Rps26 directs mRNA-specific translation by recognition of Kozak sequence elements
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We describe a novel approach to separate two ribosome populations from the same cells and use this method in combination with RNA-seq to identify mRNAs bound to *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* ribosomes with and without Rps26, a protein linked to the pathogenesis of Diamond–Blackfan anemia (DBA). These analyses reveal that Rps26 contributes to mRNA-specific translation by recognition of the Kozak sequence in well-translated mRNAs and that Rps26-deficient ribosomes preferentially translate mRNA from select stress-response pathways. Surprisingly, exposure of yeast to these stresses leads to the formation of Rps26-deficient ribosomes and to the increased translation of their target mRNAs. These results describe a novel paradigm: the production of specialized ribosomes, which play physiological roles in augmenting the well-characterized transcriptional stress response with a heretofore unknown translational response, thereby creating a feed-forward loop in gene expression. Moreover, the simultaneous gain-of-function and loss-of-function phenotypes from Rps26-deficient ribosomes can explain the pathogenesis of DBA.

Translational control of gene expression is integral to the maintenance of protein homeostasis1–4. Recent findings from ribosomal profiling studies show that different mRNAs are recruited to ribosomes with vastly differing efficiencies5–6. Furthermore, translational efficiency for any given mRNA can vary under different cellular conditions5–7. Although the molecular mechanisms underlying these differences remain poorly understood, one element that is known to affect the translation efficiency of an mRNA is the sequence immediately upstream of the start codon. Originally described by Kozak, the nucleotide changes in this sequence affect protein production by an order of magnitude10–12. Recent studies have confirmed the importance of a ten-nucleotide window upstream of the start codon13–15, and structural studies have identified a contact between eIF2α and the highly conserved nucleotide at the −3 position (with AUG in positions 1–3)16. How the other upstream bases are recognized is not well understood, partly because the mRNA in these studies did not conform to the Kozak consensus sequence, and partly because a 21–amino acid C-terminal extension of Rps26, which is located nearby, was not resolved in the structure.

Haploinsufficiency of ribosomal proteins underlies a number of diseases, such as DBA, congenital asplenia, and 5q– syndrome17–20. These diseases exhibit a range of tissue-specific symptoms but share a seemingly paradoxical phenotype: proliferative and growth deficiencies (often coupled with developmental defects) paired with a greatly increased risk of cancer20–22. Whereas the defects in rapidly proliferating tissues are perhaps expected from insufficiency in ribosomal proteins, a lack of ribosomes would predict a resistance and not a susceptibility to cancer. Rps26 is the third most commonly mutated protein in DBA23, and its location in the mRNA exit channel16, as well as crosslinking data24, predicts contacts with the mRNA upstream of the start codon during translation initiation.

Here we report the use of a purification method that enables the separation of Rps26-depleted (∆Rps26) and Rps26-containing (+Rps26) ribosomes from yeast cells, followed by RNA-seq to identify the mRNAs bound to both ribosome pools. The data show that each type of ribosome bound a specific subset of mRNAs, and that mRNAs bound to ∆Rps26 ribosomes were translated less efficiently in wild-type (WT) cells than in those enriched in +Rps26 ribosomes. Furthermore, mRNAs enriched in ∆Rps26 ribosomes lacked the sequence conservation upstream of the Kozak sequence. Luciferase reporter assays confirmed that Rps26 was required for preferential translation of mRNAs with an adenosine at position −4 and furthermore demonstrated that mRNAs with a guanosine at position −4 (−4G) were preferentially translated by ∆Rps26 ribosomes. Pathway analysis showed clustering of mRNAs bound to ∆Rps26 ribosomes in the Hog1 and Rim101 pathways, which regulate the response to high-salt and high-pH stress conditions, respectively. Correspondingly, Rps26 depletion led to constitutive activation of these pathways and therefore to increased resistance to high salt and high pH. Finally, we show that upon exposure to high salt or high pH, cells generated ∆Rps26 ribosomes, thereby allowing for preferential translation of mRNAs with mutations in the −4 position of the Kozak sequence. These data reveal the molecular basis for recognition of the Kozak sequence and suggest that perturbed protein homeostasis could play a role in the pathogenesis of DBA. Moreover, they demonstrate that the well-characterized transcriptional response to stress induced by high-salt and high-pH conditions is augmented...
by a hitherto unknown translational response that involves changes in the composition of ribosomes to enable preferential translation of a subset of stress-related mRNAs. Thus, Rps26-deficient ribosomes have physiological roles.

RESULTS

ΔRps26 and +Rps26 ribosomes bind different mRNAs

Structural and crosslinking data demonstrate that Rps26 is located in the mRNA exit channel, adjacent to the Kozak sequence\(^{16,24}\). To assess whether Rps26 influences the repertoire of mRNAs translated by the ribosome, we purified +Rps26 and ΔRps26 ribosomes from a yeast strain in which ΔRps26 ribosomes are selectively TAP tagged (Fig. 1a). In this strain, Rps26 and Rps3, a distal protein, are under galactose-inducible control. Furthermore, Rps3-TAP is under the control of the doxycycline (dox)-repressible TET promoter, allowing for separate induction of Rps3-TAP when Rps26 and Rps3 are repressed. Importantly, Rps3-TAP fully complements the absence of Rps3 (ref. 25), and ribosomes containing Rps3-TAP are recruited into polysomes akin to those with untagged Rps3 (Supplementary Fig. 1a–d). After incubation for 4 h in glucose, cells were harvested and lysed in the presence of cycloheximide to maintain the elution (containing ΔRps26 ribosomes) and the flowthrough (containing +Rps26 ribosomes) showed that this method efficiently separated the two ribosome populations (Fig. 1b). To exclude free mRNAs, we loaded the flowthrough fraction onto a sucrose gradient and collected only the ribosome-bound fractions. SDS-PAGE analysis and immunoblotting of the elute (containing ΔRps26 ribosomes) and the flowthrough (containing +Rps26 ribosomes) showed that this method efficiently separated the two ribosome populations (Fig. 1b). Furthermore, northern blotting and Bioanalyzer results demonstrated that the ΔRps26 ribosomes contained mature 18S rRNA (Fig. 1c and Supplementary Fig. 1f,g). RNAs were isolated from these ribosome pools, sequenced on an Illumina NexSeq 500, and analyzed with the DESeq2 algorithm. Notably, because the two ribosome pools were isolated from the same cells, and therefore encountered the same mRNAs, the RNA-seq data from both pools could be compared directly.

RNA-seq analysis showed that 88–95% of the reads from the +Rps26 sample and 89–95% of the reads from the ΔRps26 sample mapped to the yeast genome. Further, 90% of the open reading frames (ORFs: 5,219 out of a total of 5,784) had 128 or more reads per experiment, a threshold experimentally determined to reduce the false appearance of gene regulation\(^2\). Of the remaining 565 ORFs, 274 (49%) were annotated as ‘uncharacterized’ or ‘dubious’ and may not encode proteins (Supplementary Fig. 2c). Furthermore, data from three independently grown and purified samples showed high correlation between experiments (Supplementary Fig. 2d). Thus, RNA-seq enabled the identification of the overwhelming majority of ORFs with high confidence and reproducibility.

Using a conservative cutoff of \(P_{\text{adj}} < 0.05\), we determined that more than one-quarter of all mRNAs were significantly enriched in either of the ribosome pools. Of those, 13% were enriched in the ΔRps26 pool and 15% were preferentially bound to +Rps26 ribosomes (Fig. 1d and Supplementary Data Set 1), and all mRNAs were enriched more than 1.5-fold. Importantly, control experiments in which we sequenced Rps3-TAP-bound mRNAs demonstrated that the differences between these samples did not arise from the TAP tag on Rps26-deficient ribosomes (Supplementary Fig. 1h).

To validate these data, we determined the effects of Rps26 depletion on polysome recruitment of mRNAs enriched in the two ribosome pools. We depleted Rps26 in a dox-repressible Rps26 strain that accumulates ΔRps26 ribosomes in the presence of dox but maintains a level of the protein similar to that in the parent strain in its absence (Fig. 2a and Supplementary Fig. 3a–d). We hypothesized that if ribosome pulldowns reflect functional interactions with translating ribosomes, Rps26 depletion should selectively decrease the polysome recruitment...
Figure 2 ΔRps26 ribosomes bind a distinct set of poorly translated mRNAs. (a) Ribosomes isolated from TET-Rps26 cells exposed to dox were probed for Rps26 occupancy relative to Rps3. Shown are a western blot (left) and quantitation (right) of ribosomes purified in parallel from three separate cultures. Bars represent the mean. *P < 0.05, t = 3.795, Degrees of freedom (DF) = 4 (Student's t test). Data are representative of four experiments. (b) Translational downregulation (measured by bound ribosomes) of mRNAs enriched in +Rps26 or ΔRps26 ribosomes after Rps26 depletion. Three independent experiments were run for Abf1, Eap1 and Rox1, and duplicates were run for all others. Box plots represent the range; the midline indicates the mean. AU, arbitrary units. (c) Analysis of all mRNAs in b; data are mean ± s.d. **P = 0.0016, Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. (d–g) Metagene analysis using existing data sets.58–61. **P < 0.0001, Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. Number of mRNAs analyzed for 5′ UTR length: +Rps26, 763; ΔRps26, 575; all, 4,363. ORF length: +Rps26, 763; ΔRps26, 575; all, 5,690. Abundance: +Rps26, 804; ΔRps26, 736; all, 5,459. Translational efficiency: +Rps26, 838; ΔRps26, 736; all = 5476. Box edges represent the interquartile range, midlines indicate the median, and lower and upper whiskers extend to the 10th and 90th percentiles, respectively (Supplementary Figs. 2 and 3). Original blot images are in Supplementary Data Set 3. Source data for graphs in this figure are available online.

Rps26-based mRNA preference is mediated by Kozak sequence elements

We used Weblogo mRNA interolog to test the sequence enrichment of mRNAs bound to ΔRps26 and +Rps26 ribosomes.29 Crosslinking24 and structural16 data indicate that Rps26 is bound in the mRNA exit channel, potentially contacting residues −4, and −7 through −10 (relative to the start codon). Thus, in our analysis of sequence enrichment we focused on the sequence immediately upstream of the start codon. Analysis of all mRNAs enriched on +Rps26 ribosomes (Fig. 2b,c), thus validating the sequencing data in vivo.

Further analysis revealed that the mRNAs enriched on +Rps26 and ΔRps26 ribosomes differed in their physical characteristics. Specifically, mRNAs enriched on ΔRps26 ribosomes had longer 5′ UTRs (untranslated regions) and longer ORFs, and were less abundant than +Rps26-enriched mRNAs or the transcriptome as a whole (Fig. 2d–f). This finding held true even when mRNAs encoding ribosomal proteins, which tend to be short, were excluded (Supplementary Fig. 2e). In contrast, there were no significant differences in the average lengths of the 3′ UTRs or transcript half-lives (Supplementary Fig. 2f). Although the molecular basis for these observations is unclear, long 5′ UTRs and ORFs are known to be associated with less efficient translation.3,27,28 Importantly, mRNAs enriched on ΔRps26 ribosomes were much less efficiently translated than mRNAs enriched on +Rps26 ribosomes and the entire transcriptome. In contrast, +Rps26 ribosomes enriched highly translated mRNAs (Fig. 2g), consistent with a role for Rps26 in recognition of the Kozak sequence, which imparts highly efficient translation.
Rps26 promotes translation by recognizing specific residues in the Kozak sequence. (a–c) Weblogo conservation analysis of mRNAs enriched in +Rps26 ribosomes (a; n = 865) and ΔRps26 ribosomes (b; n = 741) versus all mRNAs in our data set (c; n = 5,696). (d) Results of luciferase reporter assays from TET-Rps26 cells grown in the absence or presence of dox, to test effects from Kozak-sequence mutations with replete (+) or depleted (−) Rps26. For +Rps26, from left to right starting with −(7–10)G: t = 10.24, 6.229, 7.594, 3.193, or 4.84 versus A10; ****P < 0.0001, **P = 0.0017. For −Rps26, from left to right starting with −(7–10)G: ****P < 0.0001, **P = 0.0011, t = 2.179; **P = 0.0064, t = 3.116. Statistical values determined by two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). DF = 184. (e) The effect of Rps26 depletion on the recognition of individual point mutations. −Rps26 versus +Rps26 from left to right, starting with −(7–10)G: P = 0.6562, t = 1.193; ****P < 0.0002, t = 4.235; P = 0.9712, t = 2.2146; P = 0.7879, t = 0.8371; P = 0.5621, t = 1.438 (two-way ANOVA). DF = 184. For d and e, experiments used the following numbers of independent cultures: −(7–10)G and −4G, n = 15; −3C, n = 7; −2G, n = 12; −1G, n = 13. Data shown are mean and s.e.m. (Supplementary Fig. 4). (f) Rps26 (blue) binds mRNA near the −4 position when the start codon (purple) is in the P site (adapted from PDB 3J8J, ref. 16). The C-terminal 21 amino acids of Rps26 are not resolved in this structure. Source data for d and e are available online.

Figure 3: Rps26 promotes translation by recognizing specific residues in the Kozak sequence. (a–c) Weblogo conservation analysis of mRNAs enriched in +Rps26 ribosomes (a; n = 865) and ΔRps26 ribosomes (b; n = 741) versus all mRNAs in our data set (c; n = 5,696). (d) Results of luciferase reporter assays from TET-Rps26 cells grown in the absence or presence of dox, to test effects from Kozak-sequence mutations with replete (+) or depleted (−) Rps26. For +Rps26, from left to right starting with −(7–10)G: t = 10.24, 6.229, 7.594, 3.193, or 4.84 versus A10; ****P < 0.0001, **P = 0.0017. For −Rps26, from left to right starting with −(7–10)G: ****P < 0.0001, **P = 0.0011, t = 2.179; **P = 0.0064, t = 3.116. Statistical values determined by two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). DF = 184. (e) The effect of Rps26 depletion on the recognition of individual point mutations. −Rps26 versus +Rps26 from left to right, starting with −(7–10)G: P = 0.6562, t = 1.193; ****P < 0.0002, t = 4.235; P = 0.9712, t = 2.2146; P = 0.7879, t = 0.8371; P = 0.5621, t = 1.438 (two-way ANOVA). DF = 184. For d and e, experiments used the following numbers of independent cultures: −(7–10)G and −4G, n = 15; −3C, n = 7; −2G, n = 12; −1G, n = 13. Data shown are mean and s.e.m. (Supplementary Fig. 4). (f) Rps26 (blue) binds mRNA near the −4 position when the start codon (purple) is in the P site (adapted from PDB 3J8J, ref. 16). The C-terminal 21 amino acids of Rps26 are not resolved in this structure. Source data for d and e are available online.

the effects of a given upstream sequence on translation relative to that of the A10 sequence.

In Rps26-replete yeast, mutation of individual adenosines at the −1, −2, −3 and −4 positions, as well as positions −7 to −10 together, reduced translation (Fig. 3d, left). These data demonstrate that residues upstream of the start codon impact translation, which is consistent with findings from Kozak’s studies in mammalian cells10–12,33 and more recent work in yeast13. In contrast, in Rps26-depleted cells, translation of the −4G and −2G mutants was indistinguishable from that of the A10 mRNA (Fig. 3d, right). Thus, Rps26 is required for preferential translation of mRNAs with adenosine at the −1 and −2 positions. Further, translation of mRNAs containing −4G was increased in Rps26-deficient versus Rps26-replete yeast (Fig. 3e). This result is consistent with the sequencing data, which show that relative to the transcriptome as a whole, ΔRps26 ribosomes specifically enriched mRNAs with a G at the −4 position. This preference came at the loss of mRNAs with an A or C at that position (Supplementary Fig. 4b). In contrast, +Rps26 ribosomes enriched for mRNAs with A or C and depleted those with G at the −4 position (Supplementary Fig. 4b). This effect was specific to Rps26, as depletion of Rps3 or Rps17 had no such effect on translation of the −4G reporter (Supplementary Fig. 4d).

Because Rps26 depletion leads to moderate 20S rRNA accumulation14, we wondered whether the accumulation of 20S rRNA and not the depletion of Rps26 was responsible for the observed defect in recognition of the −4 residue. We therefore analyzed translation of the luciferase reporter in WT yeast and in yeast lacking the 40S assembly factor Ltv1 (ΔLtv1). Similar to the Rps26-depleted strain, the ΔLtv1 strain accumulates moderate amounts of 20S rRNA35,36. Importantly, translation of the luciferase reporter was sensitive to the residue at the −4 position in ΔLtv1 yeast (Supplementary Fig. 4e), demonstrating that it is depletion of Rps26 and not accumulation of 20S rRNA that is responsible for the observed defect in recognition of the −4 residue.

Importantly, Rps26 directly contacts the −4 position, as well as an RNA residue directly neighboring an interactor of the −2 residue (Fig. 3f and ref. 16). Thus, the sequencing data, reporter assays and structural studies all demonstrate that Rps26 recognizes the −4 and −2 positions of the Kozak sequence, and that this is necessary for preferential translation of mRNAs with a Kozak consensus of A or C at that position. ΔRps26 ribosomes have lost this preference and instead show a slight preference for mRNAs containing −4G.

Accumulation of ΔRps26 ribosomes activates the Hog1 and Rim101 pathways

To assess whether mRNAs enriched in ΔRps26 ribosomes cluster in specific biological pathways in which they could produce specific biological outcomes, we used mRNAs enriched in each ribosome pool as a basis for GO-term enrichment analysis on GeneCodis37 (Fig. 1c and Supplementary Data Set 2). We found that +Rps26-ribosome-enriched mRNAs encoded mainly ribosomal proteins and translation factors. This is consistent with previous findings showing that mRNAs encoding ribosomal proteins are among the best translated5,26. In contrast, ΔRps26-ribosome-enriched transcripts were associated with highly regulated processes, including transcriptional control, phosphorylation, cell cycle, DNA repair and, notably, well-characterized
stress-responsive signaling pathways including the Hog1 pathway\(^{38}\), a MAPK cascade that responds to high-salt stress, and the Rim13 pathway\(^{39}\), which responds to pH stress (Fig. 4).

Because Rps26 depletion increased the relative translation of mRNAs enriched in ΔRps26 ribosomes (Fig. 2b,c), we hypothesized that cells depleted of Rps26 are more resistant to these stresses. To test this prediction, we measured growth rates for Rps26-replete and Rps26-depleted yeast cells in rich media with and without high salt or high pH. Surprisingly, Rps26-deficient cells grew faster in high-salt and high-pH conditions than in rich media, whereas Rps26-replete cells were sensitive to both salt and pH (Fig. 4d,e). Additionally, Rps26-deficient yeast displayed increased phosphorylation of the Hog1 MAPK at lower concentrations of NaCl (Fig. 4g) and C-terminal cleavage of the Rim13 protein, a hallmark of the high-pH response pathway, even in mildly acidic conditions (Fig. 4b). Thus, both the Hog1 MAPK and the Rim13 pathways are induced when Rps26 is depleted. This phenotype was pathway selective, as Rps26-deficient yeast were not resistant to caffeine, which activates a distinct MAPK cascade to produce cell-wall stress\(^{40}\) (Fig. 4c,f). Further, high-salt and high-pH conditions produced a growth defect in yeast strains depleted of two other late-binding ribosomal proteins, Rps3 and Rps17 (Supplementary Fig. 5a–g), demonstrating the specific role of Rps26 deficiency in resistance to salt and pH stress. Finally, ΔLtv1 cells also did not show stress resistance, demonstrating that stress resistance does not arise from the accumulation of 20S pre-rRNA in these cells (Supplementary Fig. 5h,i).

Yeast form ΔRps26 ribosomes in response to osmotic and high-pH stress

Given the high-salt and high-pH stress phenotypes observed in Rps26-deficient yeast, we reasoned that the formation of ΔRps26 ribosomes might be part of the cellular response to these stresses. To test this, we grew WT yeast in rich media containing high salt concentrations, high pH or caffeine. We then purified ribosomes from these stressed cells and from non-stressed control cells, and analyzed Rps26 protein levels by western blotting. We also assessed the levels of five additional proteins from the small ribosomal subunit (Rps0, Rps3, Rps5, Rps8 and Asc1) as controls. Notably, when normalized to any of these proteins, ribosomes from cells grown under high-salt or high-pH conditions contained less Rps26 than ribosomes from unstressed cells, whereas the levels of Rps26 in cells exposed to caffeine were similar to those in non-stressed control cells (Fig. 5a–c). These data indicate that the formation of Rps26-deficient ribosomes is part of the response to high-salt and high-pH conditions.

We next validated the in vivo translational effects of this physiological depletion of Rps26 using the dual luciferase assay. We have shown that translation of the −4G Renilla reporter is increased in Rps26-deficient yeast, whereas it is indistinguishable from that of the A10 Renilla reporter (Fig. 3d, right). We used this functional signature of ΔRps26 ribosomes as a readout for the formation and functionality of ΔRps26 ribosomes under stress. We exposed WT cells transformed with the A10 or the −4G Renilla reporters to salt, high pH or caffeine stress. As expected from the accumulation of ΔRps26 ribosomes in the presence of high salt concentrations or high pH, translation of the −4G reporter recovered to the level of that of the A10 construct when WT cells were exposed to salt or high pH stress but not when exposed to caffeine (Fig. 3d–g). These data strongly suggest that the ΔRps26 ribosomes that form when yeast are exposed to high salt or high pH translate −4G-containing mRNAs. Thus, in response to high-salt and high-pH stress, cells produce ΔRps26 ribosomes, thereby augmenting the well-characterized transcriptional response to these stresses with preferenceential translation of mRNAs from these stress-response pathways by ΔRps26 ribosomes.

DISCUSSION

Rps26 enforces the translational program encoded by the Kozak sequence

The data herein demonstrate key roles for Rps26 in recognizing adenosines at positions −2 and −4 of the Kozak sequence, leading to
preferential translation of mRNAs that contain these adenosines. Thus, these data provide a molecular basis for the effects of mutations in the Kozak sequence uncovered 30 years ago\(^{10–12,33}\) (Fig. 6a). Because of the critical role of Rps26 in recognition of the Kozak sequence, which enables efficient translation, Rps26 depletion decreases the translation of normally highly translated mRNAs, including those encoding ribosomal proteins, explaining the overall reduced ribosome numbers in Rps26-depleted cells (Supplementary Fig. 3e,f).

Notably, ΔRps26 ribosomes were also found to selectively augment the translation of mRNAs containing −4G. This might arise simply from increased competitiveness of such mRNAs, as strong Kozak mRNAs are no longer favored. Additionally, or alternatively, Rps26 deficiency might ameliorate a steric hindrance that arises from the −4G in WT ribosomes, or −4G-containing mRNAs might adopt a different structure. Regardless, Rps26 enforces the translational program encoded by the Kozak sequence, whereas Rps26-deficient ribosomes decode a separate translational program.

Remarkably, we observed that mRNAs upregulated by Rps26 depletion are not randomly distributed throughout the yeast transcriptome but instead cluster in specific pathways, including the well-characterized and highly conserved Hog1 MAPK and the high-pH-response Rim101 pathways. Growth assays and immunoblotting showed that these pathways were constitutively activated in Rps26-deficient yeast, indicating that the decreased translation of otherwise well-translated mRNAs and the increased translation of mRNAs with mutations in the Kozak sequence lead to a perturbation in cellular protein homeostasis upon Rps26 depletion. Collectively, the data support a model whereby ΔRps26 ribosomes, such as those found in DBA, play pathogenic roles by disabling the translation of essential mRNAs, including those encoding ribosomal proteins, leading to reduced ribosome production, and by selectively enhancing the translation of otherwise poorly translated mRNAs characterized by long 5′ UTRs and weak Kozak sequences.

Interestingly, whereas the large majority of mRNAs encoding ribosome-assembly factors either showed no enrichment or were enriched in ΔRps26 ribosomes, the mRNA encoding Fap7 was enriched in +Rps26 ribosomes (Supplementary Fig. 3i). Consequently, Fap7 levels were decreased in Rps26-depleted cells (Supplementary Fig. 3j). This finding explains why 20S rRNA is moderately accumulated in ΔRps26 ribosomes, such as those found in DBA, play pathogenic roles by disabling the translation of essential mRNAs, including those encoding ribosomal proteins, leading to reduced ribosome production, and by selectively enhancing the translation of otherwise poorly translated mRNAs characterized by long 5′ UTRs and weak Kozak sequences.

How can ribosomal protein haploinsufficiency lead to cancer?

In mammalian cells, activation of pro-growth pathways by translational upregulation of specific mRNAs might account for the predisposition to cancer observed in humans with DBA, whereas the overall
decrease in translation of ribosomal proteins (Supplementary Data Sets 1 and 2), and the resulting loss of ribosomes (Supplementary Fig. 3e,f), accounts for growth and developmental defects. Of note, other ribosomal proteins have also been linked to DBA53,54, and several from the small subunit are also located near the mRNA exit channel. These proteins might be similarly involved in recognition of specific mRNA features or binding of translation-initiation factors, which can have mRNA-specific effects44–46, with net effects that lead to alteration of the translational repertoire. Importantly, the method described herein for purification of ribosome subpopulations will allow assessment of mRNA-specific effects from depletion of other ribosomal proteins, or mRNA modifications, that have also been linked to cancer47,48.

Physiological roles for ribosomes lacking ribosomal proteins

In their groundbreaking work, Barna and colleagues49,50 demonstrated that deficiency of the large ribosomal subunit protein Rpl38 leads to specific developmental pathologies. Similar to Rps26, Rpl38 is required for translation of a specific subset of mRNAs from the Hox family. In contrast, Rps26 is required for ribosome recruitment of highly translated mRNAs, including those encoding ribosomal proteins.

Nevertheless, the data herein demonstrate not only that ∆Rps26 ribosomes are deficient in translation of mRNAs containing a strong Kozak sequence, but also that ∆Rps26 ribosomes selectively increase the translation of mRNAs with mutations at the –4 position in the Kozak sequence, including those encoding proteins from the Hog1 and Rim101 stress-response pathways. Most important, the data show that ∆Rps26 ribosomes are produced by WT yeast upon exposure to high-salt and high-pH stress (Fig. 6b). Thus, ∆Rps26 ribosomes also play physiological roles during stress, creating a feed-forward loop that coordinates translational and transcriptional programs that allow for cell survival in the face of changes in the extracellular milieu. Importantly, the physiological relevance of Rps26-deficient ribosomes may explain how these ribosomes can escape ribosomal quality-control mechanisms during assembly51,52 and function of ribosomes53,54.

How are Rps26-deficient ribosomes formed?

The observation that Rps26-deficient ribosomes are formed during high-salt and high-pH stress leads us to ask whether these ribosomes are formed from mature Rps26-containing ribosomes or whether, instead, newly made 40S subunits are produced that lack Rps26. To start addressing these questions, we used RT-qPCR to investigate whether levels of Rps26 mRNA decrease more under stress than those of other ribosomal proteins, which could allow for the production of Rps26-deficient ribosomes. The data shown in Supplementary Figure 6a–c demonstrate that Rps26 levels decreased similarly to those of other ribosomal proteins, perhaps less. Furthermore, forced expression of Rps26 via the galactose promoter did not have an effect on the stress sensitivity of yeast, even though the levels of Rps26 mRNA increased about 11-fold (Supplementary Fig. 6d,e). Together, these data indicate that it is not likely that downregulation of Rps26 levels leads to the de novo formation of ∆Rps26 ribosomes, consistent with the observation that the stress conditions that lead to formation of ∆Rps26 ribosomes do not support active ribosome assembly35–37. We thus speculate that ∆Rps26 ribosomes are formed from pre-existing ribosomes. In that regard, it is interesting to note that a specific chaperone for Rps26, Tsr2, has been identified15,43. In addition to delivering Rps26 to nascent ribosomes, Tsr2 might store Rps26 and allow for the fully reversible loss and reincorporation of the protein.

METHODS

Methods, including statements of data availability and any associated accession codes and references, are available in the online version of the paper.

Note: Any Supplementary Information and Source Data files are available in the online version of the paper.
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 ONLINE METHODS

 Yeast strains and plasmids. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains used in this study are listed in Supplementary Table 1 and were obtained from the GE Dharmacon Yeast Knockout Collection or were created by standard recombination techniques25. The identity of generated strains was verified by PCR and western blotting. Plasmids used in this work are listed in Supplementary Table 2.

 Isolation of mRNAs bound to Rps26 and wild-type ribosomes. We generated cells for this experiment by transforming strain yKK636 (GAL-Rps26; GAL-Rps3) with pKK3566 (TET–Rps3–TAP). An overnight culture in YPGal supplemented with 0.2 µg/ml dox was grown to mid-log phase. Cells were washed three times with prewarmed YPGal media and inoculated into YPD media at an OD600 of 0.15. After 4 h, cells were harvested after the addition of 100 µg/ml cycloheximide (Sigma Aldrich), TAP purification was performed as described21,63 except that 100 µg/ml cycloheximide was included in all steps and only the IgG-binding and elution steps were performed. The IgG eluate, containing Rps26 ribosomes, and the flowthrough, containing +Rps26 ribosomes, were collected and fractionated on a 10–50% sucrose gradient as described64. Fractions containing the 80S and polysomes were pooled. Protein was precipitated from these fractions via the TCA–DOC method and analyzed by western blotting. RNA was isolated by phenol–chloroform–isoamyl alcohol extraction.

 Illumina sequencing. Purified RNA was quantified in a Qubit 2.0 Fluorometer (Invitrogen) and run on an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer (Agilent Technologies) for quality assessment and then treated with DNase I (New England Biolabs). The DNase-treated total RNA was depleted of ribosomal RNA with the Ribolyzer Gold Yeast Kit (Illumina) and then processed with the TruSeq Stranded Total RNA sample prep kit (Illumina). Brieﬂy, chemically fragmented RNA was random-hexamer primed and reverse-transcribed to generate the first strand of cDNA. The second strand was synthesized incorporating dUTP in place of dTTP, preserving strand information. The double-stranded cDNA was then end-repaired, 3’ adenylated and ligated to PCR adaptors. The purified adaptor-ligated DNA was amplified via PCR to generate the ﬁnal libraries. The ﬁnal size of fragments was 200–600 bp with insert sizes in the range of 80–450 bp. The validated libraries were pooled at equimolar ratios and loaded onto the NextSeq 500 flow cell at a ﬁnal concentration of 1.8 pM.

 Bioinformatic processing. Demultiplexed and quality-filtered raw reads (fastq) generated from the NextSeq 500 were trimmed to remove adaptor sequences with Flexbar 2.4 and aligned to the *S. cerevisiae* genome (S288C, SacCer3) from the Saccharomyces Genome Database65 with TopHat version 2.0.9 (ref. 64). HT seq-count version 0.6.1 was used to generate gene counts, and differential gene expression analysis on three biological replicates was done with DESeq2, using standard settings65.

 Identification and characterization of enriched transcripts. We used existing data sets of mRNA characteristics to analyze the transcripts considered enriched in each gradient fraction. This was determined using GENECODIS37. Enrichment of nucleotides upstream of the start codon in transcripts that were associated with Rps26-mediated selection was determined using the Saccharomyces Genome Database58 with TopHat version 2.0.9 (ref. 64). HT seq-count version 0.6.1 was used to generate gene counts, and differential gene expression analysis on three biological replicates was done with DESeq2, using standard settings65.

 Purification of ribosomes from TET-Rps26 cells. Cells were grown to mid-log phase and flash-frozen in ribosome buffer (20 mM Hepes/KOH, pH 7.4, 100 mM KOAc, 2.5 mM Mg(OAc)2 supplemented with 1 mg/ml heparin, protease inhibitor cocktail (Sigma) and 2 mM DTT). 400 µL of each clearly stained lysate was layered over 100 µL of sucrose cushion (Ribo Buffer, 500 mM KCl, 1 M sucrose, 2 mM DTT) and spun in a Beckman TLA 100.1 rotor at 100,000 r.p.m. for 2.5 h. The resulting pellets were resuspended in high-salt buffer (Ribo Buffer, 500 mM KCl, 1 mg/ml heparin, 2 mM DTT) and analyzed by SDS-PAGE followed by western blotting.

 qPCR mRNA shift assay. We generated a yeast strain with dox-inducible Rps26 deficiency (TET-Rps26) by transforming yKK493 with pKK3968. Both strains were grown as described for TET-Rps26.

 Luciferase assay. TET-Rps26 cells were transformed with plasmids encoding firefly luciferase preceded by a 10-adenosine upstream sequence and Renilla luciferase preceded by one of six sequences (listed in Supplementary Table 1 and Supplementary Fig. 4a). Cells were then grown in selective media, depleted of Rps26 as described above and harvested in mid-log phase. Control experiments demonstrated that the copy numbers of these plasmids did not change upon dox addition (Supplementary Fig. 4c), ensuring that observed dox-dependent differences did not arise from diferential translation, although we cannot exclude effects on mRNA transcription. For luciferase assays under stress, WT cells were grown for 4 h under stress conditions (or in minimal media as controls), as detailed below, and harvested in mid-log phase. Cells were lysed, and luciferase activity was measured with the Promega Dual-Luciferase Reporter Assay System on a PerkinElmer EnVision 2104 Multilabel Reader according to the manufacturer’s protocol, with assay volumes scaled down to 15%.
**Stress pathway activation.** We tested HOG pathway activation by growing TET-Rps26 cells to mid-log phase at 30 °C in YPD with or without dox, as described above. Cells were then transferred to YPD containing 0 mM, 100 mM, 300 mM or 500 mM NaCl for 5 min, collected, and analyzed by western blotting. Rim101 pathway activation was tested as described39 with TET-Rps26 cells transformed with pKK3678 (3HA-Rim101).

**Ribosome purification from stressed cells.** BY4741 yeast cells were grown to mid-log phase before being seeded into different media. Cells were inoculated into stress media at a starting OD of 0.7 and harvested after 4 h.Ribosomes were purified as previously described66.

**Antibodies.** The phospho-p38 (D3F9) antibody from Cell Signaling Technologies was used to detect Hog1-p67. HA-tagged Rim101 was detected with anti-HA (HA.C5) from Abcam (ab18181). Anti-TAP (CAB1001) was from Thermo Fisher Scientific. Anti-Rps5 was from ProteinTech (16964-1-AP). Polyclonal antibodies were gifts from M. Seedorf, Universität Heidelberg (Rps3), G. Dieci, Università di Parma (Rps8)66, L. Valášek, Czech Academy of Sciences (Rps9) and A. Link, Vanderbilt University (Asc1). The monoclonal antibody against Tub1, developed by J. Frankel, was obtained from the Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank, created by the NICHD of the NIH and maintained at The University of Iowa. Antibodies to Fap7 and Rcl1 were raised against purified recombinant proteins by Josman, LLC. Antibodies to Rps10 and Rps26 were raised against peptides from each protein by New England Peptide. These four antibodies were tested against yeast lysates and either recombinant protein or purified 40S ribosomal subunits.

**Statistical analysis.** Various statistical tests were used as appropriate and as indicated in the respective figure legends. Unpaired, two-tailed, Student's t tests were used on small data sets. For larger data sets, or those in which there was not an assumption or normality, the nonparametric Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used. For testing changes in growth-curve rates from a hypothetical value of 1 (no change), the nonparametric two-tailed Wilcoxon signed rank test was used. Finally, a two-way ANOVA with Holm–Sidak correction for multiple comparisons was used for data sets in which two factors (for example, cell type and reporter construct) were tested.

**Data availability statement.** Sequencing data have been deposited at NCBI-GEO under accession code GSE86203. Source data for Figures 1–5 and Supplementary Figures 1–6 are available with the paper online. Other data and custom scripts will be made available upon request.
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Experimental design

1. Sample size
   Describe how sample size was determined.
   For sequencing, ribosome purification and mRNA shift experiments, sample size was limited by the cost of assays. For growth curves and other experiments, the n was chosen to be large enough to identify any biologically relevant phenotypes.

2. Data exclusions
   Describe any data exclusions.
   For quantification of western blot images, bands were excluded if they were distorted or obscured by a transfer or blotting artifact. All other data was included.

3. Replication
   Describe whether the experimental findings were reliably reproduced.
   Experimental findings for pull downs, mRNA shift assays, phenotypic assays, etc were successfully replicated with minor variance between experiments (which is included in the data and accounted for via the indicated statistical tests).

Randomization
Describe how samples/organisms/participants were allocated into experimental groups.

Yeast strains used for this experiment were clonal. When different treatments were applied to a strain, cells always originated from a common culture.

Blinding
Describe whether the investigators were blinded to group allocation during data collection and/or analysis.

No, data analysis was performed by the same researcher who performed the experiment so blinding was not possible. Instead, all data analysis was performed using a standard set of steps that were held consistent between samples.

Note: all studies involving animals and/or human research participants must disclose whether blinding and randomization were used.
6. Statistical parameters

For all figures and tables that use statistical methods, confirm that the following items are present in relevant figure legends (or the Methods section if additional space is needed).

| n/a | Confirmed |
|-----|-----------|
|     | The exact sample size ($n$) for each experimental group/condition, given as a discrete number and unit of measurement (animals, litters, cultures, etc.) | ☑ |
|     | A description of how samples were collected, noting whether measurements were taken from distinct samples or whether the same sample was measured repeatedly | ☑ |
|     | A statement indicating how many times each experiment was replicated | ☑ |
|     | The statistical test(s) used and whether they are one- or two-sided (note: only common tests should be described solely by name; more complex techniques should be described in the Methods section) | ☑ |
|     | A description of any assumptions or corrections, such as an adjustment for multiple comparisons | ☑ |
|     | The test results (e.g. $p$ values) given as exact values whenever possible and with confidence intervals noted | ☑ |
|     | A summary of the descriptive statistics, including central tendency (e.g. median, mean) and variation (e.g. standard deviation, interquartile range) | ☑ |
|     | Clearly defined error bars | ☑ |

See the web collection on statistics for biologists for further resources and guidance.

---

7. Software

Describe the software used to analyze the data in this study. Statistical tests were performed with GraphPad Prism 6, sequencing analysis is described in the methods section, upstream sequences of genes were retrieved using a custom script that is available upon request.

For all studies, we encourage code deposition in a community repository (e.g. GitHub). Authors must make computer code available to editors and reviewers upon request. The Nature Methods guidance for providing algorithms and software for publication may be useful for any submission.

---

Materials and reagents

Materials availability

Indicate whether there are restrictions on availability of unique materials or if these materials are only available for distribution by a for-profit company.

Antibodies

Describe the antibodies used and how they were validated for use in the system under study (i.e. assay and species).

All antibodies are described (with references or product numbers, as appropriate) in the methods section (page 22).

10. Eukaryotic cell lines

a. State the source of each eukaryotic cell line used.

b. Describe the method of cell line authentication used.

c. Report whether the cell lines were tested for mycoplasma contamination.

d. If any of the cell lines used in the paper are listed in the database of commonly misidentified cell lines maintained by ICLAC, provide a scientific rationale for their use.

All yeast strains used are described in supplementary table 3

Strains were validated by PCR and western blot (when possible)

N/A

N/A

Animals and human research participants

11. Description of research animals

Provide details on animals and/or animal-derived materials used in the study.

N/A
12. Description of human research participants

Describe the covariate-relevant population characteristics of the human research participants.

N/A