Deciphering the reading of the genetic code by near-cognate tRNA
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Some codons of the genetic code can be read not only by cognate, but also by near-cognate tRNAs. This flexibility is thought to be conferred mainly by a mismatch between the third base of the codon and the first of the anticodon (so-called “wobble” position). However, this simplistic explanation underestimates the importance of nucleotide modifications in the decoding process. Using a system in which only near-cognate tRNAs can decode a specific codon, we investigated the role of six modifications of the anticodon, or adjacent nucleotides, of the tRNAs specific for Tyr, Glu, Lys, Trp, Cys, and Arg in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Modifications almost systematically rendered these tRNAs able to act as near-cognate tRNAs at stop codons, even though they involve noncanonical base pairs, without markedly affecting their ability to decode cognate or near-cognate sense codons. These findings reveal an important effect of modifications to tRNA decoding with implications for understanding the flexibility of the genetic code.

The ribosome uses transfer RNAs (tRNAs) to decode codons of mRNAs into a sequence of amino acids in a polypeptide. The specificity of this process depends on two main functions of the tRNA: its recognition by cognate aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases (1) and its anticodon pairing with the mRNA codons (2). In all living organisms, correct reading of the genetic code by tRNAs is essential, to prevent the misincorporation of amino acids and premature termination. However, translation fidelity is not maximal, and misreading rates can vary from 10−3 to 10−6, depending on the tRNA and the organism considered (3, 4). Accurate decoding depends on the ability of the ribosome to discriminate between correct (cognate) and incorrect (near-cognate or noncognate) codon–tRNA interactions, while allowing the tRNA to decode synonymous codons. It was long thought that this ability was conferred by monitoring of exclusively the stability of the codon–anticodon complex, mainly based on the number of hydrogen bonds. However, recent data suggest that the ribosome plays an active role in decoding and thereafter accommodates both cognate and near-cognate tRNAs in a similar manner by forcing mismatched base pairs to adopt a Watson–Crick geometry as normal A-U/U-A or C-G/G-C base pairs (5).

More than a 100 base and ribosome modifications in tRNAs of different organisms have been shown to contribute to various aspects of gene expression (6). They can be classified into two groups: one group of modifications that serve to stabilize the core of the tRNA and its overall L-shaped structure, and a second group of modifications that are crucial for correct mRNA decoding and fine-tuning of the translation process (7). The latter modifications are mainly present within the anticodon loop, in particular at positions 34, the first nucleotide of the anticodon, and 37, located immediately 3′ to the anticodon. These modifications have a direct impact on the capacity of the tRNA to read synonymous codons and to prevent decoding of near-cognate codons (8), although this view has recently been challenged by studies revealing that, in some cases, these modifications increase the misreading of codons (3). For example, it has been suggested that the combination of 5-methylene derivatives and 2-thiolation modifications of U34 restrict the decoding of codons ending with A (9, 10); moreover, 2-thiolation increases affinity of binding to the cognate codon and reduces tRNA rejection (11). These modifications have also been implicated in protein homeostasis (12), in reading-frame maintenance (13), and in the enhancement of recognition by aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases (14).

However, data are not easily transposable from one organism to another because notable differences exist in the decoding strategies of distantly evolutionary related organisms (15). The impact of nucleotide modifications in the anticodon loop on the likelihood of near-cognate tRNA being used by the ribosome has yet to be analyzed in eukaryotes. Here, we used a system in which cytoplasmic near-cognate tRNAs do not compete with cognate tRNAs to study the impact of these modifications on the recognition of naturally occurring stop codons (Fig. 1). We constructed yeast mutant strains with deletions of genes encoding specific modification enzymes and used LC-MS/MS and ribosome profiling techniques to investigate the impact of these deletions on the selection of natural suppressor tRNAs, which are, by definition, near-cognate tRNAs. We found that modifications of the tRNA anticodon loop are required for decoding a near-cognate stop codon, but that they have no marked impact.

Significance

Protein translation is a key cellular process in which each codon of mRNAs has to be accurately and efficiently recognized by cognate tRNAs of a large repertoire of noncognate tRNAs. A successful decoding process is largely dependent on the presence of modified nucleotides within the anticodon loop, especially of tRNAs having to read A/U-rich codons. In this latter case, their roles appear to stabilize the codon–anticodon interaction, allowing them to reach an optimal energetic value close to that of other interacting tRNAs involving G/C-rich anticodons. In this work we demonstrate that, while helping an efficient translation of A/U-rich codons, modified nucleotides also allow certain unconventional base pairing to occur, as evidenced in the case of stop codon suppression.
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on the decoding of cognate codons. We also showed that overall stop codon suppression efficiency appears as a poor indicator of the ability of individual tRNAs to decode stop codons, due to adjustments between the various competing near-cognate cellular tRNAs at reading the same stop codon. Taken together, our results highlight the flexibility of the genetic code and reveal an unexpected capacity of the Saccharomyces cerevisiae translation machinery to discriminate between sense and nonsense near-cognate codons. Although one cannot rule out that increased readthrough due to Ψ35 is a direct consequence of the increased stability of the codon:anticodon pairing, one appealing hypothesis is that genes coding for enzyme catalyzing Ψ35 have been conserved through evolution to regulate stop codon readthrough according to the cellular needs.

Results
Deletion of Genes Coding Enzymes Responsible for tRNA Modifications Have No Major Impact on Cell Growth and Polysomes. To study the impact of several yeast tRNA modifications on the decoding of near-cognate codons, we used a reporter system based on the stop codon readthrough-dependent expression of a gene encoding a GST protein. This system provides a precise quantitative analysis of the incorporation of natural suppressor tRNAs at stop codons. In a previous study, we identified tyrosine, glutamine, and lysine tRNAs as the cytoplasmic tRNAs incorporated at UAA and UAG codons, and tryptophan, cysteine, and arginine tRNAs as the cognate codons. Although one cannot rule out that increased readthrough due to Ψ35 is a direct consequence of the increased stability of the codon:anticodon pairing, one appealing hypothesis is that genes coding for enzyme catalyzing Ψ35 have been conserved through evolution to regulate stop codon readthrough according to the cellular needs.

Deletion of Genes Coding Enzymes Responsible for tRNA Modifications Have No Major Impact on Cell Growth and Polysomes. To study the impact of several yeast tRNA modifications on the decoding of near-cognate codons, we used a reporter system based on the stop codon readthrough-dependent expression of a gene encoding a GST protein. This system provides a precise quantitative analysis of the incorporation of natural suppressor tRNAs at stop codons. In a previous study, we identified tyrosine, glutamine, and lysine tRNAs as the cytoplasmic tRNAs incorporated at UAA and UAG codons, and tryptophan, cysteine, and arginine tRNAs as the cognate codons. Although one cannot rule out that increased readthrough due to Ψ35 is a direct consequence of the increased stability of the codon:anticodon pairing, one appealing hypothesis is that genes coding for enzyme catalyzing Ψ35 have been conserved through evolution to regulate stop codon readthrough according to the cellular needs.

Deletion of Genes Coding Enzymes Responsible for tRNA Modifications Have No Major Impact on Cell Growth and Polysomes. To study the impact of several yeast tRNA modifications on the decoding of near-cognate codons, we used a reporter system based on the stop codon readthrough-dependent expression of a gene encoding a GST protein. This system provides a precise quantitative analysis of the incorporation of natural suppressor tRNAs at stop codons. In a previous study, we identified tyrosine, glutamine, and lysine tRNAs as the cytoplasmic tRNAs incorporated at UAA and UAG codons, and tryptophan, cysteine, and arginine tRNAs as the cognate codons. Although one cannot rule out that increased readthrough due to Ψ35 is a direct consequence of the increased stability of the codon:anticodon pairing, one appealing hypothesis is that genes coding for enzyme catalyzing Ψ35 have been conserved through evolution to regulate stop codon readthrough according to the cellular needs.

Deletion of Genes Coding Enzymes Responsible for tRNA Modifications Have No Major Impact on Cell Growth and Polysomes. To study the impact of several yeast tRNA modifications on the decoding of near-cognate codons, we used a reporter system based on the stop codon readthrough-dependent expression of a gene encoding a GST protein. This system provides a precise quantitative analysis of the incorporation of natural suppressor tRNAs at stop codons. In a previous study, we identified tyrosine, glutamine, and lysine tRNAs as the cytoplasmic tRNAs incorporated at UAA and UAG codons, and tryptophan, cysteine, and arginine tRNAs as the cognate codons. Although one cannot rule out that increased readthrough due to Ψ35 is a direct consequence of the increased stability of the codon:anticodon pairing, one appealing hypothesis is that genes coding for enzyme catalyzing Ψ35 have been conserved through evolution to regulate stop codon readthrough according to the cellular needs.
absence of the 2-thio group of uracil at position 34 bearing the 5-mcm group) decreased glutamine incorporation more strongly than the deletion of TRM9 (resulting in m-lacking c\textsuperscript{m5}U\textsubscript{34}). Quantitative analyses for the UGA codon showed that deletion of ELP3 had no effect on the ratios of the various amino acids, whereas the deletion of TRM9 strongly stimulated incorporation of arginine and also slightly increased cysteine incorporation, even though the corresponding cysteine tRNA is not thought to be modified by TRM9 (Fig. 2B). Clearly, 5-mcm modification does not have the same effect on the ability of glutamine, lysine, and arginine tRNAs to read UAA and UGA stop codons.

**Modification of the Nucleotides Adjacent to the Anticodon Plays an Important Role in Near-Cognate Decoding.** Beside the arginine tRNA\textsubscript{UCA}, the two main other suppressor tRNAs of the UGA codon are the tryptophan and cysteine tRNAs, both of which carry nucleotide modifications. The tryptophan tRNA anticodon loop is modified at C\textsubscript{32} and C\textsubscript{34} into 2-methyl cytosine (Cm) by Trm7p, while the Cys tRNA\textsubscript{GCA} is modified at A\textsubscript{37} into i\textsuperscript{Ψ}A\textsubscript{37} by Mod5p (Fig. L4). They both belong to the same four-codon family boxes. Suppression involved a mismatch base pair at position 34 of the anticodon and the third base (A) of the codon (respectively, C\textsubscript{m5}U\textsubscript{34}-A\textsubscript{37} for tryptophan tRNA and G\textsubscript{34}-A\textsubscript{37} for cysteine tRNA). As shown in Fig. S34, efficiency of UGA readthrough is not affected by TRM7 deletion (Fig S34), which also had no effect on the proportions of tryptophan, cysteine, and arginine incorporated (Fig S3B). In contrast, the absence of Mod5p affected only the relative proportions of suppressor tRNAs not the level of the UGA suppression. Indeed, cysteine was not incorporated anymore at the UGA codon in the \textit{ΔMOD5} strain (Fig S3B).

Like the cysteine tRNA, the tyrosine tRNA is modified by Mod5p, resulting in an i\textsuperscript{Ψ}A residue at position 37. We analyzed the effect of the elimination of this modification from the tyrosine tRNA on the level of stop codon suppression. Cysteine tRNA harbors a G\textsubscript{34}-A\textsubscript{37} mismatch when reading UAA and tyrosine tRNA harbors a G\textsubscript{35}-G\textsubscript{37} mismatch when reading UGA). Quantitative analyses for the \textit{ΔMOD5} strain showed that stop codon suppression efficiency at both the UAA and UAG codons was much lower than in the parental strain (Fig 3A). Contribution of the tyrosine tRNA to the global suppression observed in the \textit{ΔMOD5} strain was next investigated by quantifying the incorporation of suppressor tRNAs at UAA and UAG codons. Levels of tyrosine incorporation were slightly lower at the UAG codon and much lower at the UAA codon (Fig 3B). Thus, the effect of the i\textsuperscript{Ψ}A modification of the tyrosine tRNA depends on the codon decoded.

The Presence of a Pseudouridine Residue at Position 35 in the Tyr tRNA Is Important for Stop Codon Suppression. In \textit{S. cerevisiae}, there is only one cytosolic tyrosine tRNA, which acts as the major suppressor at the UAA and UAG stop codons, despite the creation of a G\textsubscript{34}-A\textsubscript{37} and a G\textsubscript{35}-G\textsubscript{37} mismatch, respectively. This tyrosine tRNA is unique because, in addition to being modified at position 37 (i\textsuperscript{Ψ}A), it is the only a suppressor in yeast that also has a pseudouridine (Ψ) instead of a usual uridine at the center (position 35) of the anticodon. This modification is post-transcriptionally catalyzed by Pus7p (Fig L4).

The lack of this pseudouridine residue on suppression of the UAA and UAG stop codons was investigated as above for the other tRNA modifications. \textit{PUS7} deletion did not change tyrosine tRNA stability as measured by four-leaf clover (FL)–qRT-PCR (23) (Fig S5), but resulted in lowering the level of stop codon suppression at UAG with almost no effect on stop codon suppression at the UAA codon (Fig 3A). However, a quantification of amino acids incorporated at UAA and UAG codons revealed that the frequency of tyrosine tRNA incorporation at UAG was strongly decreased at the benefit of the noncognate glutamine or lysine tRNAs (Fig S24), even more significantly than in the \textit{ΔMOD5} strain (resulting in i\textsuperscript{Ψ}A lacking A\textsubscript{37}). While in the case of UAA suppression, the incorporation of tyrosine tRNA is now almost exclusively replaced by the noncognate glutamine tRNA\textsubscript{UG} (Fig 3B). We next checked whether the observed phenotype was solely due to the absence of Pus7p, by reexpressing either the WT protein or a catalytic mutant of Pus7p, Pus7-D256A [which has been reported to be inactive (19)] in the \textit{ΔPUS7} strain. Results indicate that reexpression of the WT protein restored parental amino acid levels, whereas expression of the single mutant did not (Fig S4). Thus, both modifications of the tyrosine tRNA (i\textsuperscript{Ψ}A\textsubscript{37} and Ψ\textsubscript{35}) are important for stop codon suppression, the i\textsuperscript{Ψ}A\textsubscript{37} modification being important only for UAA readthrough, whereas the Ψ\textsubscript{35} modification appears crucial mainly for the recognition of UAG codon. We also tested the absence of both modifications by constructing a strain in which the \textit{PUS7} and \textit{MOD5} genes were deleted. Subsequent quantification of stop codon readthrough efficiency (Fig 3A) and amino acid insertion at the UAA and UAG codons (Fig 3B) demonstrated a significant additive effect on stop codon readthrough, especially on the UAG codon.

**Absence of the Pseudouridine Residue at Position 35 in the Tyr tRNA Does Not Prevent the Decoding of Tyrosine Codons.** In \textit{S. cerevisiae}, synonymous tyrosine codons UAU and UAC are almost equally used in cytoplasmic tRNAs. Only one tyrosine tRNA isoacceptor containing a \textit{G\textsubscript{34}A} anticodon exists for reading each of these two codons. Because, tyrosine tRNA is dependent on Ψ\textsubscript{35} for decoding the two near-cognate stop codons (UAA and UAG, see above), it was of interest to determine how tyrosine tRNA lacking of Ψ\textsubscript{35} behaves for decoding the two tyrosine sense codons (UAUC). We used a ribosome profiling technique that allows in vivo quantification of translation speed through calculation of the genome-wide ribosome residence time at each codon (24). We first checked the periodicity of the signal to demonstrate that the signals obtained corresponded to translating ribosomes (Fig 4A). Then, in both the parental and \textit{ΔPUS7} strains, we compared the
normalized ribosome density at each tyrosine and stop codons in the A site for each gene (Materials and Methods). We found that UAU and UAC were decoded with similar efficiency in both Δψ7 and parental strains (P = 0.4 and 0.6, respectively) (Fig. 4B) and that this efficiency was not different from that for all of the other codons. We concluded that ψ35 in Tyr tRNA does not allow a better decoding of the near-cognate UAU codon, despite it playing an important role for decoding near-cognate UAA and UAG codons. Interestingly, we did not observe any significant difference in ribosome occupancy at stop codons (Fig. 4C), whereas a reduction of in-frame ribosome footprints downstream the stop codon is evident (P = 1.5 × 10⁻³) (Fig. 4D). This confirms that stop codon readthrough is impaired in the Δψ7 strain without accumulation of ribosomes at natural stop codons when tyrosine tRNA is lacking ψ35.

Discussion

Decoding of mRNAs by tRNAs into polypeptides on the ribosome was considered for a long time as a relatively simple process, where formation of a set of H-bonds between three complementary base pairs of codons and anticodons within a minihelix configuration plays a major role. However, it is now clear that other elements of tRNA molecules, as well as of RNA of the ribosome, are also important for accurate and efficient mRNA decoding (5, 8, 25, 26). The biochemical properties of tRNAs depend strongly on posttranscriptional modifications of nucleotides within the anticodon (positions 34 and 35) and the so-called “proximal anticodon loop” of tRNA (positions 37, 38, and/or 32) (Fig. S6) (6, 15). The main role of these nucleotide modifications is generally argued to notably finely-tune the accuracy of decoding: that is, to restrict the decoding of split box codons (2:2 or 3:1 decoding boxes) or to extend the decoding of nonsplit four-codon boxes. However, it is now clear that, together with other bases of the anticodon loop, their roles are to mainly achieve a uniform ribosome binding by stabilizing the codon–anticodon interaction of tRNAs (27). This is especially important for tRNA harboring an A-U-rich anticodon triplet that have to reach about the same optimal interaction energies than tRNAs harboring G/C-rich anticodon. Base or ribose modifications lead to various chemical and physical consequences, such as keto-enol tautomerism, base protonation, uridine isomerization to pseudouridine (Ψ), anti to syn base transconformation, freezing a 2′-O-glycosidyl bond into its 3′-endo configuration, improvement of base stacking with neighboring bases, or additional interactions with ribosomal elements. One corollary of these multiple stabilizing effects is to allow certain noncanonical base pairs, which are isosteric with standard Watson–Crick pairs, to occur during decoding (28, 29).

In a preceding work, we and others identified in yeast eight naturally occurring tRNAs that misread stop codons as sense codons under in vivo conditions (Fig. 1) (16, 30). Although we are using a [PSF⁺] strain, it has been previously shown that this does not impact tRNA ratios found at the stop codon during readthrough (30). Here, we investigated the consequences of the absence of a given modification normally present in the anticodon loops (at positions 34, 35, and/or 37) on their relative efficacy to readthrough stop codons. This is a different situation from studies of missense errors at sense codons during the elongation process (3), because the near-cognate tRNAs of a stop codon will never be in competition with cognate tRNA that normally does not exist.
All tRNAs in Fig. S6 belong to the so-called “intrinsically weak, A/ U-rich” interacting tRNAs (Lys, Tyr) or “intermediate” interacting tRNAs (Gln, Arg, Trp, Cys), which are supposed to be among the most prone for miscoding (for details, see ref. 25). First, in the glutamine and lysine tRNAs, uridine-34 is modified to mcm^3U (symbolized as U^35) and to mcm^4U only (U^36) in the arginine tRNA_{35}. The chemical adduct at C^36 of U^34 has been shown to favor binding to G^37 over A^36, via enol-keto tautomerism, while the thiol (s′) group, beside reinforcing base pairing mostly with A^35, also reinforces stacking, and thus stability and conformational rigidity of both base 34 and the neighboring base pair N^32–N^33 (Fig. S6) (9, 10). Deletion (one by one) of each of the three genes responsible for U^34 modification into mcm^3s′U^34 in S. cerevisiae (ELP3, TRM9, and TUC1) shows a slight growth defect for only the deletion of TRM9 (affecting only the last methylation step of cm^3U^34) (Fig. S1). Deletion of these genes had only a slight impact on UAA readthrough efficiency, the most pronounced effect being observed for the Δelp3 mutant corresponding to the total lack of 5-mcm group on U^34 (Fig. S4). The interesting observation is that, while the efficacy is not much affected in both the Δelp3 (lacking 5-mcm but not 2-thio) and Δtuc1 (lacking 2-thio but not 5-mcm) strains, glutamine tRNA_{UGG} was no longer able to compete with tyrosine tRNA, now becoming almost the only suppressor tRNA for UAA readthrough, whereas in the Δtrm9 strain (resulting in the lack of one methyl group on s′U^34) a weak competition persists between glutamine and tyrosine tRNAs (Fig. 2B). These results demonstrate that both the fully methylated 5-mcm and 2-thio adducts of U^34 greatly improve the stability of the codon–anticodon interaction so that a noncanonical G^53–U^34 can occur, allowing glutamine tRNA_{UGG} to be stably incorporated at UAA.

Because all of the base pairs of the minihelix have to adopt a strict Watson–Crick geometry (5, 26), this G^53–U^34 pair probably fulfills this requirement through a keto-enol tautomerization of either base (31). The data obtained with lysine tRNA reading the same UAA are going in the same direction. Only when U^34 is fully modified to mcm^3s′U^34, a U^34–U^35 opposition in this case can be accommodated, yet obviously less efficiently than for a G^53–U^34. Such a U:U anticodon interaction allows a noncanonical G^53–U^34 pairing as long as the ribose, confines the H-bound formation, and in- creases hydrophobic surface, hence also stacking with neighboring bases (33). No significant effect of TRM7 deletion (lacking Cm^34) is found on either global stop codon readthrough efficiency (Fig. S4) or the nature of the amino acids incorporated, attesting again that the strong central C^35–G^32 pair rather than the 2′-O-methylation of C^35 (and C^32) is probably the main stabilizing element (Fig. S3B). An isosteric Cm or Cm:A32 opposition probably occurs through an amino ionization of either C/Cm or A/A alternately, Cm:A32 can also occur in the absence of a hydrogen bond (28, 29).

In contrast, deletion of the isopenentyl group on A^32 of cysteine tRNA in the ΔMOD5 strain prevents incorporation of cysteine at UGA stop codon (Fig. S3B). The same trend was observed with ΔA^32 containing tyrosine tRNA, the suppression efficiency being more severely affected in the case of UAA than of UAG (Fig. 3B). Thus, lowering the stability of a A^36–U^34 Watson–Crick pair by the lack of an isopenentyl group on A^37 in cysteine or tyrosine tRNA affects the efficacy of a triplet pairing involving a G^34 mispair with A^35 of stop codon UGA and UAA, respectively, or with G^35 in the case of stop codon UAG. Formation of an isosteric base pair involving two purines requires that one of the two purines switches conformation from anti to syn, probably the one of the codon, to form a Watson–Crick/Hoogsteen base pair (28, 29). Notice that codon-anticodon involving noncanonical G^35–A^34 or G^35–G^34 have been demonstrated for several tRNAs involving G/C-rich anticons and reading codons of the unsplit four-decoding boxes. For a long time, this type of decoding process has been designated as a “two-out-of-three” decoding rule (34).

Tyrosine tRNA carries an unusual Ψ at the central position of the anticodon that is catalyzed by Psi7p. Pseudouridine enables engaging a strong base pairing (almost as strong as C-G), rigidifies the sugar-phosphate backbone, and improves stacking with a neighboring base pair, forcing a Ψ-A pair to adopt an A-form conformation, as in a genuine Watson–Crick helix (35, 36). In agreement with an earlier similar observation in a plant translation system (37), we found that tyrosine tRNA in a Δpsi7 strain (lacking Ψ^35) is a less-efficient suppressor at both UAA and UAG stop codons, but mainly at UAA (Fig. 3B), although the tyrosine tRNA is equally stable in WT and Δpsi7 strains (Fig. S5). The effect of the Δpsi7 strain is independent of A^32 isopenentenylation, as shown by the additive effect of the Δpsi7 and MOD5 double deletion on UAG (Fig. 3B). The level of UAA readthrough was not affected by Δpsi7 deletion, even though this deletion prevented the incorporation of the tyrosine tRNA at UAA (Fig. 3). These results illustrate that a strong stabilization of codon–anticodon interaction allows a noncanonical G^34–A^34 base opposition to occur. Interestingly, a ribosome profiling (RibopSeq) experiment performed in parental WT and Δpsi7 strains allows us to demonstrate that a tyrosine tRNA isoacceptor (with or without Ψ^35) reads equally well both synonymous tyrosine codons, UAU and UAC (Fig. 4). This indicates the lack of involvement of Ψ^35 in discrimination between these two tyrosine codons in a situation where there is no real mismatch between the anticodon and the codon (whereas a G^34–A^34 or G^34–G^34 base opposition systematically occurs when tyrosine tRNA reads stop codons). A similar situation exists with echi-noderm asparagine tRNA_{GCUC}, harboring a Ψ^35 in reading a lysine near-cognate codon AAA, while not affecting the normal reading of asparagine codons AACU (38).

In conclusion, our findings reveal the importance of certain modifications for the suppression of stop codons. Consistent with the findings of another recent study (3), we found that tRNA modifications did not solely serve to restrict the decoding capacity of the tRNA to its cognate codon, but also allow the decoding of near-cognate stop codons. This involves an expected mismatch at the wobble position and also noncanonical base
pairs at the third anticodon position and the first codon position. The allowed base mispairs or base oppositions are, however, only those that would hold within a minihelix of the Watson–Crick type of geometry that is mandatory for the aminoacyl-tRNA to be accepted and finally captured by the mRNA-ribosome machinery (26). We observed that mismatch with a stop codon never occurred at the middle position of the anticodon, while such possibilities have been demonstrated at sense codons (6, 7). The reason is that there is no naturally occurring tRNA that could sustain such base opposition (like U-G) within a Watson–Crick minihelix in the whole tRNA repertoire of S. cerevisiae.

Only a small subset of tRNAs have been analyzed and it is likely that studies of other tRNA modifications in other translation systems, as well as organisms, will turn up other surprises. In this work, we propose that the activities of certain tRNA modification enzymes can be a regulatory device for the production of certain functional “read-through” proteins. This work should help at elaborating synthetic or mutated tRNAs able to introduce nonproteinogenic amino acids at specific locations of a mRNA where a sense codon has been appropriately mutated into a stop codon (39).

Materials and Methods

Detailed information on materials and methods used in this study is provided in SI Materials and Methods.

Strains and Plasmids.

All of the strains used in this study were derived from 74–D694 (mata ade1-14 [UGA] ura3-52 trpl-281 [UGA] his3A200 leu2-3,112 [PSI + ]).
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