Transposon molecular domestication and the evolution of the RAG recombinase
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Domestication of a transposon (a DNA sequence that can change its position in a genome) to give rise to the RAG1–RAG2 recombinase (RAG) and V(D)J recombination, which produces the diverse repertoire of antibodies and T cell receptors, was a pivotal event in the evolution of the adaptive immune system of jawed vertebrates. The evolutionary adaptations that transformed the ancestral RAG transposase into a RAG recombinase with appropriately regulated DNA cleavage and transposition activities are not understood. Here, beginning with cryo–electron microscopy structures of the amphioxus ProtoRAG transposase (an evolutionary relative of RAG), we identify amino acid residues and domains the acquisition or loss of which underpins the propensity of RAG for coupled cleavage, its preference for asymmetric DNA substrates and its inability to perform transposition in cells. In particular, we identify two adaptations specific to jawed–vertebrates—arginine 848 in RAG1 and an acidic region in RAG2—that together suppress RAG–mediated transposition more than 1,000-fold. Our findings reveal a two–tiered mechanism for the suppression of RAG–mediated transposition, illuminate the evolution of V(D)J recombination and provide insight into the principles that govern the molecular domestication of transposons.

Jawed vertebrates have evolved a sophisticated adaptive immune system that relies on the assembly of immunoglobulin and T cell receptor genes from arrays of V, D and J gene segments in developing B and T lymphocytes. The assembly reaction, known as V(D)J recombination, is initiated when RAG cleaves adjacent to the gene segments at recombination signal sequences (RSSs) that conserve heptamer and nonamer elements separated by a 12- or 23-base pair (bp) spacer (12RSS and 23RSS, respectively) (Fig. 1a). DNA cleavage by RAG occurs by a nick–hairpin mechanism in which hairpin formation occurs in a coordinated (coupled) manner in a synaptic complex that contains one 12RSS and one 23RSS, a restriction known as the 12/23 rule (Fig. 1b). The 12/23 rule and coupled cleavage are fundamental features of RAG that are thought to contribute to the proper orchestration of V(D)J recombination and protection of genome integrity1–3.

The ‘molecular domestication’ of transposons has contributed broadly to the evolution of new proteins and activities4–6, with RAG and V(D)J recombination representing a paradigmatic example of this process. The current evidence supports a model in which RAG1 and RAG2 evolved from the transposase genes of an ancient ‘RAG transposon’, while disassembled (‘split’) immunoglobulin and T cell receptor genes arose from the insertion of a transposon into a receptor gene, with the inserted terminal inverted repeats (TIRs) of the transposon becoming RSSs7,9. This model was strongly supported by the discovery, in the cephalochordate amphioxus, of ProtoRAG—a transposon with numerous features that implicate it as a descendent of the RAG transposase10.

The RAG transposon domestication model predicts a critical divergence during chordate evolution in which, in jawed vertebrates, the RAG transposase acquired properties of a recombinase, whereas in amphioxus (and probably other invertebrate chordate lineages11), transposase functions were retained. A divergence in post-cleavage reaction steps (Fig. 1b) would have been particularly pivotal, with RAG-generated DNA ends preferentially undergoing end joining (recombination) instead of transposition, and ProtoRAG retaining a strong preference for transposition over end-joining10. Indeed, RAG is notably poor at performing transposition in living cells12–14, with only a single bona fide transposition event thus far identified in mice or humans15,16. How the ancestral RAG transposon was domesticated to yield a RAG recombinase with minimal in vivo transposition activity and a strong propensity for coupled cleavage of asymmetric substrates is a key question in the evolution of V(D)J recombination and adaptive immunity in jawed vertebrates. Here, we use the structure of ProtoRAG transposase as a lens through which to view this evolutionary transformation.

Uncoupled DNA cleavage by ProtoRAG

ProtoRAG from Branchiostoma belcheri (Extended Data Fig. 1a) is composed of convergently transcribed RAG1-like (BbRAG1L) and RAG2-like (BbRAG2L) genes flanked by 5′ and 3′ TIRs that comprise a heptamer similar to the RSS heptamer, an adjacent, conserved 9–10-bp element referred to as TIR region 2 (TR2) and additional flanking sequences10 (Fig. 1a). The BbRAG1L protein contains a ‘core’ region (cBbRAG1L; amino acids (aa) 468–1136) with sequence similarity (33% aa identity) to the core region of RAG1 (cRAG1; aa 384–1008 in mouse; Fig. 1c). Within cRAG1 and cBbRAG1L, we define catalytic cores (CC and CC*, respectively) that lack one or more DNA binding elements (Fig. 1c). BbRAG2L resembles only core RAG2 (aa 1–350 in mouse; 22% aa identity) and lacks all RAG2 C-terminal elements, including an acidic hinge and plant homeodomain finger (Fig. 1c).

With a cleavage substrate containing a 5′/3′TIR pair, both core BbRAG1L (cBbRAG1L with BbRAG2L; Fig. 1d) and full-length BbRAG1L–BbRAG2L (Extended Data Fig. 1b) generate a strong band that corresponds to single cleavage at the 3′TIR (black asterisk) and
is comparable in intensity to the 5′/3′TIR double cleavage band (red asterisk). By contrast, core RAG (cRAG) predominantly generates the 12/23RSS double cleavage product (Fig. 1d). Furthermore, both core and full-length BbRAGL robustly cleave substrates containing either a single 5′TIR or a single 3′TIR (Fig. 1e, Extended Data Fig. 1b) whereas cRAG cleaves single RSS substrates poorly (Fig. 1f). These results indicate that DNA cleavage by BbRAGL is less tightly coupled than cleavage by RAG.

Deletion of the nonamer-binding domain (NBD) from cRAG eliminates RAG activity (Fig. 1f), whereas cBbRAGL that lacks its corresponding NBD* domain (which has limited sequence similarity to NBD but, similar to the NBD1), forms a dimer in solution; Extended Data Fig. 1c, d) retains substantial activity (Fig. 1e). In addition, although the C-terminal tail (CTT) of RAG1 is dispensable for activity2, the C-terminal tail of BbRAG1 (CTT*; Fig. 1c) is important for BbRAGL cleavage activity10 (Fig. 1e). Therefore, RAG1 and BbRAG1 have evolved different dependencies on the N- and C-terminal portions of their core regions.

RAG and BbRAGL show a third important difference: while both are active transposases in vitro10,12–16 (Fig. 1g). We note that BbRAGL activity is assessed here in a heterologous (mammalian) cell context.

**Structure of the ProtoRAG transposase**

To better understand these functional differences, we determined the structure of cBbRAGL together with HMGB1 (a DNA-bending cofactor that stimulates cleavage by RAG1 and BbRAG110) bound to the 3′TIR (which is bound more efficiently than the 5′TIR by the cBbRAGL tetramer; Extended Data Fig. 2a–c). Single-particle cryo-electron microscopy (cryo-EM) analysis yielded structures for cBbRAGL–HMGB1 bound to intact and nicked 3′TIRs (designed to mimic the first step of cleavage as in Fig. 1b, inset), with a resolution of 4.3 Å for the nicked 3′TIR structure after application of two-fold symmetry (Fig. 2a, Extended Data Fig. 2d–f, Extended Data Table 1).

cBbRAGL–3′TIR complexes contain a central cBbRAG1L dimer capped by two monomers of BbRAGL2 and two DNA duplexes (Fig. 2a, Extended Data Fig. 2g, h). Rather than the Y shape adopted by cRAG complexes20–23 (Extended Data Fig. 3a), cBbRAGL complexes were roughly V-shaped because no density was discernable for NBD*, HMGB1 or the heptamer-distal 25 bp of the TIRs. Despite an estimated 700 million years of evolutionary divergence, ProtoRAG and RAG exhibit a marked degree of structural similarity; cBbRAGL recapitulates the structural domains of the RAG1 catalytic core, and BbRAGL—similar to RAG2—adopts a structure consistent with a six-bladed β-propeller fold (Fig. 2b, Extended Data Fig. 2d–f). Structural similarity is clear in the vicinity of the active site and heptamer, with the nicked 3′TIR exhibiting two flipped (extrahelical) bases similar to those of nicked RSSs bound by RAG21,22 (Fig. 2c, Extended Data Fig. 3e). Similar to RAG21–23, BbRAGL switches from an ‘open’ to a ‘closed’ conformation upon TIR nicking and is particularly flexible in the BbRAGL–intact TIR complex (Extended Data Fig. 3f–h), with both molecules of BbRAGL making extensive contacts with both DNA molecules (Extended Data Fig. 4). These notable structural parallels support the hypothesis that RAG and BbRAGL evolved from a common RAG transposon ancestor.

**Modular domain function and the 12/23 rule**

To investigate how the distinct functional properties of RAG and BbRAGL relate to structural domains, we generated chimeric RAG1–BbRAG1L proteins in which the BbRAG1L catalytic core—with or without CTT*—was fused with the RAG1 NBD (Fig. 3a, b) and, reciprocally, the RAG1 catalytic core was fused to NBD* and/or CTT* of BbRAG1L (Fig. 3c). Corresponding hybrid RSS–TIR DNA targets were used as cleavage substrates (Fig. 3b, c).

When supplied with the RAG1 NBD, the BbRAG1L catalytic core no longer required CTT* (Fig. 3d) and became dependent on the RSS nonamer for activity (Fig. 3e), with spacer length requirements (12 ± 1 bp or 23 ± 1 bp) identical to those of RAG (Extended Data Fig. 6a, b). Reciprocally, when deprived of its NBD, the RAG1
catalytic core became dependent on CTT* and TR2 for activity and was active without NBD* or any portion of the DNA substrate except the heptamer and TR2 (Fig. 3f–h). Thus, CTT* renders the RAG1 catalytic core independent of an NBD, the RSS nonamer, substrate asymmetry and—hence—the 12/23 rule. Notably, proteins that contain the BbRAG1 catalytic core exhibit uncoupled cleavage (Fig. 3d) whereas those that contain the RAG1 catalytic core display coupled cleavage (Extended Data Fig. 6c, d). We conclude that the catalytic cores of RAG1 and BbRAG1 dictate the propensities of these enzymes for coupled versus uncoupled cleavage, and that the functional organization of ProtoRAG TIRs is different from that of RSSs because of a dependency on different DNA-binding domains (Extended Data Fig. 6e). Furthermore, our findings argue that the choice of dominant DNA-binding domain was pivotal for the evolution of the 12/23 rule, as CTT* would need to have been eliminated to allow dependency on the rule.

Residues that control coupled cleavage

While searching for features that might explain the intrinsic functional differences between the catalytic cores of RAG and BbRAG1, we observed that Ser963—which falls the RAG1 catalytic glutamate Glu962—is positioned to form a hydrogen bond with Glu649 in apo RAG (Fig. 4a) and RAG bound to intact RSSs (Fig. 4b), but not when RAG is bound to nicked RSSs and poised for hairpin formation (Fig. 4c). BbRAG1 cannot form this hydrogen bond because Glu649 and Ser963 have been replaced by Val571 and Ala1064 (Fig. 4d). Whether bound to intact or nicked TIRs, BbRAG1 adopts a structure similar to that of RAG1 bound to nicked DNA (Fig. 4e, f, Extended Data Fig. 6f) and therefore appears to be constitutively poised for hairpin formation. Notably, the Glu649–Ser963 amino acid pair, which is strictly conserved in jawed vertebrate RAG1, is absent from known invertebrate RAG1-like proteins (Fig. 4g).

Incorporating residues of BbRAG1 into RAG1 revealed that the BbRAG1 mutants RAG1(E649Y) (Fig. 5b) and RAG1(S963A) (Fig. 5c) showed increased uncoupled cleavage activity when compared to the wild-type (Fig. 4h, Extended Data Fig. 6g). By contrast, the RAG1(Y994F) mutation had no effect and the RAG1(N961A) mutant showed lower uncoupled cleavage than wild-type RAG1 (Fig. 4h, Extended Data Fig. 6h, i). Reciprocal mutations in BbRAG1 revealed that the BbRAG1(V751E) mutant—but not the BbRAG1(A1064S) mutant—showed decreased uncoupled cleavage, whereas the BbRAG1(V751E/A1064S) double mutation almost abolished cleavage (Extended Data Fig. 6i). We propose that Glu649 in RAG1 helps to dictate coupled cleavage by mechanisms that are partially dependent on formation of a hydrogen bond with Ser963, and that because BbRAG1 lacks Glu649, it is more likely than RAG to adopt an active site configuration that is ‘hairpin-compatible’. Notably, RAG1(E649A) has previously been shown to exhibit increased uncoupled cleavage activity in vitro and in vivo.

Two-tiered control of RAG transposition

We reasoned that structural comparisons of RAG and BbRAG1 might shed light on their markedly different capacities to perform transposition in cells. In the RAG post-cleavage complex, RAG1 Arg848 is near the RSS 3’-OH that targets target DNA during transposition (Fig. 5a). Arg848 is strictly conserved in jawed vertebrate RAG1 but is replaced by methionine in BbRAG1 and other invertebrate RAG1-like proteins (Fig. 5b, c). RAG1(R848M) cleaves DNA at wild-type levels and exhibits a notable (approximately eightfold) increase in transposition activity in vitro relative to the wild type; this is manifest as efficient generation of a slow-mobility band that represents
in vitro (Extended Data Fig. 7g, h) or substantially alter protein expression or V(D)J recombination activity in vivo (Extended Data Fig. 8f, g). Therefore, the RAG2 acidic hinge suppresses transposition specifically at a post-cleavage step and only in cells. Mapping experiments revealed that aa 362–383 have a critical role in suppressing in vivo transposition by RAG2 (1–383) (Extended Data Fig. 8h, i). In assays using RAG2 (1–350), a RAG1 (E649V) mutation boosted transposition whereas the S963A mutation had little effect (Fig. 5g). We conclude that evolutionary adaptations arose early during jawed vertebrate evolution in RAG1 and RAG2 to provide two-tiered protection against RAG-mediated transposition.

To test whether this conclusion extends to RAG-mediated transposition into the genome, we used a plasmid-to-genome transposition assay, with transposition target sites identified by high-throughput sequencing (Extended Data Fig. 9a–c). When paired with RAG2 (1–350), RAG1 (E649V/R848M), wild-type RAG1 and no RAG1 yielded 930, 16 and zero independent transposition events, respectively (Fig. 5h, Extended Data Fig. 9d). Insertion sites were found on all chromosomes (Extended Data Fig. 9e) and were strongly biased to active genes, particularly in the vicinity of the transcription start site (Extended Data Fig. 9f–h). Of the 930 RAG1(E649V/R848M)-mediated insertions, 180 (19%) occurred in protein-coding exons (P = 4 × 10⁻⁸⁵), which is noteworthy given that the primordial split antigen receptor gene of jawed vertebrates is believed to have been generated by insertion of the RAG transposon into an exon2,25,26. These data show that reversal of the protective adaptations acquired by jawed vertebrate RAG1 and RAG2 ‘reawakens’ the RAG transposase and enables widespread transposition into genes and exons in the human genome.

**Molecular domestication of the RAG transposon**

The evolutionary adaptations that protect jawed-vertebrate lymphocytes from insertional mutagenesis caused by RAG-mediated transposition have been a long-standing target of investigation and a priori, could have involved changes in the RAG proteins, changes in the host cellular milieu or both. Efficient RSS ligation was unlikely to suffice as a protective mechanism because signal joints can be re-cleaved and transposed by RAG229. Our findings reveal two critical adaptations, intrinsic to the RAG proteins and found only in jawed vertebrates, that each potentially suppress RAG-mediated transposition in vivo and together render the reaction almost undetectable. Similar to RAG1 Arg848, the RAG2 acidic hinge suppresses transposition at a post-cleavage step of the reaction, but—unlike Arg848—its suppressive effects are detectable only in the context of living cells. The RAG2 acidic hinge has previously been implicated in the regulation of catalytic activity25,26, chromatin targeting31, repair pathway choice23,24 and stability of the RAG-signal end complex33. It remains to be determined whether these activities are relevant to the suppression of RAG-mediated transposition in vivo and whether other proteins contribute to this suppression.

Accumulating evidence supports a model for RAG evolution (Extended Data Fig. 10) in which a Transib transposon17 captured a RAG2-like open reading frame in an early deuterostome to give rise to the original RAG transposon, which in turn gave rise to RAG1, RAG2 and RSSs in jawed vertebrates and RAG1L and RAG2L transposable elements and gene pairs in invertebrates8. We propose that the modular design of the RAG complex—with largely autonomous catalytic cores, swappable DNA binding modules and a RAG2 accessory subunit—facilitated the adaptation of RAG family enzymes to changing host environments and functional demands, including the adaptations in jawed vertebrates that led to a ‘tamed’ RAG recombinase that specifies coupled cleavage activity, adheres to the 12/23 rule and suppresses transposition activity (Extended Data Fig. 10). Our findings contribute to the paradigm of transposon molecular domestication4,6, which is now recognized to encompass elements in almost all branches of life ranging from CRISPR in bacteria35 to active transposases encoded in the human genome, the function and process of domestication of which remain unknown36,37.

---

**Fig. 4 | Residues that control coupled cleavage.** a–c, Structure of region surrounding RAG1 Glu649 and Ser963 before RSS binding (PDB 4WWX; a), bound to intact RSS (PDB 6C1K; b) and bound to two nicked RSSs with base flipping (PDB 5ZEE; c). In c, the potential for a hydrogen bond between Glu649 and Ser963 is disrupted by a change in the relative orientation of the residues and acquisition of a potassium ion (purple sphere). d, Structure of region surrounding BbRAG1L Val751 and Ala1064 bound to nicked TIR. e, f, Superimposition of protein structural elements containing RAG1 Glu649 and Ser963 (e) or BbRAG1L Val751 and Ala1064 (f) bound to intact or nicked DNA. Glu649, Ser963, Val751 and Ala1064 are highlighted with dark colours. In e, the intact DNA structure was obtained with a RAG1(E692Q) mutant22,23. g, Sequence alignments of RAG1 and RAG1-like proteins in the vicinity of RAG1 Glu649 and Ser963. Species name abbreviations are defined in the legend of Extended Data Fig. 5b. h, Cleavage reactions using CRAG with RAG1 mutations and DNA substrates containing one or two RSSs, as indicated above the lanes. Asterisks as in Fig. 2g.

inversion-circle intramolecular transposition products18 (Fig. 5d, Extended Data Fig. 7a, b) and enhanced transposition of an RSS-flanked antibiotic-resistance gene into a target plasmid (Fig. 5e, Extended Data Fig. 7c). Therefore, methionine at RAG1 position 848 stimulates RAG-mediated transposition at a post-cleavage step. Several amino acids at position 848 can support cleavage, with alanine stimulating and glutamate suppressing transposition relative to the wild type (Extended Data Fig. 7d, e).

Notably, in an in vivo plasmid-to-plasmid transposition assay (Extended Data Fig. 8a), the R848M mutation in RAG1 increased activity to detectable levels (Fig. 5f) whereas a reciprocal M749R mutation in BbRAG1L decreased activity relative to the wild type (Extended Data Fig. 8b, c). RAG1(R848M) was, however, still about 100-fold less active than BbRAG1L (Fig. 5f), which raises the possibility that additional mechanisms suppress RAG-mediated transposition in vivo.

The RAG2 protein used in the assays of Fig. 5f (aa 1–383) contains part of the RAG2 acidic hinge (Fig. 1c), a domain that is present in jawed vertebrate RAG2 but absent from BbRAG219 and other known invertebrate RAG2-like proteins31. Notably, complete removal of the acidic hinge (RAG2 aa 1–350) increased in vivo transposition activity about 100-fold (Fig. 5g); this result was reproduced in a second cell line and with human RAG proteins (Extended Data Fig. 8d, e). Stimulation of transposition depended strongly on the RAG1(R848M) mutation, as wild-type RAG1 lacked detectable transposition activity when paired with RAG2 (1–350) (Fig. 5g). Together, RAG1 Arg848 and the RAG2 acidic hinge suppress RAG-mediated transposition in vivo more than 1,000-fold. Transposition products generated in vitro and in vivo showed predominantly 5’-target site duplications, as expected18,19 (Extended Data Fig. 7f). Deletion of the RAG2 acidic hinge did not increase RAG-mediated transposition or DNA cleavage...
Fig. 5 | Reawakening the RAG transposon in vivo. a, Structure of region surrounding RAG1 Arg848 after hairpin formation (PD8 SZE2). b, Structure of region surrounding RAG1 Arg848 (PD8 SZE2) or BbRAG1L Met949 after nicking. c, Sequence alignments of RAG1 and RAG1-like proteins in the vicinity of RAG1 Arg848. Red-shaded residues, highly conserved binding surface for adenine base of heptamer adjacent to flipped C + 1. d, Cleavage reactions comparing intramolecular transposition by wild-type RAG1 and RAG1(R848M). The intramolecular transposition product was confirmed to contain inversion circles by inverse PCR DNA sequencing18. e, Results of in vitro transposition reactions with wild-type RAG1 or RAG1(R848M) (mean ± s.e.m.). Two-tailed t-test: **P < 0.01, f, g, Results of in vivo plasmid-to-plasmid transposition assays with RAG2(1–383) (f) or RAG2(1–350) (g) and the indicated full-length wild-type or mutant RAG1 proteins, and with full-length BbRAG1 (mean ± s.e.m.). Total antibiotic-resistant colony numbers (grey bars) were corrected (black bars) for the fraction of colonies found to contain plasmids with bone fide transposition events. Two-tailed t-test: *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.005 compared to wild-type RAG1.

h, Number of bone fide transposition events (3–7 bp target site duplications) identified in plasmid-to-genome transposition experiment.
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METHODS

Statistical methods were not used to predetermine sample size and experiments were not randomized. Investigators were not blinded to allocation during experiments and outcome assessment.

Plasmid generation. pTTS, a derivative of pTTS containing a maltose-binding protein (MBP) open reading frame (ORF), previously described 18, was modified by inserting an in-frame PreScission Protease cleavage site at the C terminus of MBP, to create pTTSMP. Codon-optimized BrRAG1L core (aa 648–1136) and full-length BbRAG2L were cloned into pTTSMP at Non restriction sites that lie downstream of the protease cleavage site by In-Fusion cloning. Truncated BrRAG1L ORFs (aa 468–1136, aa 484–1136 and ANBD (aa 547–1136) were cloned into pTTSM, as were mouse RAG1 core (aa 384–1008), RAG1 core ANBD (aa 462–1008) and RAG2 core (aa 1–383) ORFs. Chimaera protein ORFs and point mutants thereof were cloned into pTTSM. No difference in expression levels was noted between pTTSMP and pTTM5 vectors.

A 5′TIR and a 3′TIR, each with 3′ flanking ProtRAG sequences, were inserted together into the BamHI site of pUC19 by In-Fusion, creating a substrate with 402 bp between the tips of the TIRs. This vector was further modified to eliminate all instances of 5′-CAC in the DNA between the TIRs and in the ~130 bp of pUC19 flanking the 5′TIR and ~280 bp of pUC19 flanking the 3′TIR. This CAC-free region containing the TIRs was then subcloned into the EcoRV/NruI sites of pBR322 to create pB-5′3′TIR. pB-5′3′TIR was modified by deletion of the 5′TIR or the 3′TIR using PCR and In-Fusion cloning to create pB-5′TIR and pB-3′TIR. Other alterations to replace or modify the TIRs of pB-3′TIR, pB-5′TIR or pB-3′TIR, using In-Fusion cloning, resulted in plasmids containing the needed combinations of RSS, chimeric TIR/RSS and scrambled TIR mutant sequences. The mutations that scrambled portions of the TIR were made by changing A to C, T to G, C to A and G to T.

Protein expression and purification. pTTSMP-BbrRAG1L core and pTT5MP-BbRAG2L plasmids were cotransfected into exp293F cells using the ExpiFectamine 293 Transfection Kit. Cells (30–200 ml culture) containing co-expressed proteins were collected 5 days after transfection by centrifugation (500 g pressed proteins were collected 5 days after transfection by centrifugation (500 g, 10 min, 4 °C) and protein were concentrated to 4–10 µg/mL.

In vitro DNA cleavage. AGGTCGGCGGCCATCTTG. In vitro DNA cleavage and cryo-EM substrates.

plasma contamination. University of Minnesota. Cell lines used were not authenticated or tested for myco-

other alterations to replace or modify the TIRs of pB-5′3′TIR. pB-3′TIR was generated by PCR using the DNA cleavage and cryo-EM substrates.

In brief, separate models of cRAG1L and BbRAG1L were built, accounting for accessibility, charge, hydropathy, consensus secondary structure, and triple helix propensity. The models were refined by refined by mouse RAG1 structural templates in PDB 3GNA 42 for NBD of BrRAG1L and PDB 4WXX 48 for cBRAG1L and BbRAG2L. To eliminate steric conflicts and further minimize energy, these models were iter-
atively refined until convergence by repeated cycles of Generalized Born simulated annealing molecular dynamics for implicit solvent using NAMD 2.12 with CHARMM36 force field37 followed by model assessment of the global distance test total score (GDT_TS) with QA-RecombineIT48 and local loop remodelling in regions showing the highest divergence. Annealing simulations were performed with harmonic restraints on the backbone protein atom positions in regions of regular secondary structure, while irregular loop regions were left to move freely. This brought the cBBRAG1L and BBRAG2L models to GDT_TS 60 and >67, and root mean square deviations of 2.9 Å and 2.3 Å, respectively. Finally, the assembled cBBRAG1L or BBRAG2L structure was subjected to molecular dynamics simulation in explicit solvent to confirm robustness and stability and to assess configuration dynamics of cBBRAG1L and BBRAG2L domains relative to one another.

The BBRAG1L (aa 545–1104) and BBRAG2L (aa 1–366) model thus derived was flexibly fitted into the C2 symmetry mapped of the nicked 3′TR complex (4.3 Å) by molecular dynamics flexible fitting45. The flexibly fitted model was able to account for most density, except for BBRAG1L loops 640–650, 704–720, 732–740 and 1046–1053, and BBRAG2L loops 11–22, 34–49, 67–74, 85–108, 121–133, 179–190 and 300–314, which were adjusted and rebuilt in COOT 0.8. The density for loop 603–630 in BBRAG1L was insufficient for model building. An all-atomic chain was built to fit the density for the C-terminal tail (CTT′) of BBRAG1L (1105–1125). The DNA chains from the previously published model (PDB J3BY)21 were fit into the map and then changed to the correct DNA sequence in COOT 0.8. The model was adjusted in COOT 0.8 manually with iterative cycles of automatic rebuilding using the Rosetta FastRelax protocol41. The model was further refined using the phenix.real_space_refine module in PHENIX with secondary structure restraints and Ramachandran restraints42. The final model was validated using MolProbity52 and EMringer43 (Extended Data Table 1). All molecular representations were generated in PyMol (https://www.pymol.org) and Chimera55.

In vitro transposition assay. The in vitro intermolecular transposition reaction (Extended Data Fig. 7b) was performed as described in ‘In vitro DNA cleavage’. The 12/23RSS substrate was replaced by 10 nM linear donor fragment with tetra-cycline-resistant marker and 10 nM pECPF-1 target plasmid. The final concentrations of RAG protein, Mg2+, and DTT were 50 nM, 1.5 mM and 2 mM, respectively. After proteinase K digestion, DNA was ethanol-precipitated. DNA (50 ng) was transformed into electrocompetent MC1061 bacterial cells that were plated onto kanamycin-alone plate10, 18. After proteinase K digestion, DNA was ethanol-precipitated. DNA (50 ng) was transformed into electrocompetent MC1061 bacterial cells that were plated onto kanamycin-alone plate10, 18. After growth for 24 h, the media were changed to fresh media containing 50 µg/mL kanamycin, and the cells were collected. The genomic DNA was precipitated with 100 µL of a solution containing 95% ethanol and 10 mM sodium acetate. The DNA pellets were washed with 70% ethanol and then resuspended in 50 mM Tris (pH 7.5), 100 mM NaCl, 1% NP-40; cocktail protease inhibitor) on ice, and further disrupted by sonication. After centrifugation to remove insoluble debris, samples were mixed with loading buffer, subjected to sodium dodecyl sulfate polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS–PAGE) and transferred to a PVDF membrane, then incubated separately with anti-RAG1L and anti-RAG2L antibodies, and mouse monoclonal anti-β-actin (Sigma #A978) antibodies.

In vivo plasmid-to-plasmid transposition assay. The in vivo plasmid-to-plasmid transposition assay (Extended Data Fig. 8a) was performed as previously described11. In brief, 293T cells were transfected with 4 µg each of the pEBB-RAG1 or mutant and pFTTM-RAG2 truncations or pEBB-FL RAG2, 5 µg donor plasmid pEBB-RSS, and 10 µg target plasmid pEBB-ECFP. The medium was changed 24 h after transfection and cells were collected after 48 h. Plasmid DNA was precipitated and 300 ng DNA was transformed into electrocompetent MC1061 bacterial cells, which were plated onto kanamycin or kanamycin–tetracycline–streptomycin (KTS) plates. For each protein combination a donor plasmid (pTetRSS), and 107 cells were collected and the genomic DNA was precipitated. Transposition insertion targets from three independent experiments (no RAG1 or wild-type RAG1 or RAG1(E649V/R848M) were amplified using 12RSS and 23RSS linear amplification (LAM)-PCR primers with six different barcodes (12v; 2v; 12w, 23w, 12m, 23m) and MinION flowcell. The six groups were mixed and diluted as the library for high-throughput sequencing.

LAM-PCR primers: 12RSS, 5′-biotin-ccattggctagcgacttgagttgct; 23RSS, 5′-biotin-actgacgactcgacctgacctggagtt; nested-PCR primers: 12RSS, 5′-acacctttcctacacgctgcctgctgctcaaaagactacgacgatgctttatatacg; 23RSS, 5′-acacctttcctacacgctgcctgctgctcaaaagactacgacgatgctttatatacg; where XXXXX represents the barcode.

High-throughput sequencing and data analysis. High-throughput sequencing was performed on an Illumina NextSeq 500. Cutadapt version 1.16 was used to identify barcodes with the adapter-matching error rate set to allow one mismatch in a 7–8-bp barcode. We successfully matched 95.9% of reads to a barcode and unmatched reads were discarded. Next, cutadapt was used to trim the barcode sequences, primer sequences, and 12RSS and 23RSS sequences. The resulting trimmed sequencing data contained only vector sequence or genomic DNA sequence from transposition events and other random integration events. Overall, 60% of barcoded sequencing reads contained identifiable RSS sequences and other reads were discarded. Trimmed sequences were aligned to human genome GRCh38 using Bowtie2 (version 2.2.9) using ‘very sensitive’ end-to-end alignment mode. High-quality alignments (MAPQ ≥ 30; identified with Samtools 1.5) were converted to bed intervals using the bedtools bamToBed utility (bedtools version 2.27.1). Overlapping same-stranded events were merged for each of the six libraries. Bone fide transposition events give rise to 12RSS- and 23RSS-flanking genomic sequences that mapped to the same site in the genome but in opposite directions and with short overlaps (the target site duplication), a signature that was readily distinguished from random integration of the donor plasmid or excised RSS fragments (Extended Data Fig. 9b). To accomplish this, Bedtools intersect was used to identify loci at which corresponding 12RSS and 23RSS libraries showed evidence of transposition events on opposite strands. All intersecting intervals with a 3–7-bp overlap were judged to be transposition events. Gene, exon and transcription start site (TSS) definitions were downloaded from Ensembl gene v93, dataset Human Genes (GRCh38.12). Active TSSs and active genes or exons were defined based on H3K4me3 (experiment ENSCR000DTU) and H3K36me3 (experiment ENCSR091LIE) chromatin immunoprecipitation with sequencing datasets, respectively, from HEK293 cells from ENCODE (https://www.encodeproject.org).

Statistics and reproducibility. DNA cleavage experiments were typically performed three or more times. Exceptions are Figs. 3i, 4i, Extended Data Fig. 6a, c, f (lanes 10 and 11), all n = 2. Statistical analyses were performed using a two-tailed t-test (for example, Fig. 5e–g) or a one-tailed Fisher’s exact test (Fig. 5i).

Reporting summary. Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting Summary linked to this paper.

Data availability
The model of the cBBRAG1L nicked 3′TR synaptic complex has been deposited in the PDB with accession code 6B40. The cryo-EM maps of cBBRAG1L in complex with intact or nicked 3′TRs have been deposited in Electron Microscopy DataBank with accession codes EMD-7043, -7044, -7045 and -7046. High-throughput DNA sequence data to identify transposition events in the human genome have been deposited in the NCBI Sequence Read Archive with accession codes SRR8430227–SRR8430233 (project PRJNA514369).
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Extended Data Fig. 1 | ProtoRAG transposon and analysis of the BbRAG1L NBD* domain. a, Schematic of the ProtoRAG transposon and, below it, the jawed-vertebrate RAG locus and prototypical antigen receptor gene (IGH). b, Schematic of full-length and truncated BbRAG1L proteins (top), and cleavage reactions performed with those proteins (plus BbRAG2L) and TIR substrates, as indicated above and below the lanes. Core BbRAG1L (aa 468–1136) retains the cleavage pattern of full-length BbRAG1L, whereas full-length BbRAG1L exhibits strong single TIR cleavage (lanes 6, 7). Closed and open arrowheads, single 5′TIR and single 3′TIR cleavage products, respectively. For gel source data, see Supplementary Fig. 1. c, Sequence alignment of BbRAG1L NBD* with RAG1 NBD showing divergent sequences with similar predicted secondary structure elements (α-helices 1, 2 and 3). d, SEC-multiple angle light scattering (SEC-MALS) analysis of the purified NBD* protein, indicating that the protein is a dimer in solution.
Extended Data Fig. 2 | Biochemical properties and cryo-EM structure of cBbRAGL–3′TIR synaptic complexes. a, SEC-MALS of MBP–cBbRAGL, which indicates that the complex is a heterotetramer with two subunits each of cBbRAG1L and BbRAG2L. b, c, SEC profiles of cBbRAGL incubated with intact (b) or nicked (c) 3′TIR, 5′TIR or 3′/5′TIRs showing resolution of protein–DNA complex from free DNA. Gels display the components of pooled column fractions containing the protein–DNA complex. d, Representative 2D class averages of cryo-EM particles of cBbRAGL bound to intact or nicked 3′TIRs. e, f, Colour-coded local-resolution estimation of the C2 symmetrized map of cBbRAGL in complex with nicked 3′TIR, viewed from a perspective similar (with a 30° rotation) to that of g. Resolution is, in general, better for cBbRAG1L than BbRAG2L. g, h, Cryo-EM maps of cBbRAGL bound to intact 3′TIRs (5.3 Å overall resolution; g) or nicked 3′TIRs (5.0 Å overall resolution; h). One BbRAG1L subunit (grey) has been rendered partially transparent to allow visualization of DNAs inside the protein. Continuous DNA density running through the protein core is visible with nicked but not intact TIRs, which suggests that the DNA in the vicinity of the active site becomes more rigidly constrained upon nicking. This is notable in light of the recent finding that DNA in the RAG active site melts and swivels in preparation for nicking23. Clear differences between the two DNAs are visible in the bottom half of the structures, with 3′TIR-a (orange) protruding below the protein and density for 3′TIR-b (red) dissipating before the DNA emerges from the protein core. This argues that the two identical DNA molecules are engaged differently by cBbRAGL, with one (3′TIR-b) less rigidly constrained by its interactions with protein.
Extended Data Fig. 3 | Structural features of cBbRAGL. a, Comparison of the models of cBbRAGL and cRAG (PDB 5ZDZ) bound to nicked DNA but with DNA removed, illustrating the absence of NBD* from the cBbRAGL structure. NBD is a dimer that can pivot on a flexible hinge to accommodate the different spacer lengths of 12RSS and 23RSS, providing a structural explanation for the 12/23 rule.20–22,58 We speculate that NBD*, HMGB1 and distal TIR sequences constitute a flexible domain located below the main complex, by analogy with RAG–RSS complexes. b, Superimposition of cBbRAGL–nicked 3′TIR synaptic complex with RAG–nicked RSS synaptic complex (PDB 5ZDZ). c, BbRAG2L adopts a doughnut-shaped structure consistent with that of a six-bladed β-propeller. Because of low resolution, some elements cannot be unambiguously modelled as β-strands. Putative β-propellers I–VI are labelled, as are the N and C termini of the protein, showing that—as with RAG2—propeller I is composed of both N- and C-terminal sequences. d, Colour-coded linear diagram of cBbRAGL subdomains (top) and cartoon of the BbRAG1L dimer (bottom) with the subdomains of one subunit colour-coded as in the linear diagram. The other subunit is grey except for the preR subdomain. Stars indicate a gap in the BbRAG1L model that spans aa 603–630. Nomenclature and figure layout as in ref. 20. DDBD, dimerization and DNA binding domain; PreR, pre-RNase H domain; RNH, RNase H domain; ZnC2 and ZnH2, domains that contribute two cysteines and two histidines, respectively, for zinc coordination; CTD, C-terminal domain; CTT*, C-terminal tail. e, Superimposition of cryo-EM map on the model of the nicked 3′TIR in the vicinity of the flipped bases near the site of nicking. f, g, Three-dimensional classes of cryo-EM maps of cBbRAGL bound to intact (f) or nicked (g) 3′TIRs (DNA omitted). One class is enlarged and shown from two vantage points below. The arrow points to the cleft that narrows in the open-to-closed transition. With intact DNA, three distinct 3D classes are distinguishable that vary in the degree of closure of the two arms of the V. h, Superimposition of three forms of cBbRAGL illustrating the movement of a 3′TIR and BbRAG2L subunit (colour-coded as in e, f) that takes place during the open-to-closed transition. One cBbRAG1L–2L dimer has been aligned and movement is visualized in the other dimer.
Extended Data Fig. 4 | Protein–DNA interactions in the cBbRAG1L–nicked 3′TIR synaptic complex. 

**a**, Schematic diagram of the detailed interactions between BbRAG1L and nicked 3′TIR DNA. Bold underlined text, main-chain interactions; regular text, side-chain interactions; purple text, interactions involving BbRAG1L subunit a (defined as the subunit with an active site that engages the TIR depicted); cyan text, interactions involving symmetric BbRAG1L subunit b. BbRAG2L–DNA interactions could not be unambiguously assigned and are not depicted. 

**b, c**, Orthogonal views of the nicked 3′TIR–BbRAG1L subunit a interaction (b) and the nicked RSS–RAG1 subunit a interaction (c). Protein electrostatic surface potential is indicated with blue (positive charge) and red (negative charge) using the scale (kT/e) below **d, e**. 

**d, e**, RAG1 subunit b–nicked RSS interaction.
Extended Data Fig. 5 | CTT, CTT* and mutational analysis of ProtoRAG TIRs. a, Superimposition showing CTT* extending from a structurally conserved region at the C terminus of the catalytic core regions of mouse RAG1 (mRAG1), zebrafish RAG1 (zRAG1) and BbRAG1L. b, Sequence alignment of CTT from six vertebrate RAG1 proteins. Species name abbreviations used in this paper: Mm, Mus musculus (mouse); Hs, Homo sapiens (human); Gg, Gallus gallus (chicken); Xl, Xenopus tropicalis (frog); Dr, Danio rerio (zebrafish); Bb, Branchiostoma belcheri (amphioxus); Pf, Ptychodera flava (acorn worm); Sp, Strongylcotrus purpuratus (purple sea urchin); Af, Asterias forbesi (sea star); Hv, Hydra vulgaris (hydra); Rn, Rattus norvegicus (rat). c, Schematic indicating sub-regions of TIRs. Region 1 contains the heptamer and one additional bp, which in Fig. 1a and throughout the paper is defined as part of TR2. Otherwise, region 2 (broken up into 2a and 2b for the 5′TIR) corresponds to TR2. Poorly conserved regions 3 and 4 separate TR2 from a distal conserved 9-bp element (region 5). d–g, Cleavage of substrates containing a single 5′TIR (d, e) or a single 3′TIR (f, g), either intact (WT) or with the indicated region scrambled, by cBbRAGL (d, f) or the ΔNBD* cBbRAGL complex (e, g). Closed and open arrowheads, 5′TIR and 3′TIR cleavage products, respectively. Region 5 is completely dispensable for cleavage, and regions 3 and 4 contribute modestly to 3′TIR—but not 5′TIR—cleavage. Upon deletion of NBD* from cBbRAG1L, 3′TIR cleavage loses all dependency on regions 3 and 4, consistent with the possibility that NBD* engages in functionally important interactions with regions 3 and 4 of the 3′TIR.
Extended Data Fig. 6 | Activities of chimeric RAG1–BbRAG1L proteins and residues that influence coupled cleavage. a, b, Cleavage by NBD–CC* is dependent on the length of the spacer between the TIR heptamer and the RSS nonamer. Substrates depicted schematically above the gel images. In a, the substrates contain a single target based on T1 (Fig. 3b), the spacer of which ranges in length from 10 to 14 bp. In b, the substrate contains target T1 and a partner target based on T2 (Fig. 3b), the spacer of which ranges in length from 20 to 25 bp. Dark arrowheads, T1 cleavage products; open arrowheads, T2 cleavage products. c, d, Cleavage reactions using the NBD*–CC–CTT* and CC–CTT* proteins and T3 and T4 substrates (all depicted schematically in Fig. 3c), as indicated above the lanes. T3* and T4*, T3 and T4 targets with a C-to-A mutation of heptamer position 1 that renders the target uncleavable; [T4/T4]H+TR2 and [T3/ T3]H+TR2, substrates in which both targets have had all substrate sequences except the heptamer and TR2 deleted. Asterisks as in Fig. 2g. e, Cartoon depicting differences in the major protein–DNA interactions of BbRAG1L and RAG. f, Superposition of RAG1 and BbRAG1L in the region containing Glu649 and Ser963 in complexes bound to nicked DNA substrates, illustrating the similarity of positioning of the active site residues Glu962 and Glu1063 and flanking residues Asn961 and Asn1062. h, RAG1 Asn961 and BbRAG1L Asn1062 have the potential to participate in hydrogen-bond networks after nicking and could thereby stabilize the hairpin–competent configuration of the enzyme. This is notable in light of the fact that mutant RAG1(N961A) displays enhanced coupled cleavage compared to wild-type RAG1. i, Cleavage reactions using wild-type and mutant cBbRAG1L proteins (with BbRAG2L) and substrates containing one or two TIRs as indicated above and below the lanes (left). cBbRAG1L(V751E), but not cBbRAG1L(A1064S), reduces uncoupled single 3′TIR cleavage (lower black asterisk, lane 2; reduction also seen in lane 8) and single 5′TIR cleavage (seen most clearly in lane 5). The strong reduction in cleavage seen with the BbRAG1L(V751E/A1064S) double mutant suggests the possibility that hydrogen bonding between these two residues holds the active site in an inactive configuration. Right, quantification of uncoupled cleavage as the ratio of the intensity of the 3′TIR single cleavage band (lower black asterisk) to that of the double cleavage band (red asterisk) as in lanes 1–3. Mean ± s.e.m. Two-tailed t-test: **P < 0.01, compared to wild-type cBbRAG1L. ns, not significant.
Extended Data Fig. 7 | In vitro transposition by wild-type and mutant RAG proteins. a, Schematic of intramolecular transposition. If the 3′ OH nucleophiles attack the strand on which they are located, the products are two deletion circles (top), but if they attack the opposite strand, a single inversion circle product is generated (bottom). Staggered attack on the target DNA backbone yields single-stranded gaps in the products, represented as five short vertical lines. b, Inverse PCR reaction to amplify inversion circles from purified intramolecular transposition product as in Fig. 5d, third lane. The band indicated with an arrow was excised, cloned and sequenced, yielding sites at which intramolecular transposition occurred to yield inversion circles, indicated in the map of the excised 12/23RSS central fragment (below). Half arrows indicate approximate locations of PCR primers. The location of deletion circle joints detected by sequencing are not indicated. c, Schematic of intermolecular in vitro transposition assay. An RSS-flanked Tet gene is mobilized from a linear donor by RAG-mediated DNA cleavage and can transpose into a target plasmid, which is detected after bacterial transformation by the appearance of colonies on Kan/Tet/Str (KTS) plates (streptomycin (str) is not relevant in this assay). d, In vitro DNA cleavage and intramolecular transposition by position 848-mutant cRAG1 (with RAG2(1–383)). Increased transposition compared to wild-type cRAG1 is revealed by diminished intensity of the double cleavage band and increased intensity of the slow-migrating intramolecular inversion circle transposition product band (red arrow). The intensity of the inversion circle band underestimates the efficiency of transposition because deletion circle transposition products—which are of heterogeneous size, and hence not visible as a discrete band—are also produced18. e, Quantification of intramolecular transposition efficiency from three independent experiments as in d, measured by ratio of double cleavage band to 23RSS cleavage band (the latter serving as an internal control for the total amount of cleavage). The ratio decreases as intramolecular transposition increases in efficiency, consuming the double cleavage band. Mean, with data range indicated by box. Two tailed t-test; P values are indicated. f, Distribution of transposition target site duplication lengths determined by sequencing of plasmid transposition products or from high-throughput sequencing of plasmid-to-genome transposition products (Extended Data Fig. 9d), as indicated above the bars. The RAG1 protein used is indicated below the bars. g, In vitro reactions as in Fig. 5d using RAG2(1–383); in vivo plasmid target reactions as in Fig. 5g using RAG2(1–350); genome transposition products generated using RAG2(1–350). In a small fraction of plasmids, sequencing revealed deletions at the site of insertion of the RSSs (red; deletion). h, In vitro cleavage and intramolecular transposition reactions using RAG2(1–352) and RAG2(1–383) (as indicated above the lanes) and wild-type or mutant cRAG1 (as indicated below the lanes). Transposition is readily detected with both forms of RAG2 and is increased by the RAG1(R848M) mutation. i, In vitro intermolecular transposition assays using RAG2(1–383) and RAG2(1–352) and wild-type or mutant cRAG1 (as indicated below the lanes). Deleting the RAG2 acidic hinge does not increase the efficiency of intermolecular transposition in vitro.
Extended Data Fig. 8 | In vivo transposition by RAG and BbRAGL proteins. a, Schematic of plasmid-to-plasmid in vivo transposition assay. An RSS-flanked Tet gene is mobilized from a donor plasmid by RAG-mediated DNA cleavage and can transpose into a target plasmid, which is detected after bacterial transformation by the appearance of colonies on KTS plates (streptomycin (str) reduces background in the assay by selecting against bacteria containing the rpsL gene, present in the donor plasmid). b, Schematic of in vivo GFP fluorescence recombination assay, used to generate data in c (right), e (right) and g. Excision of the polyadenylation sequence (poly-A) together with its flanking RSSs or TIRs (triangles) by RAG or BbRAGL and resealing of the plasmid allows expression of GFP. c, In vivo transposition (left) and recombination (right) activity in HEK293T cells of wild-type BbRAG1L and BbRAG1L(M949R) (together with BbRAG2L). Mean ± s.e.m. Two-tailed t-test: ***P < 0.005 compared to wild-type BbRAG1L. d, In vivo transposition activity assayed in human colon cancer cell line HCT116 with full-length RAG1(R848M/E649V) and either RAG2(1–350) or RAG2(1–383). As in HEK293T cells, transposition is strongly inhibited by the RAG2 acidic hinge. Mean ± s.e.m. e, In vivo transposition (left) and recombination (right) activity in HEK293T cells of human wild-type RAG1 and RAG1(R851M) with different forms of human RAG2, beginning at amino acid 1 and ending with the amino acid indicated below the bars. Mean ± s.e.m. Two-tailed t-test: ***P < 0.005; ****P < 0.001 compared to wild-type human RAG1. f, g, Protein expression (f) and recombination activity (g) in HEK293T cells of wild-type and mutant mouse RAG1 and RAG2 proteins used in the in vivo transposition assays. The data show that the large increases in transposition activity observed with some proteins (for example, RAG2(1–350), RAG2(1–352), and RAG1(R848M)) are not due to large increases in protein expression or cleavage/recombination activity. h, i, In vivo transposition activity assayed in HEK293T cells with full length RAG1(R848M) (h) or RAG1(R848M/E649V) (i) and various forms of RAG2, beginning at amino acid 1 and ending with the amino acid indicated below the bars. FL, full-length RAG2.
Extended Data Fig. 9 | Transposition into the human genome by mutant RAG proteins. a, Schematic of plasmid-to-genome in vivo transposition assay. An RSS-flanked Puro expression cassette is mobilized from a plasmid donor by RAG-mediated DNA cleavage and can transpose into the genome, which is detected by selection with puromycin and high-throughput sequencing. b, Schematic illustrating detection of bone fide transposition events into the genome by LAM-PCR and high-throughput sequencing. LAM-PCR is performed on genomic DNA with biotinylated primers (half arrows) that extend into the DNA flanking either the 12RSS or 23RSS; thereafter, independent libraries are prepared and sequenced for the 12RSS and 23RSS flanks. If the donor plasmid randomly inserts into genome (i), then the RSS is flanked by donor plasmid sequences. If the RSS fragment is cleaved at one or both RSSs and randomly inserted into genome (ii), then a match with an appropriate sequence duplication (indicative of a TSD) will not be found between the 12RSS and 23RSS libraries. Finally, if the RSS fragment is inserted into the genome by transposition (iii), a match with a 3–7-bp TSD will be found in the 12RSS and 23RSS libraries. c, Tissue culture plates stained with crystal violet showing puromycin-resistant colonies for experiments using RAG2(1–350) and either wild-type RAG1 or RAG1(R848M/E649V). Colony numbers increase about twofold with the mutant RAG1 protein but many colonies are seen with wild-type RAG1 owing to random integration of the donor plasmid. Essentially no colonies are seen if the donor plasmid is omitted (first column of plates) d, Summary of sequence data from the plasmid-to-genome transposition experiments. For each of the six libraries, column 1 shows the total number of reads with a barcode and RSS, columns 2 and 3 show a breakdown of number of reads in which RSS flanking sequences map to the human genome or the donor plasmid (a small fraction of reads do map to either genome or plasmid owing to poor read quality), column 4 shows the number of unique reads that map to the genome (after elimination of duplicates) and column 5 shows the number of bone fide transposition events detected. e, Rainfall circos plot of transposition events into chromosomes of HEK293T cells. f–h, Genome features of transposon integration sites mediated by RAG1(R848M/E649V) and RAG2(1–350). f, Number (per cent) of transposition events into the genome features indicated. One-tailed Fisher’s exact test was used to determine whether the frequency of transposition events was greater than that expected by chance: genes (P = 9 × 10–30); protein-coding genes (P = 5 × 10–35); exons (P = 6 × 10–46); protein-coding exons (P = 4 × 10–42) and within 2 kb of a TSS (P = 5 × 10–130). g, h, Meta-analysis of integration sites within gene bodies (g) and flanking TSSs (h).
Extended Data Fig. 10 | Model of RAG evolution in metazoans. Steps leading from the ancestral Transib transposon, consisting of a RAG1-like ORF flanked by RSS-like TIRs, to the RAG recombinase and split antigen receptor genes of jawed vertebrates. I, capture of a RAG2-like ORF by a Transib transposon to generate the ancestral RAG transposon in an early deuterostome; II, key events in the evolution of RAG1, RAG2 and antigen receptor genes of jawed vertebrates: A, insertion of the RAG transposon into the exon of a gene encoding an immunoglobulin-domain receptor protein to generate the ancestral antigen receptor gene; B, loss of CTT* and acquisition of Glu649 and Ser963 by RAG1 facilitated evolution of the 12/23 rule and coupled cleavage, respectively, while acquisition of RAG1 Arg848 and the RAG2 acidic hinge powerfully suppressed RAG transposition activity. The order of events depicted in II is not known. RAG-related elements, if found in members of a given lineage, are indicated at right, as is the presence of the CTT* domain. Protostome lineages have been collapsed into a single branch. While vertical transmission is consistent with the distribution of RAG1 and RAG2 transposon and recombinase elements in deuterostomes, horizontal transmission might have contributed to the spread of Transib elements.
Extended Data Table 1 | Cryo-EM data collection, refinement and validation statistics

|                         | BbRAGL-3’TIR synaptic complex with nicked DNA refined with C2 symmetry (EMDB-7046) | PDB 6B40 | BbRAGL-3’TIR synaptic complex with nicked DNA refined with C1 symmetry (EMDB-7045) | BbRAG1L-3’TIR synaptic complex with intact DNA refined with C2 symmetry (EMDB-7044) | BbRAG1L-3’TIR synaptic complex with intact DNA refined with C1 symmetry (EMDB-7043) |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Data collection and processing** |                                                                                      |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Magnification           | 81,000                                                                               | 81,000   | 81,000                                                                               | 81,000                                                                               |                                                                                      |
| Voltage (kV)            | 300                                                                                  | 300      | 300                                                                                  | 300                                                                                  |                                                                                      |
| Electron exposure (e−/Å²) | 54                                                                                   | 54       | 80                                                                                   | 80                                                                                   |                                                                                      |
| Defocus range (µm)      | -1.2 to -2.5                                                                         | -1.2 to -2.5 | -1.2 to -2.5                                                                         | -1.2 to -2.5                                                                         |                                                                                      |
| Pixel size (Å)          | 1.35                                                                                 | 1.35     | 1.35                                                                                 | 1.35                                                                                 |                                                                                      |
| Symmetry imposed        | C2                                                                                    | C1       | C2                                                                                    | C1                                                                                    |                                                                                      |
| Initial particle images (no.) | 496,221                                                                            | 496,221 | 414,309                                                                             | 414,309                                                                             |                                                                                      |
| Final particle images (no.) | 350,143                                                                            | 205,845 | 94,922                                                                              | 94,922                                                                              |                                                                                      |
| Map resolution (Å)      | 4.3                                                                                  | 5.0      | 4.6                                                                                  | 5.3                                                                                  |                                                                                      |
| FSC threshold           | 0.143                                                                                | 0.143    | 0.143                                                                                | 0.143                                                                                |                                                                                      |
| Map resolution range (Å) | 4.1 to 5.3                                                                           | 4.8 to 6.5 | 4.5 to 6.6                                                                           | 5.0 to 7.1                                                                           |                                                                                      |
| **Refinement**          |                                                                                      |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Initial model used (PDB code) | 3JBY                                                                                 |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Model resolution (Å)    | 4.5                                                                                  |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| FSC threshold           | 0.5                                                                                   |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Model resolution range (Å) | -258                                                                                |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Map sharpening B factor (Å²) |                                                                                      |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Model composition       |                                                                                      |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Non-hydrogen atoms      | 16204                                                                                |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Protein residues        | 1838                                                                                 |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Ligands                 | 4                                                                                    |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| B factors (Å²)          |                                                                                      |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Protein                 | 50                                                                                   |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Ligand                  | 50                                                                                   |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| R.m.s. deviations       |                                                                                      |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Bond lengths (Å)        | 0.0078                                                                               |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Bond angles (°)         | 1.35                                                                                 |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Validation              |                                                                                      |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| MolProbity score        | 2.14                                                                                 |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Clashscore              | 7.58                                                                                 |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Poor rotamers (%)       | 0                                                                                    |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Ramachandran plot       |                                                                                      |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Favoré (%)              | 80.94                                                                                |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Allowed (%)             | 18.84                                                                                |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| Disallowed (%)          | 0.22                                                                                 |          |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |

Summary of relevant parameters used during cryo-EM data collection and processing. Refinement and validation statistics are provided for the molecular model of the BbRAGL-3’TIR synaptic complex with nicked DNA with C2 symmetry.
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Statistical parameters

When statistical analyses are reported, confirm that the following items are present in the relevant location (e.g. figure legend, table legend, main text, or Methods section).

☐ n/a  Confirmed

☐ The exact sample size (n) for each experimental group/condition, given as a discrete number and unit of measurement

☐ An indication of whether measurements were taken from distinct samples or whether the same sample was measured repeatedly

☐ The statistical test(s) used AND whether they are one- or two-sided

☐ Only common tests should be described solely by name; describe more complex techniques in the Methods section.

☐ A description of all covariates tested

☐ A description of any assumptions or corrections, such as tests of normality and adjustment for multiple comparisons

☐ A full description of the statistics including central tendency (e.g. means) or other basic estimates (e.g. regression coefficient) AND variation (e.g. standard deviation) or associated estimates of uncertainty (e.g. confidence intervals)

☐ For null hypothesis testing, the test statistic (e.g. F, t, r) with confidence intervals, effect sizes, degrees of freedom and P value noted

Give P values as exact values whenever suitable.

☐ For Bayesian analysis, information on the choice of priors and Markov chain Monte Carlo settings

☐ For hierarchical and complex designs, identification of the appropriate level for tests and full reporting of outcomes

☐ Estimates of effect sizes (e.g. Cohen's d, Pearson's r), indicating how they were calculated

☐ Clearly defined error bars

State explicitly what error bars represent (e.g. SD, SE, CI)

Our web collection on statistics for biologists may be useful.

Software and code
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Data collection  No software was used.

Data analysis  Image analysis was performed using MotionCor2 ver 1.1, Gctf 1.06, RELION1.4, and RELION-2.1. Initial BbRAGL model construction was performed using the Discovery Studio software suite from Accelrys 3.0 and refined using NAMD 2.12 and QA-RecombineIT. The structural model was refined using COOT 0.8, Rosetta FastRelax protocol, and PHENIX, and validated using MolProbity and EMringer. Molecular representations were generated in PyMol and Chimera. Cutadapt version 1.16 was used to divide multiplexed sequencing reads by barcoded conditions and to trim the barcode sequences, primer sequences, and 12RSS and 23RSS sequences. Bowtie2 (version 2.2.9) was used to align to GRCh38 with "very sensitive" presets in end-to-end-alignment mode. High-quality alignments (MAPQ >= 30, identified with Samtools 1.5) were converted to bed intervals using the bedtools bamToBed utility (bedtools version 2.27.1). Bedtools intersect was used to identify loci where corresponding 12RSS and 23RSS libraries showed evidence of transposition events on opposite strands.

For manuscripts utilizing custom algorithms or software that are central to the research but not yet described in published literature, software must be made available to editors/reviewers upon request. We strongly encourage code deposition in a community repository (e.g. GitHub). See the Nature Research guidelines for submitting code & software for further information.
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The model of the cBbRAGL-nicked 3’TIR synaptic complex has been deposited in the Protein Data Bank with accession code PDB: 6B40. The cryo-EM maps of cBbRAGL in complex with intact or nicked 3’TIRs have been deposited in EMDDataBank with accession codes EMD-7043, 7044, 7045, and 7046. High-throughput DNA sequence data to identify transposition events in the human genome have been deposited in the NCBI Sequence Read Archive with accession codes SRR8430227-SRR8430233 (Project PRJNA514369).

Field-specific reporting

Please select the best fit for your research. If you are not sure, read the appropriate sections before making your selection.

☐ Life sciences   ☐ Behavioural & social sciences   ☐ Ecological, evolutionary & environmental sciences

For a reference copy of the document with all sections, see nature.com/authors/policies/ReportingSummary-flat.pdf

Life sciences study design

All studies must disclose on these points even when the disclosure is negative.

| Sample size | No sample-size calculations were performed. Such calculations were not relevant given the types of data reported in our study. The number of times that experiments were repeated is addressed under “Replication” below. |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data exclusions | No data were excluded from the analyses. |
| Replication | Reproducibility of biochemical experiments was verified by performing such experiments (e.g., DNA cleavage assays) at least 3 times, except as noted in Methods under “Statistics and Reproducibility”. For transposition assays, reproducibility was verified by repeating experiments at least three times, and the data for each assay are shown as an individual symbol. Each replicate was an independent experiment and did not represent re-assay of the same material. All attempts at replication were successful. |
| Randomization | Randomization was not relevant to our study because our study did not involve the allocation of samples/organisms/participants into experimental groups. |
| Blinding | Investigators were not blinded to group allocation because group allocation was not involved in our study. Investigators were not blinded during data collection because the data being collected were quantitative in nature (gels or numbers of colonies on a plate) and were not prone to subjective interpretation. |
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Materials & experimental systems

| n/a | Involved in the study |
|-----|-----------------------|
| ☑ | Unique biological materials |
| ☑ | Antibodies |
| ☑ | Eukaryotic cell lines |
| ☑ | Palaeontology |
| ☑ | Animals and other organisms |
| ☑ | Human research participants |

Methods

| n/a | Involved in the study |
|-----|-----------------------|
| ☑ | ChIP-seq |
| ☑ | Flow cytometry |
| ☑ | MRI-based neuroimaging |

Antibodies

Antibodies used anti-RAG1 monoclonal antibody #23; anti-RAG2 monoclonal antibody #39; anti-beta-actin monoclonal antibody (Sigma #A1978)

Validation The specificity of the anti-RAG antibodies has been verified using RAG-knockout cells and protein extracts from those cells in western blots, ChIP-seq, and other assays. The specificity of the anti-beta-actin antibody was verified as a single intense band of...
the expected molecular weight by western blot, a finding also reported on the manufacturer’s website in multiple mouse and human cell lines.

### Eukaryotic cell lines

**Policy information about cell lines**

| Cell line source(s) | HEK293T cells were obtained from ATCC. Expi293 cells were obtained from Thermo Fisher Scientific. HCT116 cells were obtained from Eric Hendrickson, University of Minnesota. |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Authentication      | Cell lines used were not authenticated.                                                                                                                                                            |
| Mycoplasma contamination | Cell lines were not tested for mycoplasma contamination.                                                                                                                                               |
| Commonly misidentified lines (See [ICLAC register](#)) | None                                                                                                                                                                                                  |

### Flow Cytometry

**Plots**

- The axis labels state the marker and fluorochrome used (e.g. CD4-FITC).
- The axis scales are clearly visible. Include numbers along axes only for bottom left plot of group (a ‘group’ is an analysis of identical markers).
- All plots are contour plots with outliers or pseudocolor plots.
- A numerical value for number of cells or percentage (with statistics) is provided.

**Methodology**

| Sample preparation | Expi293F cells were harvested 72 h post-transfection, washed twice with PBS containing 1% FBS, stained with DAPI (4′,6-diamidino-2-phenylindole). |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Instrument         | Stratedigm STD-13L                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Software           | FlowJo 10.3                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Cell population abundance | Live cell sorting was not performed. Data are reported on live cells as determined by DAPI exclusion.                                                                                             |
| Gating strategy    | Negative gate established in cells transfected with GFP reporter vector but no RAG or BbRAGL expression vectors; see Supplementary Data 2.                                                        |

Tick this box to confirm that a figure exemplifying the gating strategy is provided in the Supplementary Information.