The spatial segregation of pericentromeric heterochromatin (PCH) into distinct, membrane-less nuclear compartments involves the binding of Heterochromatin Protein 1 (HP1) to H3K9me2/3-rich genomic regions. While HP1 exhibits liquid–liquid phase separation properties in vitro, its mechanistic impact on the structure and dynamics of PCH condensate formation in vivo remains largely unresolved. Here, using a minimal theoretical framework, we systematically investigate the mutual coupling between self-interacting HP1-like molecules and the chromatin polymer. We reveal that the specific affinity of HP1 for H3K9me2/3 loci facilitates coacervation in nucleo and promotes the formation of stable PCH condensates at HP1 levels far below the concentration required to observe phase separation in purified protein assays in vitro. These heterotypic HP1–chromatin interactions give rise to a strong dependence of the nucleoplastic HP1 density on HP1-H3K9me2/3 stoichiometry, consistent with the thermodynamics of multimolecular phase separation. The dynamical cross talk between HP1 and the viscoelastic chromatin scaffold also leads to anomalously slow equilibration kinetics, which strongly depend on the genomic distribution of H3K9me2/3 domains and result in the coexistence of multiple long-lived, microphase-separated PCH compartments. The morphology of these complex coacervates is further found to be governed by the dynamic establishment of the underlying H3K9me2/3 landscape, which may drive their increasingly abnormal, aspherical shapes during cell development. These findings compare favorably to 4D microscopy measurements of HP1 condensate formation in live Drosophila embryos and suggest a general quantitative model of PCH formation based on the interplay between HP1-based phase separation and chromatin polymer mechanics.

Significance

Genome stability and cell fate determination require the organization of pericentromeric heterochromatin (PCH)—a set of highly repeated DNA regions—into nuclear compartments enriched in Heterochromatin Protein 1 (HP1). Here, we investigate how the spontaneous assembly of HP1 into liquid-like condensates in vitro may affect the folding of the chromatin polymer in vivo. Using molecular simulations, we show that self-interactions among HP1 proteins, combined with their specific affinity for PCH domains, are key contributors to the kinetics and stability of PCH compartments. This minimal theoretical framework recapitulates the structure and dynamics of PCH condensates observed in early Drosophila embryos and suggests a generic model of PCH establishment based on the coupling between HP1 phase separation and chromosome polymer mechanics.
H3K9me2/3 (hereafter referred to as “methylated chromatin”) mediated by their chromodomains (CDs) (17). The high-affinity dimerization interactions have led the field to consider the HP1 dimer to be the functional form across homologs (18). The ability of HP1 molecules to form stable dimers also underlies a well-supported structural model for pericentromeres, whereby adjacent methylated nucleosomes may be transiently bridged by HP1 dimers (19, 20)—thus sequestering the underlying chromatin fiber into distinct, compact spatial compartments (henceforth referred to simply as “PCH condensates”). The second level of interactions revolves around a complex set of low-affinity forces driving primarily by the multiple intrinsically disordered regions (IDRs) within the HP1α/δ dimer, which in turn modulate the interaction strengths of both HP1 structured domains (CSD and CD) and their association with nucleic acids and other proteins (21, 22). Extensive investigations in mammals and Drosophila—based on HP1α and HP1a, respectively—have demonstrated that such interactions may drive the ability of HP1 to spontaneously form distinct, liquid-like condensates in vitro (23–25). All of these forces are further affected by ionic conditions, nucleic acid content and accessibility, and posttranslational modifications such as HP1α phosphorylation and HP1 protein-partner binding (23, 25), suggesting a multiplicity of possible processes for regulating the in vivo segregation of methylated chromatin into PCH compartments.

Building on these considerations, two main classes of mechanisms have been hypothesized (12) (Fig. 1A): 1) an “LLPS-like” mode of organization where PCH compartments result mainly from the capacity of HP1-like architectural proteins to self-interact and to form liquid-like droplets within which H3K9me2/3-rich regions may colocalize, and 2) a “bridging-like” process where condensates emerge solely from the capacity of HP1 to carry multivalent heterotypic bonds with methylated chromatin, and hence to stabilize direct, transient “bridges” between distant loci. The former is backed up by in vivo observations in mammals and Drosophila revealing a highly dynamic exchange of HP1 molecules within PCH and in the nucleoplasm (26) and the rapid kinetics of PCH assembly and disassembly during the cell cycle (25, 27). The latter is supported by in vivo studies in mammalian cell lines suggesting that the structural properties of HP1 condensates deviate from those observed in vitro in LLPS-driven solutions of purified proteins and resemble more that of polymer globules with size and compaction only weakly dependent on HP1 concentration (28). However, this assumed dichotomy between bridging- and LLPS-driven compartmentalization does not account for the complex physics of intracellular multicomponent phase separation (29), which may significantly differ from that of simple single-component LLPS phase separation within the crowded nuclear environment (11, 29, 30).

Here, we aim to reconcile these a priori conflicting in vitro and in vivo observations of HP1-driven phase separation through the lens of a simple first-principle model of endogenous chromatin–protein assemblies. The vast majority of theoretical studies to date have investigated the formation of PCH compartments (and of the 3D genome in general) using “bridging-like” models (31–37), and the generic physics of the LLPS-like mode of organization remains poorly characterized (30). Our minimal description enables us to comprehensively explore the basic biophysical behavior of heterogeneous, multicomponent coacervates composed by chromatin and architectural proteins and is contextualized to address the differential roles of HP1-HP1 and HP1-H3K9me2/3 interactions in PCH assembly. In particular, we demonstrate that the key kinetic and thermodynamic features of PCH condensate formation are compatible with a mode of organization in which chromosome structure and dynamics are driven by the coupling between fast-diffusing HP1 proteins, H3K9me2/3 patterning along the chromosome, and the constrained chromatin fiber. Our theoretical predictions are corroborated by in vivo 4D microscopy measurements of HP1a condensate formation in early Drosophila embryos and may provide a versatile framework to interpret the endogenous behavior of a wide range of biomolecular condensates.

Results

A Minimal Model for Chromosome Folding Driven by Self-Interacting Proteins. To investigate the potential interplay between the self-affinity of architectural chromatin-binding proteins such as HP1 and the large-scale organization of chromosomes, we developed a generic biophysical framework (Fig. 1B)—termed the cooperative binding model—which accounts for the coupled dynamics of the chromatin polymer and self-interacting diffusible particles (see Materials and Methods for details). Briefly, we represent chromatin as a self-avoiding, semiflexible chain (38) and describe protein binders via the lattice gas model, which corresponds to an efficient molecular-level description of phase separation (39). The spatiotemporal evolution of the system is driven by standard polymer properties (backbone connectivity,
excluded volume, and bending rigidity), in conjunction with both homotypic, HP1-HP1 interactions and a heterotypic affinity of HP1 for H3K9me2/3 monomer sites along the chromatin chain. In this context, diffusible particles represent HP1 dimers with a typical hydrodynamic radius of 20 nm, and each target monomer (referred to as a locus) corresponds to a contiguous chromatin region of length ~1 kbp, in which all constituent histones are assumed to bear the H3K9me2/3 posttranslational mark (Materials and Methods).

The Lattice-Gas Model Recapitulates In Vitro Features of HP1-Based Phase Separation. To assess the ability of the model to reproduce some of the main kinetic and equilibrium properties of classical, single-component phase separation, we first performed simulations involving pure HP1 dimers in the absence of the chromatin scaffold (Fig. 2A). For this purpose, we systematically varied the total HP1 concentration \( [\text{HP1}] \) and self-affinity \( J_{\text{HP1}} \) between HP1 dimers and monitored both the time evolution and resulting steady state of the system, starting from a well-mixed random initial state. We find that beyond a critical strength of self-affinity \( J_{\text{crit}} \), the value of HP1 concentration above which condensates form in our simulations is a steep function of \( J_{\text{HP1}} \), and decreases monotonously from \( [\text{HP1}] \approx 100 \mu M \) to \( [\text{HP1}] < 1 \mu M \) upon increasing \( J_{\text{HP1}} \) in the range \([1 - 3]\) kJ/mol (Fig. 2B, black curve). We observe that increasing the total HP1 content \( [\text{HP1}] \) induces a swelling of the condensate (Fig. 2A), while the HP1 level \( [\text{HP1}] \) outside the focus similarly remains fixed (Fig. 2C). This concentration buffering effect signifies that in the presence of condensates, the concentration of the dilute phase is independent of the total HP1 content of the system (11, 29, 40).

Then, we monitored the kinetics of HP1 condensates predicted by the model close to the stability line (Fig. 2B, black curve). It displays a marked transition from an initiation and growth stage at short times \( (t \ll 1 \text{ s}) \) to a coarsening behavior at longer times \( (t \gg 1 \text{ s}) \), in agreement with classical theories of phase separation dynamics (8) (Fig. 2A). The initial stage is characterized by a diffusion-limited growth (DLG) process, associated with a rapid
expansion of the mean condensate size \( \langle R(t) \rangle \propto t^{1/2} \) (Fig. 2D and E) (8), constrained by the diffusion rate of individual proteins within the bulk. At later time points, the coarsening regime describes the subsequent growth of larger HP1 droplets at the expense of the smaller foci, either via local collision events driven by the stochastic diffusion of proximal foci—referred to as Brownian coalescence (BC)—or via nonlocal, transient protein “evaporation” and recondensation, known as Ostwald ripening (OR) (Fig. 2E) (8). Both mechanisms are associated with a slower growth exponent \( \langle R(t) \rangle \propto t^{1/3} \) (Fig. 2D) (8) and can be observed in our simulations (Fig. 2A), although OR generally constitutes the dominant coarsening process in this simple lattice-gas framework (Materials and Methods).

Altogether, these results evidence the capacity of the model to recapitulate salient features of classical single-component phase separation, both in and out of equilibrium. We finally used such analysis to parametrize HP1-HP1 interactions based on previous in vitro investigations for purified HP1α and HP1a proteins using turbidity assays in physiological buffer conditions (23, 25, 28). Identifying \( \rho_{\text{HP1}}^0 \) as the HP1 density at the onset of turbidity (\( \rho_{\text{HP1}}^0 \equiv 7 \mu M \) for mouse HP1α and \( \rho_{\text{HP1}}^0 \equiv 20 \mu M \) for Drosophila HP1a, SI Appendix, Methods), we find \( \rho_{\text{HP1}}^0 = 2.6 \text{ kJ/mol} \) and \( J_{\text{HP1-HP1}} = 1.8 \text{ kJ/mol} \), respectively (Fig. 2B). These values are consistent with the weak, reversible interprotein interactions typically characterizing LLPS (10, 41).

*HP1-H3K9me2/3 Affinity Impacts the Thermodynamics of HP1 Condensates In Nucleo.* Having in hand a minimal model of homotypic HP1 interactions, we investigated how the formation of HP1 condensates in vivo may be impacted by the heterotypic affinity between HP1 dimers and H3K9me2/3-enriched genomic loci (Figs. 1B and 3A) and how it may in turn impact the structure and dynamics of PCH compartments (Fig. 3B–G, see also SI Appendix, Fig. S4). To that end, we consider as a first test case a simplified representation of mouse chromosome 19 (60 Mbp) featuring a unique, 10 Mbp-long H3K9me2/3 telocentric domain (Fig. 1C) in the presence of HP1α. We report in Fig. 3B that the addition of this methylated chromatin domain considerably decreases the concentration above which HP1 foci form in simulations. Indeed, HP1 condensates may now be observed at intranuclear HP1 levels far lower than the density \( \rho_{\text{HP1}}^0 = 7 \mu M \) required in vitro to phase-separate purified HP1α (Fig. 2B and 3B). This effect is found to be increasingly pronounced upon raising \( J_{\text{HP1-HP1}} = 7 \mu M \) required in vitro to phase-separate purified HP1α (Fig. 2B and 3B). This effect is found to be increasingly pronounced upon raising \( J_{\text{HP1-HP1}} = 7 \mu M \) required in vitro to phase-separate purified HP1α (Fig. 2B and 3B). This effect is found to be increasingly pronounced upon raising \( J_{\text{HP1}} \) in the range [0.1 – 0.6] kJ/mol, which corresponds to the typical magnitude of HP1-H3K9 binding energy suggested by previous computational studies (32). Coincidentally, we find that the radius \( R_0 \) of the smallest stable HP1 foci in our simulations is also significantly reduced upon increasing \( J_{\text{HP1-HP1}} \) (Fig. 3D). Both observations can be attributed to the binding of HP1 onto the methylated chromatin substrate, which promotes phase separation by facilitating focus nucleation and compensates for the higher interfacial energy costs (SI Appendix, Fig. S1) associated with smaller droplets.

Furthermore, in contrast to the pure HP1 system, the potential concentration buffering behavior is now dependent on the system composition (Fig. 3C). For moderate-to-high affinity strengths \( J_{\text{HP1}} \), we observe that the HP1 density \( \rho_{\text{HP1}}^{\text{dd}} \) in the dilute, nucleoplasmonic phase remains almost constant for low HP1 levels and then increases with \( \rho_{\text{HP1}} \) and only approaches its in vitro plateau value at very high concentrations. To interpret this stoichiometric effect, we define the stoichiometric binding isotherm as the minimal \( \rho_{\text{HP1}}(\text{HP1}–\text{H3K9}) \) values at which all the methylated loci are in contact with at least one HP1 dimer (Fig. 3E, black line). Below the isothermal value, the system is in a regime of droplet growth driven by HP1-H3K9 binding events, and most of the HP1 dimers are wetting H3K9me2/3 sites, the population of free dimers being negligible (\( \rho_{\text{HP1}}^{\text{dd}} < \rho_{\text{HP1}} < \rho_{\text{HP1}}^{\text{dd}} \)) (Fig. 3C). Beyond this point, additional dimers chiefly diffuse into the nucleoplasmonic background phase, as further swelling of the droplets does not incur any gains in HP1-H3K9 contacts. Thus, one generally obtains a sublinear growth of the focus volume \( V \) with increasing \( \rho_{\text{HP1}} \) (Fig. 3D) and only recovers the linear growth regime of standard concentration buffering in the limit of wide HP1 excess (\( \rho_{\text{HP1}} > \rho_{\text{H3K9}} \))—in which HP1-H3K9me2/3 coupling becomes statistically irrelevant, and is superseded by HP1–HP1 homotypic interactions (Fig. 3 C and D).

The formation of HP1 condensates is further found to drive the partial or total collapse of the encapsulated methylated chromatin (Fig. 3F). This structural transition starts when roughly 20 to 30% of the HP1-H3K9me2/3 loci are covered by HP1 dimers and is also associated with a dynamical cross-over. At this point, the methylated chromatin diffusion constant is reduced by roughly fivefold (SI Appendix, Fig. S3F), and the diffusion exponent goes from 0.5—consistent with the viscoelastic dynamics of a dilute, unconstrained polymer—down to \( \sim 0.4 \), characterizing the slower motion of a dense, globular chain (Fig. 3G) (42). Interestingly, the stoichiometric binding region coincides with a maximal impact on the compaction and mobility of the methylated chromatin region (Fig. 3 F and G and SI Appendix, Fig. S2H), which results from the full encapsulation of all H3K9me2/3 loci within a HP1 focus of minimal volume, and thus leads to the maximal degree of PCH packaging.

Together, these conclusions demonstrate that the ability of HP1 dimers to self-interact, coupled with the specific affinity of HP1 for methylated chromatin, mediates the formation of condensed PCH compartments at endogenous levels far below the concentrations required to observe HP1 condensation in purified in vitro assays. This result also highlights the limitations of intracellular perturbation experiments based on ectopic protein over- or under-expression in investigations of in vivo phase separation (28), whose interpretation in terms of concentration buffering generally requires a careful quantitative analysis of the levels of all the interaction partners involved (29).

**H3K9me2/3 Distribution and Chromosome Mechanics Regulate Phase Separation Kinetics.** The coupled evolution dynamics of the HP1–chromatin system studied in Fig. 3 irreversibly leads to rapid relaxation toward a fully phase-separated state, characterized by the complete segregation of methylated chromatin into a single, large focus encapsulated within a unique HP1 liquid droplet (Fig. 3 A, Right). The phase separation kinetics predicted by the model in this case reveal a quick equilibration of the mean focus size over a typical timescale \( t \lesssim 10 \text{ s} \) with a growth exponent \( \langle R(t) \rangle \propto t^{1/2} \), consistent with nucleation-driven DLG (Fig. 4E). We attribute this effect to the cooperative binding of HP1 onto the contiguous methylated chromatin domain, which leads to the strong colocalization of droplet nucleation sites within the same, H3K9me2/3-dense nuclear region (Fig. 3 A, Left)—and thus results in rapid growth independent of the slower OR and BC coarsening processes.

While our first test case (Fig. 1C) was representative of the formation of large chromocenters, it may be unable to describe the existing multiplicity of smaller, spatially distinct HP1 compartments (44), observed during interphase in conventional mammalian nuclei (35). Such complex, heterogeneous domain patterns...
are traditionally interpreted in terms of microphase separation undergone by block copolymers in the presence of self-attractions between epigenomically similar regions (45, 46). To investigate whether such distinct compartments may be physically reconciled with an HP1-driven mechanism of heterochromatin folding, we introduced as a second test case a chromosome model featuring multiple methylated domains of disparate sizes, representative of chromosome 19 in human fibroblasts (Fig. 1D and Materials and Methods). We find that this heterogeneous distribution of H3K9me2/3 along the chromatin polymer leads to drastically slower coarsening dynamics (Fig. 4B and C). HP1 dimers first stochastically aggregate across multiple separate methylated regions. These competing nucleation sites then gradually mature into a number of distinct, spherical foci, which may remain metastable over timescales \( t \gg 30 \text{ min} \) well beyond the total simulation time. This partial phase coarsening process is characterized by the rapid, OR-like evaporation of smaller foci at short times \( (t < 1 \text{ s}) \), associated with a mean growth exponent \( \langle R(t) \rangle \propto t^{1/3} \). Such events are however strongly suppressed at longer timescales \( (t > 2 \text{ s}) \), over which focus growth is instead governed by an abnormally slow growth exponent \( \langle R(t) \rangle \propto t^{0.15} \).

Similar anomalous coarsening dynamics have been recently reported for engineered intranuclear protein condensates and were ascribed to the coupling of droplet motion with the viscoelastic (VE) diffusion kinetics of the underlying chromatin network (47–49). Indeed, the strong colocalization of H3K9me2/3 loci and HP1 foci (Fig. 3A and E) imposes that condensate displacement correlates with the collective diffusion of the encapsulated methylated chromatin regions (Fig. 4B,Inset), and thus that individual HP1 foci experience a subdiffusive motion with an exponent \( \beta \) similar to that of H3K9 domains \( (\beta \approx 0.45, \text{Fig. 3G}) \) (42).

In this case, one may show (47) that the theoretical coarsening
dynamics associated with diffusion of HP1 droplets simply scale as $\langle R(t) \rangle \propto t^{1/3}$. The predicted scaling behavior $\alpha_{\text{VE}} \approx 0.15$ (Fig. 4C) is thus consistent with such anomalously slow, viscoelastic coalescence combined with an inhibition of OR, which we similarly attribute to the effective “trapping” of H3K9me2/3 domains within the HP1 condensates (50). Remarkably, a recent in vivo study in human cells based on CRISPR-engineered HP1 targeted to randomly distributed ectopic chromatin binding sites (43) revealed that the assembly kinetics of HP1 foci at their multiple distinct target loci follow a similar transition from a $\alpha \approx 1/3$ short-time exponent to a slower growth regime with $\alpha \approx 0.15$ at longer times (Fig. 4 C, Inset).

These findings suggest that anomalously slow coarsening dynamics generically arise from the interplay between HP1-driven phase separation and chromosome polymer mechanics in the presence of multiple, competing genomic binding regions. This conclusion is corroborated by an analysis of the time evolution of the distribution of droplet size (Fig. 4 B, D, and F). In the case of pure HP1 (Fig. 4F), for which OR dominates, distributions display a unimodal shape with a transient left-skewed long tail at intermediate times ($1 \text{s} < t < 300 \text{s}$), characteristic of the polydisperse population of small droplets undergoing continuous evaporation (8). In the presence of a single, large PCH genomic region (Fig. 4D), population dynamics are qualitatively similar, which may be imputed to the rapid nucleation of HP1 foci onto the homogeneously methylated chromatin substrate (51). Conversely, in the case of PCH combined with a highly dispersed pattern of H3K9me2/3 marks (Fig. 4B), we find that the tail is noticeably less pronounced and that distributions instead display a transient bimodal shape at longer timescales. This behavior is consistent with the presence of metastable, separate HP1 foci that slowly merge into larger condensates via discrete coalescence events.

Thus, our results suggest that the microphase separation of HP1 and methylated regions into long-lived, coexisting nuclear...
compartments could be simply attributed to anomalously slow equilibration kinetics originating from the dynamical asymmetry between fast-diffusing HP1 proteins and the slow, viscoelastic chromatin scaffold.

**PCH Condensate Establishment Kinetics Govern Focus Morphology.** In a wild-type context, an additional factor relevant to the coupling between chromatin polymers and HP1-based phase separation in nucleo is the highly dynamic nature of the methylated chromatin landscape. This may arise from the de novo establishment of H3K9me2/3 domains in embryogenesis and differentiation and the subsequent maintenance or removal of these marks during the cell cycle (14). To address the effects of H3K9me2/3 establishment on the assembly kinetics of HP1 condensates, we investigated the formation of PCH compartments during early fly embryogenesis. In Drosophila, most of the heterochromatin is localized at the pericentromeric regions, forming large, -20 to 45 Mbp-wide, contiguous H3K9me2/3 domains on each chromosome, encompassing almost 30% of the genome (52). During embryogenesis, the level of methylated chromatin increases from fertilization through nuclear cycle 14 (NC14), but visible HP1a foci first appear in cycle 11, likely reflecting the threshold of H3K9 methylation needed to nucleate HP1a condensates. In NC11-14, HP1a-PCH condensates become increasingly large, concomitantly with the increasing length of each cell cycle (24).

We thus introduced a minimal description of H3K9me2/3 establishment in which, starting from a fully unmethylated initial state, each pericentromeric locus may stochastically acquire the H3K9me2/3 mark with a fixed methylation rate \( r_{\text{f}}^{\text{H3K9}} \). Focusing on the case of *D. melanogaster* chromosome 2 (48.8 Mbp, Fig. 5C), we parameterized intranuclear HP1a and H3K9me2/3 concentrations based on mass spectrometry analysis of *D. melanogaster* embryos (53), and set \( r_{\text{f}}^{\text{H3K9}} \approx 5 \) min to mimic the typical evolution of methylated chromatin levels reported over the course of Drosophila NC14 (54–56) (Fig. 5C and Materials and Methods). Furthermore, in order to assess the biological relevance of our findings, we simultaneously examined the spatiotemporal dynamics of GFP-HP1a puncta across NC14 in live Drosophila embryos by means of 4D confocal microscopy (Fig. 5A and Materials and Methods). We jointly monitored the time evolution of condensate sizes and morphologies to directly juxtapose model predictions against experimental measurements over the first \( t_{\text{max}} \approx 40 \) min of NC14.

Our simulations (Fig. 5B) predict that the growth exponent \( \alpha \) of the foci is found to display a cross-over from \( \alpha \approx 1/3 \) at short times to a coarsening regime consistent with \( \alpha \approx 0.15 \) at later stages (Fig. 5F), qualitatively similar to that obtained in the case of multiple competing, human-chromosome-19-like methylated domains (Fig. 4C). However, this slower, competitive mode of phase separation contrasts with the faster, cooperative kinetics (\( \alpha \approx 1/2 \)) expected for the steady-state distribution of H3K9me2/3, which consists in one contiguous block of methylated chromatin (Fig. 5C, late NC14)—much like the telocentric mouse-like chromosome model (Fig. 4E). We attribute this anomalously slow equilibration process to the dynamic propagation of H3K9me2/3, which may lead to transient stochastic features featuring multiple, distinct H3K9me2/3-enriched regions as methylation progresses (Fig. 5C, early/mid NC14). These distinct sites in turn act as competing seeds for the nucleation of HP1 condensates. The resulting shift in the focus growth exponent from \( \alpha \approx 1/3 \) to \( \alpha \approx 0.15 \) is associated with a transition regime around \( t \sim 10^{-0.5} t_{\text{max}} \approx 15 \) min (Fig. 5F). This phenomenology does not depend strongly on the speed of H3K9me2/3 establishment (*SI Appendix, Fig. S5 A and B*). Moreover, it is corroborated by data analysis of live-embryo imaging, showing that the size of in vivo HP1 condensates exhibits very similar dynamics to those predicted by the model (Fig. 5F).

Remarkably, the maturation of these HP1-PCH foci is found to be associated with an increasing loss of sphericity during the establishment of the methylated pericentromeric domain, which is evidenced in both model and experiment by a sharp rise in the mean focus anisotropy \( A \) during the first 20 to 30 min of NC14 (Fig. 5E and *SI Appendix, Methods*) (24). The appearance of such aspherical condensates is robust to changes in the kinetics of H3K9me2/3 establishment, with slower propagation dynamics leading to a higher, more persistent anisotropy (*SI Appendix, Fig. S5C*). However, it strongly contrasts with our model predictions for the coupled HP1–chromatin system in the absence of H3K9me2/3 establishment dynamics, for which \( A \) decays toward 0 after a 10 to 30 sec-long initial plateau, indicating rapid relaxation toward increasingly round shapes in all considered scenarios (Fig. 4G). We thus attribute the increase in anisotropy observed in our embryo simulations to the dynamic propagation of chromatin methylation. Indeed, as discussed further below, the creation of new H3K9me2/3-enriched regions is found to lead to the continuous nucleation of small HP1 puncta in our model, which eventually percolate into connected structures linking larger foci—associated with early-methylated chromatin domains—in a network-like fashion (Fig. 5 B and D).

Such complex, nonconvex morphologies are consistent with in vivo observations at mid-NC14 (Fig. 5A–E). Thus, we speculate that such structures may similarly develop in nucleo as the system proceeds toward full PCH establishment and maturation. This hypothesis may be supported by the analysis of the time evolution of the focus size distributions, which reveals the presence of a significant population of small HP1-PCH condensates that persists throughout most of NC14 both in vivo and in silico (Fig. 5G and H). This persistent population of small puncta contrasts with the rapid disappearance of the smaller foci obtained in silico in the case of both pure HP1 (Fig. 4P) and static methylated chromatin domains (Fig. 4 B and D). Furthermore, it is found to be slowly superseded by a distinct population of significantly larger foci as the cell cycle progresses (Fig. 5G and H). Therefore, this persistent HP1 population in nucleo could be compatible with the continuous formation of HP1-PCH condensates around newly formed H3K9me2/3 regions, which putatively recedes as one approaches the establishment of full methylation and H3K9me2/3 nucleation subsides. At these later stages, which closely match the regime of viscoelastic-BC-like focus growth (Fig. 5F), the in vivo condensates are found to slowly relax toward sphericity—also consistent with our model predictions (Fig. 5E).

Together, these observations suggest that the dynamic establishment of H3K9me2/3 marks further promotes anomalously slow HP1 phase separation kinetics by introducing a competition between nucleated HP1 foci within individual pericentromeres and may lead to the development of long-lived aspherical, network-like morphologies compatible with those observed in live Drosophila embryos.

**Discussion and Conclusion.**

In this study, we have used generic biophysical modeling to investigate how the propensity of architectural chromatin-binding proteins such as HP1 to undergo phase separation may be impacted by heterotypic, specific interactions with the chromatin polymer, and may in turn affect both chromosome structure and mobility. In particular, we demonstrate that the
equilibrium and kinetic features displayed by in nucleo condensates of chromatin-binding proteins may quantitatively and qualitatively deviate from the classical hallmarks of single-component phase separation in several key aspects (57). First, our model predicts that in vivo, HP1 puncta may stably form around H3K9me2/3-enriched genomic regions at physiologically relevant concentrations of HP1, which are significantly lower than required in in vitro assays (Fig. 3B). Such “polymer-assisted condensation” (58) emerges from the indirect stabilization of HP1-HP1 contacts caused by the direct affinity interactions between HP1 and H3K9me2/3 nucleosomes. This heterogeneous nucleation process is fully consistent with other theoretical models of self-attracting, diffusing particles—like RNA Pol II or the pioneer transcription factor Klf4—which may also display a specific affinity for the chromatin polymer (30, 59–61). More generally, this phenomenon is a specific illustration of polyphasic linkage (62, 63) where ligands may regulate the phase separation of scaffold molecules. In our case, methylated chromatin can be viewed as a ligand that facilitates the condensation of scaffold HP1s, as it preferentially binds to
the dense scaffold (HP1) phase to maximize heterotypic interactions while maintaining high levels of homotypic interactions (64).

Second, we show that in vivo, the nucleoplasmic density of HP1 in the dilute background phase is generally not constant but instead depends on the total HP1 level (Fig. 3C). When HP1 molecules are present at substoichiometric levels compared to methylated chromatin sites, nucleoplasmic HP1 is buffered at a fixed value significantly lower than that measured in vitro. This depletion of HP1 in the dilute phase is more pronounced for stronger HP1-H3K9me2/3 interactions. Conversely, when HP1 dimers are in excess of H3K9me2/3, we predict a sublinear increase of nucleoplasmic levels with the global HP1 concentration, associated with an anomalously slow growth of the PCH compartment (Fig. 3D). A similar increase of the nucleoplasmic concentration was recently observed in mouse embryonic fibroblast when overexpressing HP1α (28), but also in HeLa cells for several proteins like NPM1 involved in the formation of other LLPS-based condensates such as nucleoli (29). Although such effects are frequently attributed to compartmentalization driven by noncooperative “bridger” proteins (see below) (1), our findings reveal that this behavior can also be displayed by self-interacting protein-based condensates in the presence of heterotypic interactions—in agreement with the generic properties of multicomponent phase separation (29, 65).

Third, our analysis demonstrates that in vivo, the kinetics of condensate coarsening may significantly deviate from the standard OR and BC (Fig. 4) and strongly depend on the linear organization of methylated chromatin along the genome, thus enabling dynamic control of the 3D PCH organization via its 1D (genomic) patterning along the polymer (66, 67). Condensate formation around long contiguous H3K9me2/3 regions is anomalously fast (Fig. 4E) and may allow the rapid recompaction of large methylated domains such as pericentromeres in late mitosis/early interphase, after the disassembly of HP1-PCH foci during mitotic prophase (24). On the contrary, the coarsening of scattered (Fig. 4C) or establishing (Fig. 5F) H3K9me2/3 domains is anomalously slow and dominated by viscoelastic Brownian coalescence. These situations are consistent with the general concept of viscoelastic phase separation (68, 69), in which strong asymmetries in the mobilities of the mixture components may lead to the formation of long-lived micro- or network-like phases. Interestingly, such inhibited equilibration kinetics corroborate in vivo measurements for HP1 (43) and FUS (47) proteins as well as in silico studies of nucleolus formation (49) and appear to generically characterize liquid droplets embedded in a polymer network—regardless of whether the heterotypic interactions with chromatin are attractive (49) or repulsive (47, 70). These slow coalescence dynamics may further explain why, in cycling cells, all methylated chromatin regions—initially spatially-dispersed after mitosis—generally do not colocalize into one single macrophase, but rather form several meta-stable microcompartments, whose fusion may be too slow to be achieved within one cell cycle (34). Our prediction is that postreplicative cells may exhibit fewer and larger PCH condensates, as has already been reported in oncogene-induced senescent fibroblasts (34) and in mouse rod photoreceptors (35).

Together, these conclusions evidence the limitations of interpreting potential intracellular observations of endogenous phase separation based on simple comparisons to the thermodynamic and kinetic properties of single-component phases. In this context, it is enlightening to compare our results to those of previous “bridger”-based descriptions of compartment formation such as the string-and-binders-switch model (32, 34, 66). Such approaches, which neglect the effects of HP1-HP1 homotypic interactions (SI Appendix, Fig. S2A), are found to display many quantitative and qualitative differences with our model (SI Appendix, Figs. S2 and S3). For instance, in the “bridging-like” model, the variations in nucleoplasmic HP1 density exhibit the same qualitative trends as in our case (SI Appendix, Fig. S2D), but the increase with HP1 concentration in the regime of stoichiometric excess is significantly more pronounced (Fig. 3C). Another notable distinction between the two models lies in the interplay between HP1 and PCH condensation. In the “bridging-like” model, both processes are tightly coupled and occur near-simultaneously (SI Appendix, Figs. S2C and S3A), with a strongly cooperative theta-collapse of the long H3K9me2/3 domains leading to high polymer compaction (SI Appendix, Fig. S3A), as well as a dramatic reduction in chromatin mobility (SI Appendix, Fig. S3C). Conversely, we observe that the nucleation of HP1 condensates at H3K9me2/3 regions may occur at much lower densities than those at which maximal PCH compaction is achieved (Fig. 3B and F), which gives rise to a more diffuse transition between the dilute coiled and dense globular states. Furthermore, the chromatin configurations predicted by our model are generally less compact (two-fold, SI Appendix, Fig. S3 A and D) and more dynamic (five-fold, SI Appendix, Fig. S3 C and F) than in the “bridging-like” model which may also exhibit coarsening dynamics with viscoelastic Brownian coalescence but at much slower speed (SI Appendix, Fig. S3 G and H).

Therefore, our results demonstrate that the composition dependence of nucleoplasmic HP1 levels and the presence of a switch-like coil-to-globule transition, which have been previously presented as irreconcilable with LLPS behavior (28), are actually compatible with both “bridging-like”- and LLPS-based mechanisms of chromatin condensation. Furthermore, it is worth pointing out that these two processes are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Indeed, the biophysical properties of condensates are known to evolve over the course of the cell cycle and cellular differentiation, displaying liquid-like properties during initial establishment that transition into more static, gel-like material states consistent with maintenance (24, 71). This cross-over could reflect the differential regulation of HP1 homotypic and heterotypic affinities by various posttranslational modifications (72), as well as potential chromatin cross-linking by HP1 binding partners (73), which could conceivably enable endogeneous HP1 to exhibit a full spectrum of in vivo behaviors in-between those of the “bridger” and cooperative binding models. In biological situations like early embryogenesis, where PCH needs to be mobile and (re) organized on a large scale during the initial establishment of the condensate, dynamic LLPS-like properties may be required and functionally desirable. However, in more differentiated cells, a constrained, “bridging”-like mode of PCH segregation may be more advantageous to ensure the higher compaction and complete silencing of methylated genomic regions, or to provide specific mechanical or optical properties to the nucleus (74, 75). Indeed, HP1 mobility inside PCH has been shown to be tightly regulated and to gradually decrease as embryogenesis progresses (24).

In addition to the magnitude of HP1-associated affinities, our analysis of early fly embryogenesis shows that the spatiotemporal dynamics of HP1 condensates also depends on the time evolution of the H3K9me2/3 mark distribution (Fig. 5). In our work, to focus on HP1 condensate coarsening, we considered simplified, stochastic kinetics of H3K9me2/3 domain formation (Fig. 5C and SI Appendix, Fig. S5). More realistically, the establishment of H3K9me2/3 domains may rely on a feed-forward spreading mechanism, whereby lysine methyltransferases (KMTs) like Su(var)3-9, SetDb1 or G9a propagate methylation marks from recruitment sites via autocatalytic reader-writer processes (14, 76, 77). As the nuclear concentration of
KMTs is usually low (53), the rapid establishment of PCH domains during development would require an efficient long-range spreading activity for KMTs (78). Therefore, the spatial organization of chromatin around KMT nucleation sites may play an important role in the regulation of such activity (79). The recruitment of HP1 by nascent H3K9me2/3 regions, and the subsequent 3D compaction of methylated chromatin, could facilitate the long-range spreading of methylation marks through a positive feedback loop based on the interplay between HP1 recruitment and chromatin compaction, which may accelerate the establishment of epigenetic patterns (80–82). While this amplification loop may be essential to facilitate the spreading of PCH, the very good agreement between our predictions and experiments (Fig. 5 E–H) indicates that the large-scale coarsening dynamics of HP1 condensates are not strongly limited by the underlying kinetics of H3K9me2/3 establishment. Instead, our results would suggest that the aspherical morphology of such condensates as a generic experimental signature of the dynamic character of the epigenetic landscape being established (Fig. 5 D and E).

To conclude, we have developed a generic quantitative framework to investigate the phase separation of architectural chromatin-binding proteins in nuclei and contextualized our investigations to the formation of PCH condensates in higher eukaryotes. However, to perform such a systematic analysis, we had to resort to several simplifying assumptions. First, our lattice-gas model omits, in the absence of the polymer, a coarsening dynamics dominated by OR over BC. However, the very few quantitative studies investigating the in vitro coarsening of proteins involved in the formation of in vivo biomolecular condensates suggest that BC might be the dominant mode (8). This may impact the early coarsening regime of scattered H3K9me2/3 domains (Fig. 4C) where OR still dominates, before viscoelastic BC drives the kinetics. Second, we limited our analysis to a finite-size system consisting of a single chromosome. Our results in the case of the human (Fig. 4) and Drosophila (Fig. 5) nuclei suggest that the presence of other chromosomes—and thus, of other competing H3K9me2/3 regions—could add an additional layer of viscoelastic coarsening dynamics driven by interchromosomal diffusion kinetics. Such very slow processes (83) could prohibit the fusion of interchromosomal condensates, except in cases where the majority of H3K9me2/3 regions are colocatalized postmitosis, as in the Rabl configuration observed during fly embryogenesis (84). Third, we did not explicitly consider the dimerization thermodynamics of HP1, the finite interaction valency of HP1 with chromatin (85, 86), or the nonspecific interactions between HP1 and DNA (19, 23, 87, 88). These additional components and effects could possibly alter the impact of HP1 on PCH compaction (61, 89) in vivo—especially for endogenous HP1 levels close to the dimer dissociation constant—but the overall phenomenology is likely to be conserved (SI Appendix, Fig. S4). Finally, we restricted our work to a binary HP1-H3K9me2/3 system, neglecting other interaction partners such as RNA or HP1 binding factors that may interfere with or facilitate the formation of PCH condensates, which could serve to further enhance the complexity of the corresponding multicomponent phase diagram (90, 91).

Future studies will thus have to integrate such ingredients, coupled to a more precise description of H3K9me2/3 establishment, in order to fully characterize the spatiotemporal dynamics of PCH condensates in various biological contexts—such as the DNA damage repair of methylated chromatin loci (92)—as well as to investigate the important role of HP1 in structuring non-pericentromeric regions (46, 93). Nonetheless, the examination of the transferability of our minimal model to other architectural proteins constitutes a promising avenue of research, in light of its remarkable ability to correctly capture the in vivo features of HP1-based PCH condensate establishment in embryogenesis. In this framework, a natural potential candidate is PRC1, which plays a crucial role in the developmental regulation of Polycomb target genes (94) and has similarly been shown to exhibit LLPS-like properties in vitro (95, 96).

Materials and Methods

Lattice-Gas Model of HP1-Based Phase Separation. Individual HP1 dimers were represented as spherical beads with effective diameter $\delta$ residing on the vertices of a face-centered cubic lattice $L$. Multivalent affinity interactions between proximal dimers were described by a nearest-neighbor pair potential of depth $J_{\text{HP1-HP1}}$.

$$J_{\text{HP1-HP1}} = \frac{-\sigma_{\text{HP1}} \sigma_{\text{HP1}}}{2} \sum_{\langle i, j \rangle} \sigma_{i,j}$$

where the double sum runs over each lattice site $i$ and its 12 connected neighbors $j \in V(i)$. In Eq. (1), the occupancy number $\sigma_i$ equals 1 if a dimer is present at site $i$ and 0 otherwise, reflecting the fact that each lattice site may contain at most a single HP1 dimer. The lattice is composed of a finite number $N$ of vertices, and periodic boundary conditions were used to mimic potential cross-interactions with vicinal intranuclear regions.

Simulations were initialized by uniformly distributing a number $N_{\text{init}}$ of HP1 dimers on the lattice in a random arrangement and were evolved through standard kinetic Monte Carlo (MC) rules at fixed temperature $T = 300$ K (97). In this context, the critical point $J_{\text{crit}}$ of the lattice-gas model for FCC lattice is $J_{\text{crit}} \approx 0.4 \ k_B T \approx 1 \ \text{kJ/mol}$ (98), with $k_B$ the Boltzmann constant, which marks the dimer-dimer interaction threshold below which HP1 may not spontaneously phase separate at any concentration. Each MC step then consists of an arbitrary number $N_{\text{trial}}$ of trial moves, in which a constituent HP1 dimer is first selected at random, whose position on the lattice we denote by $p_i$. The particle is then displaced to a random neighboring site $q \in V(p)$, with an acceptance probability provided by the Metropolis criterion associated with the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1). In the event that site $q$ is also occupied by another HP1 dimer, we implement a particle exchange protocol between sites $p_i$ and $q$, with an acceptance probability of 1, reflecting the invariance of Eq. (1) to such molecular swap moves. These evolution rules ensure that the system emulates Cahn-Hilliard-Cook (also known as Model B) dynamics in the continuum limit (99) and is therefore suitable to describe phase separation kinetics in the case of negligible hydrodynamic interactions (8)—an assumption consistent with the hydrodynamic screening approximation commonly used in numerical simulations of chromatin-based processes in nuclei (100).

In this framework, the overall molecular level $P_{\text{HP1}}$ of HP1 is governed by the fraction $N_{\text{HP1}} / N$ of occupied lattice sites, which remains fixed over the course of the simulations, and is such that $(N_{\text{HP1}} / N) \cong 0.1$ for all systems considered here. Since we mostly focus on the density regime $P_{\text{HP1}} \gtrsim K_p$, with $K_p \cong 1 \ \mu M$ the HP1 dimer dissociation constant, we assume that the majority of HP1 is present in dimerized form and neglect the population of free HP1 monomers as a first approximation. In this case, the mole fraction of HP1 simply reads as $P_{\text{HP1}} = 2(N_{\text{HP1}} / N)(N_{\text{HP1}_{\text{dimer}}})$, with $\mu$ the Avogadro constant and $v_{\text{site}} = \delta^3 / \sqrt{2}$ the effective volume of each lattice site. We set $\delta = 20$ nm, consistent with the approximate radius of gyration $2R_g = 15$ nm of the extended configuration of HP1$\times$ dimers (23), which has been shown to be generally prevalent in phase-separated HP1 assemblies (21, 23). $R_g$ was estimated from the corresponding SAXS distance distribution $P(r)(23)$ via (101)

$$R_g = \left( \frac{\int_0^{\infty} P(r) r^2 \text{d}r}{\int_0^{\infty} P(r) \text{d}r} \right)^{1/2}$$

Polymer Model of Chromatin. Chromatin was described as a self-avoiding, semiflexible polymer chain comprised of $N_{\text{CH}}$ monomers, represented as spherical beads of diameter $\delta$ residing on the same lattice as the HP1 dimers. The bending rigidity of the chromatin fiber was incorporated via a standard angular potential of stiffness $\kappa$,

$$H_{\text{bend}} = \sum_{i=3}^{N_{\text{CH}}} \kappa \left(1 - \cos \theta_i \right)$$

where $\theta_i$ denotes the angle formed by the triplet of adjacent monomers ($k - 2, k - 1, k$). Assuming a standard chromatin compaction value of 50 bp/\(\mu\)m, the effective chain diameter $\delta = 20$ nm commensurate with the typical HP1 dimer size implies that each monomer within the chain encapsulates a genomic locus of approximate length $\theta = 1$ kb. Accordingly, we set the polymer bending modulus to $K = 3.217 \times 10^{5}$, corresponding to a Kuhn length $\ell_K = 100$ nm consistent with the predictions of coarse-grained chromatin models at similar levels of spatial resolution (102, 103).

Each monomer was considered to be in one of two chromatin states, respectively depicted in red and black in Figs. 3-5, in order to differentiate genomic domains bearing the H3K9me2/3 histone modifications (red) from euchromatic regions (black). The chromodomoid-mediated binding affinity of HP1 for H3K9-methylated histone tails was accounted for through a simple short-ranged attractive potential of depth $J_{\text{HP1-H3K9}}$

$$H_{\text{HP1-H3K9}} = -J_{\text{HP1-H3K9}} \sum_{\text{rel}} \mu \sum_{\mu \in \text{sigma}} \rho_\text{H3K9}^\mu,$$

where the occupancy number $\rho_\text{H3K9}^\mu$ quantifies the number of H3K9-methylated loci present at a given lattice site $\mu$. In the model, one H3K9 monomer can interact with, at most, 13 HP1 which is consistent with the maximal number of H3K9me2/3 residues (~10) present in a fully methylated 1-kb long region.

Whole chromosome simulations were performed starting from dense, random, and unknotted initial configurations and were similarly evolved via a kinetic MC scheme, as detailed in previous work (97). In this case, each MC step consists of a number $N_{\text{trials}}$ of local trial displacements involving individual monomers, including both translation and reptation moves (38). Polymer acceptance rates were computed from Eqs. 2 and 3 based on the Metropolis rule (97), and (Eq. 3) was also incorporated into the Hamiltonian in (Eq. 1) for the determination of HP1 acceptance probabilities in coupled chromatin-HP1 simulations. Simulation and analysis codes are available at https://github.com/physical-biology-of-chromatin/LatticePoly.

**Live Embryo Imaging and Analysis.** Flies homozygous for the expression of ectopic GFP-HP1a on the second chromosome (+, GFP-HP1a/CyO; +) (24) were allowed to lay embryos on apple juice plates supplemented with yeast paste at 25 °C. Embryos were collected and dechorionated in 50% bleach before being mounted for live imaging. Embryos were imaged using a Zeiss 880 Airyscan microscope with a 63×/1.4 oil immersion objective. Time-lapse image stacks were collected every 30 s with a z-spacing of 0.36 μm. Imaging at least part of nuclear cycle 13 (NC 13) allowed the start of NC14 interphase (time = 0 s) to be clearly defined as the first time point where circular nuclei appear following mitosis. All movies were Airyscan-processed using Zen 2.3 software, and the first 72 time points of NC 14 (Tmax $\approx 36$ min) were analyzed using Arisiv software. Briefly, HP1a foci were segmented from the overall nuclear signal using an intensity threshold $\geq 75\%$ of the fluorescence intensity and a lower size threshold of 0.03 μm$^2$ corresponding to approximately 10 voxels ($0.085 \times 0.085 \times 0.36 \mu$m). All HP1a segments found to be connected in 3-dimensional space were merged into a single segment, and population statistics were calculated for each time point. Imaging data are available at DOI: 10.6078/D1T01Q67.

**Data, Materials, and Software Availability.** Microscopy data used for figure 5 have been deposited in Dryad doi:10.6078/D1T01Q67 (104); simulation and analysis codes are available on GitHub (10.6078/D1T01Q67; https://github.com/physical-biology-of-chromatin) (105).
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