Long non-coding RNA PCAT19 safeguards DNA in quiescent endothelial cells by preventing uncontrolled phosphorylation of RPA2
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In brief

Oo et al. report an essential role for the IncRNA PCAT19 in the endothelial cell proliferation-quiescence switch. Endothelial cell-enriched PCAT19 is upregulated with quiescence and binds RPA2 to prevent aberrant phosphorylation of RPA2-S33 by ATR kinase. This ensures an appropriate DNA damage response for the endothelial cell-cycle state.
In healthy vessels, endothelial cells maintain a stable, differentiated, and growth-arrested phenotype for years. Upon injury, a rapid phenotypic switch facilitates proliferation to restore tissue perfusion. Here we report the identification of the endothelial cell-enriched long non-coding RNA (lncRNA) PCAT19, which contributes to the proliferative switch and acts as a safeguard for the endothelial genome. PCAT19 is enriched in confluent, quiescent endothelial cells and binds to the full replication protein A (RPA) complex in a DNA damage- and cell-cycle-related manner. Our results suggest that PCAT19 limits the phosphorylation of RPA2, primarily on the serine 33 (S33) residue, and thereby facilitates an appropriate DNA damage response while slowing cell cycle progression. Reduction in PCAT19 levels in response to either loss of cell contacts or knockdown promotes endothelial proliferation and angiogenesis. Collectively, PCAT19 acts as a dynamic guardian of the endothelial genome and facilitates rapid switching from quiescence to proliferation.
Figure 1. PCAT19 is highly enriched in endothelial cells and is differentially expressed in vascular diseases

(A) FANTOM5 CAGE expression of the 30 most highly expressed endothelial lncRNAs across different cell types. The Z score across cell types for each lncRNA is shown.

(B) PCAT19 expression (log10(TPM + 1)) in normal human tissues from the GTEx portal (GTEx Analysis Release v.8; dbGaP accession phs000424.v8.p2). TPM, transcripts per million.

(C and D) Uniform manifold approximation and projection (UMAP) plot (C) and violin plot (D) of published scRNA-seq from healthy prostate tissue. Cell types and respective normalized PCAT19 expression are displayed.

(E) PCAT19 expression (relative fragments per kilobase of transcript per million mapped reads) in healthy vessel (CTL) and hemangioma (HA). PCAT19 expression was normalized to PECAM1 expression.

(F) PCAT19 expression relative to PECAM1 expression in healthy/early carotid artery plaque vessel samples (CTL) (n = 10) or advanced carotid artery plaque (CAP) samples (n = 12) from the Munich Vascular Biobank (30781475).
A central regulator of the genome maintenance machinery is the single-stranded DNA (ssDNA)-binding replication protein A (RPA) complex, which acts during the initiation and elongation steps of DNA replication and during DNA damage.\(^\text{17}^\) The complex consists of RPA1, RPA2, and RPA3. Of these, RPA2 is the most important with regard to RPA regulation, as it is heavily controlled by post-translational modifications, particularly phosphorylation.\(^\text{18}^\) RPA2 is sequentially phosphorylated by three phosphoinositide 3-kinase (PI3K)-like protein kinases (ATR, ATM, and DNA-PK) in response to varying degrees of DNA damage. Phosphorylation of the serine 33 (S33) residue by ATR occurs during S phase in response to replicative stress while signaling the progression of the cell cycle.\(^\text{19,20}^\) If DNA damage is extensive, subsequent hyperphosphorylation of RPA2 kinase is mediated by ATM and DNA-PK, particularly at the S4/8 residue.\(^\text{21}^\) This triggers the cell cycle checkpoints and the DNA damage response. Following S33 phosphorylation by ATR, RPA2 can also be phosphorylated at its two cyclin-CDK sites by cyclin B-Cdk1 during mitosis\(^\text{22}^\) and by cyclin A-Cdk2 at the G1/S boundary.\(^\text{23}^\)

RPA is involved in multiple DNA-repair pathways, such as nucleotide excision repair (NER), base excision repair (BER), mismatch repair (MMR), and homologous recombination (HR). Mutations in RPA are known to cause DNA damage accumulation due to faulty G1, S, and G2/M checkpoint signaling, which is in part a consequence of insufficient loading of the ATR kinase onto DNA.\(^\text{18}^\) ATR is normally activated on RPA-coated ssDNA to signal and predispose the cell to faulty checkpoint signaling and genome instability. Importantly, hyperphosphorylation of free RPA2 not bound to DNA hinders its subsequent loading onto DNA and thereby reduces the effectiveness of the DNA damage response.\(^\text{22,24}^\) While the main proteins involved in this fundamental pathway have been characterized, a growing body of evidence suggests that RNAs, and in particular long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs), act on the cell cycle to trigger cell cycle arrest and promote DNA repair. As such, problems with RPA activation and loading onto ssDNA disrupt ATR signaling and predispose the cell to faulty checkpoint signaling and genome instability. Importantly, hyperphosphorylation of free RPA2 is induced by endothelial quiescence to protect RPA2 from uncontrolled phosphorylation, primarily on its S33 residue. This permits the proper and timely loading of RPA2 onto DNA and results in a safeguarding function by PCAT19 that maintains the human endothelial cell resting state.

**RESULTS**

**PCAT19 is highly enriched in endothelial cells and is differentially expressed in vascular diseases**

When screening for endothelial lncRNAs in the FANTOM5 Cap Analysis of Gene Expression (CAGE) database,\(^\text{2}^\) we identified PCAT19 as one of the most highly expressed lncRNAs in endothelial cells, with limited expression in other cell types (Figure 1A). Interestingly, PCAT19 is listed in PanglaoDB as an endothelial marker.\(^\text{25}^\) Owing to its high endothelial expression, PCAT19 is expressed in all human tissues listed in the GTEx database (GTEx Analysis Release v.8; dbGaP accession phs000424.v8.p2). Tissues such as lung and spleen with a relatively dense vasculature, and therefore more endothelial cells, have the highest PCAT19 expression compared with other tissues (Figure 1B). This tissue expression pattern was similar for other highly endothelial-enriched genes such as CDH5 and PECAM1 (Figure S1A). Given the initial identification of PCAT19 in prostate tissue\(^\text{33}^\) and the elucidation of its role in prostate cancer,\(^\text{34}^\) we analyzed the expression of PCAT19 in the prostate gland in more detail by interrogating publicly available data from a prostate single-cell RNA-sequencing (scRNA-seq) experiment (GEO: GSE172357).\(^\text{5}^\) In this unbiased dataset, PCAT19 was highly enriched in the endothelial cell cluster with limited expression in other cell types (Figures 1C and 1D). The remarkable endothelial enrichment of PCAT19 can also be observed in the Tabula Sapiens dataset.\(^\text{9}^\) The expression levels of PCAT19, CDH5, and PECAM1 were compared across all human cell types. All three genes are clearly enriched in the endothelial cell cluster (Figure S1B). When looking at PCAT19, CDH5, and PECAM1 expression in endothelial cells (Figure 1E), we observe that PCAT19 expression is significantly higher in cells compared to other cell types, particularly in endothelial cells.
Figure 2. PCAT19 represses endothelial cell proliferation, angiogenic sprouting, and cardiac organoid vascularization

(A) Endothelial cell proliferation measured by percentage EdU-positive cells after LNA Gapmer-mediated knockdown of PCAT19 (P19) or negative control (CTL). Scale bars, 100 μm; n = 3 biological replicates, unpaired t test. Representative shown.

(B) Endothelial cell proliferation measured by percentage EdU-positive cells after overexpression (OE) of PCAT19 (P19) or pcDNA3.1+ control (CTL). Scale bars, 100 μm; n = 6 biological replicates, unpaired t test. Representative images shown.

(legend continued on next page)
only and clustering by tissue, there is a clear widespread expression of each gene across endothelial cells from different tissues (Figure S1/C).

Next, a possible impact of vascular diseases on PCAT19 expression was sought by analyzing relevant RNA-seq datasets. Diseases of the vascularature often result in, or are caused by, differential rates of endothelial proliferation. PCAT19 was significantly less expressed in hemangioma, a malformation of blood vessels largely characterized by increased endothelial cell proliferation (Figure 1E). In addition, in advanced carotid artery disease (characterized by plaque accumulation), PCAT19 expression was significantly higher than in healthy or early disease samples (Figure 1F), but was similar between stable and unstable plaques from advanced carotid artery samples (Figure 1G).

Due to the previous description of PCAT19 in cancer, we checked whether the expression of PCAT19 differed between healthy and cancerous tissues in the GEPIA database, which returned a differential expression in most of the listed cancers, the majority of which displayed a downregulation of PCAT19 in cancerous tissue compared with the respective healthy tissue (Figure S1D). This was most obvious in lung cancer samples (lung adenocarcinoma [LUAD] and lung squamous cell carcinoma [LUSC]) and highly intriguing, as lung tissue has the highest PCAT19 expression in the GTEx data. Next, it was checked whether PCAT19 expression differed specifically in the endothelial cells that formed a cancer compared with healthy endothelial cells. From publicly available lung scRNA-seq data, we observed that PCAT19 was indeed expressed in fewer cancerous endothelial cells (squamous cell carcinoma [SCC] and large-cell carcinoma [LCC]) than in normal endothelial cells (Figure 1H). These data demonstrate not only a strong enrichment of PCAT19 in endothelial cells but also its differential expression in vascular diseases and cancerous endothelial cells. This raises the question of what the functional significance of PCAT19 is in endothelial cells.

PCAT19 represses proliferation, sprouting, and vascularization

Due to the enrichment of PCAT19 in endothelial cells and its previously reported link to prostate cancer, we wondered whether the perturbation of PCAT19 would have an impact on endothelial cell cycle or growth. As determined by 5-ethynyl-2'-deoxyuridine (EdU) incorporation, the knockdown of PCAT19 with LNA GapmeRs increased the rate of endothelial cell proliferation; 6 h after EdU application, three times as many cells had incorporated EdU after PCAT19 knockdown compared with control cells (Figure 2A). Conversely, PCAT19 overexpression by electroporation reduced endothelial cell proliferative capacity (Figure 2B).

The PCAT19 knockdown and overexpression efficiency are provided in Figure S1E. PCAT19 knockdown using LNA GapmeRs was also performed in other endothelial cell types: human microvascular endothelial cells (HMECs), human carotid artery endothelial cells (HCAECs), human aortic endothelial cells (HAoECs), and human dermal lymphatic endothelial cells (HDLECs). Knockdown significantly promoted proliferation in HMECs and HAoECs but not in HCAECs or HDLECs, the latter of which did not proliferate well in general (Figure S2A). The effect of PCAT19 perturbation on endothelial proliferation could also be confirmed using a CRISPRi and CRISPRa approach. PCAT19 CRISPRi was able to promote endothelial proliferation, while PCAT19 CRISPRa had the opposite effect in attenuating proliferation (Figure S2B).

To further measure the relevance of PCAT19 in endothelial growth and its potential impact on angiogenic sprouting, a three-dimensional endothelial spheroid outgrowth assay was performed. The knockdown of PCAT19 promoted sprouting under both basal and VEGF-A-stimulated conditions (Figure 2C), while the overexpression of PCAT19 attenuated sprouting under basal conditions (Figure 2D). Since PCAT19 knockdown enhanced both endothelial proliferative and sprouting capacity, we hypothesized that a reduction in PCAT19 levels may promote vascularization. This was studied in a three-dimensional organoid system, which involved the differentiation of induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) into cardiomyocytes and endothelial cells to form functioning cardiac organoids. In this system, endothelial cells sprout and form contacts with neighboring endothelial sprouts, eventually forming a vascular network, with some vessels even containing a lumen. All cardiac organoids formed a vascular network, but those subsequently transfected with PCAT19 LNA GapmeRs produced a denser network, as measured by the cumulative vascular network length (Figure 2E). As PCAT19 knockdown promoted cell cycle progression and proliferation, we wondered whether the expression of PCAT19 itself is dependent on the cell proliferative state. Strikingly, PCAT19 expression was strongly induced with cell density (as cells become more confluent and cell cycle arrested) (Figure 2F). These data demonstrate that PCAT19 acts as an antiproliferative and antiangiogenic lncRNA that is induced during contact-mediated inhibition of the endothelial cell cycle.

To gain a deeper insight into how PCAT19 may enact these antiproliferative and antiangiogenic effects, RNA-seq was performed after PCAT19 knockdown. PCAT19 itself was...
significantly less expressed, confirming a successful knockdown (Figures 2G and 2H; Table S1). After filtering for differentially regulated genes ($p_{adj} < 0.05$), 186 genes were analyzed for Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) pathways. The top significant terms ($p_{adj} < 0.05$) were “cell cycle” and “cellular senescence” (Figure 2I), followed by “progesterone-mediated oocyte maturation” and “human T cell leukemia virus 1 infection” (Figures S2C and S2D). Some of the next terms, such as “MAPK signaling pathway,” “transcriptional misregulation in cancer,” and “p53 signaling pathway,” are interesting and relevant, but were not significantly enriched with a $p_{adj} < 0.05$. We therefore decided to focus on the top term, “cell cycle.” The same group of 186 differentially regulated genes was used to identify their potential upstream regulators using the QuaternaryProd package. The top 10 predicted regulators were mapped according to their number of significant downstream targets and whether the regulators themselves were up- or downregulated (Figures 2J and S2E). Most of these, such as CCNB1, E2F3, PLX1, and CDK1, are strongly involved in cell cycle and senescence, confirming that PCAT19 indeed has a profound impact on cell cycle. Since PCAT19 seems to be important for endothelial proliferation and angiogenic sprouting, coupled with the associated expression changes in cell cycle genes upon PCAT19 knockdown, we chose to further investigate the role of PCAT19 in cell cycle regulation, given the indication from the RNA-seq experiment that “cell cycle” is affected to some degree by PCAT19 knockdown.

**PCAT19 binds the DNA replication protein A complex**

The biological effects of IncRNAs are often mediated through their interaction with other RNAs, DNA, or proteins. Since PCAT19 had a profound effect on the cell cycle, we wondered whether this resulted from a potential interaction of PCAT19 with cell-cycle-related proteins. We first determined the subcellular localization of PCAT19 using RNA fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) and noticed a large fraction of PCAT19 localized to the nucleus (Figure S3A), which would at least place it within close proximity to cell cycle proteins. Cytoplasmic and nuclear fractionation of endothelial cells revealed an equal distribution of PCAT19 between the cytoplasm and the nucleus under subconfluent conditions (Figure S3B). Surprisingly, there was significantly more PCAT19 localized to the nucleus compared with the cytoplasm under confluent conditions, again highlighting the potential importance of PCAT19 in the nucleus. To determine whether PCAT19 indeed interacts with proteins, the endogenously expressed PCAT19 was pulled down using biotinylated antisense oligonucleotides (AS-oligos) containing a PCAT19-specific targeting sequence. Mass spectrometry identified eight significantly enriched ($p < 0.05$) proteins in the PCAT19 pull-down versus scramble control pull-down (Figures 3A and 3B; Table S2). Using the log10 intensity-based absolute quantitation (iBAQ) value, the most abundant of the eight PCAT19-enriched proteins were RPA1, RPA2, and RPA3: the three members of the RPA complex. DNA ligase 3 (LIG3) and its known interaction partner X-ray repair cross complementing 1 (XRCC1) were also enriched with PCAT19. In addition, ubiquitin-like with PHD and ring finger domain 1 (UHRF1) and UHRF2 as well as polynucleotide kinase 3’-phosphatase (PNKP) were identified as PCAT19 interaction partners. Each of these proteins is involved in the DNA damage response, DNA replication, or the cell cycle.17,29–41 Given that these proteins interact with DNA and, in some cases, with one another (Figure 3O), the primary PCAT19 interactor could not be inferred from this experiment alone. The proteins of the RPA complex (RPA1, 2, and 3) were the most abundant of the enriched interactors. Of these, RPA2 can be considered the central target of regulatory pathways, as it is subject to extensive regulation through dynamic and sequential context-dependent phosphorylation on several sites.3 A potential interaction between RPA2 and PCAT19 was therefore investigated in more detail. The PCAT19-RPA2 interaction was confirmed with AS-oligo pull-down from endothelial cell lysates and Western blotting (Figure 3D). The interaction was further confirmed with an immunoprecipitation of RPA2 followed by RNA isolation and qRT-PCR (RIP-qPCR) for PCAT19 (Figure 3E). The 18S rRNA and U4 snRNA were not enriched with RPA2, as expected. To exclude that these findings were a consequence of an indirect interaction through other proteins tightly bound to RPA2, a fully in vitro approach was used with purified His-tagged RPA2 incubated with or without in vitro-transcribed biotinylated PCAT19. Pull-down of biotinylated PCAT19 recovered His-tagged RPA2, demonstrating that the interaction between the two molecules is indeed direct (Figure 3F). The central role of RPA2 in DNA repair and synthesis processes and the role of PCAT19 in limiting cellular proliferation may suggest that PCAT19 mediates its effects through RPA2 in a cell-cycle- or DNA damage-dependent manner.

**Loss of PCAT19 predisposes and sensitizes DNA to damage**

Given that the RPA complex and the other PCAT19-interacting proteins are involved in the DNA damage and repair response, the potential contribution of PCAT19 to this process was determined. Interestingly, after PCAT19 knockdown, cells displayed a positive terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase dUTP nick-end labeling (TUNEL) signal indicative of DNA double-strand breaks, which could not be detected in the cells transfected with control LNA GapmeRs (Figure 4A). Upon treatment with camptothecin (CPT), an inducer of DNA double-strand breaks, cells displayed a noticeable increase in TUNEL signal, and this was exacerbated by LNA directed against PCAT19. This suggests that the loss of PCAT19 may lead to an accumulation of DNA damage. A comet assay confirmed these findings, as PCAT19 knockdown resulted in a significantly longer tail olive moment compared with cells transfected with control LNA (Figure 4B). In line with this, knockdown of PCAT19 enhanced the DNA damage-induced accumulation of p53 and γH2AX (Figures 4C and 4D), whereas PCAT19 overexpression had the opposite effect (Figures 4E and 4F). We also observed the LNA GapmeR-mediated knockdown of PCAT19 to increase p53 levels in HCAECs, HAcECs, HMECs, and HDLECs (Figure S3C). Again, this was more pronounced after treatment with CPT. The same was true for PCAT19 knockdown on S33-PRPA2 levels in these other endothelial cell types (Figure S3D). The effects on p53 levels in the presence and absence of PCAT19 could also be confirmed with the CRISPRi and CRISPRa approach. PCAT19 CRISPRi was able to increase p53 levels after CPT stimulation (Figure 4G), while CRISPRa reduced p53 levels
after CPT stimulation (Figure 4H). Next, an RNA in situ hybridization followed by a proximity ligation assay (rISH-PLA) was performed to determine whether PCAT19 co-localized with γH2AX and where in the cell this co-localization occurs. The biotin-tagged antisense-oligonucleotides specific to PCAT19, an antibody against biotin, and an antibody against γH2AX were used. A conventional PLA was performed with secondary antibodies against the primary biotin and γH2AX antibodies. PCAT19 and γH2AX indeed co-localized in nuclear foci as visualized by positive PLA signals, and the numbers of interaction sites significantly increased after treatment with CPT (Figures 4I and S3E). RPA is central in DNA synthesis and homologous recombination where it binds ssDNA and prevents the formation of secondary DNA structures that could impede DNA replication or repair.17 To determine whether PCAT19, via its interaction with RPA2, had an impact on DNA replication, a DNA fiber assay was performed. Despite reducing the rate of cell proliferation, PCAT19 overexpression had no effect on DNA replication speed, as indicated by similar DNA tract lengths between PCAT19 and pcDNA3.1+ control-overexpressing cells (Figure S2F).

Given the increased rate of endothelial cell proliferation and accumulation of DNA damage after PCAT19 knockdown, we wondered whether cell cycle transitions themselves were affected by PCAT19 knockdown. A bromodeoxyuridine (BrdU) incorporation and propidium iodide staining followed by fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS) analysis was performed after PCAT19 knockdown, but these cells did not display a difference in cell cycle phase profiles (Figure 4J). However, treatment with hydroxyurea (HU), which causes replication stress, led to a significantly greater accumulation of cells in early S phase (S1) and significantly fewer cells in the G2/M phase after PCAT19 knockdown compared with control cells (Figure 4J). Given that

---

**Figure 3.** RPA2 is a PCAT19 interaction partner

(A) Biotin-tagged antisense-oligo (AS-oligo) RNA pull-down of PCAT19 and its interacting proteins from endothelial cell lysate measured by mass spectrometry. Scrambled AS-oligos were used as negative control (CTL). A log_{10}iBAQ representation of enriched proteins (sum of all peptide intensities/number of observable peptides) against the log_{2} fold difference of PCAT19/CTL is shown (n = 6). Highlighted proteins indicate enrichment with PCAT19 (p < 0.05; q < 0.05). iBAQ, intensity-based absolute quantitation.

(B) Table of significantly enriched PCAT19-interacting proteins (p < 0.05, q < 0.05).

(C) Schematic depicting the proteins pulled down with PCAT19 and potential interaction map based on literature searches. RPA2 is central to the RPA complex and reportedly functions alongside most of the proteins identified with mass spectrometry.

(D) AS-oligo RNA pull-down of PCAT19 (P19) or control AS-oligos (CTL) and western blot with antibodies against RPA2 and PKNP. Lamin B1 served as negative control.

(E) RNA immunoprecipitation (RIP) in HUVEC extract with an antibody against RPA2 followed by qRT-PCR for PCAT19. Percentage of input recovery of PCAT19 versus a non-primary-antibody control (IgG) is shown. 18S rRNA and U4 snRNA served as negative controls.

(F) In vitro binding assay of RPA2 and PCAT19. His-tagged RPA2 was combined with in vitro-transcribed and biotinylated PCAT19 or pcDNA3.1+ control RNA (biotin-CTL). Streptavidin beads were used to pull down the biotin-tagged RNAs and blots stained for RPA2. Data are presented as the mean ± SD; **p < 0.01.
Figure 4. PCAT19 maintains genomic stability and limits RPA2-ATR signaling

(A) HUVECs were transfected with LNA GapmeRs against PCAT19 or negative control LNA and treated with 1 μM camptothecin or DMSO for 16 h. TUNEL assay was performed and cells were imaged for DNA double-strand breaks. Double-strand breaks are shown in red (Alexa Fluor 580 nm). DAPI was used to stain nuclei (blue). Scale bars, 100 μm. Quantification of TUNEL signal mean intensity per nucleus is shown. One-way ANOVA; error bars show the mean ± SD; n = 3 biological replicates.

(legend continued on next page)
there was no difference between control and PCAT19 knockdown cells in middle and late S phase, the increased accumulation of PCAT19 knockdown cells in early S phase presumably arises from the G2/M population. This highlights the faster transitioning through cell cycle after PCAT19 knockdown, and in this case from G2/M back to G1, and thereby a sensitization of PCAT19 knockdown cells to DNA damage.

**PCAT19 protects RPA2 from uncontrolled phosphorylation**

The phosphorylation of RPA2 on its S33 residue is a tightly controlled process mediated by the ATR kinase that precedes cell cycle transition from S phase into G2 phase (Figure 5A). S33-pRPA2 is required for the efficient repair of ssDNA that may have been produced from damaged DNA during replication. As RPA2 phosphorylation in endothelial cells has not been studied, S33-pRPA2 levels were compared between proliferating subconfluent and non-proliferating confluent human umbilical vein endothelial cells (HUVECs). Proliferating cells exhibited higher S33-pRPA2 levels than growth-arrested cells and, as expected, ATRi massively reduced S33-pRPA2 levels under both conditions (Figure 5B). Surprisingly, PCAT19 knockdown cells exhibited significantly elevated S33-pRPA2 levels (Figure 5C), while the overexpression of PCAT19 reduced S33-pRPA2 levels (Figure 5D). In all knockdown and overexpression conditions, additional ATR inhibition markedly reduced S33-pRPA2 levels, as expected (Figures 5B-5D). To determine whether S33 phosphorylation affects the interaction between RPA2 and PCAT19, a semi-in vitro binding assay was performed with recombinant His-RPA2 and in vitro-transcribed PCAT19 in the presence of ssDNA. HUVEC lysate was added to the mixture to permit RPA2 phosphorylation by kinases. RPA2 and PCAT19 were again found to strongly interact and, unexpectedly, this interaction could be blocked by ATR inhibitor or phosphatase treatment (Figure 5E). Since the phosphorylation of S4/8-RPA2 occurs after the phosphorylation of S33-RPA2, we tested whether S4/8-pRPA2 levels would be altered in the presence of PCAT19. Another semi-in vitro assay was performed, this time in HEK293 lysate, where FLAG-ATR and His-RPA2 were added with or without in vitro-transcribed PCAT19. With the addition of FLAG-ATR to the lysate containing His-RPA2, more S4/8-pRPA2 was formed (since ssDNA was also present in the mixture to promote RPA2 loading and phosphorylation). Importantly, both the His-tagged RPA2 and the endogenous RPA2 were phosphorylated on S4/8. As expected, PCAT19 was able to strongly attenuate both the endogenous and the His-tagged RPA2 S4/8 phosphorylation levels (Figure 5F). These results suggest that PCAT19 can bind to and modulate S33-pRPA2 and prevent the sequential hyperphosphorylation of RPA2, as measured by lower S4/8-pRPA2 levels. This particular assay was also performed in HEK293T lysate, where PCAT19 should not be present, to confirm the molecular action of PCAT19 on RPA2.

Since PCAT19 seems to have an effect primarily on ATR-dependent RPA2 S33 phosphorylation, we wondered whether PCAT19 mediates the interaction between ATR and RPA2. Indeed, PCAT19 overexpression attenuated the interaction between RPA2 and ATR, as determined by PLA (Figure 5G). In addition, the ATRi was able to reverse PCAT19 knockdown-induced proliferation (Figure 5H) and angiogenic sprouting (Figure 5I), indicating that this growth phenotype after PCAT19 knockdown is related to elevated p-RPA2.

Taken together, these results demonstrate a regulatory role for PCAT19 in endothelial S33-RPA2 phosphorylation, which ultimately controls the state of downstream sequential RPA2 hyperphosphorylation. PCAT19 reduces the degree of RPA2-ATR interaction and the levels of phosphorylation of the ATR target, S33-RPA2. S33-pRPA2 is required for proliferation; thus, the hyperproliferation resulting from PCAT19 knockdown is a consequence of increased ATR-dependent S33-pRPA2 phosphorylation. Importantly, premature hyperphosphorylation of RPA2 that is not bound to DNA prevents its subsequent loading onto DNA and thereby an inability to efficiently repair DNA damage. Therefore, depletion of PCAT19 promotes the uncontrolled hyperphosphorylation of RPA2, rendering it unable to repair DNA damage or signal for cell cycle arrest; this leads to the observed phenotype of endothelial hyperproliferation and DNA damage accumulation.

**DISCUSSION**

We have identified PCAT19 as a highly enriched endothelial lncRNA that is induced by quiescence to fine-tune and protect...
Figure 5. **PCAT19 limits RPA2 serine 33 (S33) phosphorylation**

(A) Depiction of RPA2 phosphorylation sites.

(B) HUVECs were seeded at subconfluent or confluent levels and treated with 10 \( \mu \)M ATRi or DMSO for 16 h. Western blot staining for RPA2 and S33-pRPA2 is shown (n = 3).

(C) HUVECs were transfected with LNA GapmeRs against **PCAT19** or negative control LNA and treated with 10 \( \mu \)M ATRi or DMSO for 16 h. Western blot staining for RPA2 and S33-pRPA2 is shown (n = 3).

(D) HUVECs were transduced with either **PCAT19** overexpression (OE) plasmid or pcDNA3.1+ backbone control plasmid and then treated with 10 \( \mu \)M ATRi or DMSO for 16 h. Western blot staining for RPA2 and S33-pRPA2 is shown (n = 6).

(E) In vitro binding assay for various combinations of His-RPA2, biotin-**PCAT19**, biotin-CTL RNA, ATRi, and phosphatase. Staining of S33-pRPA2 or RPA2 in biotin pull-down and 5% input samples is shown.

(F) In vitro phosphorylation assay of endogenous RPA2 and recombinant His-RPA2. Combinations of His-RPA2, FLAG-ATR, in vitro-transcribed **PCAT19**, ATR inhibitor, phosphatase (CIP), phosphatase inhibitor, and ATP are shown. FLAG, His, and S4/8-pRPA2 antibodies were used for staining.

(G) HUVECs were transduced with either **PCAT19** overexpression (OE) plasmid or pcDNA3.1+ backbone control plasmid. Duolink proximity ligation assay for RPA2-ATR is shown. Red signal indicates the Duolink PLA signal (546 nm), blue indicates DAPI.

(H) EdU proliferation assay after **PCAT19** LNA-GapmeR-mediated knockdown or control LNA and with or without treatment with 10 \( \mu \)M ATRi for 16 h (n = 3).

(I) Spheroid outgrowth assay after **PCAT19** LNA-GapmeR-mediated knockdown or control LNA and with or without treatment with 10 \( \mu \)M ATRi for 16 h (n = 3).

Data are presented as the mean ± SD; *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, ****p < 0.0001.
RPA2 from excessive phosphorylation. In doing so, PCAT19 aids in the slowing of the cell cycle and inhibition of angiogenic sprouting while safeguarding the DNA of endothelial cells during the proliferation-quiescence switch. When PCAT19 is knocked down, RPA2 can be prematurely and excessively phosphorylated, which influences its cell cycle and DNA damage condition-dependent functionality. This ultimately results in cell cycle promotion and hyperproliferation with an overall reduced DNA stability.

More than 100 IncRNAs were originally identified as being strongly associated with prostate cancer and subsequently termed the prostate cancer-associated transcripts (PCATs). A handful of studies have characterized some of the PCATs in more detail, one of which reported the importance of PCAT19 in the development of cancer, but did not address its physiological function in health. We were surprised to find that such a prominent cancer-related IncRNA was so highly enriched in healthy endothelial cells. The strong induction of PCAT19 with endothelial contact inhibition of the cell cycle, taken together with its previously described roles in cancer, suggested that PCAT19 could maintain certain aspects of endothelial quiescence. This quiescent state is particularly important for long-lived endothelial cells to maintain the functioning inner monolayer of blood vessels. Our data indicate that PCAT19 facilitates DNA integrity and repair, which is required for long-lived, non-dividing cells. On the other hand, endothelial cells require the ability to rapidly re-enter the cell cycle and proliferate under conditions that either damage the blood vessels or promote angiogenesis. This behavior of the endothelium is a somewhat unique cellular feature. For example, in epithelial cells, healing is facilitated by increased proliferation of progenitor cells, while mesenchymal cellular activation results in an expansion of an undifferentiated cell pool (like fibroblasts) rather than a transient activation. Thus, PCAT19, which is differentially expressed between single and confluent cells, may therefore have specifically evolved to address the conflicting needs of rapidly proliferating and long-lived endothelial phenotypes. This not only explains its endothelial-specific expression but also may help to explain why PCAT19 is a human-specific IncRNA. Humans have a relatively long lifespan compared with other mammals and therefore have a need to balance cell proliferation and repair and maintenance of DNA integrity. Indeed, genomic instability is one of the main causative factors of vascular aging, which itself is a risk factor for cardiovascular disease.

While the study of Hua et al. highlighted an SNP risk region within the PCAT19 locus that ultimately mediates prostate cancer progression, we have identified a specific role for PCAT19 in the quiescent-proliferative switch of human endothelial cells. Hua et al. demonstrated a reduced proliferation of cancer cells after PCAT19 knockdown, while we observed an increased proliferation of endothelial cells accompanied by the accumulation of spontaneous DNA damage. It is becoming abundantly clear that IncRNAs have evolved cell-type-specific functions and mechanisms of action; this includes certain IncRNAs that are highly and ubiquitously expressed. The IncRNA H19, for example, interacts with HuR in epithelial cells to regulate barrier function, with methyl-CpG-binding domain protein 1 (MBD1) in mouse embryonic fibroblasts to mediate embryonic growth, and with p53 to inhibit apoptosis in gastric cancer cells. The exact regulatory mechanisms between IncRNAs and their protein interaction partners in different cell types are not completely understood. This is likely due to a complex interplay between cell-type-specific transcription factors, the expression of IncRNAs themselves, and their downstream molecular targets. We uncovered the RPA complex as the strongest PCAT19 interactor in endothelial cells, again pointing toward a fundamental role in cell cycle regulation, specifically in DNA stability and cell cycle checkpoints. This goes hand-in-hand with our RNA-seq of HUVECs that returned “cell cycle” as the top term after PCAT19 knockdown; this supports the finding that PCAT19 is upregulated with cell cycle arrest, and its removal promotes cell cycle re-entry.

Once bound to ssDNA, RPA acts as a platform to recruit and regulate multiple other protein factors essential for DNA stability and maintenance. Since the genome is constantly exposed to different types of DNA damage, the coordination of cell cycle and DNA damage-response proteins is of paramount importance for an appropriate and measured response. Faulty checkpoint activation can result in uncontrolled growth and irreparable DNA damage, which often triggers cell apoptosis. However, if the damage occurs within oncogenes, tumor-suppressor genes, or genes that control the cell cycle, then cancer can develop. Knockdown of PCAT19 promoted proliferation and angiogenic sprouting, and this was accompanied by a heightened sensitivity to DNA-damaging agents such as CPT and HU. Owing to the strong binding of PCAT19 to the RPA complex, we hypothesized that the role of PCAT19 in endothelial quiescence and apparent safeguarding of the genome could be mediated directly through its interaction with RPA2.

RPA2 is phosphorylated on the S33 residue at the beginning of S phase and is then dephosphorylated upon the successful completion of mitosis. RPA2 can also undergo sequential hyper-phosphorylation by three PI3K-like protein kinases (ATR, ATM, and DNA-PK) depending on the type and level of DNA damage. For example, the resection of DNA double-strand breaks promotes the phosphorylation of RPA2 by ATR on the S33 residue; this then permits the subsequent phosphorylation at S4/8 by DNA-PKs. If functional ATR is missing, ssDNA accumulates from DNA resection and leads to the exhaustion of RPA pools. As such, ATR phosphorylation of RPA2 S33 aids in the prevention of ssDNA accumulation. If hyperphosphorylation of DNA-bound RPA occurs, a signaling cascade is activated that ultimately leads to cell cycle arrest and activation of the DNA damage response. However, it is important to note that if premature hyper-phosphorylation of RPA2 occurs, the RPA complex does not bind as efficiently to DNA and therefore damage can accumulate. This offers a potential explanation for the increased levels of DNA damage following PCAT19 knockdown: depletion of PCAT19 promotes the uncontrolled hyperphosphorylation of RPA2, which could prevent its efficient binding to DNA in the repair response and a potential lack of cell cycle arrest signals. This may then lead to cell cycle progression and the accumulation of DNA damage.

It has also already been shown that the phosphorylation of RPA2 is a dynamic process rather than a simple “on-off” phosphorylation switch. Lee and colleagues showed that RPA2 must
undergo phosphorylation followed by rapid de-phosphorylation by human protein phosphatase 4 (PP4) for the successful repair of double-strand breaks. Depletion of PP4 leads to an extended G2-M checkpoint and the accumulation of DNA damage. This lends support to the hypothesis that PCAT19 could also function as a mediator that fine-tunes RPA2 phosphorylation. PCAT19 knockdown heightened the levels of DNA damage and promoted S33 phosphorylation by increasing the interaction between RPA2 and ATR, the kinase responsible for S33 phosphorylation. These results suggest that PCAT19 binds RPA2 and protects it from excessive S33 phosphorylation by ATR in a cell-cycle-dependent manner. We confirmed that subconfluent proliferating endothelial cells have heightened levels of S33-pRPA2, as would be expected in cycling cells. However, when PCAT19 is knocked down, S33-pRPA2 levels increase further to maintain genome stability during a faster cell cycle progression as seen with the hyperproliferative response. This excessive S33 phosphorylation could equally disable RPA2 and negatively affect DNA damage responses. Interestingly, our *in vitro* binding experiments revealed that addition of an ATR inhibitor or a phosphatase could abolish the PCAT19-RPA2 interaction. This suggests a model in which PCAT19 may bind RPA2 to fine-tune the levels of S33 phosphorylation in the presence of phosphorylated and active ATR. S33 phosphorylation is a precursor to S4/8 phosphorylation, the hallmark of RPA2 phosphorylation, which should therefore be dependent on PCAT19-S33-pRPA2 modulation. Indeed, S4/8-pRPA2 levels were markedly reduced in the presence of PCAT19. Importantly, this semi-*in vitro* assay for S4/8-pRPA2 was performed using HEK293 lysate, indicating that the molecular mechanism would be ubiquitous. However, the endothelial enrichment of PCAT19 ensures that this particular regulation of RPA2 is restricted to endothelial cells. Of course, inhibition or removal of ATR prevents S33 phosphorylation and so PCAT19 may be removed from RPA2 to permit S33 phosphorylation and avoid faulty DNA damage-repair responses. Importantly, ATR inhibition was able to rescue the PCAT19 knockdown-induced increase in proliferation and angiogenic sprouting, supporting the idea that the heightened S33-pRPA2 levels permit cell cycling.

Under conditions that damage the vessel or promote new vessel growth, endothelial cells re-enter the cell cycle to reach confluence again. This quiescent-proliferative switch is central in many vascular diseases. For example, infantile hemangioma, which is the most common type of tumor in infants, results from increased proliferation of endothelial cells and pericytes. It was therefore interesting to find a significant and marked reduction in PCAT19 expression in hemangioma samples. The opposite endothelial proliferative scenario is often observed in carotid artery restenosis and atherosclerosis, characterized by damage to the endothelium, reduced proliferation, and formation of a neointima, which is essentially scar tissue on the inner blood vessel. In this scenario, PCAT19 is significantly more highly expressed; this again correlates with the endothelial proliferative rate. At first glance, the concept that endothelial cells favor rapid proliferation over tight control of DNA integrity is surprising. It is, however, important to mention that endothelial proliferation due to faulty contact inhibition is a somewhat rare event in mature vessels and occurs only at sites of vessel damage.

PCAT19 could play a role in many vascular diseases that depend on the proliferation of endothelial cells, as well as in tumor angiogenesis, which is crucial in supporting cancer growth. It is therefore tempting to speculate that, by targeting PCAT19 and thereby influencing the fine-tuning of the S33-pRPA2 switch, the endothelial quiescence-proliferation transition could be controlled to positively alter the outcome of vascular disease. In conclusion, with the present work, we identified the endothelial-enriched IncRNA PCAT19, which safeguards the endothelial genome by interacting with and modulating RPA2. Upon loss of contact inhibition, for example, during vascular injury, PCAT19 expression decreases and thereby facilitates rapid endothelial monolayer repair by permitting normal RPA2 phosphorylation.

**Limitations of the study**

The current study highlights the cell-type- and condition-specific functions of IncRNAs by providing new insights into the fine-tuning of RPA2 phosphorylation in endothelial cells by the IncRNA PCAT19. Our data demonstrate that PCAT19 binds RPA2, alters the RPA2 phosphorylation state, and influences cell cycle progression and DNA damage responses. Details on the precise PCAT19-RPA2 interaction are missing; the exact binding site of PCAT19 on RPA2 and whether binding at this site physically prevents kinase accessibility are unclear and would require mutagenesis experiments and structural analyses. The dynamics of this interaction and in particular the promotion of binding factors and the subsequent inhibition of binding are unknown. We propose that the endothelial enrichment of PCAT19 is what confers this endothelial-specific mechanism of RPA2 regulation. It is unclear as to whether this mechanism exists between RPA2 and IncRNAs in other cell types. Although we provide data on the differential expression of PCAT19 in vascular diseases and in cancer endothelial cells, exactly how PCAT19 is involved in these diseases is so far unknown. Evidence in human vascular disease cohorts is sparse, and the use of an *in vivo* model is not possible due to the lack of PCAT19 conservation between species. The transcriptional regulation of PCAT19 needs to be clarified, since it has been reported in cancer cells, and we report its enrichment in healthy endothelial cells.
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## STAR★METHODS

### KEY RESOURCES TABLE

| REAGENT or RESOURCE | SOURCE | IDENTIFIER |
|---------------------|--------|------------|
| **Antibodies**      |        |            |
| anti-BrdU, mouse    | BD Biosciences | 347580; RRID:AB_400326 |
| anti-BrdU, rat      | Abcam  | ab6326; RRID:AB_305426 |
| Anti-RPA32/RPA2 antibody [9H8], mouse | Abcam | ab2175; RRID:AB_302873 |
| Rabbit anti-RPA32 Antibody | Bethyl | A300-244A; RRID:AB_185548 |
| Anti-phospho-RPA32 (Ser33), rabbit | Bethyl | A300-246A; RRID:AB_2180847 |
| Anti-RPA32/RPA2 (phospho T21) antibody, rabbit | Abcam | ab61065; RRID:AB_946322 |
| Anti-phospho-RPA32 (Ser4/Ser8) Recombinant Monoclonal, rabbit | Bethyl | A700-009; RRID:AB_2765278 |
| ATR antibody (C-1)  | Santa Cruz | sc-515173; RRID:AB_2893291 |
| p53 antibody (FL-393), rabbit | Santa Cruz | sc-6243; RRID:AB_653753 |
| Lamin B1 antibody (H-90), rabbit | Santa Cruz | sc-20682; RRID:AB_2136308 |
| PNK1 Polyclonal Antibody (PNKP), rabbit | Abcam | A300-257A; RRID:AB_263356 |
| Anti-phospho-Histone H2A.X (Ser139) Antibody, rabbit | Millipore | MABE205; RRID:AB_10851746 |
| Histone H2A (L88A6) Mouse mAb | Cell Signaling Technology | 3636; RRID:AB_2118801 |
| Monoclonal Anti-α-Actinin (Sarcomeric) antibody produced in mouse | Sigma-Aldrich | A7811; RRID:AB_476766 |
| VE-Cadherin (D87F2) XP® Rabbit mAb | Cell Signaling Technology | 2500; RRID:AB_10839118 |
| DYKDDDDK Tag (D6W5B) Rabbit mAb (Binds to same epitope as Sigma’s Anti-FLAG® M2 Antibody) | Cell Signaling Technology | 14793; RRID:AB_2572291 |
| Anti-His6           | Roche  | 11922416001; RRID:AB_514486 |
| Anti-GAPDH antibody, Mouse monoclonal | Sigma-Aldrich | G8795; RRID:AB_1078991 |
| Anti-β-Actin antibody, Mouse monoclonal | Sigma-Aldrich | A1978; RRID:AB_476692 |
| Anti-Biotin antibody [Hyb-8] | Abcam | ab201341; RRID:AB_2861249 |
| **Bacterial and virus strains** | | |
| NEB Turbo Competent E. coli (High Efficiency) | NEB | C2984H |
| **Biological samples** | | |
| Pooled human umbilical vein endothelial cells (HUVEC) | PromoCell | C-12203; Lot No.: 474Z010, 408Z014, 4712011, 466Z022 |
| human coronary artery endothelial cells (HCAEC) | PeloBiotech | PB-CH-182-2011; Lot No. QC06814F10 |
| human aortic endothelial cells (HAoEC) | PeloBiotech | 304K-05a; Lot No. 2366 |
| Human dermal lymphatic endothelial cells (HDLEC) | Promocell | C-12217; Lot No. 394Z027.3, 4092401.3 |
| Human cardiac organoids (hCOs) | This study | N/A |
| **Chemicals, peptides, and recombinant proteins** | | |
| Recombinant Human VEGF 165 Protein | R&D | 293-VE; Accession # NP_001165097 |
| (S)-(+) Camptothecin | Sigma-Aldrich | C9911; CAS: 7689-03-4 |
| VE-821 ATR inhibitor | Selleckchem | S8007; CAS: 1232410-49-9 |
| Hydroxyurea | Sigma-Aldrich | H-8627; CAS: 127-07-1 |
| Phosphatase, Alkaline, Calf Intestine | Merck | 524572; CAS: 9001-78-9 |
| 5-Bromo-2-deoxyuridine (BrdU) | Roche | 10280879001; CAS: 59-14-3 |

(Continued on next page)
| REAGENT or RESOURCE | SOURCE | IDENTIFIER |
|---------------------|--------|------------|
| **Critical commercial assays** |
| STEMdiff™ Cardiomyocyte Differentiation Kit | STEMCELL Technologies | 05010 |
| Pierce RNA 3'end biotinylation kit | ThermoFisher | 20160 |
| CometAssay Single Cell Gel Electrophoresis Assay | R&D Systems | 4250-050-K |
| SMARTer Stranded Total RNA Sample Prep Kit - Hi Mammalian | Takara | 634873 |
| **Deposited data** |
| RNA-Seq PCAT19 knockdown data | This paper | GEO: GSE199091 |
| Raw mass spectrometric data of PCAT19 protein interaction partners | This paper | PRIDE: PXD032669 |
| **Experimental models: Cell lines** |
| Human microvascular endothelial cells (HMEC) | CDC | 98247 |
| 293T/17 [HEK 293T/17] (HEK293T) | ATCC | CRL-11268; RRID:CVCL_1926 |
| 293 [HEK-293] | ATCC | CRL-1573; RRID:CVCL_0045 |
| Human induced pluripotent stem cells (hiPSCs) | EbiSC | WSTIi081-A |
| **Oligonucleotides** |
| LNA GapmeR PCAT19 | This study | N/A |
| 5'-AATTCGGCTCTTACAA-3' | This study | N/A |
| Primers for 18S rRNA, GAPDH, PCAT19 and U4 snRNA, see Table S1 | This study | N/A |
| PCAT19 antisense-oligonucleotide (5'-Biotin-AAG ACA TGA GAC CTC ACT-3') | This study | N/A |
| scramble control oligonucleotide (5'-Biotin- GTG TAA CAC GTC TAT ACG CCC A-3') | This study | N/A |
| PCAT19 antisense-oligonucleotide (5'-TYE665-AAG ACA TGA GAC CTC ACT-3') | This study | N/A |
| scramble control oligonucleotide (5'-TYE665-GTG TAA CAC GTC TAT ACG CCC A-3') | This study | N/A |
| **Recombinant DNA** |
| Plasmid: pcDNA3.1 + PCAT19 | This study | N/A |
| Plasmid: pcDNA3.1+ | ThermoFisher | V79020 |
| Plasmid: CMV Flag ATRwt | Cortez et al., 200113 | Addgene plasmid #41909 |
| Plasmid: pHAGE EF1α dCas9-VP64 | Kearns et al., 201454 | Addgene plasmid #50918 |
| Plasmid: pHAGE EF1α dCas9-KRAB | Kearns et al., 201454 | Addgene plasmid #50919 |
| Plasmid: sgRNA(MS2) vector | Konermann et al., 201555 | Addgene plasmid #61424 |
| Plasmid: sgRNA(MS2) vector-CRISPRa-PCAT19_gRNA | This study | N/A |
| Plasmid: sgRNA(MS2) vector-CRISPRi-PCAT19_gRNA | This study | N/A |
| **Software and algorithms** |
| FIJI/ImageJ | Schindelin et al., 201256 | RRID:SCR_002285 |
| Leica LAS X | Leica Microsystems | RRID:SCR_013673 |
| Image Studio Ver 5.2 | Licor | RRID:SCR_015795 |
RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

Lead contact
Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the lead contact, Ralf P. Brandes (Brandes@vrc.uni-frankfurt.de).

Materials availability
Plasmids generated in this study are available from the lead contact.

Data and code availability
RNA-seq data have been deposited at NCBI GEO datasets and are publicly available as of the date of publication at GEO: GSE199091.

Mass spectrometry data have been deposited under ProteomeXchange Consortium (http://proteomecentral.proteomexchange.org) via the PRIDE partner repository with the dataset identifier and are publicly available as of the date of publication at PRIDE: PXD032669.

This paper analyzes existing, publicly available data: PCAT19 expression across organs was analyzed using the GTEx database (GTEx Analysis Release V8 (dbGaP Accession phs000424.v8.p2). FANTOM5 CAGE expression data was obtained from the FANTOM5 website (gencode v19).\ref{PCAT19}{PCAT19} Prostate tissue scRNA-seq data was obtained from GEO: GSE172357.\ref{prostate}{prostate} Haemangioma RNA-seq data was obtained from.\ref{haemangioma}{haemangioma} Lung endothelial scRNA-seq data was obtained from ArrayExpress: E-MTAB-6308.\ref{lungs}{lungs} The GEPIA database was used to analyze PCAT19 expression between normal and cancerous tissues.\ref{GEPIA}{GEPIA} Tabula Sapiens data was used for gene expression analysis.\ref{TabulaSapiens}{TabulaSapiens}

This paper does not report original code.

Any additional information required to reanalyze the data reported in this paper is available from the lead contact upon request.

EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS

Primary cell cultures and cell lines
Pooled human umbilical vein endothelial cells (HUVEC, purchased from PromoCell, #C-12203), human microvascular endothelial cells (HMEC, from CDC, 98,247, male), human coronary artery endothelial cells (HCAEC, from PeloBiotech, PB-CH-182-2011, QC06814F10) and human aortic endothelial cells (HAoEC, purchased from PeloBiotech, 304K-05a, Lot No. 2366, male) were cultured on gelatine-coated plates in endothelial growth medium (EGM) containing 12% (for HUVEC, HMEC, HCAEC) or 20% (for HAoEC) fetal calf serum (FCS, S0113, Biochrom, Germany), penicillin (50 U/mL) and streptomycin (50 μg/mL) (15,140-122, Gibco/Lifetechnologies, USA) in a humidified atmosphere of 5% CO2 at 37°C. The different batches of HUVEC were all commercial pools of cells obtained from umbilical cord/umbilical vein of caucasians (474Z010: 2 males, 1 female; 408Z014: 2 males, 1 female; 471Z011: 2 males, 2 females; 466Z022: 2
HUVEC spheroid outgrowth assays were performed as described previously. Spheroids were stimulated in EBM (6% FCS) for next day transfection. Cell cycle-related experiments also required a low seeding density to ensure continued cycling. For each experiment, at least three different batches of HUVEC from passage 3 were used.

Human dermal lymphatic endothelial cells (HDLEC, C-12217; Lot No. 394Z207.3, 4092401.3, both female) were purchased from Promocell (Heidelberg, Germany) and cultured in a humidified atmosphere of 5% CO₂ at 37°C in endothelial cell growth medium MV2 (Promocell, Heidelberg, Germany). HEK-293 (293, ATCC, CRL-1573) and HEK293T (293T/17 [HEK 293T/17], ATCC, CRL-11268) cells were cultured in DMEM (Gibco) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 1% Pen-Strep in a humidified atmosphere of 5% CO₂ at 37°C.

Human induced pluripotent stem cells (hiPSCs, WSTII081-A, EbISC, male) were used for the generation of cardiac organoids. In brief, 500 hiPSCs were cultured for 2 d on ultra-low-attachment surface in TeSR™-EBM medium (#05990, STEMCELL™ Technologies) at 37°C and 5% CO₂ in a humidified atmosphere to form iPSC-aggregates.

METHOD DETAILS

Cell stimulations
HUVEC were seeded the day before stimulation and cultured as described above. The following chemicals were used in cell stimulation experiments: Human recombinant VEGF-A 165 (50 and 100 ng/mL; R&D, 293-VE), camptothecin (1 μM and 10 μM), ATR inhibitor (10 μM, VE-821, Selleckchem) and hydroxyurea (2 mM, Sigma-Aldrich). Stimulations were performed in either EGM (12% FCS) or in EBM (6% FCS) (e.g. spheroid VEGF-A stimulations). The duration of stimulations varied between experiments and is therefore indicated in the individual figure legends.

LNA GapmeR-mediated knockdown
Cells were seeded at a density of 25,000 cells/cm² one day before transfection with LNA GapmeRs (Qiagen). Cells were transfected with LNAs using the RNAiMAX transfection reagent according to the manufacturer’s protocol (Qiagen). A final LNA concentration of 30 nM was used for 48–72 h before stopping cells with either RNA lysis buffer or protein lysis buffer. In some cases, cells were reseeded for further experiments. LNA GapmeRs were designed with the Qiagen/Exiqon LNA probe designer and had the following sequences: PCAT19 5’-ATTCGCTCTTACAA-3’ and as a negative Control 5’-AACACGTCTATACGC-3’.

Overexpression
700,000 cells were resuspended and electroporated in E2 buffer with the NEON electroporation system (Invitrogen) (1,400 V, 1 × 30 ms pulse). 7 μg of plasmid was used for each overexpression. A full medium exchange was performed every 24 h and cells were incubated for a total of 48 h. The following plasmids were used: pcDNA3.1 + vector containing PCAT19 and pcDNA3.1 + as a negative control.

EdU proliferation assay
Cells were seeded at a density of 10,000 cells/cm² in ibidi 8-well plates. After 24 h a 2X working solution of EdU (C10337, ThermoFisher) in EGM was added to the cells for 6 h. 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) was added to the cell medium for 15 min before washing with 3% BSA in PBS and then 0.5% Triton X-20 min. Cells were washed again with 3% BSA before the addition of a Click-iT reaction cocktail (Click-iT reaction buffer, CuSO₄ (Component E), Alexa Fluor Azid and Click-iT buffer additive) for 30 min at RT. Cells were washed and incubated in Hoechst 33,342 (Component G) solution 1:2000 in PBS (5 μg/mL) for a further 30 min at RT before washing with PBS. Cells were imaged for Hoechst and EdU (488 nm) with a laser scanning confocal microscope (LSM800, Zeiss) and images quantified with FIJI/ImageJ.

Spheroid outgrowth assay
HUVEC spheroid outgrowth assays were performed as described previously. Spheroids were stimulated in EBM (6% FCS) containing 50 ng/mL VEGF-A 165 for 16 h before the addition of 4% PFA to the medium. Images of 10 spheroids per condition and replicate were acquired using an Evos XL Core microscope (Life technologies) and outgrowth length and numbers quantified using ImageJ.

Human cardiac organoid formation
iPSC-aggregates were differentiated to cardiac organoids (hCOs) using the STEMdiff Cardiomyocyte Differentiation Kit (#05010, STEMCELL Technologies) following the instructions from the supplier. hCOs were then maintained in mixed medium of STEMdiff Cardiomyocyte Maintenance Basal Medium (#05020, STEMCELL Technologies) and Endothelial Cell Growth Medium 2 (#C-22111, PromoCell) at a ratio of 4:1, with medium changes every second day for a further 28 d. Medium was then changed to medium supplemented with 140 nM CTL LNA or PCAT19 LNA for 48 h. hCOs were then fixed with 4% PFA overnight at 4°C. Whole mount staining was then performed by incubating hCOs in 1% Triton X-100 for 1 h, followed by blocking in 5% horse serum for 1 h.
hCOs were immunostained with primary antibody solution (1:200 anti-alpha actinin (#A7811, Sigma Aldrich), 1:200 anti-VE-Cadherin (#2500, Cell Signaling Technologies) at 4°C overnight and secondary antibody solution (1:500 anti-mouse AlexaFlour488 (Invitrogen, A11017) and 1:500 anti-rabbit Alexa Fluor 647 (Invitrogen, A21246)) at RT for 3 h, followed by 2 h of washing in 1X PBST. Nuclei were counterstained with DAPI. The stained hCOs were transferred onto glass slides and imaged with the Leica SP8 Confocal System. The whole hCO was imaged using a z stack between two ends of the organoid. Organoids were quantified for cumulative vascular network length and organoid diameter using the Leica LAS X software.

DNA fiber assay
HUVEC were sequentially labeled with 5-Chloro-2'-deoxyuridine (CldU, 50 μM) and 5-Iodo-2'-deoxyuridine (IdU, 50 μM) for 15 min. After labeling, cells were trypsinized, resuspended in cold PBS, diluted to 1.75 × 10⁹/mL and mixed 1:1 with unlabelled cells. 7.5 μL lysis buffer (200 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 50 mM EDTA, 0.5% SDS) was mixed with 4 μL of the cell suspension on a SuperFrost Plus microscopy slide (ThermoFisher), incubated horizontally for 9 min and tilted, allowing the solution to spread to the bottom of the slide. Following air-drying, DNA spreads were fixed with 3:1 methanol:acetic acid overnight at 4°C. The spreads were then rehydrated 3 × 3 min in PBS, denatured in 2.5 M HCl for 1.5 h at RT, then washed 5 × 2.5 min in PBS. The slides were blocked for 40 min in blocking solution (2% BSA in PBS-T), followed by incubation with primary antibodies (mouse anti-BrdU, 1:100, BD Bioscience and rat anti-BrdU, 1:100, Abcam) at RT for 2.5 h. After 3 × 5 min washes with PBS-T, the slides were incubated with secondary antibodies (goat anti-mouse Alexa Fluor 647, 1:500, Thermofisher and goat anti-rat Alexa Fluor 488, 1:500, Thermo Scientific) at RT for 1 h. The slides were then washed 3 × 5 min with PBS-T, air-dried and mounted with Prolong Gold Anti-Fade Mountant (Thermo Scientific). Images of DNA fibers were acquired with a Widefield Fluorescence Microscope (Thunder, LASX software, Leica) (magnification: 100X, NA 1.44 HC PL APO oil immersion objective; LED illumination and the corresponding emission filters: 635 nm, 462/80 and 475 nm, 535/70). Lengths of DNA fibers were quantified using the Fiji/ImageJ software.

Overexpression and purification of RPA2 proteins
Recombinant overexpression of full-length RPA2 protein was achieved using Turbo E.coli chemically competent cells (NEB, catalog number: C2984H). Recombinant plasmid (pVM_MBP) was transformed by heat-shock on Luria broth agar plates and colonies were inoculated the next day in fresh Luria broth medium supplemented with 100 μg/mL ampicillin and cultured overnight at 37°C. Overexpression was induced at OD600 = 0.7 using a final concentration of 0.4 mM isopropyl-β-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG) and the cultures were further left to grow at 18°C overnight. Cells were harvested the next day by centrifugation and lysed by sonication in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris pH 7.5, 500 mM NaCl, 5% (v/v) Glycerol, 15 mM imidazole) supplemented with an EDTA-free protease inhibitor cocktail tablet (Roche Applied Science) and rat anti-BrdU, 1:100, Abcam) at RT for 2.5 min. The lysate was cleared by centrifugation at 10,000 rpm for 1 h and filtered using a 0.22 μm filter membrane, before applying the lysate to Nickel-NTA metal affinity agarose resin beads (Cube Biotech) pre-equilibrated in lysis buffer. The lysate was left to incubate on the beads at 4°C for 1 h, and the flow-through was removed after gentle centrifugation at 300 g for 2 min. The beads were washed 5 times with column volume of lysis buffer and an incubation time was 10 min at 4°C with subsequent gentle centrifugation during each step. Elutions were performed using lysis buffer supplemented with increasing imidazole concentrations of 50 mM, 100 mM, and 200 mM and 500 mM and an incubation time of 10 min and subsequent gentle centrifugation. The purest fractions, determined by SDS-PAGE, were concentrated using Merck-Millipore centricrons by centrifugation at 4,500 rpm and loaded onto a HiLoad Superdex S200 10/300 GL (GE Healthcare) column previously equilibrated in gel filtration buffer (25 mM Tris pH 7.5, 200 mM NaCl, 0.5 mM TCEP) for size exclusion chromatography. Concentrated proteins were used later for all in vitro or semi-in-vitro interaction studies.

In vitro transcription and RNA 3’ end biotinylation
pcDNA3.1+PCAT19 or control pcDNA3.1+ plasmid DNA were linearised with Smal (ThermoFisher) and purified. DNA was in vitro transcribed according to the manufacturer’s protocol with T7 Phage RNA Polymerase (NEB). Afterward, the remaining DNA was digested with RQ DNase I (Promega). The in vitro transcribed RNA was purified with the RNeasy Mini Kit (Qiagen) and biotinylated at the 3’ end with the Pierce RNA 3’ end biotinylation kit (ThermoFisher).

PCAT19-RPA2 in vitro assays
For the in vitro interaction assay, purified recombinant RPA2 protein (5 μg) was mixed with in vitro-transcribed Biotin-PCAT19 (300 ng) in a reaction containing 1 μL/mL (20 units/mL) SUPERaseIN inhibitor for 2 h at RT. For the in vitro phosphorylation assay, purified RPA2 protein (10 μg), in vitro transcribed Biotin-PCAT19 (300 ng) and HUVEC crude cell lysate (200 μg) were mixed in kinase reaction buffer (20 mM HEPES (pH 7.5), 10 mM MgCl₂, 1 mM dithiothreitol, and 0.3 μm ATP) containing 1 μL/mL (20 units/mL) SUPERaseIN inhibitor (ThermoFisher) and ssDNA from salmon sperm (100 μg/mL) (ThermoFisher). The mixture was incubated for 30 min at 37°C and alternatively, 20 μM ATR inhibitor (VE-821) (Selleckchem) or phosphatase (100 U/mL) (Merck) were added to the mixture before incubation. Importantly, biotin-PCAT19 RNA or biotin-pcDNA3.1+ control RNA was previously folded and added to the respective mixtures (in vitro phosphorylation assay and in vitro protein interaction experiment) at equimolar concentrations. Lastly, biotinylated labeled substrates were captured with 20 μL Streptavidin Magnetic Beads (NEB) and incubating the mixture overnight at 4°C. Beads were washed 4 times with cold PBS-T (0.1% Tween 20) and then boiled in 20 μL 1x Laemmli SDS sample buffer (ThermoFisher) for
10 min. Samples were applied to SDS-PAGE and Western Blotting and the detection of biotinylated-proteins was performed with the Odyssey CLx Imaging System.

For the semi-in vitro phosphorylation assay in HEK293T lysate, purified RPA2 protein (10 μg), in vitro transcribed Biotin-PCAT19 (300 ng) and HEK293T crude cell lysate (200 μg) (of transfected cells the day before with 10 μg CMV Flag ATRwt (gift from Stephen Ellidge (Addgene plasmid #41909; http://n2t.net/addgene/41909; RRID:Addgene_41909)) with PEI (Polyethyleneimine, linear, MW 25000, Polysciences, Cat# 23966)) were mixed in kinase reaction buffer (20 mM HEPES (pH 7.5), 10 mM MgCl2, 1 mM dithiothreitol, and 0.3 μM ATP) containing 1 μL/mL (20 units/mL) SUPERaseIN inhibitor (ThermoFisher) and ssDNA from salmon sperm (100 μg/mL) (ThermoFisher). The mixture was incubated for 30 min at 37°C and alternatively, 20 μM ATR inhibitor (VE-821) (Selleckchem) or phosphatase (100 U/mL) (Mercck) were added to the mixture before incubation. Samples were applied to SDS-PAGE and Western Blotting and the detection of biotinylated-proteins was performed with the Odyssey CLx Imaging System.

**RNA isolation, reverse transcription and RT-qPCR**

Total RNA was isolated and purified from HUVEC using the RNA Mini Kit according to the manufacturer’s protocol (Bio&SELL). Purified RNA was reverse transcribed with SuperScript III Reverse Transcriptase (Thermo Fisher) and oligo(dT)23 together with random hexamer primers (Sigma). cDNA was quantified with RT-qPCR using iTaq Universal SYBR Green Supermix with ROX as reference dye (Bio-Rad, 1,725,125) in an AriaMX cycler (Agilent). Human target genes were normalised to GAPDH. Relative expressions were calculated using the ΔΔCt method with the AriaMX qPCR software (Agilent). Primers used in this study are listed in Table S3.

**Protein isolation and western blot by SDS-PAGE**

HUVECs washed in Hanks solution (Applichem) were lysed with buffer A (10 mM HEPES pH 7.9, 10 mM KCl, 0.1 mM EDTA, 0.1 mM EGTA, protein inhibitor mix (PIM), Phenylmethylsulfonylfluoride (PMSF), and DTT). After 10 min incubation at 4°C, 0.75% nonidet was added to the lysate, vortexed for 10 s and centrifuged for 1 min at 16,000 g. Nuclear pellets were resuspended in buffer C (20 mM HEPES pH 7.9, 0.4 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM EGTA, protein inhibitor mix (PIM), Phenylmethylsulfonylfluoride (PMSF), and DTT) for 15 min at 4°C before centrifugation for 1 min, 16,000 g. Protein concentrations of the supernatant were determined with the Bradford assay and the cell extract was boiled in Laemmli buffer. Equal amounts of protein were separated with SDS-PAGE and the gels were blotted onto a nitrocellulose membrane and blocked in Rotiblock (Carl Roth, Germany). After incubation with the first antibody, infrared-fluorescent-dye-conjugated secondary antibodies (Licor, Bad Homburg, Germany) were used and signals detected with an infrared-based laser scanning detection system (Odyssey Classic, Licor, Bad Homburg, Germany). Images were acquired with the Image Studio Ver 5.2 software (Licor). The following antibodies were used: RPA2 (ab2175, Abcam) RPA2 (A300-244A, Bethyl), S33-pRPA2 (A300-246A, Bethyl), T21-pRPA2 (ab61065, Abcam), S4/8-pRPA2 (A700-009, Bethyl), pS3 (sc-6243, Santa Cruz), Lamin B1 (sc-20682, Santa Cruz), His6 (11922416001, Roche), DYKDDDDK Tag (D6W5B) (FLAG, 14793, Cell Signaling Technology), GAPDH (B8795, Sigma-Aldrich), Beta-actin (A1978, Sigma-Aldrich), PNKP (A300-257A, Bethyl), yH2AX (MABE205, Millipore), H2A (3636, Cell Signaling).

**RNA immunoprecipitation**

3 x 10^15 HUVEC were grown to 80% confluence and washed once with Hanks buffer. 6 mL Hanks buffer was added to the cells on ice and irradiated with 0.150 J/cm2 254 nm UV light (Bio-LINK, BLX-254, Vilber). Cells were scraped twice in Hanks buffer and centrifuged at 1,000 g at 4°C for 4 min. Isolation and lysis of the nucleus was performed as outlined above for protein isolation and immunoprecipitation. 10% of the nuclear lysate served as the “input”. 4 μg anti-RPA2 (A300-244A, Bethyl) or anti-IgG (ab37415, Abcam) negative control antibody were pre-coupled to 50 μL protein A magnetic beads (ThermoFisher) in buffer C for 1 h at RT then washed once with high salt buffer (1 M NaCl) and twice with buffer C. The antibody-coupled beads were added to the nuclear lysate and rotated for 1 h at 4°C. Samples were placed on a magnetic bar and the lysate discarded. The beads were washed three times in high salt buffer (4°C for 10 min). Beads were washed twice in buffer PNK (350 mM Tris-HCl pH 6.5, 50 mM MgCl2, 5 mM DTT). For elution of RNA, all PNK buffer was removed and RNA isolation performed with QIAzol (Qiagen) according to the manufacturer’s protocol.

**Antisense-oligonucleotide pulldown of RNA**

Antisense oligonucleotides containing a 5’-biotin tag were designed with the online GeneGlobe tool (QIAgen) using the target RNA sequence as input. HUVEC were UV-crosslinked on ice (0.150 J/cm2 254 nm UV light (Bio-LINK, BLX-254, Vilber)) and scraped. Cell pellets were flash frozen and thawed to disrupt the nuclei. Cells were resuspended in 200 μL buffer L (50 mM Tris/HCl pH8, 50 mM NaCl, 0.5% NP-40, 1 mM EDTA, protein inhibitor mix (PIM), Phenylmethylsulfonylfluoride (PMSF), DTT and superase 1L/mL), incubated on ice for 30 min and centrifuged at 10,000 g at 4°C for 3 min 1mL buffer L and 20 μL MyOne Streptavidin C1 beads were added to the lysate for 30 min at 4°C. The beads were discarded and 200 pmol of PCAT19 antisense-oligonucleotide (5’-AAGCAGACATGAGACCTCACT-3’) or scramble control oligonucleotide (5’-GTGTAACGCTCTAGCCCA-3’) added to the pre-cleared lysate for rotation overnight at 4°C. The next day, 50 μL MyOne Streptavidin C1 beads were added to the samples for rotation at 4°C for 2 h. Beads were then washed and used for mass spectrometry or cooked in Laemmli buffer for Western blotting as described above.
CRISPR/dCas9 activation (CRISPRa) and inactivation (CRISPRi)

Guide RNAs (gRNA) were designed with the help of the web-interfaces of CRISPick GPP sgRNA designer. For CRISPRa, a catalytically inactive Cas9 (dCas9) fused to the transcription activator VP64 (pHAGE EF1a dCas9-VP64) was used. For CRISPRi, a dCas9 fusion to the KRAB repressive domain (pHAGE EF1a dCas9-KRAB) was used. Either of them was transfected in HUVEC together with a gRNA(MS2) vector containing the individual guide RNA (gRNA) using the NEON electroporation system (Invitrogen). pHAGE EF1a dCas9-VP64 and pHAGE EF1a dCas9-KRAB were a gift from Rene Maehr and Scot Wolfe (Addgene plasmid # 50918, # 50919) and gRNA(MS2) cloning backbone was a gift from Feng Zhang (Addgene plasmid # 61424). The following oligonucleotides were used for cloning of the guide RNAs into the gRNA(MS2) vector: For CRISPRa, 5’-CACCGAATGTGAGACTCATCAC-3’ and 5’-AAAGCTTATGAGTCTCACACATT-3’, and for CRISPRi 5’-CACCCAGGTGTTATTTGACTGAGT-3’ and 5’-AAACACTCCAAGTCAAAATACACT-3’. After cloning, plasmids were purified and sequenced.

Mass spectrometry

Immunoprecipitation was performed as above but with the final wash of IP beads in wash buffer without protease inhibitors. Beads were transferred to fresh low-binding tubes in order not to disrupt protein digestion and to remove sticky proteins. Beads were flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and subjected to mass spectrometry. Briefly, samples underwent digestion with trypsin (Promega, Walldorf, Germany) overnight at 37 °C and stopped with trifluoroacetic acid (Sigma-Aldrich). Peptides were purified with multi-stop-and-go tips (StageTips). Liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry (LC/MS) was performed on Thermo Scientific Q Exactive Plus equipped with an ultra-high performance liquid chromatography unit (Thermo Scientific Dionex Ultimate 3000) and a Nanospray Flex Ion-Source (Thermo Scientific). Peptides were loaded and separated using gradient phases. MaxQuant 1.6.1.0.13258 and Perseus 1.6.1.399 were used for data analysis. The human reference proteome set (Uniprot) was used to identify peptides and proteins with a false discovery rate (FDR) of less than 1%. Reverse identifications and common contaminants were removed and the dataset was reduced to proteins that were identified in at least 4 of 6 samples in one experimental group. Missing LFQ values were replaced by random background values. Significant interacting proteins were determined by permutation-based false discovery rate (FDR) calculation and students t-test. The abundance of each protein was determined using the iBAQ value, which is measured by dividing the sum of peptide intensities the number of theoretically observable peptides.71

A detailed description and the mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium (http://proteomecentral.proteomexchange.org) via the PRIDE partner repository with the dataset identifier PRIDE: PXD032669.

Proximity ligation assay (PLA)

The PLA was performed similarly as described in the manufacturer’s protocol (Duolink II Fluorescence, OLink, Upsalla, Sweden). After fixation in phosphate buffered formaldehyde solution (4%), HUVEC were permeabilized with Triton X-100 (0.2%) and blocked with serum albumin solution (3%) in phosphate-buffered saline. After incubation overnight with anti-RPA2 (A300-2444A, Bethyl) and anti-ATR (sc-515173, Santa Cruz), samples were washed and incubated with the respective PLA-probes for 1 h at 37 °C. After washing and ligation for 30 min (37 °C), the amplification with polymerase was performed for 100 min (37 °C). The nuclei were stained using DAPI. Images (with Alexa Fluor, 546 nm) were acquired with a confocal microscope (LSM 800, Zeiss) and the number of PLA signals was normalised to the number of nuclei per image.

RNA-fluorescent in situ hybridisation (FISH)

RNA-FISH was performed to determine the subcellular localisation of RNAs of interest. Cells that had been grown on 8-well culture plates (Ibidi) were fixed in 4% PFA for 7 min at RT and washed 3 times with PBS. Cells were permeabilised in 0.5% Triton X-100 containing 1 μL/mL SupersaseIN on ice for 10 min. Cells were washed three times in PBS for 5 min each and rinsed with 2XSSC buffer. Hybridisation was then performed overnight at 37 °C in hybridisation buffer containing 100 μM antisense oligonucleotide probes with a 5’-TRE tag. PCAT19 antisense-oligonucleotide (5’-AAGCAGACATGAGACCTCACT-3’) or scramble control oligonucleotide (5’-GTGTAACACGTCTATACGCCCA-3’). The next day, cells were washed four times for 20 min each in 2XSSC buffer containing 50% formamide at 37 °C. DAPI staining (1:200) was included in the second wash step. Cells were imaged with a laser scanning confocal microscope (LSM800) and images quantified with FIJI/ImageJ.

RNA in situ hybridization-proximity ligation assay (rISH-PLA)

10,000 HUVECs were grown on 8-well ibidi slides, treated as indicated, and were fixed using 4% paraformaldehyde for seven minutes. To confirm the interaction between PCAT19 and γH2AX, the rISH-PLA assay was performed as described elsewhere with the biotinylated PCAT19 oligonucleotide, an anti-biotin antibody (Anti-Biotin antibody [Hyb-8] (ab201341, Abcam)) and an anti-γH2AX antibody (MABE205, Millipore).

Terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase dUTP nick end labeling (TUNEL)

The TUNEL assay was used to detect single- and double-stranded DNA breaks according to the manufacturer’s protocol (TMR red, Sigma-Aldrich). Briefly, cells that had been grown on 8-well culture plates (Ibidi) were fixed in 4% PFA for 1 h at RT. Cells were rinsed with PBS and incubated in 0.1% TritonX-100 containing 0.1% sodium citrate for 2 min on ice. Cells were then incubated in 1:2 TUNEL mix for 2 h at 37 °C. After washing, 0.1% Triton X-100 for 10 min at RT, cells were permeabilized in 0.5% Triton X-100 containing 1 μL/mL SupersaseIN on ice for 10 min. Cells were washed three times in PBS for 5 min each and rinsed with 2XSSC buffer. Hybridisation was then performed overnight at 37 °C in hybridisation buffer containing 100 μM antisense oligonucleotide probes with a 5’-TRE tag. PCAT19 antisense-oligonucleotide (5’-AAGCAGACATGAGACCTCACT-3’) or scramble control oligonucleotide (5’-GTGTAACACGTCTATACGCCCA-3’). The next day, cells were washed four times for 20 min each in 2XSSC buffer containing 50% formamide at 37 °C. DAPI staining (1:200) was included in the second wash step. Cells were imaged with a laser scanning confocal microscope (LSM800) and images quantified with FIJI/ImageJ.
reaction mixture for 60 min at 37°C in the dark. Cells were rinsed 3 times with PBS and DAPI staining (1:200) included in the second wash. Cells were imaged with a laser scanning confocal microscope (LSM800) and images quantified with FIJI/ImageJ.

**Comet assay**

The comet assay was used to detect DNA damage by single-cell gel electrophoresis according to the manufacturer’s protocol (CometAssay Single Cell Gel Electrophoresis Assay, 4250-050-K, R&D Systems). Briefly, cells were treated with and without DNA damaging agents (as indicated in figure legends). Cells treated with 100 μM H₂O₂ for 20 min at 4°C served as a positive control. Cells were trypsinised, counted and 1 × 10⁶ cells mixed with low-melting agarose before being placed on prewarmed comet slides. Slides were stored in the dark at 4°C for 30 min then immersed in lysis solution for 60 min at RT. Slides were then immersed in alkaline unwinding solution for 20 min at RT. Slides were placed in an electrophoresis chamber and 21 V applied for 30 min before immersing slides twice in distilled H₂O for 5 min, then 70% ethanol for 5 min. Slides were dried for 15 min at 37°C and 100 μL SYBR added to the cells for 30 min at RT. Slides were then briefly rinsed in distilled H₂O and dried completely at 37°C. Cells were imaged with a laser scanning confocal microscope (LSM800) and images quantified with CometScore 2.0 (TriTek Corp).

**BrdU/PI FACS**

Cells were grown on 6cm culture plates and incubated with 10μM BrdU (10280879001, Roche) for 30 min before washing in 3% BSA and centrifugation at 500 g for 10 min. Cells were resuspended in 70% ethanol while vortexing and then incubated on ice for 30 min. Cells were centrifuged again at 500 g for 10 min and resuspended in 2 mM HCl containing 0.5% Triton X-100 for 30 min at RT. Cells were then resuspended in 0.1 M Na₂B₄O₇ for 2 min. Cells were centrifuged again and resuspended in PBS/BSA +0.05% Tween 20 with 1:100 antibody (rat anti-BrdU (ab6326, Abcam)) overnight at 4°C. Cells were then incubated with 1:500 secondary antibody (anti-rat 488nm) for 30 min at 4°C, before washing and staining with 10 μg/mL Propidium Iodide in 1% BSA containing 20 μg/mL RNase (00552782, ThermoFisher) for 20 min at 4°C. Cells were then resuspended in 1% BSA containing containing 10 μg/mL Propidium Iodide for FACS analysis. Cells were subjected to FACS analysis (SH800, Sony) using the FL2 (500–550 nm) and FL3 (570–630 nm) filters for BrdU and propidium iodide detection. Data was analyzed using the FlowJo™ v10.8 Software (BD Life Sciences).

**RNA-sequencing**

RNA-sequencing was performed as described previously. Briefly, total RNA and library integrity were verified and 600 ng of total RNA used as input for SMARTer Stranded Total RNA Sample Prep Kit - HI Mammalian (Takara Bio). Sequencing was performed on a NextSeq2000 instrument (Illumina) using a P2 flowcell with v3 chemistry, resulting in an average of 36M reads per library with 1 × 72bp single end setup. The resulting raw reads were assessed for quality, adapter content and duplication rates with FastQC. Trimomatic version 0.39 was employed to trim reads after a quality drop below a mean of Q20 in a window of 10 nucleotides. Only reads between 30 and 150 nucleotides were cleared for further analyses. Trimmed and filtered reads were aligned to the Ensembl human genome version hg38 (ensembl release 104) using STAR 2.74.9a with the parameter “--outFilterMismatchNoverLmax 0.1” to increase the maximum ratio of mismatches to mapped length to 10%. The number of reads aligning to genes was counted with featureCounts 2.0.2 tool from the Subread package. Only reads mapping at least partially inside exons were admitted and aggregated per gene. Reads overlapping multiple genes or aligning to multiple regions were excluded. Differentially expressed genes were identified using DESeq2 version 1.30.1. Further analysis of RNA-seq data was performed with QuaternaryProd, ClusterProfiler and ReactomePA and visualised with ggplot2.

**Human carotid artery plaques**

Human carotid artery plaque specimens were harvested during carotid endarterectomies (CEA) performed in the Department for Vascular and Endovascular Surgery at the Klinikum rechts der Isar of the Technical University Munich. The study was approved by the local Ethics Committee, and all patients provided their written informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Two types of analysis were performed as described previously: stable (n = 6) vs. unstable (n = 5) plaques based on the Rothwell/Redgrave criteria (fibrous caps >200μm are considered stable, fibrous caps <200μm are rendered unstable or ruptured); as well as late stage, advanced atherosclerotic plaques (n = 12) compared to early diseased/healthy control (n = 10) specimens stemming from the same individual. Plaque samples underwent basic stains to assess and characterise plaque morphology using hematoxylin & eosin (HE) as well as Elastica van Giesson (EvG) protocols. For molecular analysis, plaques were placed in RNA later (Qiagen) for 24h, before being frozen at −80°C for further analysis. Both of the plaques settings were sent for bulk RNA-sequencing, as described previously.

**QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

Results are presented as mean ± standard deviation (SD). Statistical significance was calculated using GraphPad Prism 9.3.1. For multiple comparisons testing One-way ANOVA with Tukey multiple comparisons test was employed. The students t-test (paired or unpaired) was performed for experiments where only two conditions were included. Statistical analysis for RNA-sequencing experiments were performed with the DESeq2 and Diffbind packages respectively. p-value and number of replicates (n) are displayed with each result.
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Long non-coding RNA PCAT19 safeguards DNA in quiescent endothelial cells by preventing uncontrolled phosphorylation of RPA2
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Figure S1. PCAT19 expression, Related to Figures 1 and 2. A. *PCAT19, CDH5* and *PECAM1* expression (Z-score of gene TPM) in normal human tissues from The GTEx Portal (GTEx Analysis Release V8 (dbGaP Accession phs000424.v8.p2). TPM, transcripts per million. B. *PCAT19, CDH5* and *PECAM1* expression in different human cell types. Clustered by cell type. Tabula Sapiens. C. *PCAT19, CDH5* and *PECAM1* expression in individual endothelial cells across all human tissues. Clustered by tissue. Tabula Sapiens. D. *PCAT19* expression in various tumour tissues and respective normal tissues, GEPIA database. E. RT-qPCR for PCAT19 after PCAT19 or control LNA GapmeR-mediated knockdown and PCAT19 or pcDNA3.1+ control overexpression. HUVEC (n=3 biological replicates) for both. Unpaired t-test, *** signifies $P<0.001$, **** signifies $P<0.0001$. 
**Figure S2. PCAT19 on endothelial cell cycle, Related to Figure 2.**

A. Proliferation measured with Incucyte imaging system after LNA GapmeR-mediated knockdown of PCAT19 (P19) compared to negative control (CTL) LNA GapmeR for HMEC, HCAEC, HAoEC and HDLEC. n=2 technical replicates, unpaired t-test of Area under the curve (AUC). ** signifies $P<0.01$, *** signifies $P<0.001$.

B. Endothelial cell proliferation measured with Incucyte imaging system after PCAT19 CRISPRi or CRISPRa or respective negative controls. n=3 biological replicates.

C. KEGG (Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes) pathway enrichment list from 186 differentially regulated genes after PCAT19 knockdown.

D. Differentially expressed genes associated with the top significant KEGG pathways ($P_{adj}<0.05$).

| KEGG Description                              | P-adjusted Value | Gene count | Genes                                                                 |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Cell cycle                                    | 4.824335e-05     | 10         | BUB1, BUB1B, CCNA2, CCNB2, CCND2, CDC20, CDC25B, ESP11, ORC1, TTK     |
| Cellular senescence                           | 1.375276e-03     | 9          | CCNA2, CCNB2, CCND2, FOXM1, IGFBP3, MAP2K6, MAPK14, MYBL2, TGFBR2     |
| Progesterone-mediated oocyte maturation        | 2.808863e-03     | 7          | BUB1, CCNA2, CCNB2, CDC25B, CPEB4, KIF22, MAPK14                       |
| Human T-cell leukemia virus 1 infection       | 1.061092e-02     | 9          | BUB1B, CCNA2, CCNB2, CCND2, CDC20, ESP11, NFkB2, STAT5A, TGFBR2       |

E. Upstream regulator analysis (QuaternaryProd package). Top predicted regulators listed according to their number of significant downstream targets. ** signifies $P<0.01$, *** signifies $P<0.001$.

| Symbol | Regulation | Significant reachable | P-value            |
|--------|------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| AURKB  | down       | 12                    | 2.42E-10           |
| PLK1   | down       | 10                    | 4.41E-09           |
| CDK1   | down       | 12                    | 1.50E-07           |
| SMARCA2| up         | 11                    | 6.42E-05           |
| SMARCA4| up         | 11                    | 7.12E-05           |
| RB1    | down       | 6                     | 7.32E-05           |
| E2F3   | down       | 7                     | 0.000304           |
| CCNB1  | down       | 10                    | 0.000319           |

Figure S2. PCAT19 on endothelial cell cycle, Related to Figure 2. A. Proliferation measured with Incucyte imaging system after LNA GapmeR-mediated knockdown of PCAT19 (P19) compared to negative control (CTL) LNA GapmeR for HMEC, HCAEC, HAoEC and HDLEC. n=2 technical replicates, unpaired t-test of Area under the curve (AUC). ** signifies $P<0.01$, *** signifies $P<0.001$. B. Endothelial cell proliferation measured with Incucyte imaging system after PCAT19 CRISPRi or CRISPRa or respective negative controls. n=3 biological replicates. C. KEGG (Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes) pathway enrichment list from 186 differentially regulated genes after PCAT19 knockdown. D. Differentially expressed genes associated with the top significant KEGG pathways ($P_{adj}<0.05$). E. Upstream regulator analysis (QuaternaryProd package). Top predicted regulators listed according to their number of significant downstream targets. ** signifies $P<0.01$, *** signifies $P<0.001$. 
Figure S3. PCAT19 subcellular localisation and effects on DNA damage markers and DNA replication, Related to Figures 1 and 4. A. RNA-FISH for PCAT19 and β-Actin localisation in HUVEC. Respective antisense-oligonucleotide probes tagged with 5’TYE665 (647nm). DAPI counterstaining. Scale bar represents 100 µm and “Zoom” image scale bars represent 25 µm. B. HUVEC fractionation into cytoplasm (Cyto) and nucleus (Nuc) after cell growth under both subconfluent (sub) and confluent (conf) conditions. RNA isolation and RT-qPCR for PCAT19 and GAPDH. n=3, unpaired t-test, mean ± SD. C. HUVEC, HCAEC, HaoEC, HMEC and HDLEC were transfected with PCAT19 LNA (P19) or negative control LNA (CTL) and then treated with DMSO or camptothecin (CPT). n=1. Western blot staining for p53 and GAPDH or D. S33-pRPA2 (S33) and β-actin. E. RNA In Situ Hybridization Proximity Ligation Assay (rISH-PLA) PCAT19- and γH2AX-only controls. Red signal indicates PLA signal (546nm) between PCAT19 and γH2AX, blue indicates DAPI. Scale bar represents 100 µm. F. HUVEC were transduced with PCAT19 or pcDNA3.1+ control plasmids and pulsed with CldU and IdU for the DNA fibre assay. Quantification of fibres and representative images are displayed. (n=6) Scale bar represents 15 µm. *** signifies P<0.001.
### Table S3. Primers used in this study, Related to Figures 2 and 3.

| Name       | Sequence (5’-3’)                   |
|------------|-----------------------------------|
| 18S rRNA FP| CTT TGG TCG CTC GCT CCT C         |
| 18S rRNA RP| CTG ACC GGG TTG GTT TTG AT         |
| GAPDH FP   | TGC ACC ACC AAC TGC TTA GC         |
| GAPDH RP   | GGC ATG GAC TGT GGT CAT GAG        |
| PCAT19 FP  | ACC CTG CCC TTA GTC AAA TC         |
| PCAT19 RP  | TGG AAT CCC ACA CTG TTA CC         |
| U4 snRNA FP| GCC AAT GAG GTT TAT CCG AGG        |
| U4 snRNA RP| TCA AAA ATT GCC AAT GCC G           |