Nuclear organisation and replication timing are coupled through RIF1–PP1 interaction
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Three-dimensional genome organisation and replication timing are known to be correlated, however, it remains unknown whether nuclear architecture overall plays an instructive role in the replication-timing programme and, if so, how. Here we demonstrate that RIF1 is a molecular hub that co-regulates both processes. Both nuclear organisation and replication timing depend upon the interaction between RIF1 and PP1. However, whereas nuclear architecture requires the full complement of RIF1 and its interaction with PP1, replication timing is not sensitive to RIF1 dosage. The role of RIF1 in replication timing also extends beyond its interaction with PP1. Availing of this separation-of-function approach, we have therefore identified in RIF1 dual function the molecular bases of the co-dependency of the replication-timing programme and nuclear architecture.
n eukaryotes, origins of DNA replication are not activated all at once. Origin firing follows a cell-type specific temporal programme known as DNA replication timing. The replication-timing programme is mirrored by the spatial distribution in the nucleus of replication foci, which are clusters of about five simultaneously activated bidirectional replication forks. Both spatial and temporal replication patterns are re-established every cell cycle in G1, at the timing decision point (TDP), that coincides with chromosomal territories achieving their radial position and the re-establishment of chromatin architecture and interphase-nuclear configuration. The spatial organisation of DNA replication is evident at multiple levels. The units of DNA replication timing, replication domains (RD), coincide with one of the basic units of three-dimensional (3D) genome organisation, the topologically associated domains (TADs). Recently, in cis elements (early replicating control elements—ERCEs) that can simultaneously influence chromatin looping and replication timing have also been identified. Moreover, the “assignment” of RDs as early or late replicating (the establishment of the replication-timing programme), takes place on a chromosome-domain level, prior to the specification of the active origins of replication. On a global scale, the early and late replicating genomes overlap with the A and B compartments identified by Chromosome Conformation Capture methods (HiC) and are segregated in the nuclear interior or the peripheries of the nucleus and nucleolus, respectively. It has been shown that artificially re-localising chromocenters to the nuclear periphery affected their replication timing without an immediate impact on their epigenetic makeup. Finally, a recent study from budding yeast has shown that activation of early origins drives their internalisation. However, no molecular, causal link between the temporal and spatial aspects of DNA replication organisation has been established.

RIF1 is a key genome-wide regulator of replication timing. It is also involved in re-establishing spatial chromatin organisation in the nucleus at G1, and in the control of replication foci spatial dynamics. RIF1 could therefore be a molecular connection between the temporal and spatial organisation of DNA replication in mammalian cells.

The molecular function of RIF1 is still unclear, although it is involved in a variety of functions such as DNA repair, telomere length regulation in yeast, cytokinesis, epigenetic, and DNA replication-timing control. Mammalian RIF1 (266 kDa) interacts with components of the nuclear lamina, behaving as an integral part of this insoluble nuclear scaffold and chromatin organisation. RIF1 associates with the late replicating genome, forming megabase-long domains called RIF1-associated-domains (RADs). It is unknown what directs RIF1’s association with chromatin, but both the N and C terminus can mediate the interaction with DNA and RIF1 has a highly conserved interaction with protein phosphatase 1 (PP1) that is reported to be critical to regulate the firing of individual late origins of replication. Activation of these origins is promoted by RIF1’s removal in late S-phase, leading to the increasing levels of cyclin-dependent kinase (CDK) activity. These studies therefore place the role of the RIF1–PP1 interaction at the stage of execution of the replication-timing programme. However, we have also identified a role for RIF1 as a chromatin organiser earlier during the cell cycle, in G1, around the time of the establishment of the replication-timing programme. RIF1 deficiency impacts nuclear architecture, relaxing the constraints that normally limit chromatin interactions between domains with the same replication timing. It is unknown if RIF1-dependent chromatin architecture establishment affects the replication-timing programme, how RIF1 contributes to nuclear organisation, and if and how its interaction with PP1 plays a role in these functions. More generally, the functional relationship between nuclear architecture and replication timing is still unclear.

Here, we tackle these questions by interfering with the RIF1–PP1 interaction, introducing point mutations in Rif1 that specifically abolish the interaction. Our results show that both replication timing and nuclear organisation depend upon RIF1–PP1 interaction. However, unlike the replication-timing programme, we find that nuclear organisation is exquisitely sensitive to RIF1 dosage. Using this separation-of-function approach, we identify in RIF1 the molecular hub for their co-regulation. In addition, we show for the first time that the replication-timing programme can be established and executed independently of a specific 3D organisation or of the spatial distribution of replication foci.

**Results**

**Mouse embryonic stem cells (ESCs) expressing Rif1APPI.** RIF1–PP1 interaction promotes the continuous dephosphorylation of MCM4 at replication origins that are “marked” to be activated only during the later part of S-phase. This suggests that, through RIF1, PP1 contributes to control of the time of firing of individual origins of replication. However, the functional significance of RIF1–PP1 interaction for the establishment and domain-level regulation of the replication-timing programme, and in the context of nuclear 3D organisation is unknown.

Mutations that perturb RIF1–PP1 interaction are potential tools to achieve separation-of-function between nuclear organisation and replication timing. We have recently identified the sites within RIF1 that mediate the physical contacts with PP1 (SILK and RVSF motifs, respectively residues 2128–2131 and 2150–2153). Point mutations of these residues reduce RIF1’s interaction with PP1 to undetectable levels (RIF1APPI: SILK into SAA and RVSF into RVSA). We therefore sought to express the Rif1APPI mutant allele in mESCs. Rif1 overexpression is toxic, hence, to create a system to expresses Rif1APPI at controlled and as physiological levels as possible, we have utilised Rif1FH/flox mESCs. In these cells, one allele of Rif1 contains loxP sites flanking exons 5 to 7 (Rif1floX), while the second is a knock-in of a FLAG-HA tag (FH) into the Rif1 locus (Rif1FH) (Supplementary Fig. 1A and B). We then targeted the FH allele with a mini-gene encoding Rif1APPI. As a control, following the same strategy, we also knocked-in a Rif1 wild type mini-gene (Rif1WT). Thus, Cre-mediated deletion of the Rif1floX allele leaves either the FH-tagged Rif1APPI, Rif1WT or the parental Rif1FH allele as the sole source of RIF1, effectively creating inducible FH-tagged Rif1 hemizygous cells. Upon tamoxifen-mediated Cre recombination, we have then studied the consequences of abolishing RIF1–PP1 interaction in Rif1APPIfloX (Rif1APPI), control Rif1WTfloX (Rif1WT), and the parental Rif1FHfloX (Rif1FH) cell lines. In agreement with the fact that, upon Cre induction, all the Rif1 FH-tagged alleles are hemizygous, Rif1–APPI, Rif1–WT and Rif1–FH, are expressed at comparable levels (Fig. 1a, b and Supplementary Fig. 1C) and Rif1–PP1 interaction is undetectable in Rif1APPI (Fig. 1c). As it was previously shown, we also found that expression of Rif1APPI leads to accumulation of hyper-phosphorylated MCM4 (data not shown). Both Rif1APPI and Rif1WTWT have a comparable degree of chromatin-association (Fig. 1d and Supplementary Fig. 2A).

RIF1 deficiency in mESCs affects nuclear function at multiple levels. One of the features of Rif1-KO cultures is the doubling of the cell population in G2, accompanied by a decreased S-phase population (Fig. 1e). Our data show that Rif1 hemizygosity
Fig. 1 Expression levels and chromatin association of RIF1-TgWT and RIF1-ΔPP1 are comparable to those of RIF1 in hemizygous cells. a Quantitative analysis of total levels of FH-tagged RIF1, measured by intra-cellular FACS staining. Anti-HA mouse ascites 16B12 was used to stain the indicated cell lines. Rif1FH/FH: homozygous knock-in FH-tagged RIF1, as a control of quantitative staining. The plot shows distributions of densities from HA signal, measured in arbitrary units. One representative experiment is shown. b Quantification from Fig. 1a. The bar plot represents the median intensities for the experiment shown and the error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals, calculated through bootstrapping with 10,000 iterations. c Total proteins were extracted from cells expressing untagged wild type RIF1 (WT), or from hemizygote cells expressing RIF1-TgWT or RIF1-ΔPP1 (HA tagged), and immunoprecipitated with anti-HA antibody. The input, immunoprecipitated complex and flow through were analysed by western blot with anti-mouse RIF1 affinity-purified rabbit polyclonal antibody (1240) and anti-PP1α. d Quantitative analysis of the levels of chromatin-associated FH-tagged RIF1 throughout the cell cycle measured by FACS staining. Cytoplasmic and nucleoplasmic proteins were pre-extracted before fixing chromatin-associated proteins. Anti-HA mouse ascites 16B12 was used to visualise FH-tagged RIF1 as in a. Cell cycle stage was determined by DNA quantification (DAPI staining). Means from the results from two independent experiments, each with 2 or 3 independent cell lines per genotype are summarised. The error bars indicate standard deviations. P values were calculated by two-sided unpaired t test. e Cell cycle distribution of the indicated cell lines, as determined by FACS quantification of EdU incorporation (S-phase) and DAPI staining (DNA amount). The mean value of three independent clones per genotype, from three experiments is shown. Error bars indicate the standard error of the mean. P values are calculated using two-sided Wilcoxon rank-sum test.
(Rif1-FH and Rif1-TgWT) results in an altered cell cycle similar to Rif1 deficiency (Fig. 1e). Importantly, cell cycle distribution in both Rif1-ΔPP1 and Rif1-TgWT cell lines appears comparable to Rif1-FH cells. These results suggest that the defective cell cycle progression of Rif1 null cells is not attributable to altered PP1 function but to insufficient levels of Rif1.

Loss of Rif1 function also results in an altered gene expression profile in mESCs, including the de-repression of MERVLs, an effect that Rif1 shares with other epigenetic and DNA replication regulators. We therefore compared the level of MERVL RNA in Rif1-WT, Rif1-TgWT, Rif1-KO and Rif1-ΔPP1 cells. After 4 days of depletion, MERVLs are upregulated not only in Rif1-ΔPP1 and Rif1-KO cells, but, surprisingly, also in the hemizygous control (Rif1-TgWT, Supplementary Fig. 2B), suggesting that, as for cell cycle progression, gene expression control is also sensitive to Rif1 dosage.

RIF1–PP1 interaction is important for the replication-timing programme. The most conserved function of RIF1 is the control of the replication-timing programme and Rif1-KO cells show pronounced genome-wide changes in the temporal programme of origin firing, including the de-repression of MERVLs, an effect that Rif1 shares with other epigenetic and DNA replication regulators. The level of MERVL RNA in Rif1-WT, Rif1-TgWT, Rif1-KO and Rif1-ΔPP1 cells. After 4 days of depletion, MERVLs are upregulated not only in Rif1-ΔPP1 and Rif1-KO cells, but, surprisingly, also in the hemizygous control (Rif1-TgWT, Supplementary Fig. 2B), suggesting that, as for cell cycle progression, gene expression control is also sensitive to Rif1 dosage.

In Supplementary Fig. 5A, we have identified early S-phase cells by a diffuse nucleoplasmic MCM3 staining and absence of histone H3 phosphorylated on Ser10-H3S10p. In Supplementary Figs. 5B and 6D, cells in early S-phase were identified by DNA staining, either by FACs sorting (Supplementary Fig. 5B, P1 and P2, empty white arrowheads), or by quantification of DAPI staining in 3D-SIM images (Supplementary Fig. 6D, early, Rif1-WT). In Rif1-KO cells, a diffuse distribution of replication foci (EdU or BrdU) similar to early S-phase also appears aberrantly in cells in later S-phase (Supplementary Fig. 5B, P4, empty white arrowheads and Supplementary Fig. 5C, clusters of H3S10p signal, often at chromocenters, MCM3 discrete foci, larger-mid- or smaller-late and peripheral). Normally at this stage, EdU or BrdU signal appears as discrete foci of different sizes, often associated with heterochromatin (Supplementary Fig. 5A). B, P4, full, yellow arrowheads, and Supplementary Fig. 6D, mid/late, Rif1-WT).

To study the effect of Rif1 deficiency or expression of Rif1ΔPP1 on the total number of replication forks and their clustering, we employed 3D-structure illumination microscopy (SIM—Supplementary Fig. 6A). Since Rif1 depletion and expression of Rif1ΔPP1 induce a loss of equivalence between replication focus distribution and replication timing, we could not classify early, mid and late S-phase from the EdU patterns. We therefore used DNA quantification based on DAPI staining to categorise them. Rf1 deficiency results in an increase of the total number of replication forks throughout S-phase (Supplementary Fig. 6B) that could explain the apparent increase in the proportion of cells displaying early-like replication patterns. However, expression of Rif1ΔPP1 does not increase the total number of replication forks per nucleus at any stage of S-phase (Supplementary Fig. 6B), yet it causes an accumulation of early-like replication patterns that is comparable to Rif1-KO cells (Fig. 2d). Considering the different extent of the impact of Rif1 loss (Rif1-KO) and loss of RIF1–PP1 interaction (Rif1ΔPP1) on replication timing, this discrepancy in the effect on the total number of forks is interesting and indicates that the altered distribution of replication foci observed in both cell lines is not linked to the change of total number of replication forks. Moreover, by matching the total number of replication forks to the number of replication foci, we could not find a correlation between the number of forks per replication focus (Supplementary Fig. 6C) and the changes of distribution of replication patterns (Fig. 2d). These data indicate that the increase of the proportion of cells with early-like replication patterns observed in Rif1-KO and Rif1-ΔPP1 cells is not attributable to the de-clustering of the replication forks. Finally, our analysis shows that Rif1 hemizygosity (Rif1-hem = Rif-FH + Rif1-TgWT) has an impact on the spatial distribution of replication foci that is similar to, although milder, than Rif1 deficiency or expression of Rif1ΔPP1 (Fig. 2d). However, hemizygosity does not result in an increased number of total replication forks or a measurable perturbation of the replication-timing programme. These results suggest that spatial distribution of replication foci and the timing of replication can be uncoupled. In conclusion, loss or reduced Rif1 levels and loss of Rif1–PP1 interaction all impact on the distribution of replication foci, but not all affect replication timing.

RIF1 dosage is important for nuclear compartmentalisation. The distribution of replication foci in the nucleus reflects the spatial organisation of the underlying chromatin. As a consequence, the altered spatial configuration of replication foci in Rif1-hem and Rif1-ΔPP1 cells suggests that a reduced amount of Rif1 or loss of Rif1–PP1 interaction could affect chromatin organisation similarly to what we have shown for Rif1 null cells, and irrespective of their effects on replication timing. We
cannot be explained by the increased fraction of cells in G2 in (Fig. 3a) of opposite replication timing (Fig.4a). These changes induce a gain of reducible degree of change. Halving Rif1 (Fig. 7A), similarly and to a degree at least comparable to the increases of chromatin contacts in cis, especially at long range (>10 Mbp) (Rif1-WT and Rif1-KO, Fig. 3a and b and Supplementary Fig. 7b)58. The contacts gained preferentially involve late-replicating genomic regions (Fig. 4a). Loss of RIF1 and RIF1-enriched regions gaining contacts with RIF1-poor genomic regions (Fig. 4b). Loss of Rif1–PP1 interaction has the same effect as the loss of Rif1 (Rif1-ΔPP1, Figs. 3a, b and 4a, b). Unexpectedly, chromatin architecture in Rif1 hemizygous cells (Rif1-FH and Rif1-TgWT) shows an intermediate but reproducible degree of change. Halving Rif1 dosage is sufficient to induce a gain of in cis contacts between distant genomic regions (Fig. 3a) of opposite replication timing (Fig. 4a). These changes cannot be explained by the increased fraction of cells in G2 in Rif1-KO, Rif1-ΔPP1 and Rif1-hem cells, as it was shown that chromosome compaction in G2/M favours the establishment of short-range interactions59. Consequently, the increased proportion of Rif1-KO, Rif1-ΔPP1 and Rif1-hem cells in G2 will lead to an under-estimate of the true extent of the accumulation of long-range interactions. They suggest instead the alteration of the A/B compartmentalisation in mutant cells compared with Rif1-WT cells. Indeed, principle component analysis shows that Rif1-WT on one side and Rif1-KO and Rif1-ΔPP1 on the other, display a distinctly different compartment organisation (Fig. 4c). In agreement with previous data that have reported a more open chromatin12,13,17; Rif1 loss of function, as well as the loss of Rif1–PP1 interaction, induces an expansion of the A compartment (and corresponding contraction of the B compartment, Fig. 4d) and compartment strength is weakened (Fig. 4e and f), with increased inter-compartment interactions (Fig. 4e). Principal component analysis (PCA) of the overall A/B compartment organisation in Rif1-TgWT and Rif1-FH cells lies between with Rif1 null and Rif1-ΔPP1 cells on one side, and Rif1-WT (Fig. 4c) on the other, with an expansion of the A compartment (Fig. 4d)
and weakened compartmentalisation (Fig. 4e and f) that is intermediate between Rif1-WT and Rif1-KO/Rif1-ΔPP1 cells. These data indicate PP1 plays a key role in RIF1-dependent control of chromatin organisation, but, also, that chromatin architecture is exquisitely sensitive to RIF1 dosage, with decreasing the levels of RIF1 inducing a progressive alteration of nuclear organisation. This is in striking contrast with the lack of any effect on the regulation of replication timing, when varying RIF1 levels.

**Discussion**

The remarkable coincidence of spatial distribution and replication timing of different portions of the genome, at multiple levels of organisation and throughout evolution, has encouraged the idea of a causal relationship between nuclear architecture and replication timing. At a molecular level, their covariation—for example during cell fate determination and embryonic development—finds a confirmation in their co-dependence on RIF1. In this work, we show that both aspects of nuclear function depend upon the interaction between RIF1 and PP1. However, 3D organisation of chromatin contacts and replication timing show a different degree of dependency on RIF1–PP1 interaction and are differentially influenced by RIF1 dosage. The loss of RIF1–PP1 interaction affects the compartmentalisation of chromatin contacts comparably to a complete loss of RIF1 function, while it partially recapitulates the effects of Rif1−/− on the control of replication timing. In addition, the former is sensitive to RIF1 dosage, while Rif1 haploinsufficiency does not affect the latter. The fact that halving Rif1 dosage affects chromatin contact organisation but not replication timing is not attributable to a lesser sensitivity of Repli-seq as compared to HiC. Replication timing measurement, even by Repli-chip, have detected differences between samples as small as 10%Δf. In summary, there is a clear division into two groups: (i) replication timing is only affected by complete loss of functional RIF1 (Rif1-KO and Rif1-ΔPP1). (ii) On the contrary, nuclear compartmentalisation, long-range chromatin contacts, replication foci spatial organisation and MERVL repression all show sensitivity to RIF1 dosage, with the effect of lack of RIF1–PP1 interaction clearly worsening the effect of hemizygosis for the long-range chromatin interactions and nuclear compartmentalisation. We hypothesise that the reason for the difference of the effect of
Fig. 4 Segregation of A and B nuclear compartments is sensitive to RIF1 dosage. a Top row: Saddle plot of Hi-C data, binned at 250 kb resolution for loci ranked by their replication timing. An increase in contacts of genomic positions of opposite replication timings is progressively more evident from Rif1-WT to Rif1-KO. The triplicates for each genotype (except for Rif1-FH) were combined. Lower row: Hi-C for each genotype, data normalised to Rif1-WT. Red indicates a gain in contacts. A and B indicates the compartments. b Top row: Saddle plot of Hi-C data, binned at 250 kb resolution for loci ranked by their association with RIF1\textsuperscript{13}. An increase in contacts between RIF1-associated and RIF1-devoid genomic positions is progressively more evident from Rif1-WT to Rif1-KO. The triplicates for each genotype (except for Rif1-FH) were combined. Lower row: Hi-C for each genotype, data normalised to Rif1-WT. Red indicates a gain in contacts. A and B indicates the compartments. c Principle component analysis of A/B compartmentalisation for the indicated genotypes in triplicate, except for Rif1-FH. d Distribution of genomic regions of 250 kb windows between the A and B compartment. Mean of three biological replicates is shown, except for the parental line Rif1-FH. e Top row: Saddle plot of Hi-C data, binned at 250 kb resolution for loci ranked by their eigenvector values. An increase in contacts between genomic positions in different compartments is progressively more evident from Rif1-WT to Rif1-KO. The triplicates for each genotype (except for Rif1-FH) were combined. Lower row: Hi-C for each genotype, data normalised to Rif1-WT. Red indicates a gain in contacts. A and B indicates the compartments, calculated from our data. f Compartment strength variation with distance for the indicated genotypes. Individual values for the three biological replicates are represented by the outlined circles, except for Rif1-FH. The line represents the median and the bars the standard deviations.

RIF1–PP1 loss of interaction between chromatin contacts/nuclear compartmentalisation and replication foci distribution/MERVL overexpression, is that chromatin contacts/nuclear compartmentalisation are the primary features affected by loss of RIF1-dependent dephosphorylation of critical substrate/s, that directly or indirectly control them. The alteration of replication foci distribution is a more indirect way to visualise the same changes (therefore less sensitive), and modifications in gene expression (MERVL upregulation, in this case) could also be an indirect consequence of these architectural changes, as we had already hypothesised\textsuperscript{12,13}. We have indeed shown that the transcriptome is only altered after a few cell cycles in the absence of RIF1, while nuclear architecture changes are an immediate consequence of RIF1 absence, in the first cell cycle after Rif1 deletion\textsuperscript{13}. Analysis of the effects of the loss of RIF1–PP1 interaction is extremely complex. Chronic deletion of Rif1 causes cell cycle arrest\textsuperscript{12}, cell death\textsuperscript{13} and genome instability\textsuperscript{19}. If and when a Rif1\textsuperscript{−/−} cell lines can be obtained, it is through selection of survivors that are transcriptionally and genomically unstable and difficult to control for. Since Rif1-KO and Rif1-ΔPP1 share most of the cellular phenotypes, homozygous knock-in of Rif1-ΔPP1 would have the same issues as Rif1\textsuperscript{−/−} cells. On the other hand, Rif1 over-expression can only be analysed in transient, as it is toxic. Therefore, although Rif1-hem present the inconvenience of a basal level of deregulation of most of RIF1 functions, this system represents the best-controlled situation to address the key question of the role of RIF1–PP1 interaction.

RIF1 is known to multimerise\textsuperscript{45,47,61} and to interact with the nuclear lamina\textsuperscript{13,42}. RIF1 multimers could act as a sub-stochiometric platform, interacting with different regulators of replication timing, in addition to PP1. In this case, the consequences of the complete loss of RIF1 function on the replication-timing programme would amount to the sum of perturbation of multiple pathways that control the timing of origin activation. For example, RIF1–ΔPP1 may only specifically interfere with the PP1-dependent control of DDK (Dbf4-dependent kinases) activity at origins, while other RIF1 interactors may contribute to the epigenetic control of origin activation. Proteins associated with RIF1 are enriched for chromatin and epigenetic regulators\textsuperscript{52}, and the contribution of histone modifiers to the control of replication timing has long been
recognised\textsuperscript{60,62–66}. However, an understanding of the effect of Rif1 deletion on the epigenetic landscape is still missing, leaving this hypothesis currently hard to test\textsuperscript{23,33,67}. In the context of chromatin architecture, Rif1 multimers could directly participate in the creation of local scaffolds that restrict chromatin mobility or could regulate other proteins with this role. In either case, a reduction of Rif1 dosage could have structural, quantitative consequences.

Our results identify Rif1 as a molecular link, a point of convergence and co-regulation. We propose that Rif1, specifically, and not generic nuclear architecture, coordinates the replication-timing architecture could be important to coordinate gene expression and at the time of zygotic genome activation in zebra

\begin{align*}
&\text{vergence and co-regulation. We propose that RIF1, specifi} \\
&\text{cation both emerge around the time when zygotic transcription starts}\textsuperscript{71}. \text{Could uncoupling these two events have consequences on gene expression? We can alter chromatin organisation, leaving replication timing intact, by halving RIF1 dosage. This affects cell cycle distribution analysis.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Cell cycle distribution analysis. After 4 days of OHT treatment, cells were} \\
\text{used for 30 minutes with 10 \mu M Edu (Invitrogen A10444). Cells were} \\
\text{then washed with cold DPBS (Thermo Fisher Scientific 14190094), collected,} \\
\text{and fixed in 75%. EtOH Samples were kept at \text{−20}°\text{C for at least overnight.} \\
\text{7.5 \times 10^5 cells were then processed for click-chemistry detection of Edu.} \\
\text{After washing in cold DPBS, cells were permeabilised in DPBS/} \\
\text{1% BSA/0.01% Triton X-100 (Sigma H3462-} \\
\text{250ML) for 10 minutes on ice. After washing twice, cells were incubated in 900} \\
\text{\mu M Alexa Fluor 647 Azide (Thermo Fisher Scientific A10277) and CuSO}_4 \\
\text{0.1 M (Sigma C1297) for 30 minutes at room temperature in the dark, rotating.} \\
\text{Cells were washed in DPBS/} \\
\text{1% BSA/0.05% Tween 20 (Sigma P9416-100ML) for 10 minutes on ice. After washing, cells were incubated in 100} \\
\text{\mu M DAPI with 10 mM Na-Ascorbate (Sigma A7631-25G).} \\
\text{\text{1} \mu M Alexa Fluor 647} \\
\text{was added 5 minutes in saponin solution (COMPONENT E from kit C10424,} \\
\text{Thermo Fisher Scientific) at room temperature and anti-HA antibody (Covance} \\
\text{monoclonal HA.11 clone 16B12 \text{MMS-101R, RRID:AB_291262}) was added at} \\
\text{1:500. After 1 hour at room temperature rotating, cells were washed twice} \\
\text{in DPBS/Triton X-100 0.1%, cells were incubated 5 minutes in saponin solution with} \\
\text{anti mouse-} \\
\text{fluorescein isothiocyanate (BD Biosciences) for 15 minutes on ice. After washing,} \\
\text{cells were fixed in 400} \\
\text{μl of saponin with DAPI 2.5 g/ml (Thermo Fisher Scientific D1306) and analysed on an LSR II FAC} \\
\text{BD). Data were processed using R version 3.5.1. The con} \\
\text{trols for the FACS analysis of Rif1 were the wild type, drawn the gates and applied them} \\
\text{to all the samples12. Gating strategy in Figs. S9 and S10.}
\end{align*}
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