Thymidine nucleotides are required for faithful DNA synthesis and repair, and their \textit{de novo} biosynthesis is regulated by serine hydroxymethyltransferase 1 (SHMT1). The SHMT1 transcript contains a heavy chain ferritin, heterogeneous nuclear ribonucleoprotein H2, and CUG-binding protein 1-responsive internal ribosome entry site (IRES) that regulates SHMT1 translation. In this study a non-lethal dose of UVC is shown to increase SHMT1 IRES activity and protein levels in four different cell lines. The mechanism for the UV-induced activation of the SHMT1 IRES involves an increase in heavy chain ferritin and heterogeneous nuclear ribonucleoprotein H2 expression and the translocation of CUG-binding protein 1 from the nucleus to the cytoplasm. The UV-induced increase in SHMT1 translation is accompanied by an increase in the small ubiquitin-like modifier-dependent nuclear localization of the \textit{de novo} thymidylate biosynthesis pathway and a decrease in DNA strand breaks, indicating a role for SHMT1 and nuclear folate metabolism in DNA repair.

UV radiation is mutagenic and damages cellular macromolecules, including proteins, lipids, and DNA. Thymine bases within DNA are sensitive to UV-induced damage, forming cyclobutane-type pyrimidine dimers and (6–4)-photoproducts. These lesions hinder RNA polymerase processivity and, thus, inhibit transcription. In mammalian cells, cyclobutane-type pyrimidine dimers and (6–4)-photoproducts are repaired by nucleotide excision repair (NER). Several studies have demonstrated that whereas the majority of 5,10-methylene-THF derived from the reduction of 10-formyl-THF or through the activity of thymidylate synthase (TS)-catalyzed conversion of deoxyuridine monophosphate (dUMP) to thymidylate, 5,10-Methylene-THF can be generated by two alternative pathways; that is, the reduction of 10-formyl-THF or through the activity of serine hydroxymethyltransferase 1 (SHMT1), which catalyzes the conversion of THF and serine to glycine and 5,10-methylene-THF.

The SHMT1 enzyme is a key regulator of \textit{de novo} thymidylate biosynthesis and is poised to play a role in the repair of UV-induced DNA damage. In addition to providing 1-carbon units for the synthesis of thymidylate, SHMT1-derived 5,10-methylene-THF can be reduced by methylene-THF reductase to form 5-methyl-THF, a cofactor utilized in the remethylation of homocysteine to methionine (see Fig. 1). The concentration of free folate in the cell is negligible, and therefore, TS and methylene-THFR compete for limiting pools of the 5,10-methylene-THF cofactor (5–8). Several studies have demonstrated that whereas the majority of 5,10-methylene-THF derived from the reduction of 10-formyl-THF is directed toward the synthesis of methionine (9, 10), SHMT1-derived 5,10-methylene-THF is partitioned to TS (11) through the cell cycle-dependent and small ubiquitin-like modifier (SUMO)-mediated nuclear localization of the thymidylate biosynthesis pathway (12, 13) that enables the nuclear \textit{de novo} synthesis of thymidylate (14) (Fig. 1).

The DNA damage caused by UV radiation evokes adaptive cellular responses which include cell cycle arrest (15) and changes in transcription (16, 17) and translation. At the translational level, UV radiation reduces global cap-dependent protein synthesis by inducing the phosphorylation of eukaryotic initiation factor 2α (eIF2α) (18–20) and thereby preventing the recycling of the ternary complex (eIF2GTP-tRNA\textsubscript{Met}) (21). Despite the reduction in cap-dependent translation, several mRNAs whose protein products are essential for the UV-induced stress response (for example, p53 (22) and Atpaf-1 (23)) have evolved alternative mechanisms of protein synthesis that allow for their continued expression after exposure to UV. One
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**FIGURE 1. Folate-mediated one-carbon metabolism.** Folate-mediated one-carbon metabolism is required for de novo synthesis of purines and thymidylate and for the remethylation of homocysteine to methionine. Mitochondrial-derived formate can enter the cytoplasm and function as a one-carbon donor through the conversion of THF to 10-formyl-THF. 5,10-Methylene-THF, which can be generated through the reduction of 10-formyl-THF or through the catalytic activity of SHMT1, provides the one-carbon units for the TS-catalyzed conversion of dUMP to thymidylate. It also serves as a substrate for methylene-THF reductase (MTHFR), which reduces 5,10-methyleneTHF to ultimately form 5-adenosylmethionine (AdoMet), the one-carbon donor in numerous cellular methylation reactions. De novo thymidylate biosynthesis also occurs in the nucleus through the SUMO-dependent import of the thymidylate synthesis pathway during S-phase. Hcy, homocysteine; DHF, dihydrofolate.

such mechanism involves ribosome recruitment to an internal ribosome entry site (IRES) located within the 5′-untranslated region (UTR) of the transcript (24, 25).

We have previously shown that the SHMT1 5′-UTR contains an IRES whose activity is stimulated by heavy chain ferritin (H ferritin), heterogeneous nuclear ribonucleoprotein H2 (hnRNP H2) (55), and CUG-binding protein 1 (CUGBP1) (26). However, the responsiveness of the IRES to stress stimuli that inhibit cap-dependent translation has not been explored. In the present study we demonstrate the role of the SHMT1 IRES- and SUMO-mediated nuclear translocation of the folate-dependent nuclear thymidylate biosynthesis in UV-induced DNA damage repair.

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

**Cell Culture**—Human MCF-7 mammary adenocarcinoma cells (HTB22), HeLa cells (CC12), and pagetoid sarcoma skin fibroblasts (CRL-7677) were obtained from ATCC. The human SH-SY5Y neuroblastoma, a subline of the SK-N-SH neuroblastoma, was obtained from June Biedler (Fordham University). MCF-7, HeLa, and SH-SY5Y cells were cultured in α-MEM (HyClone Laboratories) containing 11% fetal bovine serum (HyClone Laboratories). Pagetoid sarcoma skin fibroblasts were cultured in Dulbecco’s modified Eagle’s medium (Invitrogen) containing 11% fetal bovine serum (HyClone Laboratories). All cells were maintained at 37 °C and 5% CO₂.

**Treatment and Preparation of Cell Extracts**—MCF-7 cells at 30% confluence were arrested at the G₂/M phase of the cell cycle by treatment with 60 ng/ml nocodazole (Calbiochem) for 24 h. Cell cycle analysis was carried out by fluorescence-activated cell sorting using 3 mM sodium citrate containing 1% Triton X-100 and 50 ng/ml propidium iodide as the lysis/DNA binding reagent. For experiments involving UV treatment, cells at 95% confluence were washed twice with phosphate-buffered saline and then exposed to 10,000 μJ/cm² UV (254 nm) using the Stratagene UV Stratalinker 2400. The medium was then replaced, and the cells were cultured under normal conditions. At the indicated time intervals after treatment, the cells were harvested by trypsinization and washed in phosphate-buffered saline. To obtain whole cell extracts, the cells were resuspended in lysis buffer (50 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 1% Nonidet P-40, 5 mM EDTA, 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride, 1:100 dilution of Sigma protease inhibitor mixture, 10 mM N-ethylmaleimide) and lysed on ice for 30 min. Nuclear and cytoplasmic extracts were obtained using the NE-PER nuclear and cytoplasmic extraction kit (Pierce) according to the manufacturer’s protocol. The protein concentration of all extracts was determined using the Lowry assay as modified by Bensadoun and Weinstein (27).

**Trypan Blue Exclusion**—MCF-7 cells were treated with UV according to the protocol above. 24 h after UV exposure the cells were harvested by trypsinization, pelleted by centrifugation, and then resuspended in serum-free α-MEM. The suspension was then diluted 1:1 with 0.4% trypan blue (Invitrogen), and the viable and non-viable cells were counted using a hemocytometer.

**Metabolic Labeling**—Control and UV-irradiated cells were labeled with 100 μCi/ml EasyTag™ Expre35S™ protein labeling mix (PerkinElmer Life Sciences, 1175 Ci/mmol) for 30 min in methionine/cysteine-free Dulbecco’s modified Eagle’s medium (Sigma). Cells were then harvested and lysed as described above. The protein concentration of all extracts was determined using the Lowry assay as modified by Bensadoun and Weinstein (27), and equal amounts of extract were separated by 12% SDS-PAGE. The gel was stained with Coomassie Blue (R-250), dried, and autoradiographed. To quantify the amount of 35S incorporation, equal amounts of protein were precipitated with trichloroacetic acid, and radioactivity was quantified in a LS 6500 multipurpose scintillation counter (Beckman Coulter).

**Western Blotting**—Proteins were separated by SDS-PAGE using a Tris-glycine gel and transferred to a polyvinylidene difluoride membrane. The membrane was blocked with 5% nonfat dry milk in phosphate-buffered saline containing 1% Nonidet P-40 for 1 h at room temperature, incubated with primary antibody overnight at 4 °C, and then incubated with horseradish peroxidase-conjugated anti-IgG for 1–3 h at room
temperature. After each incubation, the membrane was washed with phosphate-buffered saline, 0.1% Tween 20. Proteins were visualized using Super Signal® substrate (Pierce) followed by autoradiography. Mouse anti-phospho-p53 (Ser-15, Cell Signaling) was used at a 1:1000 dilution, rabbit anti-phospho-eIF2α (Ser51, Cell Signaling) was used at a 1:1000 dilution, affinity-purified sheep anti-human SHMT1 was used at a 1:40,000 dilution, sheep anti-TS (Abcam) was used at a 1:2000 dilution, mouse anti-CUGBP1 (3B1, Santa Cruz Biotechnology) was used at a 1:10,000 dilution, affinity-purified sheep anti-H ferritin was used at a 1:500 dilution, goat anti-hnRNP H (N-16, Santa Cruz Biotechnology) was used at a 1:1000 dilution, rabbit anti-SUMO-1 (Active Motif) was used at a 1:1000 dilution, rabbit anti-p53 (Active Motif) was used at a 1:1000 dilution, goat anti-eIF2α (Santa Cruz Biotechnology) was used at a 1:1000 dilution, goat anti-Lamin A (H-102, Santa Cruz Biotechnology) was used at a 1:100 dilution, and mouse anti-GAPDH (Novus Biologicals) was used at a 1:14,000 dilution. Goat anti-mouse IgG, rabbit anti-sheep IgG, rabbit anti-goat IgG, and goat anti-rabbit IgG were all purchased from Pierce and used at a 1:5000 dilution. When necessary, membranes were stripped with 0.2 M sodium hydroxide.

Real Time PCR—RNA was extracted from cells using Trizol (Invitrogen) according to the manufacturer’s protocol. After incubating with DNase I for 1 h at 37 °C to remove any residual DNA, the RNA was purified using the RNeasy mini kit (Qiagen) and reverse-transcribed to cDNA using the High Capacity cDNA reverse transcription kit (Applied Biosystems). The PCR was carried out using either the 2X Taqman Universal PCR mix and 6-carboxyfluorescein-labeled Taqman probes complimentary to SHMT1 (Hs0051038_m1) and GAPDH (Hs99999905_m1) or the QuantiFast SYBR Green PCR kit (Qiagen) and primers complimentary to Fluc (5'-TCACTTGGAGCCCTGCAGACATT-3' (forward) and 5'-GCCATGCAGTCTCCGAAAATGGG-3' (reverse)), CUGBP1 (5'-TCACTTGGAGCCCTGCAGACATT-3' (forward) and 5'-AGCAGATATTTGCTGGATACC-3' (reverse)), and ATF4 (5'-CCAACACAGCAAGGAAGATGCTCTTTC-3' (forward) and 5'-GGATCATGCGAACTGTTACG-3' (reverse)).

Generation of Capped Bicistronic mRNA for Use in MCF-7 Cell Transfections—The generation of pSP64 poly(A) DNA templates containing the Renilla and Firefly luciferase reporter genes and either the SHMT1 5'-UTR, SHMT1 5'-UTR, and 3'-UTR, the reverse complement of the SHMT1 5'-UTR (reverse UTR), or the mouse SHMT1 5'-UTR is described elsewhere (26). The DNA templates were linearized with EcoRI and purified using the Roche Applied Science PCR clean-up column. The templates were transcribed using the T7 mMESSAGE mMACHINE kit (Ambion) according to the manufacturer’s protocol. The crude mRNA was treated with DNase I (Ambion) for 15 min at 40 °C and precipitated in 2 M LiCl at −80 °C. All RNA procedures were conducted under RNase-free conditions, and all mRNA was stored with Recombinant RNasin® ribonuclease inhibitor (Promega). The mRNA was quantified by spectrophotometry, and its quality was verified by electrophoresis.

mRNA Transfections—Cells were cultured in 6-well plates and then treated with UVC or nocodazole according to the protocol above. 12 h after UV treatment or 24 h after nocodazole treatment, the cells were incubated in Opti-MEM (Invitrogen) containing a 1:100 dilution of DMRIE-C transfection reagent (Invitrogen) and 5 μg/ml bicistronic mRNA (capped and polyadenylated) for 4 h at 37 °C and 5% CO₂. The Opti-MEM was then replaced with α-MEM or Dulbecco’s modified Eagle’s medium, and the cells were incubated for an additional 6 h at 37 °C and 5% CO₂. Renilla and Firefly Luciferase activity was quantified on a Veritas Microplate Luminometer (Turner Biosystems) using the Dual-Glo luciferase assay system (Promega) according to the manufacturer’s protocol.

siRNA Transfections—MCF-7 cells were grown to ∼40% confluence in 6-well plates. The cells were transfected with 5 nm concentrations of either negative control siRNA (Ambion), hnRNP H2 siRNA (Qiagen; r(CAU GAG AGU ACA UAU UGA A)dTdT (sense) and r(UUC AUU AUG UAC UCAU G)dCdG (antisense)), or CUGBP1 siRNA (Qiagen; r(GGACUGUUCUCCGAAACAGU)dTdT (sense) and r(UACUGUGUGCAGAGUUC)dCdG (antisense)) using the HiPerFect transfection reagent (Qiagen) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. After incubation with siRNA for 48 h at 37 °C and 5% CO₂, the cells were treated with UVC according to the protocol above. The cells were then either lysed and subjected to SDS-PAGE/immunoblot analysis to determine knockdown efficiency or used in mRNA transfection experiments as described above.

Immunofluorescence—MCF-7 cells were grown on sterile coverslips to ∼30% confluence and then exposed to 10,000 μJ/cm² UV (254 nm) according to the protocol above. 22 h after UV treatment, the coverslips were incubated in phosphate-buffered saline containing 10 μM DRAQ5 (Biostatus Ltd.) for 5 min at room temperature and then fixed with 100% methanol for 5 min. After a brief wash in phosphate-buffered saline, the
coverslips were blocked with phosphate-buffered saline containing 2% bovine serum albumen and 0.1% Triton X-100. After 2 h the blocking solution was removed, and the coverslips were incubated in phosphate-buffered saline containing 2% bovine serum albumen and a 1:250 dilution of mouse anti-CUGBP1 (3B1, Santa Cruz Biotechnology) for 2 h at room temperature. After extensive washing with phosphate-buffered saline, the coverslips were incubated in phosphate-buffered saline containing 2% bovine serum albumen and a 1:500 dilution of an Alexa-Fluor 488-conjugated goat anti-mouse IgG secondary antibody (Invitrogen) for 1 h. The coverslips were then washed extensively with phosphate-buffered saline and mounted to slides using Fluoromount-G (Southern Biotech). The cells were visualized using a Leica TCS SP2 confocal microscope at the Cornell University Microscopy and Imaging Facility.

**Comet Assay**—MCF-7 cells were grown to ~20% confluence in 6-well plates. The cells were transfected with 5 nm concentrations of either negative control siRNA (Ambion) or SHMT1 siRNA (Qiagen; r(CUAGGCUCUUUGCUUAAAUA)dTdT (sense) and r(UAUAUAGCAAGAGCCUAG)dGdG (antisense)) using the HiPerFect transfection reagent (Qiagen) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. After incubation with siRNA for 5 h at 37 °C and 5% CO2, the cells were exposed to 10,000 µJ/cm2 UV (254 nm) according to the protocol above. At the indicated times after UV treatment, the cells were scraped from the plate. Half of the cells were subjected to Western blot analysis according to the protocol above to confirm SHMT1 knockdown. The other half were resuspended in α-MEM (Hyclone Laboratories) supplemented with 10% DMSO and 20 mM EDTA, pH 7.5, dispensed into cryogenic tubes, frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at −80 °C.

The cryopreserved cells from above were thawed at room temperature and then diluted to a final concentration of 10^5 cells/ml with phosphate-buffered saline, pH 7.4. The diluted cells were then combined 1:10 with 1% low melting point agarose and dispensed onto a CometSlide (Trevigen). After the agarose solidified, the slides were immersed in lysis solution (10% DMSO, 1% Triton X-100, 2.5 M NaCl, 100 mM EDTA, 10 mM Tris, pH 10.2) for 1–3 h at 4 °C. After a 10-min incubation in 0.4 M Tris, pH 7.5, the slides were placed in an electrophoresis tank and incubated in alkaline (pH 13) electrophoresis buffer (0.3 M NaOH, 1 mM EDTA, pH 8.0) for 20 min at 4 °C to allow the unwinding of supercoiled DNA. Electrophoresis was carried out at 27 V for 40 min at 4 °C. The slides were then incubated in 0.4 M Tris, pH 7.5, for 15 min, washed for 5 min in 100% ethanol, and dried overnight. To assess DNA damage, the dried slides were flooded with SYBR GoldTM (Invitrogen) and then visualized at 20× magnification using a fluorescent microscope (Olympus BX-50) at the Cornell University Microscopy and Imaging Facility. Cells were photographed using a QImaging Retiga EXi cooled CCD camera and analyzed using Komet 5.5 software (Andor Technology). The parameters analyzed included % tail DNA (the proportion of DNA that has migrated from the nucleoid core), tail length (the distance (microns) of DNA migration from the nucleoid core), extent tail moment (% tail DNA/tail length/100), and olive tail moment ((tail center of gravity - head center of gravity) × % tail DNA/100). The olive tail moment value captures both the smallest detectable size of migrating DNA (which is quantified in the comet tail length) and the number of strand breaks (quantified by the intensity of DNA in the tail). The mean value from 75 scored cells was taken as an index of damage for a given sample. Sensitivity of the assay was established by incubating untreated MCF-7 cells in 0, 50, 100, or 200 µM hydrogen peroxide for 15 min before lysis and then quantifying the

**FIGURE 2.** Nascent protein synthesis decreases after UV treatment. A, MCF-7 cells were treated with 10,000 µJ/cm2 UVC (254 nm). At the indicated times after UV treatment, the cells were pulse-labeled with [35S]Met/Cys, and total cell extracts were resolved by SDS-PAGE. The gel was then stained with Coomassie Blue (right panel) to visualize total proteins followed by autoradiography (left panel) to detect newly synthesized proteins. B, equal amounts of protein from A were precipitated with trichloroacetic acid, and 35S incorporation was quantified in a scintillation counter. The counts per min recorded for the 0 h sample was given a value of 1.0. The data represent the average of three independent trichloroacetic acid precipitations ± S.E.
The concordance of each measured parameter in relation to hydrogen peroxide concentration ($R^2$) ranged from 0.92 to 0.96.

**Thiazolyl Blue Tetrazolium Bro-mide (MTT) Assay**—MCF-7 cells were treated with either negative control siRNA or SHMT1 siRNA and then exposed to 10,000 $\mu$/cm$^2$ UVC according to the protocol above. 24 h after UV treatment, MTT (Sigma) was added to the medium (final concentration of MTT, 0.5 mg/ml). After a 1-h incubation at 37 °C, 5% CO$_2$, the media were removed from the cells, and the insoluble formazan (formed by the reduction of MTT by living mitochondria) was resuspended in DMSO. The absorbance at 550 nm was measured using a Dynex MRXTC II microplate reader.

**Immunoprecipitations**—MCF-7 whole cell extracts were incubated for 2 h at 4 °C with 40 $\mu$g of protein A/G-conjugated agarose beads (Pierce) to remove nonspecific matrix-binding proteins. The pre-cleared extracts were incubated with 10 $\mu$g of either sheep IgG (Pierce), affinity-purified sheep anti-human SHMT1 antibody, or sheep-anti-human TS antibody (Abcam) overnight at 4 °C. 40 $\mu$l of the protein A/G-agarose beads were then added, and the reaction was allowed to incubate for 2 h at 4 °C. The beads were collected and washed 5 times with lysis buffer (50 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 1% Nonidet P-40, 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride, 1:100 dilution of Sigma protease inhibitor mixture), and bound proteins were eluted in 2 $\mu$l SDS-PAGE sample buffer (160 mM Tris, pH 6.8, 4% SDS, 20% glycerol) at 95 °C for 10 min. The samples were analyzed by Western blotting as described above, except that TrueBlot™ (eBio-science, 1:1000 dilution) was used as the secondary antibody to eliminate IgG contamination.

**RESULTS**

The Expression of SHMT1 Is Induced by UV Radiation—Previously we showed that SHMT1 is rate-limiting for de novo thymidylate biosynthesis during DNA replication in MCF-7 cells (28) and that mice lacking SHMT1 exhibit elevated levels of uracil in nuclear DNA (29). In this study the effect of UV radiation on resulting comets as stated above. The concordance of each measured parameter in relation to hydrogen peroxide concentration ($R^2$) ranged from 0.92 to 0.96.
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SHMT1 protein levels was examined to investigate the regulation of the enzymes in the nuclear thymidylate biosynthesis pathway during DNA repair. MCF-7 cells were treated with 10,000 $\mu$/cm$^2$ UVC (254 nm). This dose of UV was not lethal, as 90% of treated cells remained viable 24 h after UV exposure compared with 97% of untreated cells. However, the dose was sufficient to evoke a stress response. As anticipated based on previous studies (18–20, 30), global protein synthesis was impaired (Fig. 2, A and B), p53 protein levels increased (Fig. 3A), and both p53 and eIF2$\alpha$ became phosphorylated in a time-dependent manner after UV exposure (Fig. 3A), indicating that DNA damage had occurred and that cap-dependent protein synthesis was reduced. Western blot analysis of SHMT1 protein levels revealed that despite the decrease in cap-dependent translation, SHMT1 protein levels were increased 12 and 24 h after UV treatment (Fig. 3A). The increase in SHMT1 protein levels in response to UV exposure was not specific to MCF-7 cells, as similar results were obtained with cervical cancer (HeLa) cells (Fig. 3B), transformed skin fibroblasts (Fig. 3C), and neuroblastoma (SH-SY5Y) cells (Fig. 3D).

The SHMT1 IRES Is UV-responsive—SHMT1 mRNA levels did not increase after UV treatment, indicating that the increase in SHMT1 protein levels may be because of elevated rates of translation. Consistent with this hypothesis, the polysome analysis of untreated (Fig. 4A) and UV-treated (Fig. 4B) MCF-7 cells revealed that SHMT1 mRNA continued to be actively translated after UV exposure. CUGBP1 mRNA, which is not known to contain IRES activity, was not associated with polysomes after UV exposure (Fig. 4B). Because cellular IREs are typically responsive to stress stimuli that inhibit global cap-dependent translation (24), the effect of UV treatment on SHMT1 IRES activity was investigated. After UV treatment, MCF-7 cells, HeLa cells, transformed skin fibroblasts, and SH-SY5Y cells were transfected with bicistronic mRNAs. The bicistronic transcript contained the SHMT1 5’-UTR inserted between the Renilla luciferase (Rluc) and Firefly luciferase (Fluc) reporter genes and the SHMT1 3’-UTR located 3’ of the Fluc gene (Fig. 5A). Whereas expression of the first cistron in this transcript (Rluc) is cap-dependent, expression of the second cistron (Fluc) is dependent on IRES activity. The activity of the SHMT1 IRES increased significantly in all UV-exposed cells compared with unexposed cells as quantified by the Fluc/Rluc ratio (Fig. 5B). Bicistronic mRNAs containing either the reverse complement of the SHMT1 5’-UTR or the mouse SHMT1 5’-UTR, both of which have been shown previously to lack IRES activity (26), were not stimulated by UV exposure (Fig. 5C). The results from these control bicistronic mRNAs demonstrate that SHMT1 IRES activity is associated only with the human 5’-UTR and indicate that ribosomal re-initiation cannot account for the induction of Fluc translation after UV exposure. Real-time PCR analysis of Fluc and Rluc RNA levels after the transfections revealed that degradation of the bicistronic construct is likewise not respon-

FIGURE 5. UV treatment results in an increase in SHMT1 IRES activity. A, shown is the bicistronic construct used to quantify SHMT1 IRES activity. It consists of (in the 5’ to 3’ direction) a cap analog, the Rluc reporter gene followed by three sequential in-frame stop codons, the human SHMT1 5’-UTR, which contains the IRES element, the Fluc reporter gene, the human SHMT1 3’-UTR, which was shown to stimulate SHMT1 IRES activity (26), and a 30-nucleotide poly(A) tail. B, untreated (light bars) and UV-treated (dark bars) cells were transiently transfected with the bicistronic construct in A. 22 h after treatment Fluc and Rluc activities were quantified. The relative ratio of total Fluc activity divided by total Rluc activity in untreated cells was given a value of 1.0. The data represent the average of three independent experiments ± S.E. C, untreated (light bars) and UV-treated (dark bars) MCF-7 cells were transiently transfected with either the bicistronic construct containing the human SHMT1 5’-UTR or bicistronic constructs where the human SHMT1 5’-UTR was replaced with either the reverse (Rev) complement of the human SHMT1 5’-UTR or the mouse SHMT1 5’-UTR. None of the bicistronic constructs used in this experiment contained the SHMT1 3’-UTR. IRES activity is reported as the ratio of total Fluc activity divided by total Rluc activity as measured 22 h after UV treatment. The data represent the average of three independent experiments ± S.E. D, MCF-7 cells were treated with 10,000 $\mu$/cm$^2$ UVC and transiently transfected with the bicistronic mRNA in A. 22 h after UV treatment, total RNA was extracted from the cells and reverse-transcribed into cDNA. Rluc and Fluc mRNA levels were determined by real-time PCR. The data represent the average of three independent experiments ± S.E.
The UV-induced Increase in SHMT1 IRES Activity Is Mediated by H Ferritin, hnRNP H2, and CUGBP1—SHMT1 IRES activity has previously been shown to be stimulated by H ferritin (26) and the IRES trans-acting factors hnRNP H2 and CUGBP1 (26, 55). It is known that the regulation of many cellular IRESs during stress conditions depends on a change in concentration and/or subcellular location of IRES trans-acting factors. For example, during apoptosis, an increase in polypyrimidine tract binding protein levels correlates with the activity of apoptotic IRESs (31); the genotoxic-stress-induced IRES-mediated translation of BAG-1 results from the relocalization of the BAG-1 IRES trans-acting factors from the nucleus to the cytoplasm (32), and the relocalization of hnRNP A1 from the nucleus to the cytoplasm after osmotic shock inhibits XIAP IRES activity (33). Thus, given the significant role that H ferritin, hnRNP H2, and CUGBP1 play in the stimulation of SHMT1 IRES activity, their concentration and/or subcellular localization after UV treatment was investigated.

Several transcription factors are activated by UV-induced DNA damage. Among them is NFκB (34), a known activator of H ferritin expression (35). In agreement with the UV-induced activation of NFκB, Western blot analysis of H ferritin protein levels in MCF-7 cells, HeLa cells, transformed skin fibroblasts, and SH-SY5Y cells revealed a time-dependent increase after UV treatment (Fig. 3, A–D).

Western blot analysis of hnRNP H1/H2 protein levels in all four cell lines also revealed a time-dependent increase after UV treatment (Fig. 3, A–D). To determine whether hnRNP H2 is essential for SHMT1 IRES activation by UV, siRNA was used to reduce hnRNP H2 protein levels in MCF-7 cells by 60–70% (Fig. 6A). After UV treatment, these cells were transfected with bicistronic mRNAs containing either the SHMT1 5′-UTR or the SHMT1 5′- and 3′-UTRs. Although hnRNP H2 depletion had no effect on the IRES activity of mRNA containing the 5′-UTR alone, the IRES activity of mRNA containing the 5′- and 3′-UTRs decreased 33% in UV- and hnRNP H2 siRNA-treated cells compared with UV-treated control cells (Fig. 6B). This reduction in IRES activity correlates with the decrease in SHMT1 protein levels observed upon hnRNP H2 knockdown in UV-treated cells (Fig. 6A).

In contrast to H ferritin and hnRNP H2, CUGBP1 protein levels decreased after UV exposure in the majority of the cell types tested (Fig. 3, A–D). However, given that CUGBP1 is primarily a nuclear protein under normal cellular conditions (36, 37), we hypothesized that CUGBP1 cellular localization changes, thereby enabling increased SHMT1 IRES activity after UV treatment. To test this hypothesis we determined the nuclear versus cytoplasmic distribution of CUGBP1 in MCF-7 cells by Western blot analysis (Fig. 7A) and immunofluorescence (Fig. 7B) 22 h after UV exposure. Both methods showed that CUGBP1 protein levels increase in the cytoplasm and decrease in the nucleus after UV treatment. CUGBP1 was also shown to be essential for IRES activation by UV. Treatment of MCF-7 cells with CUGBP1 siRNA depleted CUGBP1 protein levels by 90% compared with cells treated with negative control siRNA (Fig. 7C) and reduced SHMT1 protein levels (Fig. 7C) and IRES activity (Fig. 7D) in UV-treated cells by 50% compared with levels in cells treated with negative control siRNA. CUGBP1 depletion had the greatest impact on UV-activated IRES activity when the SHMT1 3′-UTR was present in the...
bicistronic construct (Fig. 7D). Previously, we have shown that CUGBP1 exerts its effect on SHMT1 IRES activity by binding to the 3'-UTR of the transcript (26, 55). These data indicate that the increase in H ferritin and hnRNP H2 expression combined with the relocalization of CUGBP1 to the cytoplasm is responsible for the UV-mediated increase in SHMT1 IRES activity.

**The Increase in SHMT1 Levels Is Independent of Cell Cycle**—The increase in SHMT1 IRES activity could result directly from UV exposure or result from UV-induced inhibition of the cell cycle. Indeed, 24 h after UV exposure, MCF-7 cells exhibited cell cycle arrest in the G2/M phase. Many cellular IRESs are known to be activated during G2/M when cap-dependent translation is inhibited (38–40). To determine whether the enhanced levels of SHMT1 protein resulted directly from UV treatment or resulted from a UV-induced G2/M cell cycle block, MCF-7 cells were treated with nocodazole, and changes in SHMT1 IRES activity, protein expression, and protein localization were monitored. Like UV, nocodazole arrests cells in the G2/M phase of the cell cycle, but whereas UV acts by causing DNA damage, nocodazole acts by disrupting microtubules. After nocodazole treatment, 74% of the cells were arrested in the G2/M phase compared with 24% after UV treatment. However, nocodazole treatment did not affect SHMT1 IRES activity (Fig. 8A) or SHMT1, hnRNP H, or H ferritin protein levels (Fig. 8B). As in the case with UV treatment, CUGBP1 protein levels decreased in response to nocodazole treatment (Fig. 8B), but there was no relocalization from the nucleus to the cytoplasm (Fig. 8C). These results demonstrate that the increase in SHMT1 levels after UV treatment was not the result of cell cycle arrest at G2/M and raised the possibility that SHMT1, through its involvement in de novo thymidylate biosynthesis, plays a role in NER.

**SHMT1 Enhances Genome Stability after UV Exposure**—To test the hypothesis that SHMT1 is involved in the repair of UV-induced DNA damage, we determined the impact of SHMT1 depletion (Fig. 9A) on genome stability after UV treatment using the comet assay. The assay involves the use of electrophoresis to separate intact DNA from damaged DNA, which forms a “comet” (Fig. 9B). The head of the comet represents intact DNA, and DNA-containing strand breaks comprises the comet tail. Four different parameters...
were calculated for each comet as defined under “Experimental Procedures”: % tail DNA, extent tail moment, olive tail moment, and tail length. All parameters are directly proportional to the amount of DNA strand breaks. Before UV treatment, SHMT1 depletion did not affect any of the comet assay parameters, indicating that SHMT1 did not influence DNA integrity before UV exposure. After UV exposure, SHMT1 depletion resulted in increased levels of DNA damage compared with the control cells for each comet assay parameter measured (Fig. 9, C–F). The increased amount of DNA damage in the SHMT1-depleted cells correlates with the reduced viability of these cells relative to control cells after UV treatment (Fig. 9G) and supports a role for SHMT1 in the repair of UV-induced DNA damage.

**SHMT1 and TS Localize to the Nucleus in Response to UV Treatment—**De novo thymidylate biosynthesis occurs in both the cytoplasm and the nucleus (Fig. 1). Nuclear thymidylate biosynthesis is enabled by the SUMO-dependent nuclear import of SHMT1 and TS (12, 13). An increase in SUMOylation in response to UV treatment has previously been reported for several proteins involved in cellular stress response including TIP60 (41), xeroderma pigmentosum, complementation group C (42), and DJ-1 (43). Immunoprecipitation of SHMT1 and TS from untreated and UV-treated MCF-7 whole cell extract revealed that the SUMOylation of these proteins is likewise increased in response to UV radiation (Fig. 10, A and B). These findings are supported by an increase in the amount of SHMT1 and TS in the nucleus of UV-treated cells (Fig. 10C). In the case of TS, increased nuclear concentration occurs despite an overall decrease in protein levels (Figs. 3A and 10C).

**DISCUSSION**

The results from this study demonstrate a role for SHMT1 and nuclear folate-dependent thymidylate biosynthesis in the repair of UV-induced DNA damage. Previous studies have demonstrated that SHMT1 activity is the rate-limiting activity in thymidylate biosynthesis in MCF-7 cells. Overexpression of SHMT1 in MCF-7 cells not only favors the partitioning of folate-derived one-carbon units to thymidylate biosynthesis but also enhances the efficiency of *de novo* thymidylate biosynthesis relative to synthesis through the salvage pathway (11). Unlike the other enzymes involved in folate-mediated one-carbon metabolism, SHMT1 expression is not ubiquitous. Although it is expressed primarily in the liver and kidney (44), significant amounts of the SHMT1 transcript are present in exposed tissues of the body such as the eyes and skin (Unigene, National Center for Biotechnology Information; Fig. 3C), which are highly susceptible to UV-induced DNA damage.

The UV-responsive IRES located within the 5′-UTR of the SHMT1 transcript enables SHMT1 to escape the control mechanisms that repress cap-dependent translation during cellular stress and to function in DNA repair. SHMT1 is not the only protein whose expression is activated by a UV-responsive IRES. It was recently shown that lethal doses of UVC result in an increase in both the IRES activity and protein levels of the pro-apoptotic factor Apaf-1 (23). However, this is the first report to our knowledge of a UV-responsive IRES that regulates the translation of a protein involved in DNA repair. Whereas the mechanism responsible for the UV-induced activation of the Apaf-1 IRES has yet to be
FIGURE 9. **SHMT1 is involved in the repair of UV-induced DNA damage.** MCF-7 cells were treated with negative control siRNA (light bars) or SHMT1 siRNA (dark bars) for 55 h and then exposed to UV radiation. At the indicated times after UV treatment, the cells were harvested and divided into two samples. One sample was used for immunoblotting to ensure the knockdown of SHMT1, and the other sample was used in the comet assay to determine DNA damage or in the MTT assay to determine cell viability. A, shown is a representative Western blot showing SHMT1 and TS protein levels in cells treated with either the negative control siRNA or the SHMT1 siRNA. GAPDH serves as a control for equal protein loading. B, for the comet assay, single cells were embedded in agarose, lysed, and subjected to electrophoresis. The DNA content of each cell was visualized using SYBR Gold. The panels are representative images of (from left to right) a cell with little DNA damage, a cell with an intermediate amount of DNA damage, and a cell with extensive DNA damage. C–F, the DNA content of the cells was quantified using Komet 5.5 software. The data represent the average of three independent experiments ± S.E. Each experiment was performed in duplicate, and 75 cells were analyzed per experiment per time point. The asterisk represents statistical significance (p < 0.05) at a given time point as determined by Student's t test. C, % tail DNA = the proportion of DNA that has migrated from the nucleoid core. D, extent of tail moment = % tail DNA × tail length/100. E, olive tail moment = (tail center of gravity – head center of gravity) × % tail DNA/100. F, tail length = the distance (microns) of DNA migration from the nucleoid core. G, for the MTT assay, the production of formazan by living mitochondria was measured in negative control siRNA-treated cells (light bars) and SHMT1 siRNA-treated cells (dark bars) 24 h after UV treatment by recording the absorbance at 550 nm. The absorbance from non-irradiated, negative control siRNA-treated cells was given a value of 100%. The results represent the average of four independent experiments ± S.E. The asterisk indicates statistical significance (p = 0.0002) as determined by Student's t test.
midylate generated in the cytoplasm can freely diffuse into the nucleus, production of this deoxyribonucleotide directly at the nucleus of DNA repair may allow for more rapid DNA synthesis and enhance the fidelity of the repair polymerase by decreasing uracil miscoponsetion. As uracil miscoponsetion can ultimately result in DNA strand breaks (4), this would account for the decrease in DNA damage observed in UV-treated control cells compared with those depleted of SHMT1 (Fig. 8, C–F).

In mice such a response to UV-induced DNA damage is not possible as the 5′-UTR of the murine SHMT1 transcript, which shares only 42% sequence identity with the human SHMT1 5′-UTR, lacks IRES activity (26). The species specificity of the UV-inducible SHMT1 IRES suggests that it may have evolved as an adaptive response to protect the skin from UV damage.
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**FIGURE 10.** **SHMT1 and TS SUMOylation and nuclear localization increase in response to UV treatment.** SHMT1 (A) and TS (B) were immunoprecipitated (IP) from untreated and UV-treated MCF-7 whole cell extracts 22 h after UV exposure. Immunoblotting was performed on the immunoprecipitates using antibodies against SUMO-1, SHMT1, and TS. The IgG immunoprecipitate (lane 1) serves as control for nonspecific binding. C, whole cell (WCE), nuclear (NE), and cytoplasmic (CE) fractions were isolated from untreated and UV-treated MCF-7 cells 22 h after UV exposure. All extracts were resolved by SDS-PAGE and subjected to immunoblotting using an anti-SHMT1 or anti-TS antibody. GAPDH is shown as a control to demonstrate that the nuclear fractions are free of cytoplasmic contamination. Lamin A is shown as a control to demonstrate that the cytoplasmic fractions are free of nuclear contamination. Both GAPDH and Lamin A serve as controls for equal protein loading.

**TABLE 1.** **SHMT1 and TS SUMOylation and nuclear localization increase in response to UV treatment.**
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