-stranded arms as described above.

In addition to the annealed oligo substrates described in Table 4.2 and used in the helicase assays shown here, DNA substrates were also constructed by annealing oligos of different lengths to single-stranded circular φX174 virion DNA. As described above, very little substrate unwinding was detected using these substrates (~3% maximum), and additionally, the annealing reactions contained an excess of the unpaired labeled oligo despite a 3-fold excess of φX174 virion DNA relative to the oligo. Gel purifying the annealed oligo + φX174 substrate prior to use in helicase assays could address both of these issues.

The initial study that characterized the helicase activity of purified Sgs1 used the annealed oligo + φX174 substrates and claims to have used a 1 µM DNA substrate concentration for helicase assays in which 5 nM Sgs1 helicase is sufficient to unwind the majority of the substrate in 30 minutes at 30° C (Bennett et al. 1998). Since Sgs1 unwinds annealed oligo substrates under similar conditions at a DNA
substrate concentration of 1 nM, it seemed more appropriate in these studies to use nanomolar concentrations of DNA substrate. However, since very little unwinding of these substrates was detected at concentrations ranging from 0.1 nM to 10 nM (data not shown), it is possible that the substrate concentration is a problem. Since the DNA sequence of these substrates and the supplier of the φX174 virion DNA are the same as in previously published studies (Tsaneva et al. 1993; Bennett et al. 1998), the reason for lack of robust helicase activity on these substrates in our hands is unclear.

Substrate issues aside, it is possible that S. cerevisiae Sgs1 is not stimulated by Msh2-Msh6 as its human homologs are, though the physical interaction remains conserved. Or, despite the physical interaction between Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268}, stimulation of helicase activity may require residues on Sgs1 that are absent in this recombinant soluble fragment. The N-terminal 400 amino acids of Sgs1 that are lacking in Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} are known to harbor the Top3 interaction site (Fricke et al. 2001), but the C-terminal 179 amino acids and remaining portion of the N-terminus that are missing Sgs1\textsubscript{400-1268} are of unknown function. These regions of the protein may be required for stimulation of helicase activity by Msh2-Msh6.

**Does Sgs1 re-localize to mismatched heteroduplexes following DSB resection in a Msh2-Msh6-dependent manner?** Recent work has shown a critical role for Sgs1 in the 5’ to 3’ resection of DSBs (Gravel et al. 2008; Mimitou and Symington 2008; Zhu et al. 2008). This role positions Sgs1 at DSBs in the very earliest stages of DSB repair. Since heteroduplex rejection occurs at later stages in recombination following strand invasion and/or strand annealing, the role Sgs1 in heteroduplex rejection is likely to be a separate function of the protein requiring re-localization to recombination intermediates. During resection, Sgs1 would help to unwind the 5’ strand in a 3’ to 5’ direction to allow cleavage by an associated nuclease, which is
proposed to be one of the two prominent long-range resection mechanisms (Gravel et al. 2008; Mimitou and Symington 2008; Zhu et al. 2008). After this process, Sgs1 would be located at a distance from the single-stranded 3’ end, near the 5’ end of the opposite strand where resection has ceased. During heteroduplex rejection, the entry point for Sgs1 on recombination intermediates is expected to be one of the 3’ single-stranded ends, since in vitro unwinding by Sgs1 requires substrates with 3’ single-stranded DNA (This chapter; Bennett et al. 1998; Bennett et al. 1999). During single-strand annealing, this free 3’ end is a nonhomologous tail that is revealed upon Rad52-dependent annealing of the homologous sequences (see Figure 4.2). Hence, heteroduplex rejection is expected to require re-loading of Sgs1 after resection to place it at 3’ ends for 3’ to 5’ unwinding of annealed recombination intermediates.

In order to assess recruitment of Sgs1 to heteroduplexes, future experiments could assay localization of the Sgs1 helicase to mismatched recombination intermediates during the process of SSA by chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP). Such experiments could be carried out in wild-type strains harboring either identical (A-A) or 3% divergent (F-A) repeated sequences as well as in derivative msh6 mutants to test whether recruitment of Sgs1 to intermediates depends on Msh2-Msh6.

Chromatin IPs could be carried out in strains containing the HA-tagged Sgs1 as described previously for Msh2-HA (Goldfarb and Alani 2004), except that the HO cut site would be situated between two direct repeats of URA3 sequence in Haber A-A/F-A SSA strains (Sugawara et al. 2004; Goldfarb and Alani 2005). The homeologous repeats (F-A) have 7 mismatches between them, and rejection is known to occur efficiently in this scenario (Sugawara et al. 2004; Goldfarb and Alani 2005). Additionally, the presence of several mismatches may enhance the ChIP signal by having more mismatches for Msh2-Msh6 to bind to. Briefly, cells would be induced with galactose to initiate DSB formation and collected at various time points,
crosslinked with formaldehyde, and lysed. Protein-bound DNA would be sonicated into fragments, then immunoprecipitated with 12CA5 α-HA antibody (Roche). After reversal of crosslinks, DNA would be extracted and used for quantitative or semi-quantitative PCR (Goldfarb and Alani 2004). In order to make sure that Sgs1 is being cleared from the lysate, pre-IP and post-IP samples could be run on 8% SDS-PAGE and analyzed by Western blot using the α-HA antibody.

The strains created for ChIP of Sgs1-HA are EAY1141/1143 (A-A/F-A single-strand annealing strains) transformed with digested pEAI206 to integrate SGSI-HA::KANMX. The wild-type (EAY1340-EAY1342) and msh6Δ (EAY1179, EAY1180) derivatives of EAY1141 were made by Tamara Goldfarb, whereas I created the wild-type (EAY2398, EAY2399) derivatives of EAY1143. Primers to be used for ChIP to the A/A or F/A heteroduplex region have been used previously to look at ChIP localization of the Rad1 protein to SSA intermediates (Li et al. 2008). Primer sets pJC1 + pJC2 (AO2379 + AO2380) and pJC3 + pJC4 (AO2381 + AO2382) amplify DNA at the junction of the 3’ nonhomologous tails within the annealed heteroduplex, which would be predicted to be the entry point for Sgs1 at a mismatched single-strand annealing intermediate. Primers pJC5 + pJC6 (AO2383 + AO2384) amplify a sequence at the annealed intermediate that is farther from the 3’ tails. All signals should be set relative to the PCR signal obtained using control primers located elsewhere in the genome.

Both the extent and timing of Sgs1 localization in wild-type cells of both the A-A and F-A background can be compared to those in msh6Δ mutants to see whether Sgs1 recruitment is Msh6-dependent, and similar analyses can be performed in top3Δ and rmi1Δ strains. Analysis of Sgs1 localization in the absence of Top3 and/or Rmi1 may be more useful than genetic knockout studies of rejection in these mutants since top3Δ and rmi1Δ strains are slow-growing, sick, and prone to suppressor mutations.
Top3 and Rmi1 are known to form a complex with Sgs1 (Chang et al. 2005), and these experiments would help to determine whether these factors are also involved in Sgs1-dependent heteroduplex rejection.

It is yet to be confirmed whether Sgs1-HA3 can easily be immunoprecipitated, so initial ChIP trials should be analyzed by Western blot. Studies in several labs have found the Sgs1 protein difficult to detect (Mullen et al. 2000). For detection by Western blot, one option is to perform consecutive IPs prior to blotting (as in Mullen et al. 2000). Once IP of Sgs1-HA3 in these strains has been confirmed by Western blot using the α-HA antibody, ChIP experiments could be carried out as described above, with the additional use of the protein-protein crosslinking agent EGS to enhance Sgs1 signal as done in Zhu et al. (2008). If immunoprecipitation of Sgs1 is difficult, use of the helicase-dead Sgs1-K706A allele may also enhance the signal.

Additionally, these experiments could be expanded to also look at recruitment of Msh2 and compare the timing of localization to that of Sgs1. Presumably Msh2 and Msh6 bind to the mismatches as a heterodimer during heteroduplex rejection as they do during post-replicative MMR. Since Msh2 is also involved in 3’ non-homologous tail removal (Pâques and Haber 1997; Sugawara et al. 1997; Studamire et al. 1999; Goldfarb 2005), and perhaps in the DNA damage response during SSA (Duckett et al. 1999; Franchitto et al. 2003; Wang and Qin 2003), Msh2 localization specifically for rejection may be difficult to discern. Comparison of Msh2 localization in identical vs. mismatched repeats and the use of the Msh2Δ1 mutant protein defective in 3’ nonhomologous tail removal but proficient in MMR and rejection could be useful in this regard (Lee et al. 2007). Msh2-HA4 localization by ChIP has been done previously in our laboratory (Goldfarb and Alani 2004; Evans et al. 2000).
DNA sequence requirements for heteroduplex rejection. How many mismatches are required for Msh2-Msh6- and Sgs1-dependent heteroduplex rejection? It is reported that as little as one mismatch is sufficient to reduce the rate of recombination between two otherwise identical sequences (Datta et al. 1997). Is this sufficient in the SSA system? Does it matter what type of mismatch? Are the most-recognized mismatches during rejection the same as those that are best repaired by post-replicative DNA mismatch repair? If several mismatches are required, or if more mismatches increase the robustness of heteroduplex rejection, what is the effect of mismatch spacing? Presumably, a minimum amount of homology (the MEPS) lacking mismatches would need to be present in order for recombination to initiate in the first place.

Are 3’ nonhomologous tails required for Sgs1-mediated heteroduplex rejection? Given what is known about the recombination intermediates that Sgs1 unwinds, it would be interesting to test whether the presence of 3’ nonhomologous tails is required for Sgs1-mediated heteroduplex rejection. Sgs1 is a 3’ to 5’ helicase whose in vitro helicase activity is most active on substrates containing 3’ single-stranded ends. During SSA, as depicted in Figure 4.2, extensive 5’ to 3’ resection reveals long 3’ single-stranded regions of DNA that anneal at homologous sequences. The DNA adjacent to the original DSB site is, in many cases, not homologous to the sequence that is situated on the opposite strand following this annealing. Thus, the 3’ ends are nonhomologous tails. As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, 3’ nonhomologous tail removal is a process involved in many homologous recombination events, and as shown in Figure 4.2, removal of these 3’ nonhomologous tails is required for completion of DSB repair by SSA. The canonical model of heteroduplex rejection during SSA, depicted in Figure 4.5, follows the same scheme as the repair event.
Figure 4.18. **Single-strand annealing between dispersed or tandem repeated sequences.** During SSA between dispersed repeats, the intervening sequences are not homologous to those flanking the other repeat sequence, thus leaving two 3’ nonhomologous tails in the intermediate. Prior to removal of these 3’ tails by Rad1-Rad10, they may serve as entry points for the Sgs1 helicase for unwinding during heteroduplex rejection. When a DSB is located in or between tandem repeats, SSA can occur without involving 3’ nonhomologous tails. It is unclear whether such intermediates could be efficiently acted upon by Sgs1 to elicit heteroduplex rejection.
depicted in Figure 4.2 up until the 3’ nonhomologous tail removal step. In heteroduplex rejection during SSA, it is proposed that Sgs1 would load onto mismatched recombination intermediates via the 3’ single-stranded tails. Such entry would allow for 3’ to 5’ unwinding of inappropriate intermediates, and resumption of a homology search to find a better recombination substrate.

While the proposed model for rejection seems to hold true in many situations, single-strand annealing does not necessarily involve 3’ nonhomologous tails. As shown in Figure 4.18, a DSB formed within a repeated sequence or at the edge of a tandemly repeated sequence can be repaired by single-strand annealing without the formation of 3’ nonhomologous tails. In such a situation, would Sgs1-dependent heteroduplex rejection be able to occur? One might predict that rejection would be of lower efficiency if Sgs1 could not load as easily onto the DNA substrate via 3’ single-stranded tails. It is also possible that recruitment of Sgs1 to mismatched intermediates by Msh2-Msh6 might position Sgs1 on the DNA in such a way that 3’ tails would not be required. The proposed necessity for single-stranded 3’ tails is based on in vitro observations, so it remains possible that the in vitro and in vivo DNA loading requirements for the helicase may differ.

**Does heteroduplex rejection operate similarly during gene conversion and SSA?**

It remains to be tested directly whether Msh2-Msh6- and Sgs1-dependent heteroduplex rejection operates via similar mechanisms during single-strand annealing, gene conversion, crossing over, and break-induced replication. As described in the introduction to this chapter, Msh2-Msh6 and Sgs1 are both known to limit the frequency recombination between slightly divergent sequences. However, it is unclear how often both factors act in the same pathway of anti-recombination during non-SSA recombination events. Gene conversion by synthesis-dependent strand
annealing to form noncrossover products can involve one or two 3’ nonhomologous tails, as described in Chapters 1, 2, and 3 (See Chapter 1, Figure 1.2). Rejection during gene conversion will depend on where the mismatches are located with respect to the initiating DSB. If mismatches are present between the invading strand sequence and the donor sequence, one might expect rejection to be most effective when there are two 3’ nonhomologous tails, since this requires that the invading strand contain a 3’ nonhomologous tail, and thus an entry point for Sgs1. If, however, the invading strand contains perfect homology to the donor sequence and it is the newly-replicated (gene converted) sequence copied from the donor that displays mismatches when annealed back to the original locus, one might expect that rejection would be unaffected by the presence or absence of a 3’ nonhomologous tail on the invading strand, and would only depend on the presence of a single 3’ nonhomologous tail on the non-invading strand.

What is the role of the DNA damage checkpoint in heteroduplex rejection? DSB resection usually produces sufficient single-stranded DNA to induce the DNA damage checkpoint response, stalling the cell cycle to allow for proper DSB repair. It is unclear whether this damage response is activated as a direct result of exposing single-stranded DNA during 5’ to 3’ resection of the break, or by binding of RPA to the single-stranded DNA. As a critical resection factor (Gravel et al. 2008; Mimitou and Symington 2008; Zhu et al. 2008), Sgs1 thus plays a key role in allowing checkpoint activation. Following activation of the DNA damage response, DNA repair factors are phosphorylated, activated, and recruited to the break site. It is possible that Sgs1 is recruited by the DNA damage checkpoint machinery to participate in later steps of repair as well as heteroduplex rejection. If the annealed region of a homologous recombination substrate contains mismatched DNA, which might be sensed due to the
resulting perturbations in the DNA backbone or disruptions in the binding of proteins to the annealed DNA, checkpoint factors might aid in recruitment of Msh2-Msh6 as well as Sgs1. Alternatively, mismatch recognition by the Msh2-Msh6 complex could lead to checkpoint-dependent signaling that recruits Sgs1 for heteroduplex rejection. Future experiments in the lab are planned using rad9Δ mutants containing single-strand annealing cassettes to test whether checkpoint activation is necessary for heteroduplex rejection. Preliminary results from graduate student Carrie George suggest that the absence of Rad9 leads to increased death specifically in strains bearing divergent repeats (Carrie George, personal communication). It remains to be seen whether this mismatch-dependent death is due to enhanced heteroduplex rejection activity or to an inability to complete rejection or repair at mismatched heteroduplexes in the absence of Rad9. It would be interesting to look at Sgs1 localization to mismatched SSA intermediates by ChIP in rad9Δ mutant strains to test whether checkpoint activation is required for Sgs1 recruitment specifically to mismatched intermediates.

As mentioned above, it is unclear whether checkpoint activation is required for heteroduplex rejection during single-strand annealing. While the DNA damage checkpoint is typically activated during SSA, SSA can be completed in the absence of checkpoint activation in S. cerevisiae. When SSA occurs between slightly divergent repeats, the activated DNA damage checkpoint response may directly promote heteroduplex rejection at the level of mismatch recognition. Msh6 is known to be a direct phosphorylation target of the Mec1/Tel1 checkpoint kinases (Smolka et al. 2007), though it is unclear what the function of this phosphorylation might be. Interestingly, this phosphorylation of Msh6 is independent of Rad53. The predicted SQ phosphorylation sites on Msh6, S102 and S130, lie N-terminal to domain I of the Msh6 protein and C-terminal to the PIP-box that interacts with PCNA (Clark et al. [missing text])
Future experiments should investigate the necessity of these phosphorylated residues during heteroduplex rejection, which requires Msh2-Msh6 mismatch recognition, but entails quite different downstream events than mismatch repair that are not well understood.

The protein sequence of Sgs1 harbors quite a few S/TQ motifs that could be potential targets of Mec1/Tel1 phosphorylation. It is reported that Sgs1 is phosphorylated in vivo (Fricke et al. 2001), and also physically interacts with the Rad53 DNA damage checkpoint factor (Bjergbaek et al. 2005). Indeed, Sgs1 functions independently of Top3 and Rad51 in stimulating the Rad53 checkpoint kinase in response to HU-dependent replication fork stalling, though this checkpoint function does not require the helicase activity of Sgs1 (Bjergbaek et al. 2005). Given the variety of roles that Sgs1 has in maintaining genome integrity, including replication restart/fork integrity, inhibiting crossover formation, 5’ to 3’ DSB resection, and heteroduplex rejection, it would not be surprising if Sgs1 had roles in checkpoint signaling or activation outside of S-phase.

**What is the role of Mlh1 in heteroduplex rejection?** In addition to Msh2-Msh6, the Mlh1 mismatch repair factor has also been shown to exhibit anti-recombination properties. The absence of Mlh1 increases the frequency of recombination between divergent sequences in a variety of assays (Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1999; Nicholson et al. 2000; Sugawara et al. 2004). *mlh1Δ* mutants exhibit a less severe anti-recombination defect in the two 205 bp-repeat SSA assay than *msh6Δ* or *sgs1Δ* mutants, with a divergent/identical repeat recombination ratio of 0.30 to 0.48 in *mlh1Δ* mutants compared to 0.16 in wild-type and 0.64 in *msh6Δ* (Sugawara et al. 2004). *mlh1Δ* and *pms1Δ* mutants are also less defective than *msh2Δ* mutants in anti-
recombination between divergent inverted repeats (Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1999; Nicholson et al. 2000).

Studies of the human Blm helicase have shown a direct physical interaction with hMLh1 both in vivo and in vitro, and S. cerevisiae Sgs1 interactions with yeast Mlh1 have been detected by yeast two-hybrid and affinity capture-Westerns (Langland et al. 2001; Pedrazzi et al. 2001; Argueso et al. 2002; Argueso et al. 2003). Since Mlh1 alone and the Mlh1-Pms1 complex have been purified in our lab (Aaron Plys, personal communication), it would be exciting and feasible to study the effect of Mlh1 on Sgs1 helicase activity in vitro. Like the interaction of Msh2-Msh6 with Sgs1, it is possible that this interplay between Mlh1 and Sgs1 could be relevant to post-replicative DNA mismatch repair as well as heteroduplex rejection. Since Mlh1-Pms1 has endonuclease activity (Kadyrov et al. 2007), and on its own binds to DNA in vitro in electrophoretic gel mobility shift experiments (Aaron Plys, personal communication). Sgs1 might unwind DNA that has been nicked by Mlh1-Pms1. It would be interesting to see whether mutation of the endonuclease motif in Pms1 has an effect on its anti-recombination activity; if not, Mlh1-Pms1 (or Mlh1-Mlh3) might act as a simple matchmaker to enhance the recruitment of Sgs1 helicase to Msh2-Msh6-bound mismatches within recombination intermediates to promote heteroduplex rejection. Mlh3 and Sgs1 have been reported to coimmunoprecipitate during meiosis (Wang and Kung 2002), which might implicate Mlh1-Mlh3 and Sgs1 in meiotic rejection in addition to their roles in regulating meiotic crossing over.

To test the effect of Mlh1 and Mlh1-Pms1 on Sgs1 helicase activity, purified proteins in the range of approximately 20 to 200 fmol could be added to Sgs1 helicase reactions as described in Materials and Methods. 3’-tailed or forked DNA substrates with and without mismatches could be compared to see whether any observed effect depends on the presence of a mismatch. Eventually, both Msh2-Msh6 and Mlh1-
Pms1 complexes could be added to helicase reactions, though this could potential sequester some of the ATP needed by Sgs1. In addition, gel shift assays with Mlh1-Pms1 (or Mlh1 alone) and Sgs1 could be performed to see whether super-shifted complexes containing both proteins form on DNA. Such experiments cannot distinguish between both proteins binding separately to a given piece of DNA or the two proteins binding to each other while one of them is bound to DNA, but the use of various DNA substrates could parse apart these questions. Binding of one protein might preclude binding of the other; this can be tested with order-of-addition experiments by pre-incubating one protein/complex with the DNA for 5 minutes at room temperature prior to the addition of the second protein/complex.

Interestingly, Mlh1 also harbors a Mec1/Tel1 phosphorylation site at S441 whose modification is Rad53-independent (Smolka et al. 2007). Use of phosphorylation-defective mlh1 mutants in in vivo anti-recombination assays might further enhance our understanding of the role of checkpoint kinase-dependent Mlh1 phosphorylation. It remains to be seen how this phosphorylation affects the endonuclease activity of Mlh1-Pms1 or its interaction with Msh2-Msh6, and whether abolishing this residue or mimicking constitutive phosphorylation has any effect on post-replicative MMR or homologous recombination.

Characterization of the cell cycle response during heteroduplex rejection. It would be interesting to see if synchronizing the single-strand annealing (A-A/F-A or A-A-A/A-F-A) strains prior to DSB induction would affect 1) SSA timing or efficiency or 2) heteroduplex rejection. While SSA is a slow process that may be unaffected by cell cycle context, heteroduplex rejection efficiency could be greatly affected if it is checkpoint-regulated. If the strains were made bar1Δ to sensitize them to α-factor, cells could be synchronized in G1 phase and released prior to DSB
induction. In addition to cell survival and Southern blot analyses that could follow, the ability to synchronize these strains would aid in comparison of the cell cycle arrest in cells harboring identical vs. divergent repeats by FACS analysis of DNA content, pedigree analysis, or Western blots of time course samples to detect phosphorylated checkpoint and DNA repair factors. Are the arrests longer in cells with divergent repeats? Do the arrests have the same genetic requirements? The increased death in rad9Δ mutants in F-A strains but not in A-A strains in experiments by Carrie George suggest that the arrests in cells undergoing SSA between divergent repeats have functional consequences that we have yet to understand. Further analysis of the DNA damage response in cells undergoing heteroduplex rejection could employ mass spectrometry technology to assess the differences in phosphorylation of key checkpoint and repair factors in cells undergoing single-strand annealing between identical vs. divergent repeats.
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Supplementary Figure 2.6. Southern blot analysis of mating type switching in wild-type and rad1Δ strains containing two nonhomologous ends. A. Diagram of the MAT locus showing the restriction sites used for Southern blot analysis, expected fragment lengths, and location of the probes used for detection for mating type switching involving two nonhomologous ends due to insertion of KANMX sequence distal to the DSB. B. Southern blot analysis of digested DNA for wild-type and rad1Δ mutants. Experiments were performed at least three times, with representative time courses shown. C. Quantification of Yα product formation relative to the MAT proximal loading control for wild-type, rad1Δ, msh2Δ, and msh3Δ mutants containing the KANMX insertion. Data points are the mean ± SEM.
Supplementary Figure 2.7. Detection of Ya loss in wild-type and rad1Δ mutants. A. Location of restriction sites, expected band sizes, and double-stranded probe used for detection of Ya. B. Southern blot analysis of Ya sequence in wild-type and rad1Δ strains during mating type switching. C. Quantification of Ya signal relative to t = 0 for wild-type and rad1Δ (mean ± SEM for 4 individual blots).
Supplementary Figure 2.8. Large-budded morphology (A) and number of cells at death (B) observed in rad1Δ mutants undergoing mating type switching. rad1Δ mutant cells induced for mating type switching were photographed under the light microscope during pedigree analysis. A. rad1Δ cells exhibited large-budded morphology for a prolonged period of time indicative of G2/M cell cycle delay. B. Following separation of the two daughter cells, rad1Δ mutants that died continued to divide several times to yield an average of 8 ± 1 cells prior to death.