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Y-family DNA polymerases carry out translesion synthesis past damaged DNA. DNA polymerases (pol) η and ε are usually uniformly distributed through the nucleus but accumulate in replication foci during S phase. DNA-damaging treatments result in an increase in S phase cells containing polymerase foci. Using photobleaching techniques, we show that polη is highly mobile in human fibroblasts. Even when localized in replication foci, it is only transiently immobilized. Although ubiquitination of proliferating cell nuclear antigen (PCNA) is not required for the localization of polη in foci, it results in an increased residence time in foci. polε is even more mobile than polη, both when uniformly distributed and when localized in foci. Kinetic modeling suggests that both polη and polε diffuse through the cell but that they are transiently immobilized for ~150 ms, with a larger proportion of polη than polε immobilized at any time. Treatment of cells with DRAQ5, which results in temporary opening of the chromatin structure, causes a dramatic immobilization of polη but not polε. Our data are consistent with a model in which the polymerases are transiently probing the DNA/chromatin. When DNA is exposed at replication forks, the polymerase residence times increase, and this is further facilitated by the ubiquitination of PCNA.

INTRODUCTION

Most types of damage in cellular DNA block the progress of the replication fork because the highly stringent replicative DNA polymerases (polδ) δ and ε are unable to accommodate the damaged bases in their active sites. An important mechanism by bypassing these replication blocks is by translesion synthesis (TLS), in which a low-stringency specialized polymerase is able to substitute for the blocked replicative polymerase (Friedberg et al., 2005). Most of these specialized TLS polymerases belong to the Y-family, whose members have a much more open structure than the B-family replicative polymerases (Yang and Woodgate, 2007). This enables them to accommodate damaged bases in their active sites, each Y-family polymerase having a different specificity for different types of altered bases. For example, polη can accommodate both bases of a cyclobutane pyrimidine dimer (CPD) in its active site and is able to replicate past a CPD with similar efficiency to an undamaged base (McCulloch et al., 2004). Moreover, in most cases it inserts the “correct” bases opposite the CPD (Masutani et al., 2000). Mutations in the POLH gene result in the variant form of xeroderma pigmentosum (XP-V) (Masutani et al., 1999; Johnson et al., 1999a). The high incidence of sunlight-induced skin cancer associated with this disorder probably results from a less efficient polymerase substituting for polη in its absence. When this substituting polymerase carries out TLS past UV photoproducts, it is presumed to be more error-prone than polη, resulting in a higher UV-induced mutation frequency, as seen in XP-V cells (Maher et al., 1976).

Polη and its parologue polε are uniformly distributed throughout the cell nucleus in G2-M-G1 phases of the cell cycle. During S phase, both pols are localized in microscopically visible bright foci, representing replication factories (Kannouche et al., 2001, 2003). Treatments like UV and the inhibitor hydroxyurea (HU) result in an accumulation of cells in which polη and ε are localized in foci (Kannouche et al., 2001, 2003). These treatments reduce or block the progression of replication forks, slow down the passage through S phase and result in an increase in the proportion of S phase nuclei in the cell population. This accounts at least partially for the increased number of cells with polymerase foci.

The actual engagement of pol η and ε at the sites of stalled replication forks is mediated by the homotrimeric sliding clamp accessory protein PCNA. When the replication fork stalls, exposed single-stranded regions of DNA at the stalled forks activate the E3 ubiquitin ligase Rad18. Together with its E2 partner Rad6, Rad18 mono-ubiquitinates PCNA at the stalled fork on lysine-164 (Hooge et al., 2002; Kannouche et al., 2004; Watanabe et al., 2004). As well as having “PIP box” PCNA-binding motifs (Kannouche et al., 2001; Vidal et al., 2000).
pol η and ε both have ubiquitin-binding motifs in the C-terminal parts of the proteins (Bienko et al., 2005). Thus, when PCNA is ubiquitinated, its affinity for these polymerases is increased by virtue of these motifs, and this facilitates their binding to the stalled forks. This mechanism, deduced from in vivo studies, has recently been demonstrated for pol η in a reconstituted in vitro system (Zhuang et al., 2008).

The microscopically visible replication foci presumably represent subnuclear structures at which replication-associated factors are concentrated. However, little is known about the nature of these structures or about the dynamics of the different factors that are localized in them. We have used high-resolution confocal microscopy and fluorescence recovery after photobleaching (FRAP) together with biochemical fractionation to give further insight into the relationship of pol η and pol ε to the replication foci. Both polymerases were highly mobile within the nucleus, and interacted with immobile elements (most likely DNA) very transiently, with characteristic binding times of the order of 100–200 ms. Remarkably, we find that even when localized in foci, they remained highly mobile, with half-lives of < 1 s. The foci thus represent dynamic “work stations” with polymerases entering and exiting continually, remaining in the foci for fractions of a second. We demonstrate that the two polymerases act independently, and we show that ubiquitination of PCNA facilitates but is not essential for accumulation of pol η into the foci.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cell Lines and Culture Conditions

XP38O SV40 transformed fibroblasts were transfected with enhanced green fluorescent protein (eGFP-polu) and eGFP-pol ε-poly-dead plasmids, and stable clones expressing the respective alleles of pol η were isolated. All cell lines described in this article were grown in Eagle’s minimal essential medium supplemented with 15% fetal calf serum. Cell lines were generated as described previously (Kannouche et al., 2001).

For FRAP and FRAP in Local Damage, the cells were treated essentially as described previously (Kannouche et al., 2001) and irradiated, unless otherwise stated, with 15 J m⁻² UV-C before a further incubation for 7 h. For local UV-irradiation, cells were UV-irradiated with 120 J m⁻² through 5-μm pores of a polycarbonate filter. For HU treatment, the cells were incubated in 1 mM HU for 24 h. To inhibit the proteasome, the cells were preincubated for 1 h with 0.1 μM epoxomicin before UV-irradiation and incubated for a further 6 h in epoxomicin-containing medium after irradiation. DRAQ5 (Biostatus Limited, Nottingham, UK) was used to determine the concentration of 10 μM and incubated with the cells for the duration of the experiment. Detectable DNA staining was visible already after a 3-min incubation.

Transfections and Plasmids

Plasmids were transfected into simian virus 40 (SV40)-transformed fibroblasts by using FuGENE 6 as described previously (Kannouche et al., 2001). eGFP-polu, eGFP-pol ε, eGFP-H2B, hRad18, and hRad18C28F were constructed in peGFP-C3 (Clontech, Palo Alto, CA) by using a 40× numerical aperture 1.3 differential interference contrast oil objective. Except otherwise stated, a region of 1.44 μm² was monitored for 3 s (100 scans every 30 ms) before being bleached (1 iteration), and recovery of fluorescence was subsequently monitored for another 16.5 s (550 scans every 30 ms). For the strip-FRAP, the monitored region was changed to a 2-μm strip positioned in the middle and spanning the whole nucleus. Using monodirectional scans, the cell was followed for 4 s before bleaching (200 scans every 20 ms, monodirectional) and 22 s after bleaching (1000 scans every 20 ms, bidirectional).

To avoid monitor bleaching, the laser was set to a power of 700 nW except during the bleaching iterations (140 μW). Raw fluorescence data were then background subtracted and normalized as described previously (Houts miller and Vermeulen, 2001). Briefly, the relative fluorescence was calculated as I/Lo, where I represents the fluorescence intensity at time t, and Lo represents the average intensity of 20 points just before bleaching. Average measurements of at least 30 cells were used for each FRAP curve. The I/Lo was calculated by interpolation on the FRAP curves as the time required to reach half-fluorescence recovery (I/Loₗ = 0.5(I/Lo_end + I/Lo₀), where I/Lo₀ is the average fluorescence of the last 20 points, and I/Lo_end is the fluorescence recorded immediately after the bleaching). The long-lasting immobile fraction is calculated as (1 – I/Lo)/(1 – I/Lo₀).

Half-Nucleus Bleaching Combined with Fluorescence Loss in Photobleaching (FLIP)-FRAP

For FRAP-FRAP, half of the nucleus was bleached for 2.4 s (4 iterations), after which the whole cell was imaged every 2 s for 50 s. To analyze the data, the FRAP (intensity of fluorescence in the whole of the bleached half-nucleus) was subtracted from the FLIP (intensity of fluorescence in the whole of the unbleached half-nucleus). The difference between FLIP and FRAP after bleaching was normalized to 1. The results are presented on a log scale, and the mobility of the protein is presented as the time necessary for the FRAP value to reach 90% of the prebleach value. Errors bars represent the SEs of the mean.

FRAP Data Modeling

For the model-based analysis of the FRAP data, raw FRAP curves were normalized to prebleach values and the best fitting curve (by least squares) was picked from a large set of computer simulated FRAP curves in which three parameters representing mobility properties were varied: diffusion rate (ranging from 0.04–25 μm²/s), immobile fraction (ranging from 0 to 90%), and time spent in immobile state (ranging from 0.1 to 300 s). The Monte Carlo computer simulations used to generate FRAP curves for the model were based on a model that simulates diffusion of molecules and binding to immobile elements in an ellipsoidal volume. The laser bleach pulse was simulated based on experimentally derived three-dimensional (3D) laser intensity profiles, which were used to determine the probability for each molecule to get bleached, considering their 3D position. The simulation of the FRAP curve was then run using discrete time steps corresponding to the experimental scan interval of 21 ms. Diffusion was simulated at each new time step t = Δt by deriving the new positions (xᵢ, yᵢ, zᵢ) by (xᵢ = xᵢ + rᵢ, yᵢ = yᵢ + rᵢ, zᵢ = zᵢ + rᵢ), where rᵢ is a random number (0 ≤ rᵢ ≤ 1) chosen from a uniform distribution, and G(ᵢ) is an inversely cumulative Gaussian distribution with μ = 0 and σ² = 62Δt, where Δt is the diffusion time step. Immobilization was derived from the kind of kinetics described by kᵢ/Fᵢ = Fᵢ₀/Fᵢ₀₀ = Fᵢ₀₀/Fᵢ₀, where Fᵢ₀₀ is the relative number of immobile molecules. The probability for each particle to become immobilized is defined as P_immobilized = kᵢ/Fᵢ₀₀ = Fᵢ₀₀/Fᵢ₀₀ = Fᵢ₀₀/Fᵢ₀, where kᵢ/Fᵢ₀₀ is the average time spent in the immobile state, and Fᵢ₀₀ is the average time spent in the mobile state. The rate at which to be released is given by P_rel = 1 - 1/Fᵢ₀₀. In simulations of two immobile fractions with different kinetics, two immobilization/mobilization probabilities were evaluated at each unit time step. Simulations of the FRAP curve were performed at every time step by counting the number of unbleached molecules in the bleached region after simulations of diffusion and binding during that time step.

In all simulations, the size of the ellipsoid was based on the size of the nuclei, and the parameters used in this study were determined by using the size of the simulated bleached region. The laser intensity profile used in the simulation of the bleaching step was derived from confocal images stacks of chemically fixed nuclei containing green fluorescent protein (GFP) that were exposed to a stationary

In Vivo Cell Imaging

Cells were plated at 5 × 10⁶ cells/3-cm dish (MatTek, Ashland, MA) for at least 48 h before imaging. The cells were monitored under the microscope in a temperature-controlled chamber in 5% CO₂ atmosphere.

All the FRAP analysis was performed on an LSM 510 confocal microscope (Carl Zeiss Jena, Germany) by using a 40× numerical aperture 1.3 differential interference contrast oil objective. Except otherwise stated, a region of 1.44 μm² was monitored for 3 s (100 scans every 30 ms) before being bleached (1 iteration), and recovery of fluorescence was subsequently monitored for another 16.5 s (550 scans every 30 ms). For the strip-FRAP, the monitored region was changed to a 2-μm strip positioned in the middle and spanning the whole nucleus. Using monodirectional scans, the cell was followed for 4 s before bleaching (200 scans every 20 ms, monodirectional) and 22 s after bleaching (1000 scans every 20 ms, bidirectional).

To avoid monitor bleaching, the laser was set to a power of 700 nW except during the bleaching iterations (140 μW). Raw fluorescence data were then background subtracted and normalized as described previously (Houts miller and Vermeulen, 2001). Briefly, the relative fluorescence was calculated as I/Lo, where I represents the fluorescence intensity at time t, and Lo represents the average intensity of 20 points just before bleaching. Average measurements of at least 30 cells were used for each FRAP curve. The I/Lo was calculated by interpolation on the FRAP curves as the time required to reach half-fluorescence recovery (I/Loₗ = 0.5(I/Lo_end + I/Lo₀), where I/Lo₀ is the average fluorescence of the last 20 points, and I/Lo_end is the fluorescence recorded immediately after the bleaching). The long-lasting immobile fraction is calculated as (1 – I/Lo)/(1 – I/Lo₀).

**Molecular Biology of the Cell**
In previous work, we showed that eGFP-polycles translocated into human fibroblasts was uniformly distributed throughout the nucleus outside S phase but that it accumulated in bright foci representing replication factories in S phase cells. In cells treated with 15 J m\(^{-2}\) UV-irradiation and incubated for 7 h or with 1 mM HU for 24 h, the number of cells in which pol\(_\eta\) was located in foci increased substantially, partly or wholly because of the accumulation of S phase cells after these treatments (Kannouche et al., 2001). Supplemental Figure S1 shows stills from a confocal time-lapse series in which the stable cell line was UV-irradiated through a micropore filter to generate localized damage within the nucleus (Volker et al., 2001). Using this procedure, proteins involved in processing of DNA damage accumulate at the sites of the localized irradiation. We found that, throughout S phase, eGFP-pol\(_\eta\) accumulated at the sites of local damage. Within the damaged area pol\(_\eta\) accumulated in a focal pattern because of the stalling of replication forks (Kannouche et al., 2001). In contrast, in G2 the eGFP-pol\(_\eta\) neither accumulated at the local damage nor was it in bright foci, but it became uniformly distributed through the nucleus. These data confirm the S phase-specific function of pol\(_\eta\).

We have used FRAP to measure the mobility of pol\(_\eta\) under different conditions. We photobleached a small square of the nucleus and measured the rate of recovery of fluorescence within the square. Pol\(_\eta\) that was uniformly distributed in the nucleus (i.e., in G1 or G2 cells) relocalized into the bleached area extremely rapidly with a \(t_{1/2}\) of 0.15 s (Figure 1B, pol\(_\eta\) untreated-diffuse), indicating that it is highly mobile within the nucleus.

We next photobleached the eGFP-pol\(_\eta\) within a focus in an S phase nucleus by aligning the square over a visible focus in S phase cells (Box-FRAP). We used a square as small as possible so that the focus filled almost the whole area of the square. In this situation, the recovery rate was reduced about two-fold (Figure 1B). The \(t_{1/2}\) was still very short, 0.33 s. The mobility of pol\(_\eta\) in foci generated in cells irradiated with UV-irradiation or following HU treatment was indistinguishable from that in an unperturbed S phase (Figure 1B). Thus, surprisingly, even when associated with microscopically visible structures, the majority of the pol\(_\eta\) molecules within the focus remained highly mobile. Examination of the curves in Figure 1B at later times (up to 15 s; see inset) suggests that at most only 7% of the molecules were immobilized for a long period (see Materials and Methods for definitions of \(t_{1/2}\) and immobile fraction). In contrast to the highly dynamic association of eGFP-pol\(_\eta\), we observed a relatively large (~60%) fraction of eGFP-PCNA (Figure 1C), in which proteins were significantly immobilized for long periods (see Materials and Methods for calculation of long-lasting immobile fractions), in line with previous studies (Spörbert et al., 2002; Essers et al., 2005). This demonstrates that our system was capable of detecting immobilized proteins.

To determine whether the catalytic activity of pol might affect its mobility, we generated an XP30RO cell line expressing eGFP-pol\(_\eta\) in which amino acids (aa) D115 and E116, shown to be vital for catalytic activity (Johnson et al., 1999b), were mutated to alanines. This mutation allows the incoming dNTP to bind but cannot support the formation of the phosphodiester bond (Li et al., 1998). The mobility of this "pol dead" pol\(_\eta\) mutant, when distributed uniformly in the nucleus, was identical to that of wild-type pol\(_\eta\) (data not shown), but interestingly, its mobility in foci was about twofold lower than that of wild-type pol\(_\eta\), with a \(t_{1/2}\) of ~0.67 s and a long-lasting immobile fraction of 15% (Figure 1C).

As an alternative methodology, we have also used FLIP-FRAP in which we bleached half the nucleus. We then
measured both the rate of reduction in fluorescence intensity of the unbleached half (FLIP) and the rate of recovery in the bleached half of the nucleus (FRAP). With this technique, we are able to analyze the overall mobility in the whole of the nucleus, providing the collective mobility of pol\(\eta\)/H9257 in a large number of foci, in contrast to the mobility within a single focus in the experiments described above. As with bleaching of a small square, we observed rapid redistribution of pol\(\eta\). The difference between FLIP and FRAP immediately after bleaching was normalized to 1, and, in Figure 1D, at different times after bleaching, the normalized difference between the FLIP and FRAP is presented on a log scale. With nuclei in which pol\(\eta\) was uniformly distributed, pol\(\eta\) had returned to 90% of the prebleach distribution (i.e., normalized fluorescence = 0.1) in 25 s (Figure 1D). Using this FLIP-FRAP analysis, we have examined the effect of different doses of UV on the mobility of pol\(\eta\) in nuclei containing focal pol\(\eta\). We compared pol\(\eta\) mobility in these cells with its mobility when diffusely distributed in untreated cells. A UV dose response was observed, with increasing delay in pol\(\eta\) redistribution due to transient immobilization to subnuclear structures (Figure 1D). Higher UV doses resulted in a more pronounced delay in redistribution, reaching a maximum after irradiation with 16 J m\(^{-2}\), with a redistribution time of about 45 s, compared with ~25 s in untreated cells not exhibiting foci. This approximate doubling of the redistribution time agrees well with the approximately two-fold decrease in mobility in the Box-FRAP data presented in Figure.

**Figure 1.** Dynamics of eGFP-pol\(\eta\) in living cells. (A) Western blot of the XP30RO-eGFP-pol\(\eta\) cell line used in this study (lane 3), compared with MRC5 (lane 1) and XP30RO (lane 2). (B) Comparison of FRAP curves (relative fluorescence recovery plotted against time) of eGFP-pol\(\eta\) uniformly distributed in untreated XP30RO-eGFP-pol\(\eta\) cells and in foci in S phase cells from untreated, UV-treated, and HU-treated cells. (C) Fluorescence recovery of “pol-dead” mutant (blue) and wild-type pol\(\eta\) (red) in foci (7 h after 15 J m\(^{-2}\) UV-C). Also shown is the FRAP curve for eGFP-PCNA in foci (orange), showing large immobile fraction. (D) FLIP-FRAP analysis of eGFP-pol\(\eta\). Cells were not irradiated (no UV, mean of 63 cells) or globally irradiated with 12 (mean of 50 cells) and 16 J m\(^{-2}\) (mean of 27 cells). Five hours later, half-nucleus bleaching associated with FLIP-FRAP analysis was performed. The data were normalized as described in Materials and Methods. The error bars represent the SE of the mean. (E) eGFP-pol\(\eta\) accumulated at site of local irradiation. (F) Five hours after local irradiation, the area of local damage was entirely bleached, the recovery of fluorescence was measured in the bleached area and normalized to the level of fluorescence in the whole nucleus. Control cells represent cells in which no local damage was inflicted, but in which a square of the same size as irradiated cells was bleached.
Overexpression of Rad18 (together with mRFP-α-tubulin, used as transfection marker) had no effect on the mobility of uniformly distributed polη (Figure 2D). In contrast, there was a decrease in the mobility of polη in foci (Figure 2D). To determine whether this effect of Rad18 was mediated by ubiquitination of PCNA or by binding to polη, we mutated the RING finger motif of Rad18 that is required for its ubiquitin ligase activity and the ubiquitination of PCNA but is not involved in direct interaction of Rad18 with polη (Watanabe et al., 2004). Using the Rad18-C28F mutation (Tateishi et al., 2000), in which the E3 ubiquitin ligase activity is inactivated, levels of ubiquitinated PCNA were the same as in mock-transfected cells (Figure 2C, lane 6), and the reduction in mobility of focal polη was abolished (Figure 2D).

USP1 is a deubiquitinating enzyme (DUB), which removes the ubiquitin from ubiquitinated PCNA (Huang et al., 2006). Depletion of USP1 by using siRNA results in increased levels of ubiquitinated PCNA in undamaged cells (Huang et al., 2006; Figure 2E, bottom, lane 3). In these USP1-depleted cells, the mobility of uniformly distributed GFP-polη was slightly reduced; in foci in HU-treated cells, it was reduced to a similar level to that in the cells overexpressing Rad18 (Figure 2F). (Note that we could not use UV in these experiments as UV-irradiation results in disappearance of USP1 from the cell. This is not seen after HU treatment; Huang et al., 2006 and our unpublished data.) Together, these results suggest that although ubiquitination of PCNA is not required for accumulation of polη into replication factories, it results in an increased residence time of polη in the factories.

Role of PCNA-Ubiquitination

Polη has a PIP box binding motif for interaction with PCNA (Haracska et al., 2001; Kannouche et al., 2001), and it is likely that PCNA plays a role in assisting polη to find its substrate. After exposure of cells to UV-irradiation or other agents that block progression of the replication fork, PCNA becomes mono-ubiquitinated on lysine-164 at the sites of stalled forks, a reaction mediated by the Rad6–Rad18 ubiquitination system (Hoege et al, 2002; Kannouche et al., 2004; Watanabe et al., 2004). It is widely assumed, but without direct evidence, that ubiquitination of PCNA is required for localization of polη in replication foci.endantuma et al. (2006) reported that treatment of cells with the general proteasome inhibitor MG132 induced a depletion of the free ubiquitin pool and a concomitant reduction of mono-ubiquitinated target proteins such as ubiquitinated histones. We observed similar effects on UV-irradiation-induced PCNA mono-ubiquitination when cells were treated with either MG132 (data not shown) or with another proteasome inhibitor epoxomicin (Figure 2A). Remarkably, polη accumulated in foci to a similar extent in UV-irradiated MRC5 cells treated with or without epoxomicin (Figure 2B), indicating that ubiquitination of PCNA is not essential for polη foci formation.

These findings do not however rule out the possibility that ubiquitination of PCNA affects the dynamics of polη in foci. Because inhibition of the proteasome is likely to have many pleiotropic effects, it would be difficult to interpret dynamic experiments making use of this inhibitor. An alternative way of preventing PCNA ubiquitination is by depletion of Rad18, by using siRNA (Kannouche et al., 2004). However, Rad18 interacts physically with polη and is required for the accumulation of polη in foci, independently from its role in PCNA ubiquitination (Watanabe et al., 2004); so, this approach also could not be used. Instead, we looked at the effect of overexpressing Rad18 in our eGFP-polη-expressing cells and measured the mobility of polη, both uniformly distributed and in foci. Overexpression of Rad18 has been reported to cause increased PCNA ubiquitination (Huang et al., 2006; Davies et al., 2008). To test whether this was also the case in our experimental system, we cotransfected His-PCNA and Rad18. The use of His-PCNA was needed because the low transfection efficiency of our cell lines made it impossible to detect any changes in endogenous PCNA. In the overexpressing cells, there was an increase in the level of ubiquitination of His-tagged PCNA, especially after UV-irradiation (Figure 2C, compare lanes 4 and 2).
proportion of their time transiently immobilized. To distinguish between these alternatives, we have applied Monte Carlo simulations to the redistribution kinetics of uniformly distributed pol/H9257 and pol/H9259. The best fits to the data are shown in Supplemental Figure S2 and Table 1, and they are derived from a model in which both polymerases diffuse through the cell but are transiently immobilized. As shown in Table 1, the diffusion coefficients of the two polymerases inside the cell are quite similar, but it is the proportion of transiently immobilized pol/H9257 (48%) that is much greater than that of pol/H9259 (17.5%) and accounts for the slower redistribution of pol/H9257 than pol/H9259. The immobilization time is 150 ms for both.

To explore further the relationship between pol/H9257 and pol/H9259 inside cells, we have fractionated cell lysates by both gel filtration and glycerol gradient centrifugation and analyzed the fractions for the polymerases by immunoblotting. Gel filtration separates proteins on the basis of their size and shape, whereas glycerol gradient fractionates on the basis of sedimentation coefficient, which is determined by mass, size, and shape (see Materials and Methods). Using gel filtration (Figure 4A), we found that pol/H9257 and pol/H9259 were associated with complexes of different Stokes radii, and interestingly the exclusion of pol/H9257 increased following UV-irradiation. On the glycerol gradients (Figure 4B), both polymerases sedimented at approximately the same rate and this was independent of UV-irradiation. Combining the biochemical with the cell biological data, we conclude that the majority of pol/H9257 and pol/H9259 molecules diffuse independently in the cell, possibly complexed with...
other proteins, but the major difference in their mobilities results from the larger fraction of transiently immobilized polη than polλ.

**Effect of Chromatin Structure on Mobility of Polymerases**

To gain further insight into factors affecting the intracellular mobilities of the polymerases, we looked for ways of disrupting chromatin structure to expose the DNA. We made use of the intercalating agent DRAQ5, which binds to DNA with selectivity for A-T base pairs (Njoh et al., 2006). DRAQ5 has recently been shown to disrupt chromatin structure (Wojcik and Dobrucki, 2008), and we have shown that the immobile fraction of transcription factor TFIIH becomes mobilized on treatment of cells with DRAQ5 (Giglia-Mari and Vermeulen, unpublished data). We measured the effect of DRAQ5 on the mobility of the core histone H2B. Histones are normally completely immobile in chromatin, but remarkably, 20% of H2B became mobile within minutes of DRAQ5 treatment (Figure 5A). This result is consistent with findings of Wojcik and Dobrucki (2008). After 1 h in DRAQ5, the original immobility was restored (data not shown). These data suggest that DRAQ5 causes a temporary opening up of the chromatin structure. We next exposed cells to DRAQ5 and measured the effects on the mobilities of polη and i. Strikingly, we found that treatment of cells in which polη is uniformly distributed resulted in a long-lasting immobilization of 25% of the total polη population within 3 min (Figure 5A). In contrast, the effect on the mobility of poli was much smaller (Figure 5A), with just a slightly reduced mobility and <5% increase in the long-lasting immobilized fraction. The effect of DRAQ5 on polη was temporary, and normal mobility was restored within 1 h (data not shown), consistent with the reimmobilization of H2B. We interpret these data as follows: DRAQ5 loosens chromatin structure resulting in release of histones and exposure of the DNA to nucleoplasmic proteins. Polη is then able to bind to DNA and becomes immobilized for a long time (in contrast to the very transient immobilization seen under normal conditions). We can exclude the possibility that DRAQ5 generates a DNA damage response that somehow accounts for the observed changes in mobility, because DRAQ5 treatment does not result in either ubiquitination of PCNA or activation of a DNA damage checkpoint (Verbiest, Mari, Gourdin, Sabbioneda, Wijgers, Dinant, Lehmann, Vermeulen, and Giglia-Mari, unpublished data).

Poli has a lower affinity for DNA than polη and remains mobile. Consistent with the idea that poli is more loosely associated with nuclear structures than polη, we confirmed our earlier findings (Kannouche and Lehmann, 2004) that polη localized in foci was resistant to extraction with triton, whereas poli was quantitatively extracted under identical conditions (Figure 5B).

**DISCUSSION**

Our data show that 1) Polη is highly mobile in nuclei of human fibroblasts; 2) even when localized in replication factories, it remains very mobile, albeit somewhat less so than when uniformly distributed in the nuclei, and this mobility in foci is similar during a normal S phase or in cells treated with UV light or hydroxyurea; 3) although ubiquitination of PCNA is not required for the localization of polη in replication foci, it results in an increased residence time in foci; 4) poli is even more mobile than polη, both when uniformly distributed and when localized in factories; and 5) treatment of cells with DRAQ5, which seems to result in the transient opening of the chromatin structure, causes a dramatic immobilization of polη but not poli.

The high mobility of polη in human cells, both uniformly distributed and in foci, agrees with the observations of Sоловjeva et al. (2005) using Chinese hamster cells, and emphasizes that even though visible in fluorescent replication structures, proteins may still interact there very transiently. Our biochemical data suggest that polη may be associated with another protein in a complex of total molecular mass of 112 kDa. Rad18 has been shown to interact with polη both in cell lysates and as recombinant proteins (Watanabe et al., 2004; Yuasa et al., 2006). However in cells depleted of Rad18 the mobility of diffusely localized polη is hardly affected (data not shown), ruling out the possibility that binding to
Rad18 is responsible for the reduced mobility of pol q inside cells.

Our modeling shows that the principal factor responsible for the reduced mobility of pol q relative to pol l is the greater proportion of transiently immobilized pol q molecules. We hypothesize that this immobilization represents pol q transiently probing either the DNA itself or proteins associated with the DNA. Our data are consistent with a model in which pol q has a weak affinity for DNA (Kusumoto et al., 2004) and is continually probing the chromatin. Outside S phase, the DNA is almost inaccessible inside chromatin, so pol q is only retarded very briefly. During S phase, DNA is exposed at the replication forks, pol q probes the exposed DNA for suitable substrates and its residence in the foci is increased by binding to the exposed DNA and by interaction with PCNA, especially when PCNA is ubiquitinated. However even under these circumstances, binding is weak and the polymerase remains at the fork for <1 s. Only when the fork is blocked is a substrate available for pol q to engage and carry out TLS. This is likely to render the engaged pol q molecule immobile for a relatively long period (compared with the transient immobilization discussed above). We have calculated that there are ~80,000 molecules of pol q in MRC5 cells (and a similar number of pol l molecules) (Sup-

Figure 4. Fractionation of pol q and pol l from cell lysates. (A) Lysates from unirradiated or UV-irradiated MRC5 cells were fractionated on a Superdex 200 gel filtration column, and fractions were analyzed by immunoblotting for pol q and pol l. L, load. (B) Equivalent lysates were centrifuged on glycerol gradients. (C) Molecular weight calculations from data obtained in A and B.

Figure 5. Effects of DRAQ5 on the mobilities of pol q and l. (A) Effect of DRAQ5 on the mobility of eGFP-histone H2B, eGFP-pol q, and eGFP-pol l. Cells were treated with or without DRAQ5 for 3 min and then subjected to FRAP analysis. (B) MRC5 cells transfected with either eGFP-pol q or eGFP-pol l were UV irradiated, incubated for 6 h, and either fixed immediately or extracted with Triton X-100 before analysis by epifluorescence.
ubiquitination of PCNA and Localization of pol8

In a previous study, we showed that pol8 and λ colocalize in replication foci and that the localization of pol8 in foci is dependent on pol8. The two polymerases are able to interact physically, as demonstrated by Far Western blotting, yeast two-hybrid analysis, and coimmunoprecipitation in insect cells (Kannouche et al., 2003). However, three observations suggest that pol binds less strongly to chromatin than pol8 inside cells. First, our modeling data suggest that less pol is transiently immobile (Table 1). Second, pol8 is less tightly bound in replication foci than pol8 (Figure 5B). And third, pol8 is temporarily immobilized after treatment with DRAQ5, whereas pol is not (Figure 5A). Taking our previous and present observations together, we conclude that interactions between pol8 and λ must be transient or unstable, that pol8 helps pol8 to accumulate in foci, but that pol dissociates from foci more rapidly than pol8. Our finding of pol8 and λ in different complexes on gel filtration also suggests that interactions between them are likely to be transient.

Ubiquitination of PCNA and Localization of pol8 in Foci

Our finding that PCNA ubiquitination is not required for pol8 to localize in foci is at first sight surprising, because focal localization is dependent on the UBZ ubiquitin-binding motif of pol8 (Bienko et al., 2005). However, pol8 localization in undamaged S phase cells is also dependent on the UBZ motif, even though there seems to be minimal ubiquitination of PCNA under these conditions. We conclude that ubiquitinated PCNA is not the only ubiquitinated target that drives pol8 into foci. However, once localized in foci, our data are consistent with the idea that ubiquitinated PCNA increases the residence time of pol8, presumably by binding to pol8 via its UBZ motif at sites of stalled replication forks. A schematic diagram to account for our data is indicated in Figure 6. Outside of S phase, the polymerases are probing the chromatin with $K_{on}/K_{off}$ for pol8 greater than that for pol. In S phase cells exposed to HU or DNA damage, there are two steps, namely, accumulation into foci and binding at the fork. For the first step, accumulation of pol8 in foci ($K_{on}$) is independent of PCNA ubiquitination. The second step is facilitated by PCNA ubiquitination, which stabilizes the presence of pol8 and pol at the stalled replication fork. This results in an increase in the overall $K_{on}/K_{off}$ for both polymerases with consequent decreased mobility.
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Figure 6. Model for dynamics of pol8 and λ. (A) In undamaged cells, pol8 and pol probe the chromatin, but the residence time of pol8 is greater than that of pol, implying either a higher $K_{on}$ or lower $K_{off}$ rate. The double-headed arrow signifies weak interaction between the two polymerases. (B) In damaged S phase cells, where there is a replication fork blocked by damage and resulting ubiquitination of PCNA, there are two dynamic processes, transport into the focus and association with the blocked fork.


