DNA-repair scaffolds dampen checkpoint signalling by counteracting the adaptor Rad9
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In response to genotoxic stress, a transient arrest in cell-cycle progression enforced by the DNA-damage checkpoint (DDC) signalling pathway positively contributes to genome maintenance. Because hyperactivated DDC signalling can lead to a persistent and detrimental cell-cycle arrest, cells must tightly regulate the activity of the kinases involved in this pathway. Despite their importance, the mechanisms for monitoring and modulating DDC signalling are not fully understood. Here we show that the DNA-repair scaffolding proteins Slx4 and Rtt107 prevent the aberrant hyperactivation of DDC signalling by lesions that are generated during DNA replication in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. On replication stress, cells lacking Slx4 or Rtt107 show hyperactivation of the downstream DDC kinase Rad53, whereas activation of the upstream DDC kinase Mec1 remains normal. An Slx4–Rtt107 complex counteracts the checkpoint adaptor Rad9 by physically interacting with Dpb11 and phosphorylated histone H2A, two positive regulators of Rad9-dependent Rad53 activation. A decrease in DDC signalling results from hypomorphic mutations in RAD53 and H2A and rescues the hypersensitivity to replication stress of cells lacking Slx4 or Rtt107. We propose that the Slx4–Rtt107 complex modulates Rad53 activation by a competition-based mechanism that balances the engagement of Rad9 at replication-induced lesions. Our findings show that DDC signalling is monitored and modulated through the direct action of DNA-repair factors.

Slx4 is an evolutionarily conserved DNA-repair scaffolding protein that is important for the cellular response to exogenous DNA-damaging agents, and mutations in human SLX4 were recently linked to Fanconi anaemia. In S. cerevisiae (budding yeast), cells that lack SLX4 (slx4Δ cells) are highly sensitive to methyl methanesulphonate (MMS), a DNA-alkylating agent that blocks replication and induces the DDC pathway. While investigating the activation status of the S. cerevisiae DDC kinase Rad53 in slx4Δ cells, we noted that MMS treatment leads to hyperphosphorylation, and thus hyperactivation, of Rad53 compared with in wild-type cells (Fig. 1a, Supplementary Fig. 1a), which is consistent with a previous report. However, the phosphorylation of histone H2A (also known as Htα1 and Htα2), a substrate of the upstream DDC kinase Mec1, at serine 129 (here referred to as H2A129) was not increased in slx4Δ cells (Fig. 1a, lower panel). These results suggest that the hyperactivation of Rad53 in slx4Δ cells is not caused by increased damage-induced Mec1 signalling but by improper downstream regulation of Rad53 activation. To test this possibility, we compared the phosphorytotome of wild-type and slx4Δ cells after MMS treatment, using quantitative mass spectrometry. Although most of the detected Mec1 targets were phosphorylated to the same extent in both cell types, Rad53-dependent phosphorylation was significantly higher in slx4Δ cells than in wild-type cells (Supplementary Fig. 1b), further supporting the idea that Slx4 has a role in specifically blocking Rad53 hyperactivation. Because the activation of Rad53 in response to MMS mostly depends on the checkpoint adaptor Rad9 (Fig. 1b and Supplementary Fig. 2), Slx4 probably counteracts Rad9-dependent Rad53 activation.

To test whether the sensitivity of slx4Δ cells to MMS is caused mostly by aberrant Rad53 hyperactivation, we used hypomorphic alleles of rad53 that result in lower Rad53 activation, reasoning that these alleles would rescue the MMS sensitivity of slx4Δ cells. Rad53 has two FHA domains, which bind to phosphorylated Rad9 in a redundant manner and mediate Rad53 activation (Fig. 1c). Mutations in the FHA2 domain promote a stronger reduction in MMS-induced Rad53 activation than do mutations in the FHA1 domain. Whereas a mutation (R70A, in which arginine is substituted with alanine at amino acid 70) in the FHA1 domain of Rad53 had no effect on the MMS sensitivity of slx4Δ cells, a mutation (R605A) in the FHA2 domain reduced the MMS sensitivity of slx4Δ cells (Fig. 1d). Consistent with our hypothesis that Rad53 hyperactivation is the cause of the MMS sensitivity of slx4Δ cells, mutation of the FHA2 domain resulted in a decrease in Rad53 activation in slx4Δ cells to a level similar to that of wild-type cells (Fig. 1e). Collectively, these results suggest that Slx4 has a crucial role in preventing excessive Rad9-dependent activation of Rad53 (Fig. 1f).

The levels of MMS used here require that cells pass through the S phase of the cell cycle for Rad53 to become active; therefore, our results suggest that Slx4 counteracts the Rad9–Rad53 pathway in response to replication-induced lesions. The finding that combined deletion of the SLX1 and RAD1 genes, which encode nucleases that are known to associate with Slx4, leads to lower MMS sensitivity and Rad53 activation than in slx4Δ cells (Supplementary Fig. 4) supports a nuclease-independent function for Slx4 during the cellular response to MMS-induced replication stress.

We recently reported that on replication stress, Slx4 binds to Dpb11 (ref. 14), a replication factor that is involved in DDC activation. Because Dpb11 binds to Rad9 and positively regulates Rad9-dependent Rad53 activation, we assessed whether the Slx4–Dpb11 interaction has a role in counteracting Rad53 activation during MMS treatment. We previously showed that phosphorylation of Slx4 by Mec1 mediates the interaction of Slx4 with Dpb11 and that an Slx4 mutant lacking seven Mec1 consensus phosphorylation sites (Slx4-7MUT) cannot stably interact with Dpb11 (ref. 14). Rad53 is hyperactivated in slx4Δ MMS-treated S. cerevisiae lysates (Fig. 2a), supporting a model in which the Slx4–Dpb11 interaction is important for preventing Rad53 hyperactivation.

Next, we tested whether the Slx4–Dpb11 interaction inhibits the ability of Rad9 to bind to Dpb11 in wild-type and slx4Δ cells. Deletion of SLX4 leads to a significant increase in the MMS-induced interaction between Dpb11 and Rad9 (Fig. 2b and Supplementary Fig. 5), suggesting that Slx4 and Rad9 compete for Dpb11 binding. Dpb11 contains two pairs of BRCT domains, which bind to phosphorylated motifs. We found that recombinant BRCT domains 1 and 2 (BRCT1/2) of Dpb11 can bind phosphorylated Slx4 and phosphorylated Rad9 from MMS-treated S. cerevisiae lysates (Fig. 2c). This finding is consistent with a model in which Slx4 and Rad9 compete for BRCT1/2 binding.

Dpb11 BRCT1/2 was previously shown to interact directly with cyclin-dependent kinase (CDK)-dependent phosphorylation sites in Sld3, thereby initiating DNA replication. To better understand the mechanism of the Slx4–Dpb11 interaction, we searched for a
CDK-targeting motif in Slx4 that resembles the Dpb11-binding region in Sld3. Notably, Slx4 contains proline-directed phosphorylation sites that align well with serine 600 (S600) and S622 of Sld3, which are important for the Dpb11–Sld3 interaction19,20 (Supplementary Fig. 6). We tested the importance of the proline-directed sites within the Sld3-like region of Slx4 and found that S486 of Slx4 is crucial for the MMS-induced interaction with Dpb11 (Fig. 2d). In addition, three canonical Mec1 phosphorylation sites (S/T-Q sites) that are important for mediating a robust Slx4–Dpb11 interaction14 are located in or near the Sld3-like Dpb11-binding region in Slx4. We conclude that the Slx4–Dpb11 interaction is mediated by the coordinated action of both Mec1 and a proline-directed kinase at a motif that is probably targeted by BRCT1/2 of Dpb11. Although we detected residual binding between Dpb11 and Slx4S486A, suggesting that the phosphorylation of S486 has a more important role in mediating the Slx4–Dpb11 interaction than the Mec1 consensus phosphorylation sites. This is also supported by the finding that slx4S486A leads to Rad53 hyperactivation (Fig. 2e) and to a higher MMS sensitivity than does slx4S70A (Fig. 2f). Interestingly, previous reports showed that proline-directed sites in Rad9 are also important for the Dpb11–Rad9 interaction17,18 (Supplementary Fig. 7).

To further test the model that Slx4 antagonizes Rad53 activation by binding to Dpb11 and outcompeting Rad9, we overexpressed Slx4 using an ADH1 or a TDH3 promoter and monitored different steps of checkpoint activation. In an early step in checkpoint activation, Rad9 assembles into a ternary complex with Dpb11 and Mec1 and is hyperphosphorylated by Mec1 (ref. 18). We first monitored the phosphorylation status of Rad9 in cells expressing Slx4 from its endogenous promoter and in cells overexpressing Slx4. Overexpression of wild-type Slx4 but not S486A mutated Slx4 significantly inhibited the MMS-induced hyperphosphorylation of Rad9 (Fig. 2g), as shown by the strong decrease in the slower migrating band at 45 and 60 min after release from α-factor arrest. We then monitored the effect of Slx4 overexpression on Rad53 activation in response to MMS treatment (Supplementary Fig. 8a). Although overexpression of Slx4 leads to a small but consistent decrease in Rad53 activation early in the response, we did not observe the same effect at later time points. We speculated that after 40 min, the Rad53 activation that was observed in Slx4-overexpressing cells was being mediated by a parallel mechanism based on Dot1-mediated histone H3K79 methylation, which can promote the recruitment of Rad9 to lesion sites independently of Dpb11 (ref. 21). We therefore monitored Rad53 activation in cells lacking DOT1 and found that Slx4 overexpression significantly reduces Rad53 activation also at later time points (Fig. 2h); this effect depends on S486 of Slx4 (Supplementary Fig. 8b, c). Next, we determined whether Slx4 overexpression specifically disrupts the Rad9–Dpb11 interaction. We detected hyperphosphorylated Rad9 in a Dpb11 pull-down from cells expressing Slx4 from its endogenous promoter, but we did not detect Rad9 in a Dpb11 pull-down using cells that overexpressed Slx4 (Fig. 2i). This effect was specific for S486 of Slx4. These findings support our model that Slx4 counters DDC signalling by binding to Dpb11 and preventing its stable interaction with Rad9 (Fig. 2j).
Rad53 activation. Rtt107 recognizes H2ApS129 through its carboxy-terminal pair of BRCT domains (BRCT5/6), and this region is essential for the role of Rtt107 in the MMS response22 (Supplementary Figs 9 and 10). Furthermore, the S129A mutation (h2a-S129A) abrogated Sxl4 phosphorylation on MMS treatment (Fig. 3b), suggesting that the recruitment of Rtt107 to H2ApS129 occurs upstream of Sxl4–Dpb11 complex formation. Because H2A\(^{S129}\) can function as a positive regulator of Rad9-dependent Rad53 activation23, we reasoned that the hyperactivation of Rad53 in \(rtt107A\) cells could be suppressed by h2a-S129A. \(rtt107A\) cells expressing the H2A(S129A) mutant had lower Rad53 activation and MMS sensitivity than did \(rtt107A\) cells expressing wild-type H2A (Fig. 3c, d). Disruption of the Rad9–H2A interaction by mutation of the C-terminal pair of BRCT domains of Rad9 (K1088M) partially rescued the MMS sensitivity of \(rtt107A\) cells (Supplementary Fig. 11a). A similar rescue was also observed when overexpressing BRCT5/6 of Rtt107 (Supplementary Fig. 11b). Taken together, these results show that, like Sxl4, Rtt107 also counteracts DDC signalling. The anti-checkpoint function of Rtt107 depends on its recognition of H2ApS129.

To further test the anti-checkpoint function of the Sxl4–Rtt107 complex, we developed an alternative experimental set-up in which the presence of Sxl4 would sensitise cells to replication stress by decreasing DDC signalling below the level required for a proper cellular response. For this set-up, we used cells lacking Mrc1, which is a checkpoint adaptor that works in parallel with Rad9. Mrc1 mediates Rad53 activation at stalled replication forks and therefore has a more...
central role than Rad9 in Rad53 activation in response to hydroxyurea4. On hydroxyurea treatment, mrc1 cells rely solely on Rad9 to activate Rad53. The interaction of Slx4 with Dpb11 was enhanced in mrc1 cells (Fig. 4a), especially in response to hydroxyurea, suggesting that the Slx4–Rtt107 complex actively counteracts Rad9 in mrc1 cells (Fig. 4b). Consistent with our finding that the Slx4–Dpb11 interaction requires H2A(S129), high levels of H2A(S129) accumulated close to the origins of replication in mrc1 cells after hydroxyurea treatment (Fig. 4c). Because we expect that the kinase activity of Rad53 is limiting in mrc1 cells, we reasoned that deletion of SLX4 would be beneficial in hydroxyurea-treated mrc1 cells, allowing more activation of Rad53 through Rad9. Consistent with this idea, mrc1Δh2aΔ cells had a significantly higher hydroxyurea resistance than mrc1 cells (Fig. 4d), and this resistance correlated with higher Rad53 activation (Fig. 4e). Taken together, these results show that Slx4 sensitizes mrc1 cells to replication stress, and they provide strong additional evidence that the Slx4–Rtt107 complex counteracts Rad9 in response to replication-induced lesions (see detailed model in Supplementary Fig. 12). Because this function of the Slx4–Rtt107 complex depends on Mec1-dependent phosphorylation, we propose that Slx4–Rtt107 is involved in a mechanism that we have named DAMP — dampens checkpoint adaptor-mediated phospho-signalling — by which DDC signalling self-monitors its activation state. We speculate that by uncoupling upstream Mec1 signalling from downstream Rad53 activation, DAMP could allow Mec1 to maintain control over specific effectors, such as repair enzymes, without an aberrant arrest in cell-cycle progression.

METHODS SUMMARY

The yeast strains and plasmids used are described in Supplementary Tables 3 and 4. The mass-spectrometry-based phosphorylation analyses of whole cell lysates or purified Rad53, as well as the other procedures used for cell growth and synchronisation, genotoxic treatment and chromatin immunoprecipitation analysis, are detailed in the Methods.

Full Methods and any associated references are available in the online version of the paper.
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METHODS

Yeast strains and plasmids. Strains generated in this study were derived either from MB164 or MBS191 (both congenic to S288C) or W303 (where indicated). Unless indicated, all tags were inserted at the C terminus of the corresponding genes by homologous recombination at the genomic loci and were verified by western blotting. Tagged strains were assayed for sensitivity to MMS to ensure they behaved similarly to the wild-type strain. Sensitivity assays were independently confirmed in strains derived from freshly sporulated diploids. Standard cloning methods were used to generate the plasmids for this study. Plasmids containing domains of Dbp11 or Rtt107 tagged at the amino terminus with a PATH tag (2× protein A + TEV cleavage site + 6× Histid) were based on the pET21a vector (Novagen). HA-tagged full-length Rtt107, together with its native promoter, was cloned into pH5S416 (Stratagene) to generate pMBS163. Wild-type alleles cloned into pRS416 or pFA6a vector. All point mutations were generated by site-directed mutagenesis using either the QuikChange Multi Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (Stratagene) or the Pfu Ultra II kit (Agilent). All yeast strains and plasmids used in this study are described in Supplementary Tables 3 and 4 and are available on request.

Cell synchronization and genotoxic treatment. Yeast cells were grown in yeast peptone dextrose (YPD) or drop-out medium at 30 °C. Log phase cultures (optical density at 600 nm = 0.3) were subjected to α-factor (0.5 μg ml⁻¹) or nocodazole (1.5 μg ml⁻¹) treatment for G1 or G2/M arrest, respectively. Cells were washed and resuspended in warm medium containing the indicated genotoxin.

Western blotting and immunoprecipitation. For western blotting, about 50 mg frozen cell pellet was lysed by bead beating at 4 °C in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 0.2% Tergitol, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM EDTA, 1 mM phenylmethylsulphonyl fluoride (PMSF), Complete, EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Roche) and PhosSTOP (Roche)). SDS loading buffer with 60 mM dithiothreitol (DTT) was added. Samples were separated by standard SDS-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS–PAGE). Proteins were detected using the following antibodies: anti-Rad53 (yc-19, 1:10,000, Santa Cruz Biotechnology), anti H2A (25–29, 07-0745, 1:10,000, Millipore), anti-HA (12CA5, 1:10,000, Roche) and anti-Flag (M2, 1:5,000, Sigma) antibodies. For immunoprecipitation (IP), approximately 100 mg frozen cell pellet was lysed by bead beating at 4 °C in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 0.2% Tergitol, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM EDTA, 1 mM PMSF, Complete, EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail, 5 mM sodium fluoride and 10 mM β-glycerophosphate). After adjusting protein concentrations to about 6 μg ml⁻¹, inputs were aliquoted, and lysates were incubated with either anti-HA or anti-Flag agarose resin (Sigma) for 2–3 h at 4 °C. After three washes in lysis buffer, proteins were eluted with three resin volumes of SDS elution buffer (100 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, and 1% SDS) for HA IP or of Flag peptide (Sigma) solution (0.5 μg ml⁻¹ in 100 mM Tris and 0.2% Tergitol) for Flag IP. SDS loading buffer with DTT was added, and samples were analysed by western blotting with the indicated antibodies.

Pull-down with recombinant BRCT domain. Protein domains (for Dbp11 BRCT1/2, amino acids 1–270; and BRCT3/4, amino acids 271–582) containing an N-terminal PATH tag (see Yeast strains and plasmids) were expressed in Escherichia coli, bound to human IgG–agarose resin (GE Healthcare) and then used as bait for pull-downs from yeast lysates as previously described27.

SILAC labelling of yeast. For mass spectrometry experiments, cells were grown in (−)Arg (−)Lys drop-out medium (‘light’ version complemented with normal arginine and lysine; ‘heavy’ version complemented with lysine 15N₁, 15N₂ and arginine 13C₁, 13C₂ for at least five generations. Purification of phosphopeptides by immobilized metal-ion affinity chromatography (IMAC). For the purification of Rad53 phosphopeptides, approximately 0.6 g cell pellet from wild-type (grown in heavy medium) or slsΔ (grown in heavy medium) strains was lysed by bead beating at 4 °C in 4 ml lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 0.2% Tergitol, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM EDTA, Complete, EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail, 5 mM sodium fluoride and 10 mM β-glycerophosphate). Lysates were incubated with anti-HA–agarose resin (Sigma) for 4 h at 4 °C. After three washes with lysis buffer, bound proteins were eluted with three resin volumes of elution buffer (100 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, and 1% SDS). Eluted proteins from light or heavy medium were mixed together, reduced, alkylated and precipitated. Proteins were resuspended in a solution of 2 M urea and 12.5 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, and digested with trypsin for 16 h at 37 °C. Phosphopeptides were enriched using an ‘in-house’ IMAC column, then eluted with 10% ammonium and 10% acetonitrile and dried in a SpeedVac evaporator.

Phosphoproteome analysis. Approximately 0.6 g cell pellet from wild-type (grown in light medium) and slsΔ (grown in heavy medium) strains was lysed by bead beating at 4 °C in 4 ml lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 0.2% Tergitol, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM EDTA, Complete, EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Roche), 5 mM sodium fluoride and 10 mM β-glycerophosphate). Protein lysates were denatured in 1% SDS, reduced, alkylated and then precipitated with three volumes of a solution containing 50% acetonitrile and 50% ethanol. Proteins were solubilized in a solution of 2 M urea, 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, and 150 mM NaCl, and then TPC1-treated trypsin was added. Digestion was performed overnight at 37 °C, and then trifluoroacetic acid and formic acid were added to a final concentration of 0.2%. Peptides were desalted with a Sep-Pak C18 column (Waters), dried in a SpeedVac evaporator and resuspended in 1% acetic acid. Phosphopeptides were enriched by IMAC as previously described28, reconstituted in 85 μl solution containing 50% acetonitrile and 1% formic acid, and fractionated by hydrophilic interaction liquid chromatography (HILIC) as previously described29, before analysis by liquid chromatography with tandem mass spectrometry (LC–MS/MS). More than 3,570 phosphopeptides were identified or quantified, and phosphopeptides containing a phosphorylation site known to be a Mecl target or a target of Rad53-dependent phosphorylation30,29 were selected.

Mass spectrometry analysis. IMAC elutions or HILIC fractions were eluted in a SpeedVac evaporator, reconstituted in 0.1% trifluoroacetic acid and analysed by LC–MS/MS using a 125 μM ID capillary C18 column and an Orbitrap XL mass spectrometer coupled with an Eksigent nanoflow system. Database searching was performed using the SORCERER system (Sage-N Research) running the program XPOSE. After searching a target-decoy budding yeast database, results were filtered either based on probability score to achieve a 1% false positive rate or manual inspection. Quantification of heavy/light peptide isotope ratios was performed using the Xpress program as previously described31.

Chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP). Cultures were grown in YPD to an optical density at 600 nm = 0.3, arrested in G1 with α-factor for 2 h and released in the presence of 200 mM hydroxyurea (HU) for 1 h. Cultures were formaldehyde-crosslinked (1% final concentration) for 20 min followed by quenching with 125 mM glycine. Protein–DNA complexes were immunoprecipitated with a yeast-specific anti-phospho-histone (H2A)2 antibody (07-745, Millipore). Quantitative PCR was performed with the purified DNA from the immunoprecipitate as previously described32 using pairs of primers designed to amplify the genome sequences shown in Fig. 4c. The primer sequences were as follows: 39.3Kb_for, 5'-GGGAGATTCCATTTCCGCA; 47.3Kb_for, 5'-GGCCAGACGTACATTAGGAACA-3', 39.3Kb_rev, 5'-CCCCGGAATGCATACGATGGAACA-3'; 43.1Kb_rev, 5'-TCAAGTTGCTGGTTATGATGCC-3', 43.1Kb_rev, 5'-CACTGTCTCGCTTGTCAAGTTGCT-3'; 47.3Kb_for, 5'-TTATCTGGGCGCTTTTGGTGC-3', and 47.3Kb_rev, 5'-GGGAGATTCCATTTCCGCA-3'.
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