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Publications


Genomic DNA is compacted into a protein-DNA complex known as chromatin, which regulates diverse cellular processes including transcription, DNA replication, recombination, DNA repair and the maintenance of genome integrity. The structure and activity of chromatin is regulated by DNA sequences, histone variants, post-translational histone modifications and chromatin remodelling complexes. Chromatin remodelling complexes are multi-subunit entities that contain a single core catalytic ATPase subunit able to generate an array of nucleosome-related outputs. Importantly, recent studies have revealed that genes of the SWI/SNF family of chromatin remodeling complexes are frequently mutated in diverse cancers; however, their functional contributions in tumourigenesis are largely unclear.

This work is comprised of four major results chapters, examining the roles of targeting subunits of the RSC SWI/SNF complex in budding yeast and the homologous BAF180 tumour suppressor protein in mammalian cells. We identify novel functions for these proteins that are directly relevant to tumourigenesis. In the first section we explored the contributions of the two isoforms of the RSC SWI/SNF complex in DNA repair. We found that the two isoforms provide both overlapping and distinct functions in this process. In the second section we identify a novel function for BAF180 in promoting centromeric sister chromatid cohesion. Importantly, this defect was transcription-independent and represents a paradigm shift in the field of chromatin remodeling and cancer. In the third section we show that PBRM1 missense mutations identified in cancer samples specifically impair a cohesion-related subset of functions when expressed in budding yeast. Moreover, these mutations completely ablated centromeric cohesion in human cells. In the final section we report the findings that novel HDAC inhibitors, which constitute a promising class of anticancer drugs, selectively sensitize cells lacking BAF180. These significant results suggest that HDAC inhibitors could be important tools for the treatment of BAF180-deficient tumours.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Chromatin structure and organization

Genomic DNA is compacted into a protein-DNA complex known as chromatin. 147bp of DNA tightly wrapped in ~1.7 superhelical turns around an octomeric core of two histone H2A-H2B dimers and a H3-H4 tetramer constitutes the canonical nucleosome, the basic unit of chromatin (Richmond & Davey 2003). In yeast, nucleosomes are separated by ~20bp of linker DNA, and the primary chromatin structure of a polynucleosomal tract resembles ‘beads on a string’ when observed using electron microscopy. The linker histone H1 stabilizes further condensation of nucleosomes into 30nm chromatin fibres, at least in vitro (Horn & Peterson 2002). The regulation of higher order chromatin structure beyond the level of the 30nm fibre through to the level of the mitotic chromosome is largely unknown. Compaction of genomic DNA into chromatin regulates access of DNA-binding proteins to nucleosomal DNA (Clapier & Cairns 2009). DNA transactions including transcription, replication, recombination, repair and the maintenance of genome integrity are consequently regulated by nucleosomes and chromatin. In this section we consider the major factors that specify and organize chromatin structure, including DNA sequence, histone variants, post-translational histone modifications and chromatin remodelling complexes.

1.1.1. DNA sequences

DNA sequences strongly determine the in vivo positioning of nucleosomes and provide binding sites for specific DNA-binding proteins (Rando & Chang 2009). The DNA sequence-dependent positioning of nucleosomes is particularly important for sculpting the chromatin structure of a gene to facilitate its regulation. A typical yeast promoter contains a nucleosome-free region (NFR) upstream of the transcription start site (TSS), which contains poly-A and poly-T tracts that intrinsically repel nucleosomes (Rando & Chang 2009). The promoter NFR is the site at which the majority of transcription factors bind and is flanked by two well-positioned nucleosomes, termed +1 and -1. NFRs also frequently occur at the 3' termination site. The coding regions of genes typically contain DNA sequences that favour the positioning of nucleosomes, such as AT-rich dinucleotides, particularly around the +1, +2 and +3 nucleosomes (Rando & Chang 2009). In mammalian cells NFRs also occur upstream of TSSs, but in contrast to yeast genes, additional nucleosome-depleted, DNAase hypersensitive sites (DHS)
occur that provide further transcriptional control. Enhancer DHSs are often found up to hundreds of kilobases distal to TSSs, and insulator DHSs function to disrupt communications between promoters and enhancers (Rando & Chang 2009).

Another specialised region of chromatin in which DNA sequence plays an important regulatory role is at the centromere. The centromere is a unique region of the chromosome that mediates the attachment of chromosomes via the kinetochore to the mitotic spindle and is essential for chromosome segregation. In budding yeast the centromere consists of three conserved sequences that together span 116-120bp (Verdaasdonk & Bloom 2011). CDEI is a non-essential 8bp palindromic sequence that is required for high-fidelity chromosome segregation and serves as a binding site for the centromere protein and transcription factor Cbf1 (Hemmerich et al. 2000). CDEII is an essential AT-rich sequence 78-86bp in length that is required for chromosome segregation. CDEIII is an imperfect 26bp palindromic sequence to which the four-protein CBF3 complex binds, a step that is essential for the subsequent assembly of the ~60 unique proteins that constitute the kinetochore (Lechner & Carbon 1991, Doheny et al. 1993, Strunnikov et al. 1995, McAinsh et al. 2003, Cohen et al. 2008). In contrast, human centromeres are substantially larger (up to 5Mb in length) and more complex owing to the presence of large tracts of repetitive 171-bp α-satellite sequences (Verdaasdonk & Bloom 2011). In addition to their repetitive occurrence, the similarity between α-satellite sequences has made the assignment of centromere competency to individual sequences difficult.

1.1.2. Histone variants

The core histones H2A, H2B, H3 and H4 all share a common structural architecture of a core domain, which is composed of three α-helices connected by short loops, and an unstructured N-terminal tail domain (Luger et al. 1997). The tetramer of two H3-H4 dimers is formed through a strong 4-helix bundle (4-HB) between the two H3 molecules along the H3-H4 tetramer. Additionally, the C-terminal docking domain of H2A interacts with H3 and H4, and L1 loops from each H2A molecule interact to stabilize the association of the two H2A-H2B dimers within the nucleosome (Luger et al. 1997, Bönisch & Hake 2012). Histone variants differ from canonical histones in their primary structure and expression timing. They are incorporated to create specialized nucleosomes that provide further levels of chromatin regulation. Three major histone variants will be considered here: H2A.Z, which is implicated in transcription, DNA repair, heterochromatin formation and chromosome segregation, H2A.X, which has a
fundamental role in the DNA damage response, and Cse4 (CENPA in vertebrates), which is required for the formation of a fully functional kinetochore at the centromere.

H2A.Z

H2A.Z is ~60% identical to canonical H2A in any one species and is essential in many organisms but not in S. cerevisiae or S. pombe, in which H2A.Z deletion leads to a severe growth phenotype (Zlatanova & Thakar 2008, Jackson & Gorovsky 2000, Carr et al. 1994, Bönisch & Hake 2012). The C-terminus of canonical H2A is an important regulatory domain for the protein because it occurs at the DNA entry/exit site of the nucleosome (Bönisch & Hake 2012). The C-terminus harbours an acidic patch that interacts with DNA, the linker histone H1, and the H4 N-terminal tail; the latter two of which are involved in establishing higher order chromatin structure. H2A.Z contains an extended acidic patch that alters the behaviour of the protein and confers unique properties (Bönisch & Hake 2012). The M6 region of the H2A.Z C-terminus is an important binding site for the chromatin remodelling complex SWR1, which exchanges H2A-H2B dimers for free H2A.Z-H2B dimers (Luk et al. 2010). The extended acidic patch of H2A.Z also fosters the formation of a more compact secondary chromatin structure due to stronger H4-H2A.Z inter-nucleosomal electrostatic interactions. Interestingly, the heterochromatin-associated protein HP1α preferentially binds highly condensed H2A.Z-containing chromatin and further enhances intrafibre folding (Fan et al. 2004). H2A.Z is present at centromeres and is likely to have important roles in organizing centromere structure and function (Greaves et al. 2007). H2A.Z also occurs in +1 and -1 nucleosomes at promoters in plants, mammals and in S. cerevisiae, as well as at enhancers and insulators in mammalian cells (Bönisch & Hake 2012). H2A.Z incorporation at promoters is known to have both repressive and activating roles in transcription due to its ability to alter nucleosome mobility and positioning. The incorporation of H2A.Z into euchromatin forms a boundary to adjacent heterochromatin by antagonizing the spread of Sir-dependent silencing (Bönisch & Hake 2012)

H2A.X has a specific role in the DNA damage response (DDR)

The minor histone variant H2A.X is rapidly phosphorylated at S129 across ~50kb either side of a DNA DSB in S. cerevisiae and S139 for several Mb in H. sapiens (Tsaber & Haber 2013). This phosphorylation is an early event in the DDR and is necessary for DNA damage checkpoint activation, HR and NHEJ. The role of H2A.X phosphorylation in these processes will be discussed in more detail in the DNA repair pathways section.
Cse4 (human CENPA) is a centromere-specific H3 variant

The H3 variant Cse4, known as CENPA in human cells, is unique to the centromere and is essential for recruiting kinetochore components (Van Hooser et al. 2001). Both canonical H3 and CENPA histones contain a histone fold domain in the N-terminus that consists of four α-helices termed N1, α1, α2 and α3. The loop between α1 and α2 in CENPA harbours the CENPA-targeting domain (CATD) that is required for centromere targeting and function (Black et al. 2004, Black et al. 2007). An interaction between the CATD and the CENPA chaperone HJURP is required for the deposition of CENPA during early G1 (Jansen et al. 2007, Foltz et al. 2009, Dunleavy et al. 2009). HJURP recruitment requires the Mis18 complex, which is recruited to centromeres during telophase (Barnhart et al. 2011, Moree et al. 2011). The CATD also serves as a docking site in conjunction with acidic patches on H2A and H2B for CENPN (Guse et al. 2011, Kato et al. 2013). The C-terminus of CENPA serves as a binding site for CENPC, which functions with CENPN to recruit other kinetochore components (Carroll et al. 2009, Carroll et al. 2010). CENPB also contributes to kinetochore integrity and binds directly to mammalian centromere repeats. This binding is stabilized via interaction with the N-terminus of CENPA (Fachinetti et al. 2013). The N1 α-helical domain of CENPA is shorter than that of H3, and CENPA-containing nucleosomes are wrapped by only 121bp of DNA and therefore protect less DNA (Hasson et al. 2013).

In budding yeast a single Cse4 nucleosome forms the core of a point centromere, whilst regional centromeres found in mammalian cells contain multiple CENPA nucleosomes interspersed with canonical nucleosomes (Furuyama and Biggins 2007, Blower et al. 2002). CENPA-H4 tetrasomes are structurally distinct from H3-H4 tetrasomes in that they are more rigid, and CENPA nucleosomes are more prone to unwrapping and releasing H2A-H2B dimers than canonical nucleosomes (Black et al. 2004, Sekulic et al. 2010, Conde e Silva et al. 2007). Drosophila and human CENPA nucleosomes also have reduced height relative to H3 nucleosomes, and the height varies with the cell cycle (Dalal et al. 2007, Dimitriadis et al. 2010, Bui et al. 2012). This height difference forms the basis for the proposed existence of alternative CENPA nucleosome structures, including hemisomes (half-nucleosomes). However, recent reports strongly support the idea that CENPA-containing nucleosomes are indeed homotypic octamers (with two CENPA proteins) (Miell et al. 2013, Zhang et al. 2012, Padeganeh et al. 2013, Catania & Allshire 2014).
CENPA specifies regional centromeres in higher organisms

Fascinating recent studies have shed some light on how complex regional centromeres found in higher organisms are specified and assembled. Unlike budding yeast point centromeres, in which specific DNA sequences are sufficient to initiate kinetochore assembly, the repetitive DNA sequences found at the centromeres of higher organisms display a lack of common features. Thus, it has been suggested that regional centromeres are largely specified epigenetically (Catania & Allshire 2014). Deletion of a 127kb DNA sequence containing the centromere of chromosome Z in DT40 cells initiated the formation of neocentromeres that retained the Z-chromosome (Shang et al. 2013). Peaks of CENPA at neocentromeres did not preferentially occur in association with repetitive DNA sequences, and predominantly arose flanking the original Z centromere. This suggests that residual CENPA at these sites dictates the seeding of neocentromeres. Artificial tethering of CID (Drosophila CENPA) to DNA recruited kinetochore components and mediated microtubule association (Mendiburo et al. 2011), suggesting that CENPA alone is sufficient to direct kinetochore assembly. In addition, tethering of HJURP in human cells led to CENPA deposition and kinetochore assembly (Barnhart et al. 2011).

In Drosophila and S. pombe centromere formation requires the presence of heterochromatin (Folco et al. 2008, Kagansky et al. 2009, Olszack et al. 2011). In contrast, neocentromere formation does not appear to rely on the presence of methylated H3K9 in DT40 (Shang et al. 2013), or HP1 in C. elegans (Gassman et al. 2012, Yuen et al. 2011), suggesting that centromere formation in these organisms is heterochromatin-independent. Instead, CENPA deposition might rely on the activity of factors involved in histone deacetylation, chromatin remodelling, replication initiation and DNA repair, which reside in heterochromatin at high density (Grewal 2010, Catania & Allshire 2014). Interestingly, forced induction of dicentric chromosomes in S. pombe leads to inactivation of one of the centromeres (Sato et al. 2012). This was accompanied by loss of CENPA and the engulfment of the intact centromeric chromatin by flanking heterochromatin, which prevented subsequent centromere activation. These data indicate that a context-dependent interplay exists between regions of CENPA chromatin and flanking heterochromatin. This appears to determine the influence of heterochromatin on CENPA and kinetochore assembly (Catania & Allshire 2014).
1.1.3. Histone post-translational modifications (PTMs)

Recent intense research has focused on identifying and mapping an ever-growing, bewildering array of histone post-translational modifications. Functional characterization of PTMs has led to their implication in various all chromatin-templated processes, particularly transcription, DNA repair, and genome stability. Importantly, factors responsible for performing or recognising PTMs are often misregulated in cancer. PTMs predominantly occur on histone N-terminal tails and affect chromatin structure and regulation in two major ways. First, they can alter nucleosomal net charges that lead to changes in histone-DNA and internucleosomal contacts. Second, they serve as recognition sites for various chromatin-binding factors that influence downstream processes (Musselman et al. 2012). PTMs are thought to constitute a ‘histone code’ that is read in a combinatorial manner by such effector proteins, leading to a tailored array of outputs (Jenuwein & Allis 2001, Strahl & Allis 2000). In this section an overview of the diversity of currently known PTMs will be given, with a focus on methylation, acetylation and phosphorylation modifications and their roles in transcription and mitosis. A more detailed overview of PTMs involved in the DNA damage response is provided in the DNA repair pathways section.

Histone methylation

Histone methylation occurs on lysine and arginine residues, which can be mono-, di- or trimethylated. Methylation does not alter the net charge of the residue but alters its size and hydrophobic properties. Canonical methylated lysine residues include K4, K9, K26, K27, K36 and K79 of H3, K20 of H4, and K26 of H1 (Musselman et al. 2012). Proteins that bind methyllysine residues typically do so via an aromatic cage that contains two to four aromatic residues. The composition of residues that constitute the cage and the size of the pocket determine the specificity of the protein for the mono-, di- or trimethylated state of the lysine. Protein modules that are known to recognise methyllysine include ATRX-DNMT3-DNMT3L (ADD), ankyrin, bromo-adjacent homology (BAH), chromobarrel, chromodomain, double chromodomain, malignant brain tumour (MBT), plant homeodomain (PHD), Pro-Trp-Trp-Pro (PWWP), tandem tudour domain (TTD), Tudour, WD40 and the zinc finger CW (zf-CW) (Musselman et al. 2012). Some ‘readers’ of methyllysine are highly specific to a certain lysine residue, whilst others are selective for a particular methylation state (mono-, di- or tri-), and are therefore promiscuous binders.
Lysine tri-methylation at the 5’ end of actively transcribed genes is conserved from yeast to higher eukaryotes and highlights the role of lysine methylation in transcription. H3K4 is methylated by the SET1 family of methyltransferases and functions largely as a gene activation mark; however the transcriptional output is highly context dependent (Schneider et al. 2004, Bernstein et al. 2002, Liang et al. 2004). For example, binding of the PHD finger of TAF3, which is part of the TFIID basal transcription complex, to H3K4me3 is associated with gene activation (Vermeulen et al. 2007). In contrast, binding of the PHD finger of ING2, a subunit of the mSin3a histone deacetylase complex to the same mark is associated with gene repression (Shi et al. 2006). H3K4me1 is a marker of active enhancer elements, and recognition of this mark by the chromo-barrel domain of the acetyltransferase TIP60 facilitates estrogen-induced transcription (Jeong et al. 2011). H3K4me2 is associated with an active or potentially active ‘permissive’ chromatin state, whilst H3K4me3 occurs with active transcription (Bernstein et al. 2002, Schneider et al. 2004). H3K36 is another methylated lysine involved in transcription, displaying a progressive shift from mono- to trimethylation between the 5’ and 3’ ends of genes (Bannister et al. 2005). Set2, which methylates H3K36 recognises H3K36me and binds elongating RNA polymerase II, which recruits the Rpd3S histone deacetylase complex (Carrozza et al. 2005, Joshi et al. 2005, Keogh et al. 2005). The histone deacetylase activity of Rpd3S is necessary to prevent spurious intragenic transcription in the wake of RNA polymerase II (Venkatesh et al. 2012). H3K36me is also implicated in the DNA damage response, replication, as well as mRNA alternative splicing and dosage compensation gene upregulation in D. melanogaster (Musselman et al. 2012).

H4K20 is di-methylated by Suv4-20H1/Suv4-20H2 and binds to the BAH domain of Orc1 to regulate replication licensing (Kuo et al. 2012). In yeast the Orc1 BAH domain also interacts with the silent information regulator 1 (Sir1) protein (Hsu et al. 2005), a component of the Sir complex with structural roles in silencing at HM loci and telomeres (Norris & Boeke 2010). H4K20me2 is also involved in the DDR via interaction with the TTD of 53BP1, which competes with the DDR-external binding by the demethylases JMJD2A and JMJD2B to this residue (Botuyan et al. 2006, Mallette et al. 2012) (discussed in more detail later). H3K9 and H3K27 methylation marks are largely associated with the formation of constitutive and facultative heterochromatin and silencing (Musselman et al. 2012). H3K27me1 and H3K9me3 are located in pericentric heterochromatin (Peters et al. 2003, Rice et al. 2003), whilst H3K27me3 and H3K9me2 are found together in transcriptionally repressed euchromatin. K27me recruits Polycomb proteins to repressed chromatin (Fischle et al. 2003, Min et al. 2003), and K9me recruits heterochromatin protein 1 (HP1) for heterochromatin
formation and spreading (Jacobs et al. 2002, Lachner et al. 2001, Canzio et al. 2011), via their chromobbarrel domains. Competition between the silent information regulator 3 (Sir3) BAH domain and the methyltransferase Dot1 for binding to methylated H3K79 constitutes an important regulatory mechanism for silencing at HM loci and telomeres in yeast (Norris & Boeke 2010).

Arginine residues can also be mono- or dimethylated, the latter of which occurs in symmetrical (Rme2s) or asymmetrical (Rme2a) conformations. Currently identified arginine methylation sites include H3R2, H3R8, H3R17, H3R26, H4R3, H2AR11, and H2AR29. Methylarginine residues are recognised by aromatic cages present in ADD, Tudour and WD40 domains (Musselman et al. 2012). The Tudour domain of the TDRD3 transcription co-activator recognises H3R17me2a and H4R3me2a to facilitate gene activation (Yang et al. 2010). H4R3me2s is bound by the ADD domain of the DNA methyltransferase DNMT3a and has a role in silencing of the β-globin gene (Zhao et al. 2009). Symmetric dimethylation of H3R2 by PRMT5 and PRMT7 is recognised by the WD40 domain of the co-activator complex component WDR5, which is required for euchromatin maintenance (Migliori et al. 2012).

Histone acetylation

Acetylation of lysine results in charge neutralization of the residue and changes the electrostatic properties of histones. Lysine acetylation induces a more relaxed chromatin structure by weakening the interaction with negatively charged DNA, and is largely associated with active transcription. Lysine is acetylated on H3 (K4, 9, 14, 18, 23, 27, 36 and 56), H4 (K5, 8, 12, 16, 20, 91), H2A (K5 and 9) and H2B (K5, 12, 15, 16, 20 and 120) (Musselman et al. 2012). Three protein binding modules recognise acetylated lysine: the bromodomain, PHD domain and PH domain. Bromodomains are ~110 amino acid residue structures that bind acetylated lysine and several flanking residues (Hudson et al. 2000, Mujtaba et al. 2002). Bromodomains fold into a highly conserved four-helix bundle that consists of αA, αB, αC and αZ α-helices. Acetyllysine residues insert into a deep hydrophobic cavity created by inter-helical ZA and BC loops and contact several hydrophobic residues; often two conserved tyrosines, with stabilization achieved through hydrogen bonding to a highly conserved asparagine (Musselman et al. 2012).

The binding affinity of individual bromodomains to single acetyllysine residues is often very weak, but binding can be substantially strengthened when multiply acetylated residues are recognised by covalently linked tandem bromodomains. For
example, the tandem bromodomains of TAF1, the largest subunit and core scaffold of the TFIID basal transcription factor complex, together form a V-shaped structure, with each bromodomain separated by 25Å and angled in the same direction (Jacobson et al. 2000). The protein has a much higher affinity for H4K5ac H4K12ac and H4K8ac H4K16ac doubly acetylated H4 tails than mono-acetylated peptides, with each bromodomain separately binding to one acetyllysine in the same H4 peptide. The first bromodomain of the bromodomain testes-specific protein (Brdt), which is involved in spermatogenesis, has a wider hydrophobic cavity that accommodates two acetyllysines, namely H4K5ac and H4K8ac. The second bromodomain of Brdt binds to H3K18ac (Mornière et al. 2009).

The double PHD finger of Ppf3b, which functions with the SWI/SNF chromatin remodelling complex BAF in transcriptional programs associated with heart and muscle development, is also known to associate with acetylated histone peptides (Lange et al. 2008, Zeng et al. 2010). The first PHD finger of Ppf3b binds to H3K14ac, whilst the second PHD finger binds to several N-terminal residues in the H3 tail. The double PH domain of the histone chaperone Rtt106 binds to H3K56ac and is involved in gene silencing and the DDR (Su et al. 2012). Histone acetylation is also important in the DDR through recruitment of SWI/SNF chromatin remodelling complexes (discussed in more detail later). Recognition of H4Kac by the double bromodomain-containing proteins Bdf1 and Bdf2 in yeast is important for the regulation of transcription, chromatin dynamics, replication-coupled DNA repair and mRNA splicing (Albulescu et al. 2012, Koerber et al. 2009, Garabedian et al. 2012, Matangkasombut & Buratowski 2003). The bromodomain-containing protein ACF7 is enriched in replicating pericentromeric heterochromatin and is required for normal cell cycle progression (Collins et al. 2002).

Histone phosphorylation

Histone phosphorylation adds a large, negatively charged group to residues and similarly changes the electrostatic and topographic properties of the histone (Musselman et al. 2012). Serine and threonine residues are phosphorylated at T3, T6, S10, T11, S28 and T45 of H3, S1 of H4, S1 and T120 of H2A, S139 (human) and S129 (yeast) of H2A.X and S14 of H2B (Musselman et al. 2012). S129 and S139 are phosphorylated by the phosphoinositide 3-kinase-like kinases (PIKKs) Mec1-Ddc2 in S. cerevisiae and ATR, ATM and DNA-PK in H. sapiens as an important signal transduction step following DNA DSB formation. Phosphorylated H2A.X (γ-H2A.X) plays a critical role in recruiting numerous DNA damage response proteins to the DSB.
Mitosis and transcription are also regulated by serine and threonine phosphorylation. Phosphorylation of H3S10 by Aurora B kinase during mitosis regulates chromosome condensation and segregation by disrupting the interaction between the HP1 chromodomain and H3K9me3, resulting in the release of HP1 from chromatin (Hirota et al. 2005, Fischle et al. 2005). Aurora B kinase activity at the centromere requires binding of Survivin to H3T3ph (Jeyaprakash et al. 2011, Wang et al. 2010). Finally, recognition of H3S10ph and H3S28ph by 14-3-3 protein family isoforms (Bmh1 and Bmh2 in yeast) is important for GAL1 and HDAC1 gene transcription (Walter et al. 2008, Winter et al. 2008).

Patterns of histone modifications at mammalian centromeres

Mammalian centromeres are comprised of distinct chromatin regions characterized by the presence of CENP-A, H3K9me2/3 and H3K4me2. These regions regulate the unique properties of the centromere and the flanking pericentromeric regions. A discrete chromatin domain adjacent to the outer kinetochore contains CENP-A nucleosomes that regulate kinetochore function. Adjacent to this is a section of chromatin containing H3K4me2, which is thought to contribute to the physical organization of the centromere (Dunleavy et al. 2005). Surrounding these domains is a large pericentromeric region characterized by H3K9me2- and H3K9me3-enriched chromatin in addition to H4K20me3 (Sullivan & Karpen et al. 2004). These modifications function to recruit proteins such as cohesin and HP1, which are required for the structural maintenance and function of the pericentromeric heterochromatin (Nonaka et al. 2002, Verdaasdonk & Bloom 2011).

A number of modifications have been identified that occur specifically on the N-terminal tail of Cse4/CENPA. In budding yeast, Cse4 is methylated on R37, acetylated on K49, and phosphorylated on S22, S33, S40 and S105. (Boeckmann et al. 2013). These serine residues are phosphorylated by the Aurora B kinase Ipl1 and appear to regulate sister kinetochore bio-orientation (Boeckmann et al. 2013). Mutation of R37 to alanine impaired the association of kinetochore components with centromeres (Samel et al. 2012). In human cells, CENPA is phosphorylated on S7 by Aurora kinase and regulates kinetochore function and cytokinesis (Zeitlin et al. 2001). CENPA phosphorylation appears to be important during mitosis by facilitating the binding of 14-3-3 proteins, which stabilize the association of CENPC (Goutte-Gattat et al. 2013). Phosphorylated S16 and S18 also occur on CENPA and affect kinetochore integrity, although a relationship with 14-3-3 or other proteins has not been identified (Catania & Allshire 2014).
1.1.4. Chromatin remodelling complexes

In addition to DNA sequence, histone variants and posttranslational histone modifications, chromatin is regulated by chromatin remodelling complexes. These complexes have widespread roles in establishing chromatin architecture, regulation of transcription, silencing, chromosome segregation, DNA replication and DNA repair (Clapier & Cairns 2009). Chromatin remodelling complexes are multi-subunit complexes that contain a single core catalytic ATPase subunit able to generate an array of nucleosome-related outputs. These include nucleosome sliding or repositioning, ejection, DNA unwrapping, transfer of H2A/H2B dimers and histone octamers between nucleosomes and to histone chaperones or other DNA molecules (Clapier & Cairns 2009). Central to these processes is the generation of force provided by ATP hydrolysis that breaks histone-DNA contacts and translocates DNA. How the ATPase translocates DNA and generates force and how translocation and force generation are coupled on nucleosomes is fundamental to understanding the remodelling process (Sirinakis et al. 2011).

Chromatin remodelling complexes function during DNA replication to eject and chaperone histone octamers in the path of DNA polymerases, as well as deposit and reposition them after replication (Clapier & Cairns 2009). Similarly, chromatin remodelling complexes replace and reposition nucleosomes ejected during transcription. They control the exposure of regulatory DNA sequences and DNA break sites to allow access for DNA binding proteins and the DNA repair machinery. There are four families of chromatin remodelling complexes, namely SWI/SNF, ISWI, CHD and INO80, which are specialized for particular biological functions and contexts (Clapier & Cairns 2009). This section focuses on SWI/SNF chromatin remodelling complexes, reviewing their subunit composition and summarising their known roles in various chromatin-related activities from yeast to humans.

Subunit composition of SWI/SNF chromatin remodelling complexes

SWI/SNF (switching defective/sucrose non-fermentable) chromatin remodelling complexes are composed of between 8 and 14 subunits (Clapier & Cairns 2009). In most eukaryotes two related complexes that contain related ATPase catalytic subunits are found. The catalytic ATPase subunits contain an N-terminal HSA (helicase-SANT) domain, an ATPase domain that is split into two parts termed DExx and HELICc, and a single C-terminal bromodomain. Various other conserved subunits that harbour
conserved domains are found in both complexes, in addition to subunits that are unique to each complex and provide functional specificity.

In yeast, the two SWI/SNF complexes are known as SWI/SNF and RSC (remodels the structure of chromatin). RSC is an abundant (~1000-2000 molecules per cell), essential chromatin remodelling complex (Cairns et al. 1996) from which 17 subunits have been identified, namely Sth1, Rsc1, Rsc2, Rsc3, Rsc4, Rsc6, Rsc7/Npl6, Rsc8, Rsc9, Sfh1, Arp7, Arp9, Rsc30, Htl1, Rtt102, Rsc58 and Ldb7. Sth1, which is essential for viability, provides the ATPase catalytic activity and is closely related to the Swi2/Snf2 catalytic subunit of the SWI/SNF complex. Rtt102, Arp7 and Arp9 are found in both RSC and SWI/SNF complexes, and Sfh1, Rsc8 and Rsc6 are homologous to subunits found in SWI/SNF (Table 1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. cerevisiae</th>
<th>Human</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSC</strong></td>
<td><strong>SWI/SNF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sth1</td>
<td>Snf2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arp7</td>
<td>Arp7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arp9</td>
<td>Arp9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rtt102</td>
<td>Rtt102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc6</td>
<td>Swp73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sfh1</td>
<td>Snf5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc8</td>
<td>Swi3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc1, Rsc2 and Rsc4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swi1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ldb7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Htl1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snf6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snf1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swp29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swp82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table adapted from Chambers et al. 2012. Catalytic subunits are shown in bold. Rows show homologous subunits. RSC and SWI/SNF share Arp7, Arp9 and Rtt102, and four other homologous subunits. RSC is homologous to the human PBAF complex, and SWI/SNF is homologous to the human BAF complex. BAF180, BRD7 and BAF200 are specific to PBAF, and BAF250 is specific to BAF.
Domain architecture of the RSC complex subunits Rsc1, Rsc2 and Rsc4

At least two isoforms of the complex occur, containing either Rsc1 or Rsc2 (Cairns et al. 1999). Deletion of both RSC1 and RSC2 is lethal, whilst single deletion retains viability, suggesting that there is some degree of functional redundancy. Rsc2 is approximately 10-fold more abundant than Rsc1 but both proteins have highly similar domain organization with 46% amino acid sequence identity and 62% similarity (Cairns et al. 1999) (Figure 1.1). Both proteins contain two bromodomains, the first of which is largely dispensable whilst the second is important for protein function (Cairns et al. 1999). They also contain an AT hook, a bromo-adjacent homology (BAH) domain and a C-terminal region (Figure 1.1). AT hooks are short DNA-binding motifs that preferentially bind to the minor groove of AT-rich DNA (Cairns et al. 1999). Although the AT hook is only necessary for Rsc1-specific functions, an AT hook must be present in either Rsc1 or Rsc2 for viability (Cairns et al. 1999). The C-terminal regions of Rsc1 and Rsc2 are necessary and sufficient for incorporation into the rest of the RSC complex (Cairns et al. 1999).

Rsc4 contains two bromodomains in tandem (Figure 1.1); the first (BD1) binds acetylated lysine 25 (K25ac) of Rsc4 itself and the second (BD2) binds acetylated lysine 14 of histone H3 (H3K14ac) (VanDemark et al. 2007). Gcn5 acetylates both Rsc4 K25 and H3K14, and binding of Rsc4 K25ac to BD1 prevents binding of BD2 to H3K14ac, indicating an autoregulation mechanism for histone modification recognition (VanDemark et al. 2007). A specific role for H3K25ac in promoting resistance to replication stress was discovered more recently (Charles et al. 2011). Less is known about the binding targets of the Rsc1 and Rsc2 bromodomains. Whilst the first bromodomain (BD1) of each protein is largely dispensable, the second bromodomain is important for function (Cairns et al. 1999). One study has examined the in vitro binding ability of the individual bromodomains of Rsc1 and Rsc2. Interestingly, all four bromodomains displayed extremely weak binding to the selection of acetyl-lysine-containing histone peptides tested and were classed as ‘non-binders’ (Zhang et al. 2010). It is therefore possible that these bromodomains in fact bind other non-histone acetylproteins.
Bromo-adjacent homology (BAH) domains are ~200 amino acid residue structures found in several chromatin-associated proteins (Goodwin & Nicolas 2001, Callebaut et al. 1999). BAH domains fall into two classes based on amino acid sequence (Callebaut et al. 1999, Oliver et al. 2005). The ‘RSC-like’ class includes the BAH domains of Rsc1, Rsc2 and the two BAH domains found in the homologous BAF180 protein, as well as those of the transcription factor Ash1 and the CpG-DNA methyltransferase DNMT1 (DNA (cytosine-5) methyltransferase 1). The ‘Sir3-like’ class includes the BAH domains of Orc1 (origin recognition complex 1) and Sir3 (silent information regulator 3), which arose through a duplication of Orc1 in *S. cerevisiae* (Hickman & Rusche 2010, Chambers et al. 2013).

Transcriptional silencing by Orc1 and Sir3 at telomeres and the HML/R loci in budding yeast is critically dependent on their BAH domains (Norris & Boeke 2010). The BAH domain of Orc1 interacts with Sir1 (silent information regulator 1) (Hsu et al. 2005), and in higher eukaryotes an interaction exists between Orc1 and HP1 (heterochromatin protein 1) (Duncker et al. 2009). The BAH domain of Orc1 also mediates an interaction with nucleosomes (Noguchi et al. 2006, Muller et al. 2010). In higher eukaryotes this interaction is via H4K20me2 and is important for replication licensing (Kuo et al. 2012). In yeast the Sir3 BAH domain also binds to nucleosomes (Norris et al. 2008, Onishi et al. 2007) via the LRS (loss of ribosomal silencing) region, which includes sequences from H3 and H4, and also makes extensive contacts with all four core histones (Armache et al. 2011).

Recently, work in our lab identified a role for the Rsc2 BAH domain in rDNA silencing and nucleosome binding, which in contrast to the Sir3 BAH domain interacts specifically with H3 (Chambers et al. 2013). Furthermore, resolution of the Rsc2 BAH crystal structure at 2.4A revealed major differences between the structure of Rsc2 BAH...
compared to those of Orc1 and Sir3. The canonical BAH domain is comprised of a
distorted B-barrel core with additional N- and C-terminal B-strand and $3_{10}$ elements
(Callebaut et al. 1999, Oliver et al. 2005). The core fold of all three BAH domains is
highly conserved, and the Orc1 and Sir3 BAH domains contain an inserted H-domain
(involved in protein-partner interactions) as well as a C-terminal helix-turn-helix motif
(involved in specific nucleosome interactions). Notably, both of these additional
structural motifs are absent in the Rsc2 BAH domain, presenting a unique and distinct
interface for H3 binding. The study also showed that the Rsc1 and homologous
proximal BAF180 BAH domain similarly display H3-specific binding. In addition, a novel
Rsc2 BAH domain motif was identified that when mutated abrogates H3 binding \textit{in vitro}
and causes defective Rsc2 function \textit{in vivo} (Chambers et al. 2013).

\subsection*{1.1.5. Properties of the RSC complex}

\textit{Structural conformations of the RSC complex}

Studies utilizing cryo-electron microscopy to visualize the structure of the RSC complex
revealed a central cavity that appears able to accommodate a nucleosome. Addition of
nucleosomes resulted in an increased density within the central cavity, suggesting that
it indeed constitutes a nucleosome-binding cavity (Leschziner et al. 2007, Chaban et al.
2008, Asturias et al. 2002). Two different conformations of the complex were observed
when Rsc2-RSC (Leschziner et al. 2007) and mixtures of the Rsc1-RSC and Rsc2-
RSC (Chaban et al. 2008, Skiniotis et al. 2007) complexes were analysed, termed
‘open’ and ‘closed’. The predominant difference between the conformations was the
positioning of the lower arm part of the complex. The ‘closed’ conformation was
stabilized when acetylated H3 N-terminal peptides were incubated with the complexes
(Skiniotis et al. 2007). A third conformation was also observed in \textasciitilde16\% of complexes in
which part of the lower arm was absent or had reduced density. This might represent a
conformation specific to Rsc1-RSC since this complex is known to account for \textasciitilde10\% of
all RSC (Skiniotis et al. 2007, Chambers & Downs 2012). Addition of nucleosomes did
not result in any major changes to RSC structure, however changes to the nucleosome
were observed, including loss of H2A-H2B dimers (Chaban et al. 2008). In support of
RSC-induced changes to nucleosomes the sensitivity of nucleosomal DNA to
degradation by exonuclease III and DNase I was found to increase upon RSC binding
(Lorch et al. 2010, Lorch et al. 1998).
**Biochemical activity of the RSC complex**

The RSC complex has been shown in vitro to perform nucleosome remodelling, repositioning, disassembly and octamer transfer. Its ATPase activity can be stimulated by at least 25bp of DNA but was not stimulated further upon addition of nucleosomes. A maximal turnover rate of ~7.5 ATP molecules per second was also observed (Cairns et al. 1996, Boyer et al. 2000, Saha et al. 2002). By itself, Sth1 was found to have ~2.5 times lower ATPase activity compared to the intact Rsc2-RSC complex (Saha et al. 2002). ATP hydrolysis by Sth1/RSC was also coupled to 3’-5’ translocase activity as shown by DNA length-dependent stimulation, as well as stimulation by DNA minicircles and triplex displacement activity (Saha et al. 2002, Saha et al. 2005).

RSC has been shown to bind DNA and nucleosomes with comparable affinity, and incubation with nucleosomes and ATP induces a slower migrating ‘activated’ form of the complex. This form of RSC renders nucleosomal DNA more sensitive to DNase I and suggests RSC is able to alter the structure of the nucleosome (Lorch et al. 1998). In a different assay an inaccessible restriction site on the surface of the nucleosome was rendered accessible to digestion after ATP-dependent remodelling by RSC (Cairns et al. 1996, Lorch et al. 1998, Saha et al. 2002). Additional RSC functions include nucleosome repositioning, histone octamer transfer onto naked DNA and nucleosome disassembly in the presence of histone chaperones (Lorch et al. 2006, Lorch et al. 1999, Ferreira et al. 2007).

Other RSC subunits are important for maximal RSC activity because Sth1 alone was found to be five to six-fold less active than RSC in nucleosome mobilization (Saha et al. 2002). These auxiliary subunits might function to increase the affinity of RSC for nucleosomes. Tetra-acetylated H3-containing nucleosomes were remodelled by RSC ~16 times faster than unmodified nucleosomes due to preferential binding to the acetylated nucleosomes (Ferreira et al. 2007). In addition, RSC binds to nucleosomes acetylated by NuA4 with greater affinity (Ferreira et al. 2007), suggesting a possible role for the bromodomain-containing subunits (Rsc1, Rsc2, Rsc4 and Sth1) in RSC recruitment to chromatin and maximal remodelling activity (Chambers & Downs 2012). It is unclear as to whether the Rsc1- and Rsc2-containing isoforms of RSC possess different biochemical properties. This is because the in vitro assays described above have largely used either Rsc2-RSC alone or a mixture of Rsc1-RSC and Rsc2-RSC.

Studies have examined the molecular mechanism of nucleosome remodelling by RSC using single molecule approaches. RSC formed relaxed supercoiled DNA loops between 400 and 700bp in length in an ATP-dependent manner on DNA tethered...
and stretched at low force with a magnetic trap (Lia et al. 2006). Loop formation of sizes between 20 and 1200bp (averaging ~100bp) was also observed on nucleosomal DNA templates, but these loops could not form at higher tensions (Zhang et al. 2006). Loop slippage was observed on both DNA templates, however the highest rate of translocation occurred on naked DNA (>500bp per second) compared to nucleosomal DNA (12bp per second). Together these data suggest a mechanism for remodelling that first sees the formation of a DNA bulge on the surface of the nucleosome. This bulge is then extended to generate a larger bulge, which upon dissipation can lead to reversal of the translocation, a jump in the position of the nucleosome, or nucleosome sliding (Chambers & Downs 2012).

In vivo functions of the RSC complex

RSC is known to regulate the transcription of many genes and co-immunoprecipitates with all three RNA polymerases (Angus-Hill et al. 2001, Soutourina et al. 2006, Ng et al. 2002). RSC activates and represses transcription of a group of genes that are distinct from those regulated by SWI/SNF (Du et al. 1998, Angus-Hill et al. 2001, Floer et al. 2010). Binding of RSC was observed at ~700 promoters (~11% of genes) when assayed by ChIP-on-ChIP, and there was no difference in the binding profiles between Rsc1 and Rsc2 (Ng et al. 2002). Furthermore, in a rsc4 mutant strain ~12% of RNA polymerase II-transcribed genes were up- or down-regulated by at least 2-fold (Soutourina et al. 2006). RSC was also present at a number of tRNA promoters transcribed by RNA polymerase III and enriched at numerous genes involved in mitochondrial function, nitrogen and carbon metabolism as well histone gene promoters. Several rsc mutants display misregulated gene transcripts affecting cell wall integrity, cell cycle control and spindle pole body formation, yet RSC was not enriched at their corresponding promoters. Conversely, some transcripts from promoters at which RSC is enriched were not misregulated in rsc mutants (Angus-Hill et al. 2001), indicating that there is not a straightforward correlation between RSC occupancy at promoters and transcriptional activity.

RSC is also involved in kinetochore function. Mutations in Sth1 and Sfh1 were found to interact genetically and biochemically with mutants of various kinetochore components, the centromere-specific histone H3 variant Cse4 and mutated centromeric DNA elements (Hsu et al. 2003). In addition, RSC localized to centromeric and centromere-proximal chromatin. Sth1 and Sfh1 mutants displayed an altered centromeric chromatin structure, yet kinetochore components, including Cse4, remained associated with the centromere. This suggests that RSC functions in a post-
recruitment step to assemble or maintain centromeric chromatin structure, which in turn leads to the correct configuration of the kinetochore. Consistent with kinetochore dysfunction the Sth1 and Sfh1 mutants missegregated authentic chromosomes at a higher frequency than wild-type strains (Hsu et al. 2003).

Other functions of RSC include adaptation to the spindle assembly checkpoint (Rossio et al. 2010), nuclear pore complex localization (Titus et al. 2010) and sister chromatid cohesion (Baetz et al. 2004, Huang et al. 2004) (discussed later). Several rsc mutants also affect cell cycle progression and strains harbouring deletions, temperature sensitive alleles or degron alleles of genes encoding various RSC subunits (namely Sth1, Sfh1, Rsc3, Rsc4, Rsc6, Rsc8, Rsc9 and Rsc58) activate the G2/M DNA damage checkpoint (Chambers & Downs 2012).

1.1.6. Mammalian SWI/SNF complexes

Mammalian cells contain two closely related SWI/SNF complexes known as BAF (BRG1- or hBRM-associated factor) and PBAF (polybromo-BAF) (Wilson & Roberts 2011) (Table 1.1). PBAF (also called SWI/SNF-B) is the mammalian orthologue of the yeast RSC complex and contains twelve subunits, four of which constitute a highly conserved core including BRG1, the catalytic ATPase, BAF155, BAF170 and SNF5 (Table 1.1). Five subunits are classed as variant subunits, including β-actin, BAF53A/B, BAF60A/B/C, BAF57 and BAF45A/B/C/D. These core and variant subunits are also found in the BAF complex, which is orthologous to the yeast SWI/SNF complex (Table 1.1). BAF contains either the ATPase subunit BRG1 or hBRM, which are mutually exclusive, as well as the BAF-specific subunit BAF250A/B, whilst BAF180, BAF200 and BRD7 are unique to PBAF (Wilson & Roberts 2011). Table 1.2 shows the gene and protein names for the complete list of SWI/SNF subunits.

Mammalian SWI/SNF complexes are highly diverse owing to the differential lineage-restricted expression timing of the variant subunits. Along with the differential inclusion of subcomplex-specific subunits it is thought that several hundred variant SWI/SNF complexes might exist (Wu et al. 2009). A major role of mammalian SWI/SNF complexes is the regulation of lineage-specific differentiation during neurogenesis, myogenesis, apipogenesis, osteogenesis and haematopoiesis (Kaeser et al. 2008, Lickert et al. 2004, Wu et al. 2009, Lessard et al. 2007, Yan et al. 2008). This appears to be achieved through interaction with tissue-specific transcription factors to regulate tissue-specific gene activation and repression. The differentially expressed variant subunits might modulate this activity by interacting with the tissue-specific factors to direct the complex’s remodelling activity to specific loci (Wilson & Roberts 2011).
Recent whole-exome sequencing studies have identified frequent mutations in subunits of SWI/SNF chromatin remodelling complexes in a diverse range of cancers. Most of these studies have analysed one tumour type, often reporting a strikingly high frequency of mutation in one specific SWI/SNF subunit. However, these studies have largely focused on the ‘top hits’ as the most frequently mutated genes. In an effort to systematically define the frequency and spectrum of SWI/SNF mutations across a broad range of human cancers, Shain and Pollack analysed mutational datasets from 24 studies, covering 18 cancer types. The authors revealed that the cancer types most frequently harbouring SWI/SNF mutations were ovarian clear-cell carcinoma (75%), clear cell renal cell carcinoma (57%), hepatocellular carcinoma (40%), gastric cancer (36%), melanoma (34%), and pancreatic cancer (26%). Strikingly, across all cancer types analysed, the average frequency of SWI/SNF mutation was 19%, approaching that of p53 at 26% (Shain & Pollack 2013).

The size of SWI/SNF’s collective genomic ‘footprint’ might account for a high frequency of passenger mutations that could explain such mutation frequencies in cancer. In argument against this, it was found that the vast majority of mutations (72%) were predicted to be deleterious (38.8% frameshift, nonsense, rearrangement and splice-site, and 33.2% missense damaging). This suggests that most SWI/SNF mutations are likely to be driver mutations in cancer. Reports suggest that alternative mechanisms, including genomic DNA deletions, rearrangements and epigenetic silencing might contribute to SWI/SNF subunit inactivation (Shain et al. 2012, Delbov
et al. 2011). Therefore, these sequencing results might actually underestimate the true frequency of SWI/SNF inactivation (Shain & Pollack 2013).

The enzymatic and targeting subunits of SWI/SNF are preferentially mutated in cancer

SWI/SNF subunits can be roughly grouped as enzymatic subunits (Brg1 and hBRM), targeting subunits that confer functional specificity to each complex (BAF250A/B for BAF, BAF180, BAF200 and BRD7 for PBAF), and the remaining core and variant subunits, termed scaffolding subunits (Shain & Pollack 2013). Intriguingly, the majority of SWI/SNF mutations were found to occur in the genes of the enzymatic or targeting subunits. Specifically, the five most frequently mutated genes were ARID1A (9% of SWI/SNF nonsynonymous mutations), PBRM1 (4%), SMARCA4 (3%), ARID1B (2%) and ARID2 (2%). However, mutations were found in the scaffolding subunits albeit at a noticeably lower frequency (none exceeded a frequency of 0.6%). The fact that mutations are found in a range of subunits suggests that they impact in part or whole the functional activity of the complex. That the enzymatic and targeting subunits are mutated more frequently might suggest that they are particularly critical for SWI/SNF function.

Certain cancer types often exhibit mutations predominantly in a single SWI/SNF subunit

Analysis of individual cancer types often reveals that a single SWI/SNF subunit is mutated. The most striking cases include SMARCB1, which is mutated in all malignant rhabdoid tumours (Roberts et al. 2000), and PBRM1, which is mutated in 41% of all renal cell clear cell carcinomas (Varela et al. 2011). However, most other cancer types, including melanoma, pancreatic cancer and diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) display a more balanced spectrum of mutations across the most commonly mutated subunits. An interesting question is therefore why do certain cancer types harbour mutations of single SWI/SNF subunits? It is possible that the affected subunit (and complex containing it) has cell- or tissue-type specific functions. Another possibility is that cell- and tissue-type specific mutational processes that preferentially affect a certain SWI/SNF gene or genomic locus might be operational (Shain & Pollack 2013).

Another interesting question is whether SWI/SNF mutations preferentially occur within certain subunit domains or structural motifs. Shain & Pollack report that no obvious mutation ‘hotspots’ were apparent from the exome data analysed as a whole. However, they note that the data appears too sparse to draw any firm conclusions in
this regard. Nevertheless, a few validation studies that analysed specific subunits (including ARID1B) in much larger cohorts similarly reported a lack of mutation ‘hotspots’ (Wang et al. 2011, Wiegand et al. 2010). The authors also investigated whether mutations in different SWI/SNF subunits were mutually exclusive of each other. They revealed that two mutations in different subunits occurred in the same tumour at roughly the same frequency as that expected by chance. This suggests that mutational ‘hits’ in two different subunits are not functionally redundant, and that individual mutations might incrementally impair the function of the complex (Shain & Pollack 2013).

Mutations in SWI/SNF are not mutually exclusive of other cancer gene mutations

The tumour suppressive role of SWI/SNF complexes is widely thought to operate by transcriptionally regulating the activity and expression of key tumour suppressor genes and pathways. These include Rb, p53, Polycomb, sonic hedgehog, Myc, stem cell programs and nuclear hormone receptor signalling (discussed later) (Wilson & Roberts 2011). Shain & Pollack performed a mutual exclusivity analysis on the exome sequencing data in an effort to identify key SWI/SNF tumour suppressor pathways. The rationale follows that one particular linear pathway in a tumour is unlikely to harbour multiple components with a mutation because these mutations would be functionally redundant. Thus, identifying components of a pathway that are only mutated when SWI/SNF mutations are not present could indicate a shared pathway. Similarly, identifying components that are always found mutated with SWI/SNF mutations in the same tumour might indicate a necessary cooperating pathway (Shain & Pollack 2013).

Mutual exclusivity has been previously reported with ARID1A and p53 mutations in both ovarian clear cell carcinoma and gastric cancer (Wang et al. 2011, Guan et al. 2011). Shain & Pollack similarly concluded from the datasets available that a trend towards mutual exclusivity occurs with SWI/SNF and p53 mutations in these cancers, although only gastric cancer reached statistical significance ($P=0.018$; Fisher’s exact test). The authors highlight a need for caution when interpreting these trends, however, because of histological and genetic diversity amongst these two cancer types. Thus, mutual exclusivity might actually correlate with a cancer subtype rather than a mechanistic relationship. In contrast, mutual exclusivity was not observed between SWI/SNF and p53 in pancreatic cancer, melanoma, hepatocellular carcinoma and DLBCL. In fact, in pancreatic cancer all cases harbouring SWI/SNF mutations actually had a p53 mutation, indicating a trend towards mutual inclusivity ($P=0.085$; Fisher’s exact test) (Shain & Pollack 2013).
SWI/SNF complexes are also thought to contribute to tumour suppression by antagonizing the oncogenic activity of polycomb repressive complex 2 (PRC2) (Shain et al. 2012, Wilson et al. 2010). EZH2 is the enzymatic component of PRC2 and harbours activating mutations in ~15% of DLBCL. The study by Shain & Pollack revealed several cases of DLBCL containing a mutation in both SWI/SNF and EZH2, suggesting that mutual exclusivity does not occur with these mutations (Shain & Pollack 2013). In an effort to more systematically identify cancer gene mutations that display mutual exclusivity with SWI/SNF mutations, the authors analysed the top 189 mutated genes (those with \( \geq 13 \) mutations) from the entire exome sequencing dataset from all 24 studies. These genes included many well-established tumour suppressor genes (e.g. KRAS, BRAF, CDKN2A, PTEN, NF1, APC, SMAD4) that function in canonical cancer signalling pathways, including Ras, PI3K, Wnt and Notch. However, no significant mutual exclusivity (or inclusivity) was observed with SWI/SNF mutations. As a favoured explanation for this the authors suggest that SWI/SNF impacts many of the aforementioned pathways simultaneously, which might obscure any mutually exclusive relationships (Shain & Pollack 2013). In support of this, the fact that SWI/SNF mutations are found in such a broad range of cancers in diverse tissue types implies that SWI/SNF impacts upon processes that are largely conserved. In addition, recent studies have identified between 5,000 and 10,000 SWI/SNF binding sites within the genome (Ho et al. 2009, Euskirchen et al. 2011), suggesting that SWI/SNF transcriptionally regulates many genes. Finally, and as mentioned previously, the orthologous SWI/SNF-related complexes in yeast are known to transcriptionally regulate diverse biological processes, including mitochondrial function, nitrogen and carbon metabolism, and cell cycle regulation. Deregulation of the equivalent processes in human cells (perhaps relating to growth, survival and metabolism) might also contribute to tumourigenesis (Shain & Pollack 2013).

1.1.7. Transcriptional regulation as a potential SWI/SNF tumour suppressor mechanism

Regulation of p21

Cellular senescence is an irreversible cell cycle arrest that serves to restrain the proliferation and transformation that results from oncogene activation. A unifying feature of oncogene-induced senescence is the activation of a robust DNA damage response (DDR) (Di Micco et al. 2006, Bartkova et al. 2006, Mallette et al. 2007), indicating that DNA damage is an important senescence stimulus. p53 is a transcription
factor with diverse roles in cell cycle control, DNA repair, apoptosis and stress responses, and is a major component of the senescence pathway. p53 is activated in response to several oncogenes, including RasV12, STAT5, E2F1, Mos and Cdc6, and is dependent on the DDR kinases ATM, ATR, Chk1 and Chk2 (Di Micco et al. 2006, Bartkova et al. 2006, Mallette et al. 2007). Activated p53 induces the expression of the CDK inhibitor p21, which effects cell cycle arrest (Rufini et al. 2013).

As mentioned previously, the gene encoding the PBAF-specific subunit BAF180 (PBRM1) is mutated in many cancers. PBRM1 was first identified as harbouring multiple truncating mutations in breast cancer in a screen for novel breast cancer tumour suppressor genes (Xia et al. 2008). Specifically, 3 out of 26 breast cancer cell lines harboured truncating mutations that abolished protein expression and showed strong evidence of loss of heterozygosity (LOH). In addition, mutational screening of 52 primary breast tumours identified one other truncating mutation, and 25 of these samples (48.1%) showed BAF180 LOH without a mutation. Interestingly, all four of the identified mutations occurred in the bromodomains of BAF180 (Xia et al. 2008).

To investigate a potential tumour suppressor role the authors showed that re-expressing exogenous BAF180 in a mutant BAF180 breast cancer cell line reduced colony number and size. In addition, the BAF180-expressing cells were significantly enriched in G1, suggesting a role in regulating the transition from G1- to S-phase (Xia et al. 2008). This was found to correlate with increased expression of p21 in these cells, and siRNA depletion of BAF180 in a normal breast epithelial cell line led to reduced p21 protein levels. Furthermore, BAF180 depletion led to a reduction in p21 mRNA and BAF180 was found to reside at the p21 promoter when analysed by ChIP in a BAF180-expressing breast cancer cell line (Xia et al. 2008). In addition to p53, other signal-regulated transcription factors are known to activate the p21 promoter, including SMAD2/3/4, signal transducer and activator of transcription 3 (STAT3), vitamin D3 receptor, retinoid X receptor α, and peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor γ (Xia et al. 2008). The effects of γ-radiation-induced p53-dependent and TGF-β-induced SMAD-dependent p21 activation in the absence of BAF180 were also tested. The authors found that in response to these extracellular stimuli the induction of p21 and G1 cell cycle arrest were attenuated in the BAF180 siRNA-depleted breast cancer cells. Together, these data indicate that BAF180 functions as a regulator of cell cycle exit at G1, at least in part via p21 regulation, in response to various environmental stimuli (Xia et al. 2008).

A subsequent study by Burrows et al. similarly identified BAF180, as well as another PBAF-specific subunit, BRD7, as being unique regulators of replicative senescence in
human cells (Burrows et al. 2010). The authors performed a whole-genome shRNA screen in primary BJ fibroblasts and found that BRD7-depleted cells were largely unable to senesce compared to the control cells. BRD7-depleted BJ fibroblasts significantly delayed senescence and showed increased proliferation under normal conditions as well as in cells expressing the HPV E7 oncoprotein, which binds and inhibits Rb. This suggests that BRD7 regulates senescence independently of Rb. In addition, RasV12D-induced p53-dependent senescence was reduced in BRD7-depleted cells, suggesting a role for BRD7 in both replicative and oncogenic senescence (Burrows et al. 2010).

The authors next examined p53-dependent p21 induction in cells lacking BRD7, and found that basal p21 mRNA levels were reduced in BRD7 shRNA-treated cells. In addition, treatment with nutlin-3a, an inhibitor of MDM2 that results in p53 stabilization, similarly led to reduced p21 mRNA levels in the absence of BRD7. Stabilization of p53 after nutlin-3a treatment was found to be normal in the BRD7 shRNA-treated cells, consistent with a role of BRD7 downstream of p53. Interestingly, MDM2 mRNA levels were also reduced, indicating that p21 is not the only p53 target gene regulated by BRD7. Both p21 and Mdm2 basal mRNA levels were also reduced in BRD7-depleted cells transduced with RasV12D compared to control cells, implicating BRD7 in the expression of several p53 target genes following replicative and oncogenic stress senescence induction (Burrows et al. 2010).

To further analyse the involvement of BRD7 in p53-mediated gene expression the authors performed gene expression profiling on control and BRD7 shRNA-depleted cells after nutlin-3a treatment. The genes found to be most differentially expressed between the control and BRD7 shRNA-treated cells were then compared with a list of previously identified p53 target genes (Riley et al. 2008). A number of additional p53 target genes were found to be down-regulated in BRD7-depleted cells, including DcR1, TRIM22, NDRG1 and PLYCARD. However, expression of other p53 target genes, such as Bax, did not require BRD7, suggesting that BRD7 is required for expression of only a subset of p53 target genes (Burrows et al. 2010). BRD7 was found to co-immunoprecipitate with p53, suggesting that the two proteins physically interact. BRD7 contains a single bromodomain that is known to bind H3K14ac (Peng et al. 2006). To determine whether the BRD7 bromodomain is also required for the interaction between BRD7 and p53, a strain harbouring a deletion of the bromodomain was created. The BRD7-p53 interaction was found to remain in this strain, indicating that the bromodomain is dispensable for this interaction (Burrows et al. 2010).

BAF180 was similarly found to be required for replicative senescence, consistent with the findings by Xia et al. BAF180 depletion led to delayed senescence
and proliferation, decreased basal and nutlin-3a-induced p21 expression, and decreased nutlin-3a-induced Mdm2 and DcR1 expression. This suggests that BAF180 is also required for expression of a subset of p53 target genes (Burrows et al. 2010).

Wild-type BRD7 overexpression in BJ fibroblasts led to premature senescence and elevated p21 expression, whilst overexpression of the BRD7 bromodomain mutant did not slow proliferation or increase p21 to the same level. In response to nutlin-3a reduced p21 was also observed in the mutant-expressing cells compared to wild-type BRD7-expressing cells. This suggests that the BRD7 bromodomain has a functional role in mediating p21 expression, and might function to bridge p53 to chromatin for its transcriptional activity (Burrows et al. 2010). In a database consisting of 3,131 samples and cell lines from 54 cancer subtypes (Beroukhim et al. 2010) BRD7 was deleted at a statistically significant frequency, supporting a tumour suppressor function. Again, the scale of involvement of this subunit in tumour suppression might be underestimated by mutation frequency alone, because BRD7 expression was silenced by promoter methylation in samples of nasopharyngeal carcinoma (Liu et al. 2008).

Finally, the authors showed that BRD7 also affects p53-independent p21 transcription. BRD7 was found to be required for TGF-β-induced SMAD-dependent p21 activation in HCT116 cells, similar to findings by Xia et al. with BAF180, as well as for p21 induction by 1α,25(OH)2D3 (vitamin D) in human mammary epithelial cells (Burrows et al. 2010).

Regulation of pluripotency and differentiation

In embryonic stem (ES) cells a unique subset of variant SWI/SNF complexes cooperate with various ES cell-associated factors to regulate pluripotency and self-renewal (Yan et al. 2008, Ho et al. 2009, Kidder et al. 2009, Gao et al. 2009). Mouse embryos lacking BRG1, SNF5, BAF155 or BAF250A die around the peri-implantation stage of development, soon after the formation of ES cells (Roberts et al. 2000, Klochendler-Yeivin et al. 2000, Guidi et al. 2001), and BRG1 or BAF250A deficiency results in self-renewal defects and increased differentiation (Bultman et al. 2000, Gao et al. 2009). A variant complex in which BAF170 is replaced by a second BAF155 subunit interacts with ES cell-specific transcription factors such as OCT4, SOX2 and NANOG at ES-specific target promoters (Ho et al. 2009). Overexpression of BRG1 and/or BAF155 results in the reprogramming of fibroblasts into induced pluripotent stem (iPS) cells (Singhal et al. 2010). In addition, upregulation of stem cell-associated signatures occurs following SNF5 inactivation in primary embryonic fibroblasts as well as in SNF5-mutated malignant rhabdoid tumours, which are characteristically poorly
differentiated (Wilson et al. 2010). Thus, the regulation of pluripotency and differentiation might represent one possible mechanism for SWI/SNF’s tumour suppressor activity (Wilson & Roberts 2011).

**Antagonism of PRC2 oncogenic activity**

Studies in *D. melanogaster* revealed that SWI/SNF mutations suppressed defects associated with mutated PcG (Polycomb Group) proteins (Kennison & Tamkun 1988, Tamkun et al. 1992). EZH2 is the enzymatic subunit of PRC2 (polycomb repressive complex 2) and has a key role in lineage-specific developmental silencing by facilitating the trimethylation of H3K27 (Cao & Zang 2004). Whilst PcG proteins were shown to repress *Hox* gene expression, SWI/SNF complexes were required for *Hox* gene activation (Kennison 1995), suggesting an antagonistic relationship. As mentioned previously, EZH2 expression is often elevated in various cancers, including breast cancers, prostate cancers and lymphomas, and correlates with advanced disease progression and poor prognosis (Simon & Lange 2008). A mechanistic relationship between PcG and SWI/SNF in cancer was suggested after finding that SNF5 re-expression in an SNF5-deficient rhabdoid tumour cell line resulted in PcG eviction at the *CDKN2A* locus (encoding the CDK inhibitor p16INK4A) (Kia et al. 2008). Supportively, primary SNF5-deficient tumours and primary cells with inactivated SNF5 display elevated EZH2 expression (Wilson et al. 2010), the latter indicating that it is a primary effect and not a secondary consequence of oncogenic transformation. PRC2 target genes are repressed in SNF5-deficient tumours and SNF5-inactivated mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) (Wilson et al. 2010, Kia et al. 2008), consistent with increased PRC2 activity. In addition, levels of H3K27me3 are increased in the absence of SNF5, and tumour formation is prevented in an SNF5-deficient mouse model after conditionally inactivating EZH2 (Wilson et al. 2010). Finally, EZH2 overexpression has been associated with the pathogenesis of other cancer types, in which SWI/SNF mutations frequently occur, including ovarian and renal cell carcinomas (Lu et al. 2010, Wagener et al. 2008). Together, these findings suggest that the antagonistic relationship between SWI/SNF and PcG complexes is an important tumour suppressor mechanism.

**Regulation of cell cycle progression and aneuploidy via the Rb pathway**

Rb is a multifunctional protein with diverse roles that might variously contribute to tumour suppression. These include G1 checkpoint regulation, cell cycle exit control
(relating to differentiation, senescence and quiescence), and regulation of autophagy, apoptosis, angiogenesis and metastasis (Burkhart & Sage 2008). The impact of Rb on these processes is thought to be due to transcriptional regulation of key target gene pathways. More recently, however, loss of Rb has been shown to increase genomic instability, likely stemming from defects in mitosis, and probably represents an important tumour suppressive function (Manning & Dyson 2012) (discussed later).

The most intensely researched role of Rb is its ability to transcriptionally repress E2F-regulated genes (Manning & Dyson 2012). These include genes involved in regulating cell cycle progression at G1/S and proliferation, as well as DNA synthesis, DNA repair, mitosis, the spindle assembly checkpoint (SAC), G2/M control, apoptosis and differentiation. Hence, the Rb-E2F pathway constitutes an important coupling between cell cycle progression and the SAC (Stevaux & Dyson 2002, Hernando et al. 2004). Rb is negatively regulated by the cyclin-dependent kinase (CDK) inhibitor p16INK4A, which inhibits cyclin D1-CDK4-mediated phosphorylation of Rb (Lowe & Sherr 2003). Hyperphosphorylated Rb leads to its dissociation from E2F genes, thereby relieving its antiproliferative effect. SWI/SNF is implicated in controlling this pathway because SNF5 inactivation leads to reduced p16INK4A expression (Isakoff et al. 2005, Oruetxebarra et al. 2004). SWI/SNF and Rb also cooperate directly to transcriptionally repress E2F-regulated genes during differentiation (Trouche et al. 1997). Interestingly, E2F target genes are upregulated in SNF5-mutated rhabdoid tumour cells as well as SNF5-deficient MEFs (Isakoff et al. 2005, Versteege et al. 2002). Co-inactivation of Rb or p16INK4A and SNF5 does not result in accelerated tumour formation (Isakoff et al. 2005), and loss of SNF5 can replace the loss of Rb in pituitary tumour generation (Guidi et al. 2006). These observations suggest that SWI/SNF and Rb have redundant functions in tumourigenesis. However, tumours arising after SNF5 inactivation occur more rapidly and in different tissue types than those caused by Rb or p16INK4A inactivation, suggesting the involvement of other tumour suppressor pathways.

A fascinating study by Vries et al. showed that four cancer-associated point mutations in SNF5 from MRTs were fully able to initiate p16INK4A-dependent G1 arrest, senescence and apoptosis. This suggests that other processes other than proliferation might underlie the cancer association of these mutations (Vries et al. 2005). Expression of the S284L SNF5 mutation in a predominantly diploid SNF5-deficient MRT cell line (harbouring multiple structural chromosome aberrations) led to multilobed nuclei, aneuploidy, polyploidy and spindle and centrosome amplifications. Expression of wild-type SNF5 in these cells did not result in this phenotype, and after 96 hours of expression the ~10% of cells in this cell line that were near tetraploid became almost
perfectly diploid (Vries et al. 2005). This suggests a role for SNF5 in the mitotic (SAC) checkpoint. Furthermore, aborted anaphases in S284L expressing cells appeared to be caused by failed kinetochore-microtubule attachment. Strikingly, whilst wild-type SNF5 re-expression rapidly purged aneuploid cells to become diploid, two cancer-associated SNF5 mutations (P48S and R127G) were unable to generate a diploid population. The other two mutations (S284L and S289A) strongly promoted further aneuploidy (Vries et al. 2005).

Previously it was shown that SNF5-induced senescence was achieved by activating p16<sup>INK4A</sup>, which inhibits CDK4-mediated phosphorylation of Rb (Oruetxebarria et al. 2004). Therefore, the authors tested whether SNF5-dependent ploidy control is exerted via p16<sup>INK4A</sup>. Expression of a p16<sup>INK4A</sup>-insensitive CDK4<sup>R24C</sup> mutant in parallel with SNF5 expression could not revert the aneuploidy, suggesting that disruption of the Rb pathway prevents SNF5-dependent ploidy control (Vries et al. 2005). Re-expression of SNF5 led to altered expression of multiple E2F target genes, including those involved in mitotic control, including strong downregulation of MAD2 and E2F1. Overexpression of MAD2 and E2F1 is observed in many MRTs and can lead to aneuploidy (Hernando et al. 2004). Furthermore, expression of CDK4<sup>R24C</sup> abolished the SNF5-mediated downregulation of these genes. The authors conclude that regulation of the p16<sup>INK4A</sup>-cyclinD/CDK4-Rb-E2F pathway by SNF5 is important for ploidy control in MRTs. However, it is noted that additional structural roles of SNF5 (and SWI/SNF), such as regulation of centromere structure and/or cohesion, could also contribute to aneuploidy with high importance in tumourigenesis (Vries et al. 2005).

SWI/SNF appears to regulate cyclin D1 expression levels, which might also contribute to tumourigenesis. Firstly, cyclin D1 levels are increased in SNF5-deficient rhabdoid tumour cells, and SNF5 re-expression resulted in binding if SNF5 to the cyclin D1 promoter, reduced cyclin D1 expression and cell cycle arrest (Zhang et al. 2002, McKenna et al. 2008). Secondly, in cyclin D1-deficient mice SNF5 loss does not result in tumour formation (Tsikitis et al. 2005). Contrary to a role of elevated cyclin D1 expression in tumourigenesis is the observation that in kidney rhabdoid tumours cyclin D1 levels are reduced (Gadd et al. 2010). However, cyclin D1 inhibitors attenuate the growth of rhabdoid tumour cells (in which all are currently known to contain an SNF5 mutation) in vitro and in vivo. These inhibitors might therefore offer a therapeutic approach to the treatment of SNF5-deficient tumours (Lunenberger et al. 2010, Alarcon-Vargas et al. 2006, Smith et al. 2011).

Interaction with MYC
The MYC oncogene is often overexpressed in cancer and functions to regulate the transcription of genes involved in cell cycle control, apoptosis and differentiation. MYC interacts directly with SNF5 to effect MYC target gene activation \textit{in vitro} (Cheng \textit{et al.} 1999), yet SWI/SNF complexes are also known to repress MYC expression during differentiation-associated cell cycle arrest (Nagl \textit{et al.} 2006). Interestingly, BAF complexes containing BAF250A repress Myc transcription, whilst BAF complexes containing BAF250B promote Myc transcription (Nagl \textit{et al.} 2007). MYC is consistently overexpressed in malignant rhabdoid tumours, all of which harbour SNF5 mutations (McKenna \textit{et al.} 2008, Gadd \textit{et al.} 2010). Thus, MYC deregulation may have important implications in the suppression of SWI/SNF-mutant cancers

\textit{Interaction with nuclear hormone receptors (NHRs)}

SWI/SNF complexes interact with a range of nuclear hormone receptors (NHRs), including glucocorticoid, oestrogen, vitamin D3 and retinoic acid receptors (Trotter \textit{et al.} 2008). These receptors transduce hormonal stimuli to regulate the expression of genes associated with proliferation and differentiation, and many are implicated in oncogenic transformation. In acute lymphoblastic leukaemia (ALL) reduced expression of several SWI/SNF subunits was found to be associated with increased glucocorticoid resistance (Pottier \textit{et al.} 2008). Specific SWI/SNF complexes appear to regulate specific NHR gene targets, as PBAF, but not BAF, interacted with the retinoic acid receptor-α (RXRA), vitamin D3 receptor (VDR) and peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-γ (PPARG) to facilitate transcription, at least \textit{in vitro} (Lemon \textit{et al.} 2001). In contrast, BAF is necessary and sufficient for \textit{in vivo} glucocorticoid receptor-mediated transcription (Chen \textit{et al.} 2005, Trotter \textit{et al.} 2004).

\textit{Regulation of Hedgehog (HH) pathway signalling}

Misregulation of the Hedgehog (HH) pathway, particularly through mutation of upstream pathway components, occurs in several types of cancer. Several SWI/SNF subunits interact with GLI1, an important effector of the HH pathway involved in differentiation and patterning, and reside at GLI1-regulated promoters (Jagani \textit{et al.} 2010). SNF5 inactivation resulted in enhanced HH signalling and was found to be essential for growth of rhabdoid tumour cells \textit{in vivo}, raising the possibility that GLI1 targeting may be beneficial as a therapeutic strategy in treating this cancer (Jagani \textit{et al.} 2010).
al. 2010). In addition, repression of HH signalling in neural stem cells requires the function of BRG1 in a neural stem-cell specific variant complex (Lessard et al. 2007).

Transcriptional regulation of genes involved in cellular motility

SWI/SNF complexes regulate the transcription of actin cytoskeleton genes, and misregulation of these pathways is observed in SNF5-deficient rhabdoid tumours. Specifically, SNF5 controls cytoskeletal structure and cell migration by regulating the RHOA pathway, which is upregulated following SNF5 loss (Caramel et al. 2008). RHOA functions to stimulate contractility and the formation of stress fibres, and overexpression in cancer correlates with poor prognosis (Karlsson et al. 2009). Cancer cells lacking BRG1 also display altered cytoskeleton structures, and reduction of BRG1 levels in a BRG1-expressing pancreatic carcinoma cell line increased the number of actin stress bundles (Rosson et al. 2005). In contrast, re-expression of BRG1 in a BRG1-deficient cervix carcinoma cell line induced the formation of stress fibre-like actin filament bundles. This was found to be due to increased expression of the RHOA component RHO-associated protein kinase 1 (ROCK1) (Asp et al. 2002). SWI/SNF dysfunction correlated with aberrant expression of the CD44 transmembrane glycoprotein, which is also associated with metastasis. Loss of BRG1 or hBRM resulted in CD44 downregulation, and CD44 re-expression was achieved when BRG1 or hBRM were re-expressed in doubly deficient cells lines (Strobeck et al. 2001, Reisman et al. 2002).
1.2. DNA double-strand break repair

1.2.1. DNA double-strand breaks

DNA lesions are continuously generated in eukaryotic cells from endogenous and exogenous sources. The most dangerous lesion is a DNA double-strand break (DSB) (Kanna & Jackson 2001), generated through replication fork stalling, oxidative metabolism-generated reactive oxygen species (ROS), ionizing radiation (IR) and chemotherapeutic agents. An unrepaired or misrepaired DNA DSB can initiate cellular senescence and apoptosis, in addition the generation of chromosome fragments and rearrangements. Importantly, these can result in loss of heterozygosity and genome instability, which in higher eukaryotes is associated with tumourigenesis. It is therefore imperative that the cell is able to correctly repair a DNA DSB in a timely manner in order to retain viability and fitness. Two conserved, major pathways are utilised to perform DNA DSB repair: non-homologous end-joining (NHEJ) and homologous recombination (HR). In this section a review of these pathways in budding yeast and mammalian cells will be provided.

1.2.2 Non-homologous end-joining

Non-homologous end-joining (NHEJ) is the process by which the two broken DNA molecules of a DNA DSB are directly religated. NHEJ is an error-prone DSB repair mechanism that operates throughout the cell cycle. In mammalian cells, NHEJ represents the major DNA repair pathway (Rothkamm et al. 2003), and ~80% of IR-induced DNA DSBs are repaired with fast kinetics by NHEJ in G2 (Beucher et al. 2009). There are several sequential steps involved in NHEJ that are currently thought to occur in a stepwise manner (Williams et al. 2014). Firstly, the two DNA ends are recognized and the NHEJ protein components are assembled and stabilized. Next, the ends are tethered together, positionally stabilized, and processed. Finally, the ends are ligated and the protein components are dissipated (Davis & Chen 2013).

DSB end recognition by Ku

Recognition of the DNA DSB is performed by the Ku heterodimer, which is composed of the Ku70 and Ku80 subunits. Both subunits contain an N-terminal von Willebrand A (vWA) domain, a core domain and a C-terminal region (Downs & Jackson 2004). The
vWA and core domain are involved in heterodimerization of the Ku complex. The C-terminal region of Ku70 contains SAF-A/B, Acinus and PIAS (SAP) domains, the latter of which is likely to bind DNA (Aravind & Koonin 2000, Zhang et al. 2001). The Ku80 C-terminal region folds into a flexible arm structure that resembles a common scaffold involved in protein-protein interactions (Zhang et al. 2004). Ku localizes to laser-induced DNA DSBs within seconds of creation (Mari et al. 2006). Such rapid localization is thought to be due to its high abundance (~400,000 molecules per cell), its ability to bind DNA in a sequence independent manner (via sugar-backbone binding), and its extremely high binding affinity for DNA ends (equilibrium dissociation constant of 2X10^9 M^-1) (Downs & Jackson 2004, Mimori et al. 1986, Walker et al. 2001, Blier et al. 1993). Binding of the Ku heterodimer to DNA is achieved by sliding of the DSB end through its central β-barrel ring structure (Walker et al. 2001). In mammalian cells, Ku is thought to bind to all double-ended DNA DSBs and initiates a first attempt at repair by NHEJ, regardless of cell cycle phase (Beucher et al. 2009, Shibata et al. 2011).

Assembly and stabilization of NHEJ factors

Ku is unquestionably the first NHEJ factor to localize to a DSB. The order of recruitment of factors following Ku is likely to be flexible and dependent on the complexity of the break (Davis & Chen 2013). Break complexity is also likely to define which factors are necessary for the completion of the NHEJ process. For example, a break that shares a microhomology consisting of two perfectly complementary 4bp overhangs can be repaired by XRCC4 and DNA ligase IV alone, without Ku, at least in vitro (Gu et al. 2007). However, such perfect microhomologies are very rare in nature, and efficient NHEJ typically requires an orchestrated use of many factors that are able to function alone as well as synergistically (Davis & Chen 2013). Many of these factors play important roles in several of the steps involved in NHEJ, as will be discussed below.

The Ku-DNA complex is thought to function as a scaffold to which multiple NHEJ proteins can bind (Davis & Chen 2013). In vertebrates Ku is able to directly recruit the phosphatidylinositol 3’ kinase-like kinase (PIKK) DNA-PKcs in the presence of DNA (Gottlieb & Jackson 1993). DNA-PKcs forms a complex with Artemis, and together have important functions in the processing of DSB termini (Lieber 2010). Recruitment of the XRCC4-DNA Ligase IV-XLF complex (corresponding to Lif1-Dnl4-Nej1 in budding yeast) is also dependent on Ku. Ku70 physically interacts with XRCC4 (Mari et al. 2006) and the Ku heterodimer physically interacts with the tandem BRCA1
C-terminal (BRCT) domains in the C-terminus of DNA Ligase IV (Costantini et al. 2007, Hsu et al. 2002). An interaction between the Ku heterodimer and the C-terminus of XLF recruits XLF to the DNA end in a DNA-dependent manner (Yano et al. 2008, Yano et al. 2011). Aprataxin-and-PNK-like factor (APLF) is known to bind the Ku80 vWA domain via a conserved peptide in the protein’s MID domain (Grundy et al. 2013).

XRCC4 is thought to function as a second NHEJ scaffold with complex roles in NHEJ such as securing the ability of processing enzymes and accessory proteins to interact with the DSB (Davis & Chen 2013). XRCC4 has no known enzymatic activity and contains a globular head, alpha-helical stalk and a C-terminal tail domain (Junop et al. 2000). DNA ligase IV interacts with the XRCC4 alpha-helical stalk via the linker region between its tandem C-terminal BRCT domains (Sibanda et al. 2001, Wu et al. 2009). Polynucleotide kinase-phosphatase (PNKP), Aprataxin (APTX) and APLF also interact with XRCC4 via their FHA domains in a manner dependent on casein kinase 2 (CK2) phosphorylation of XRCC4 (Koch et al. 2004, Kanno et al. 2007, Macrae et al. 2008, Iles et al 2007, Clements et al. 2004). Several proteins involved in processing require both Ku and XRCC4 for recruitment to the DNA DSB, including the DNA polymerase u and the RecQ helicase family member Werner (WRN) (Mahajan et al. 2002, Cooper et al. 2000, Karmakar et al. 2002, Kusumoto et al. 2008). The NHEJ complex assembled thus far is stabilized by Ku, DNA-PKcs and XRCC4 (Yano et al. 2009). APLF has also been implicated in assembling NHEJ components and appears to have a major role in retaining XRCC4, DNA ligase IV and XLF at the DSB (Grundy et al. 2013).

*Positional stabilization and tethering of DSB termini*

Ku has an important role in protecting the DSB ends from spurious processing that could result in the generation of chromosomal aberrations (Davis & Chen 2013). This is likely due to its ability to draw and hold the DSB ends together in a synaptic complex (Pang et al. 1997). Another protective role of Ku arises from the ability of Ku80 to prevent DSB ends from ‘roaming’ the nucleus. A positionally stabilized DSB is unable to locate other breaks in the nucleus, which might lead to a damaging translocation. This positional stabilization was found to be independent of DNA repair factors, H2A.X, MRN and the cohesin complex (Soutoglou et al. 2007). DNA-PKcs forms a distinct structure at the DSB after its recruitment by Ku and is thought to form a synaptic complex that tethers DSB termini (Cary et al. 1997, Weterings & van Gent 2004). Recent structural insights indicate that the DNA-PKcs HEAT repeats function as compressible macromolecular springs (Williams et al. 2014). These are thought to
regulate the transfer of energy within the NHEJ flexing scaffold to control its overall conformation (Williams et al. 2014). The globular head domain residues Arg54, Leu65 and Leu115 of XRCC4 interact with the globular head of XLF, which through alternating head domain interfaces form super helical filaments that bridge DSB termini (Hammel et al. 2010, Andres et al. 2012). These filaments might function as an additional or alternative bridging and tethering mechanism. However, the co-ordination between bridging and tethering by Ku-DNA-PKcs and XRCC4-XLF is unknown (Davis & Chen 2013).

**Processing of the DSB termini**

Processing is necessary to transform a break that cannot be ligated into a ligatable substrate. Numerous proteins are implicated in processing, including Artemis, PNKP, APLF, the DNA polymerases u and y, WRN, APTX and Ku (Davis & Chen 2013). These proteins can variously perform the removal of blocking end groups, resection, and gap filling. Again, the precise nature of the DSB determines which factors are required to produce a ligatable substrate.

The proteins PNKP and APTX have been shown to remove blocking end groups from DSB termini (Bernstein et al. 2005, Ahel et al. 2006). PNKP has dual kinase and phosphatase activity; its kinase domain can add phosphate groups to 5' hydroxyls and the phosphatase removes 3' phosphate groups (Bernstein et al. 2005). APTX belongs to the histidine triad family of nucleotide hydrolases and transferases and removes adenylate groups covalently linked to the termini of 5' phosphates (Ahel et al. 2006).

DNA-PKcs exists in complex with Artemis, which together perform the majority of the short-range resection in NHEJ by utilizing a diverse array of nuclease activities (Lieber 2010). Upon DNA binding DNA-PKcs acquires serine/threonine phosphatase activity (Hartley et al. 1995). Phosphorylation of Artemis by DNA-PKcs stimulates 5' endonuclease, 3' endonuclease and hairpin opening nuclease activities (Ma et al. 2002), allowing the resection of a wide range of damaged DNA overhang types (Ma et al. 2005, Yannone et al. 2008). WRN has 3' to 5' exonuclease activity that is dependent on its interaction with Ku and XRCC4, whilst its 3' helicase activity is not (Cooper et al. 2000, Kusomoto et al. 2008, Perry et al. 2006). APLF has endonuclease and 3' to 5' exonuclease activity that is not dependent on any other NHEJ factors. However, resection of 3' overhangs by APLF is required in vitro for the subsequent ligation step by DNA ligase IV-XRCC4 (Kanno et al. 2007, Li et al. 2011).
Nucleotide gap filling is performed by the Pol X family polymerases mu and lambda. Polymerase mu is an error-prone polymerase that reduces the incidence of deletion events and is capable of template-dependent synthesis with dNTPs and rNTPs, as well as template-independent synthesis (Moon et al. 2007). The incorporation of uracil at the break site is thought to be important in G1 NHEJ when levels of rNTPs are high and dNTPs low. The uracil can possibly then be altered at a later time after base removal by uracil glycosylases (Nick McElhinny & Ramsden 2003). Polymerase mu can polymerize across a discontinuous template strand in the presence of Ku and DNA ligase IV-XRCC4 to effectively cross the two ends of DSB (Nick McElhinny et al. 2005, Davis et al. 2008). In addition, by adding nucleotides to the 3’ ends of the break polymerase-generated microhomology can be achieved to increase the efficiency of ligation (Gu et al. 2007). Polymerase lambda also has known roles in NHEJ gap filling, including template-dependent functions in magnesium buffers and template-independent activity in manganese buffers (Bertocci et al. 2006, Lee et al. 2004, Ramadan et al. 2004, Moon et al. 2007).

The MRX (Mre11-Rad50-Xrs2) complex performs the comparable resection and tethering roles of DNA-PKcs in budding yeast

In yeast, MRX (Mre11-Rad50-Xrs2) localizes to the DNA DSB in a temporally similar manner to that of Ku and has roles in the detection, signaling, protecting NHEJ, HR and DNA damage checkpoint activation (Daley et al. 2005). MRX is critical for some of the resection in NHEJ and is also likely to facilitate the tethering and synapsis of DSB ends (Daley et al. 2005). It appears that in vertebrates the DNA-PKcs-Artemis nuclease system evolved to replace that of MRX during the inception of V(D)J recombination (a B or T cell-specific physiological system that makes intentional DSBs for generating antigen receptor genes) at the vertebrate/invertebrate transition (Falck et al. 2005, Lieber 2010).

Mre11 has critical roles in the detection, signalling, protection and repair of DNA DSBs (Stracker & Petrini 2011, Williams et al. 2007, Wyman & Kanaar 2006). Mre11 is an SbcCD family nuclease capable of DNA binding, 3’ to 5’ dsDNA exonuclease, ssDNA structure-specific endonuclease, hairpin nuclease and strand-annealing activities (Paull & Gellert 1998, Trujillo et al. 1998, Hopfner et al. 2000, Lim et al. 2011). Two Rad50 proteins each contribute a split ABC ATPase domain that associate to form a functional Rad50 ABC ATPase. The resulting Rad50 dimer is stabilised by Mre11, which additionally locks residues around the ATP-binding site and facilitates efficient Rad50 ATP hydrolysis (Lim et al. 2011). This drives a substantial conformational
change in both Rad50 and Mre11 that dislocates Rad50 from the Mre11 nuclease domain and subsequently exposes its active site (Lim et al. 2011). This is thought to be necessary for critical MRX functions, including tethering of DSB ends, Mre11 endonuclease activity and DNA-unwinding activity (Trujillo & Sung 2001, Lim et al. 2011). One hypothesis for a tethering mechanism follows that two Rad50 proteins bound to each DSB end interact through association of Zn hook structures present at the tips of a long looped coiled coil region. This reduces the volume and entropy for the ensuing NHEJ reaction (Hopfner et al. 2002, Daley et al. 2005).

Xrs2 has intrinsic DNA binding affinity and is required for binding MRX to DNA and bridging DSB ends (Trujillo et al. 2003). The protein contains N-terminal forkhead-associated (FHA) domains that interact with phosphorylated threonine residues in Lif1, highlighting an NHEJ-specific function of Xrs2 (Chen et al. 2001, Matsuzaki et al. 2008, Palmbos et al. 2008). The C-terminus of Xrs2 contains BRCT domains that interact with the phosphatidylinositol 3' kinase-like kinase (PIKK) Tel1, highlighting a critical role of MRX in DNA damage checkpoint activation, discussed later (Daley et al. 2005, Falck et al. 2005, Becker et al. 2006, Palmbos et al. 2008).

1.2.3. Homologous recombination

In contrast to NHEJ homologous recombination (HR) is an error-free DSB repair mechanism that relies on the availability of an intact sister chromatid, and therefore is restricted to late S and G2 phases of the cell cycle. In mammalian cells, HR overlaps with NHEJ in the repair of two-ended DSBs, and also promotes replication fork stabilization and one-ended DSB repair (Jeggo et al. 2011, Schlacher et al. 2011). HR can proceed via several distinct pathways: double-strand break-repair (DSBR), synthesis-dependent strand annealing (SDSA), single-strand annealing (SSA) and break-induced replication (BIR) (San Filippo et al. 2008). Correctly regulating the choice of pathway and their activities is important for maintaining genome integrity, since some forms of HR can lead to detrimental rearrangements. In this section an overview of these various HR mechanisms, the steps involved in each and their regulation will be provided.

The DSBR model involves the following steps: nucleolytic 5' to 3' resection of DSB ends to yield single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) termini, formation of a recombinase filament on the ssDNA, strand invasion into a homologous DNA sequence to form a D-loop, extension of the invading strand from the 3' end by DNA polymerase, capture of the second DSB end by annealing to the extended D-loop, formation of two Holliday junctions (HJs), and finally HJ resolution to yield crossover or noncrossover products.
DSDA differs from the DSBR model in that it envisages a migrating D-loop that does not result in capture of the second DSB end. After resection, strand invasion and DNA synthesis the invading strand is displaced and anneals to the second resected DSB end; no HJ is formed and thus only crossover products result (San Filippo et al. 2008). SSA is a deletion process that involves annealing of resected ssDNA strands to each other instead of engaging a homologous template, and occurs when a DSB is flanked by direct repeats (San Filippo et al. 2008). Single-ended DSBs that occur at telomeres and replication forks are repaired by BIR, which involves invasion of a single ssDNA strand into a donor DNA sequence (Lydeard et al. 2007).

**DNA resection**

The first stage in HR is 5’ to 3’ resection of the DSB ends. This is a complex and tightly regulated process involving redundant pathways containing nucleases, DNA helicases and other associated proteins (Niu et al. 2010). The MRX complex (human MRN; MRE11-RAD50-NBS1) and Sae2/CtIP) can directly initiate resection by generating short 3’ ssDNA tails, or indirectly by recruiting the 5’-3’ exonuclease Exo1/EXO1, the helicase Sgs1/BLM, and the endonuclease Dna2/DNA2 (Mimitou & Symington 2008, Mimitou & Symington 2010, Shim et al. 2010, Zhu et al. 2008). The generation of long 3’ tails through long-range resection requires Exo1 or Sgs1-Top3-Rmi1 (STR complex) in association with Dna2 (Gravel et al. 2008, Mimitou & Symington 2008, Zhu et al. 2008). As described previously, Mre11 possesses endonuclease and exonuclease activity. A fascinating recent study showed that specific inhibition of MRE11 endonuclease activity promoted NHEJ in lieu of HR in IR-treated G2 cells, whilst inhibiting the exonuclease activity led to a DNA repair defect (Shibata et al. 2014). These findings indicate that the endonuclease activity is required to initiate resection, thus licensing repair via HR. The subsequent exonuclease activity in concert with EXO1/BLM promotes long-range resection that results in commitment to HR (Shibata et al. 2014).

The Fun30 (human SMARCAD1) Snf2-family ATPase chromatin remodeler was recently found to promote Exo1/EXO1- and Sgs1/BLM-dependent resection in S. cerevisiae and human cells (Costelloe et al. 2012, Chen et al. 2012). As discussed later, the differential regulation of resection during the cell cycle is a critical determinant of DNA pathway choice in mammalian cells (Symington & Gautier 2011).
RPA and Rad51 binding to ssDNA

The heterotrimeric replication protein A (RPA) is the first protein to bind ssDNA and has various regulatory roles in HR (Krejci et al. 2012). Firstly, RPA has several roles in resection itself: it stimulates Sgs1 helicase activity, enhances 5’ strand incision by Dna2 and protects the 3’ strand from its degradation (Cejka et al. 2010, Niu et al. 2010). RPA also removes secondary structure in ssDNA to facilitate the assembly of multiple Rad51 recombinase proteins (Sung et al. 2003), which in the presence of ATP forms a right-handed helical polymer, known as a presynaptic filament (San Filippo et al. 2008). Once a Rad51-mediated D-loop has formed RPA prevents its reversal by sequestering and scavenging ssDNA. This serves to prevent DNA from entering Rad51’s second DNA-binding site (Eglinger et al. 2002, Van Komen et al. 2002). RPA can also inhibit Rad51 association and thus has stimulatory and inhibitory roles in HR. RPA has a higher binding affinity for ssDNA than Rad51 and is recruited earlier, yet for HR to proceed correctly RPA must be displaced by Rad51, aided by various mediator proteins (Krejci et al. 2012).

RPA is SUMOylated in both yeast and humans upon DNA damage, and RPA70 SUMOylation in human cells facilitates RAD51 foci formation, promotes HR and DNA damage resistance (Burgess et al. 2007, Dou et al. 2010). RPA SUMOylation is also required for the recruitment of RPA to DNA damage sites (Galanty et al. 2009, Morris et al. 2009). Disruption of the SUMO pathway also leads to defective RAD51 trafficking and impaired RAD51 foci formation in human cells (Saitoh et al. 2002). RPA is phosphorylated by the DNA damage checkpoint kinase Mec1 (ATM in humans) and cell cycle cyclin-dependent kinases (CDKs). RPA phosphorylation is critical for recruitment of Rad51 to DSBs and increases the affinity of Rad52 for ssDNA (Zou & Elledge 2003, Shi et al. 2010). Rad51 is also phosphorylated by various kinases with several regulatory effects on the protein. These include enhanced DSB repair and drug resistance in the case of Try315 phosphorylation by BCR/ABL, inhibition of Rad51 binding and ATPase-dependent strand-exchange in the case of Tyr54 phosphorylation by c-ABL (Slupianek et al. 2011, Yuan et al. 1998), and enhanced ATPase and DNA binding activity in the case of Ser192 phosphorylation by Mec1 (Flott et al. 2011). Phosphorylation of human RAD51 at Ser14 by PLK1 triggers adjacent Ser13 phosphorylation by casein kinase 2 (CK2), to which NBS1 (MRN complex) then binds to facilitate Rad51 recruitment (Yata et al. 2012).

Human cells contain the two additional ssDNA binding proteins SSB1 and SSB2 that are part of the DSB sensing complex. These proteins are required for ATM signalling, and loss of either results in defective DNA damage checkpoint activation
and impaired HR (Richard et al. 2008, Huang et al. 2009, Li et al. 2009). SSB1 also has a role in DSB processing by stimulating MRN activity via interaction with NBS1 (Richard et al. 2011).

Mediators of Rad51

Proteins referred to as Rad51 mediators are able to overcome RPA’s inhibitory effect on Rad51 and include Rad52, paralogues of Rad51, Rad55 and Rad57. They function to facilitate Rad51 loading onto ssDNA, stabilize the presynaptic filament and protect Rad51 from removal by various factors (Krejci et al. 2012). Rad52 interacts with Rad51 as well as ssDNA-bound RPA (Seong et al. 2008, Shinohara et al. 1992). Rad52 binding to Rad51 is required for efficient recruitment and nucleation of Rad51 onto ssDNA (Krejci et al. 2002, Shinohara & Ogawa 1998). However, the concomitant displacement of RPA during Rad51 filament assembly is not conducted directly by Rad52, but rather by the action of Rad51 polymerization along the ssDNA (Song & Sung 2000, Sugiyama et al. 1998). The C-terminus of Rad52 is responsible for Rad51 and DNA binding, whilst its central region interacts with RPA and is important for repair foci localization (Seong et al. 2008, Plate et al. 2008). The N-terminus is involved in oligomerization, DNA binding and annealing, and interacts with the homologous Rad59 protein (Shinohara & Ogawa 1998, Davis & Symington 2001, Mortensen et al. 1996). Both Rad52 and Rad59 promote second end capture during DSBR as well as strand annealing during SSA (McIlwraith & West 2008, Nimonkar et al. 2009. Human RAD52 does not possess mediator activity lacks the C-terminal regions of yeast Rad52 involved in Rad51 and RPA interactions; in this regard it is more similar to yeast Rad59 (Seong et al. 2008, Krejci et al. 2012). Human RAD52 can perform strand annealing and acts in parallel with BRCA2 (discussed below) (Feng et al. 2011, Singleton et al. 2002, Van Dyck et al. 2001). RAD52 also has a late role in HR at stalled forks not shared by BRCA2.

In budding yeast Rad52 is SUMOylated on lysines 10, 11 and 220 after DNA damage in S-phase, with diverse outcomes that are dependent on the DNA substrate (Ohuchi et al. 2008, Ohuchi et al. 2009, Krejci et al. 2012). In human cells, SUMOylation of RAD52 is not induced upon DNA damage but instead alters RAD52 subcellular localization (Saito et al. 2010). Rad52 is constitutively phosphorylated in yeast and occurs at Try104 following DNA damage in humans (Antunez de Mayolo et al. 2006, Kitao & Yuan 2002). This modification might direct RAD52 to DNA repair intermediates that undergo strand annealing (Honda et al. 2011).
Rad55 and Rad57 both have ATPase activity like Rad51, and assemble as a heterodimeric ssDNA-binding complex, however they cannot stimulate strand exchange (Hays et al. 1995, Johnson & Symington 1995, Sung 1997). Rad55-Rad57 interacts with Rad51 to facilitate its loading onto RPA-coated ssDNA. The heterodimer also forms co-filaments with Rad51 that resists the anti-recombinase action of Srs2 (discussed later) (Liu et al. 2011). Rad55 is phosphorylated at Ser2, 8 and 14 by DNA damage checkpoint kinases to promote Rad51 function (Herzberg et al. 2006). The Shu complex, consisting of Shu1, Psy3, Shu2 and Csm2 is a poorly understood positive regulator of Rad51 that appears to have specialized roles in HR during replication stress (Mankouri et al. 2007).

In human cells several paralogues of RAD51 function as RAD51 mediators and share 20-30% sequence identity to RAD51. Two RAD51 paralogue complexes exist: the first consists of RAD51B, RAD51C, RAD51D and XRCC2 and has a high affinity for branched DNA damage substrates such as stalled replication forks (Masson et al. 2001, Badie et al. 2009, Henry-Mowatt et al. 2003, Petermann et al. 2010, Yokoyama et al. 2004); the second consists of RAD51C and XRCC3 and associates with HJ resolution activity (Kuznetsov et al. 2007, Liu et al. 2007).

**BRCA2 fulfils Rad52 mediator roles in mammalian HR and is regulated by several proteins**

BRAC2 functions as the central RAD51 mediator in human cells despite the presence of RAD52 and has no homology to RAD52. As the central mediator BRCA2 controls RAD51 nucleofilament assembly (San Filippo et al. 2008, Thorslund & West 2007) and contains two types of BRC repeat domains that interact with RAD51. The first type targets RAD51 to ssDNA and stabilizes the RAD51 nucleofilament in its active form by down-regulating its ATPase activity. The second type prevents RAD51 nucleation onto dsDNA (Carreira et al. 2009, Carreira & Kowalczykowski 2011, Pellegrini et al. 2002, Shivji et al. 2009). An additional interaction with RAD51 in its filament form exists with the C-terminus of BRCA2. This interaction is under cell cycle control and appears to be important for nucleofilament and replication fork stability (Davies & Pellegrini 2007, Esashi et al. 2007, Ayoub et al. 2009, Shlacher et al. 2011).

The proteins DSS1, PALB2 and MCPH1 function as regulators of BRCA2. DSS1 interacts with the C-terminal DNA-binding domain (DBD) of BRCA2 and facilitates BRCA2-mediated RAD51 filament formation (Yang et al. 2002, Sonoda et al. 1998). PALB2 interacts with the N-terminus of BRCA2 and has several roles in HR, including stabilizing BRCA2 by promoting its chromatin association and by possibly
affecting RAD51 function directly. PALB2 oligomerization is also known to promote the delivery and stabilization of RAD51 at DSBs (Xia et al. 2006, Sy et al. 2009). MCPH1 (microcephalin) is another BRCA2-interacting protein that negatively regulates BRCA2 by reducing levels of BRCA2 and RAD51 at DSBs (Wu et al. 2009).

Rad54 and Rdh54 have multiple roles in regulating Rad51

The Snf2/Swi2 family DNA-dependent ATPase helicases Rad54 and Rdh54 are able to translocate along duplex DNA and have multiple roles in HR (Krejci et al. 2012). They can positively regulate Rad51 by stabilizing pre-synaptic filaments, stimulating Rad51-mediated strand invasion, and at least in the case of Rad54 enhance D-loop branch migration. Rad54 and Rdh54 also function as negative Rad51 regulators by limiting the non-specific binding of Rad51 to dsDNA, as well as by removing Rad51 to allow access to 3’-OH primer termini for DNA replication (Krejci et al. 2012). Rad54 activity is regulated by ubiquitination and phosphorylation. Ubiquitin-mediated proteolysis controls Rad54 activity in G1-phase S. pombe cells (Trickey et al. 2008), and Rad54 is phosphorylated by Rad53, suggesting its activity is regulated by the DNA damage checkpoint (Chen et al. 2010).

Negative regulators of Rad51

Srs2 is a 3’-5′ SF1 helicase able to dismantle Rad51 presynaptic filaments in budding yeast (Aboussekhra et al. 1989, Krejci et al. 2003, Veaute et al. 2003), an activity that requires its translocase function and interaction with Rad51. This activity is further enhanced in the presence of RPA, which prevents Rad51 re-nucleation (Krejci et al. 2003, Veaute et al. 2003, Colavito et al. 2009, Krejci et al. 2004, Seong et al. 2009). Null mutants of srs2 are characterized by increased rates of spontaneous recombination (Aguilera & Klein 1988), synthetic lethality with deletion of the RecQ helicase sgs1 (Lee et al. 1999, Wang et al. 2001), and hypersensitivity to various sources of DNA damage (Bennett et al. 2001, Aboussekhra et al. 1992, Birrell et al. 2002). Srs2 is phosphorylated in a Cdk1-dependent manner and this modification promotes the use of the SDSA pathway (Saponaro et al. 2010). Srs2 is also SUMOylated but the function of this is less clear (Krejci et al. 2012).

A functional analogue of Srs2 was first identified in C. elegans, known as SPAR-1, and subsequently in vertebrates, known as RTE1 (regulator of telomere length 1) (Barber et al. 2008). Deletion of spar-1 in C. elegans resulted in synthetic lethality with deletion of the RecQ helicases him-6 (human BLM) and rcq-5 (human
The synthetic lethality was accompanied by a massive accumulation of recombination intermediates, and *spar-1* single mutants displayed elevated meiotic recombination and hypersensitivity to DNA damage that specifically affects replication fork progression (Barber *et al.* 2008). Moreover, depletion of human RTEL1 led to increased recombination and hypersensitivity to mitomycin C (MMC), but not IR (Barber *et al.* 2008). RTEL1 was also found to prevent D-loop formation *in vitro*, but rather than disassembling presynaptic filaments this activity was due to disrupting pre-formed D-loops (Barber *et al.* 2008). Collectively, these findings indicate that RTEL1 is critical for suppressing HR, which is likely to have importance for preventing genome instability and cancer.

More recent studies have further revealed that RTEL1 functions as a prominent genome stability factor, with key roles in DNA replication, recombination, DNA repair and maintenance of telomere integrity (Vannier *et al.* 2012, Uringa *et al.* 2012, Vannier *et al.* 2013, Vannier *et al.* 2014). RTEL1 removes telomeric DNA secondary structures, such as T-loops and G-quadruplex (G4) DNA, to prevent telomere fragility and loss (Vannier *et al.* 2012). In mouse cells, loss of Rtel1 leads to misregulated recombination, defective telomere replication, and facilitates telomere elongation by telomerase (Uringa *et al.* 2012). RTEL1 has also been linked to global replication through an interaction with PCNA (proliferating cell nuclear antigen) (Vannier *et al.* 2013). Disruption of the RTEL1-PCNA interaction led to accelerated senescence, replication fork instability and reduced fork extension (Vannier *et al.* 2013). Furthermore, tumourigenesis onset was accelerated in p53-deficient mice compromised for the RTEL1-PCNA interaction (Vannier *et al.* 2013). Intriguingly, significance-associated SNPs within RTEL1 introns 15 and 17 have been identified in cases of glioma and astrocytoma (Wrensch *et al.* 2009, Shete *et al.* 2009), suggesting that the various roles of RTEL1 in maintaining genome stability represent important tumour suppressor activities.

The Mph1 translocase (FANCM in humans) is also able to disrupt Rad51-coated D-loops, stimulate branch migration and displace the extended primer in D-loop-associated DNA synthesis (Gari *et al.* 2008, Prakash *et al.* 2009, Sun *et al.* 2008, Zheng *et al.* 2011, Sebesta *et al.* 2011). Consequently, a prominent role of Mph1 is in channelling HR into the SDSA pathway over DSBR to suppress potentially deleterious crossovers in mitotic cells (Prakash *et al.* 2009). The RecQ family helicase Sgs1 forms a complex with Top3 and Rmi1 in yeast (Ahmad & Stewart 2005, Chang *et al.* 2005) and is homologous to BLM in mammalian cells. Like BLM, Sgs1 might directly
dismantle presynaptic filaments (Bugreev et al. 2007, Ira et al. 2003, Mankouri et al. 2002). Addition roles include the elimination of aberrant invasion events, resolution of recombination intermediates (Oh et al. 2007, Oh et al. 2008), dissolution of dHJs to yield non-crossovers (Cejka et al. 2010, Wu & Hickson 2003), and possibly direction of D-loop intermediates away from DSBR and into SDSA (Krejci et al. 2012). SUMOylation of Sgs1 is known to promote recombination at telomeres at least in yeast (Lu et al. 2010), whilst SUMOylation of BLM in human cells leads to increased Rad51 binding and promotes HR at stalled replication forks (Ouyang et al. 2009).

1.2.4. The DNA damage response in budding yeast

The DNA damage checkpoints trigger cell cycle arrest in response to a DSB or defective replication fork to provide time for the cell to deal with the problem. Without this mechanism damaged or mutated DNA will be segregated and can lead to genome instability or cell death. In budding yeast Mec1 and Tel1 represent the two major upstream ‘sensor’ phosphatidylinositol 3’ kinase-like kinases (PIKKs) (Tsaber & Haber 2013). These are recruited to the site of damage by interaction with other DNA damage response (DDR) proteins, and promote checkpoint activation through two interrelated processes. Firstly, they phosphorylate S129 on H2A.X that triggers a signalling cascade and recruits many additional DDR factors. Secondly, they activate the downstream ‘effector’ kinases Rad53 and Chk1, which have multiple targets involved in enforcing an appropriate cellular response to the problem.

Recruitment of the sensor kinases Mec1 and Tel1

Tel1 is directly recruited to MRX-bound DSBs through interaction with the C-terminus of Xrs2 (Nakada et al. 2003). Tel1 phosphorylates H2A.X S129 but cannot spread this modification far beyond the DSB due to its restrictive association with MRX (Tsaber & Haber 2013). Because DSBs in G1 cells remain relatively unresected Tel1 alone phosphorylates H2A.X at S129 to become γ-H2A.X. Recruitment of Mec1 to a DSB is indirectly dependent on MRX, which initiates resection upon binding to the DSB to yield ssDNA that is coated by RPA (Tsaber & Haber 2013). Mec1-Ddc2 is recruited to the DSB via an interaction between RPA and Ddc2. Mec1 also phosphorylates H2AX at S129, which initially spreads over a range of ~50kb on either side of the DSB within 15-30 minutes (Shroff et al. 2004). Continued resection along the length of the chromosome at a slower rate facilitates further spreading of γ-H2A.X as Mec1-Ddc2 binds to the newly recruited RPA (Kim et al. 2007).
γ-H2A.X is required in conjunction with H3K79 methylation for the adapter protein Rad9’s recruitment to the DSB (Shroff et al. 2004, Javaheri et al. 2006). Mec1 also phosphorylates Rad9 at multiple S/TQ motifs, which subsequently interact with Rad53 FHA domains. This activates Rad53 and induces extensive Rad53 autophosphorylation (Sun et al. 1998). Phosphorylated Rad9 and Rad53 then dissociate in a complex that subsequently multimerizes, resulting in further trans-autophosphorylation of Rad53 (Harrison & Haber 2006). Fully activated Rad53 then dissociates from the complex before interacting with and/or phosphorylating a myriad of effector proteins involved in cell cycle arrest and/or DSB repair (Harrison & Haber 2006).

1.2.5. The DNA damage response in human cells

Activation of ATM and H2AX phosphorylation

In mammalian cells H2A.X phosphorylation at S139 occurs within one minute following DSB induction (Bewersdorf et al. 2006, Celeste et al. 2002, Rogakou et al. 1998, Rogakou et al. 1999) and is largely dependent on the Mec1 homologue Ataxia-Telangiectasia Mutated (ATM). In NHEJ DNA-PKcs mediates H2A.X phosphorylation downstream of ATM, whilst the Tel1 homologue ATM- and Rad3-related (ATR) in association with ATRIP (Ddc2 homologue) appear to promote H2A.X phosphorylation once recruited to ssDNA after DNA processing at replication forks (Pinto & Flaus 2010). ATM and ATR phosphorylate CHK2, and CHK1, respectively, which leads to their activation (Jazayeri et al. 2006). The maintenance of IR-induced checkpoint arrest in G2 requires sustained ATM-CHK2 activation as well as resection-dependent ATR-CHK1 activation (Shibata et al 2010). Phosphorylated CHK1 and CHK2 target CDC25, which inactivates cyclin-dependent kinases (CDKs), leading to cell cycle arrest (Jazayeri et al. 2006).

Activation and recruitment of ATM as a consequence of ATM-mediated autophosphorylation is proposed to be dependent on local DNA conformational changes, the presence of MRE11-RAD50-NBS1 (MRN) (Lee & Paull 2007), and the activity of the histone acetyltransferases (HATs) MOF1 and TIP60 (Gupta et al. 2005, Sun et al. 2005). Depletion of MOF1, which acetylates H4K16 leading to abrogated 30nm fibre formation and global chromatin compaction, results in impaired ATM activity (Shogren-Knaak et al. 2006). Indeed, γ-H2AX formation occurs preferentially in euchromatin (Kim et al. 2007), suggesting that a more condensed chromatin structure attenuates ATM activity. Binding of TIP60 to H3K9me3 via its chromodomain promotes
acetylation of ATM by TIP60, leading to ATM activation (Sun et al. 2009). Recently, DNA damage-dependent phosphorylation of TIP60 on T44 was shown to increase the binding of TIP60 to H3K9me3, leading to ATM activation (Kaidi & Jackson 2013).

Recruitment of factors required for amplification of the DDR

Mediator of DNA damage checkpoint protein 1 (MDC1) binds to γ-H2A.X via its BRCT domain, and MDC1 recruitment is essential for ionizing radiation-induced foci (IRIF) and G2 checkpoint maintenance (Jungmichel & Stucki 2010, Stucki et al. 2005, Shibata et al. 2010). MDC1 recruitment initiates a positive-feedback loop that perpetuates the expansion of γ-H2A.X by recruiting more ATM (Lou et al. 2006, Stucki et al. 2005). MDC1 is phosphorylated by casein kinase 2 (CK2) at several repeated motifs and is required for an interaction between MDC1 and NBS1 that retains MRN at IRIFs (Chapman & Jackson 2008, Melander et al. 2008, Spycher et al. 2008, Wu et al. 2008). Subsequent DNA end processing by MRN stimulates the recruitment of additional ATM (Lee & Paull 2007). Binding of MDC1 to γ-H2A.X directly or indirectly requires MOF1-dependent acetylation of H4K16 (Li et al. 2010) and is also negatively regulated by phosphorylated H2A Y142 (Cook et al. 2009, Xiao et al. 2009).

γ-H2A.X appears to stimulate the binding of the HATs GCN5, p300, CBP and TIP60 that acetylate various lysine residues on H3 and H4 of DSB-flanking nucleosomes (Deem et al. 2012). These acetylation marks are required for the recruitment of SWI/SNF chromatin remodeling complexes (discussed later) and various other DDR proteins. TIP60 mediates H4 acetylation that can extend for several kilobases flanking the DSB and promotes the recruitment of MDC1, 53BP1, BRCA1 and RAD51 (Murr et al. 2006).

Recruitment and activity of the DDR mediator and effector 53BP1

53BP1 (Rad9 homologue) is a core component of the DNA DSB response, functioning as a scaffold for other DSB factors, a DNA damage checkpoint mediator, and a critical determinant of DNA repair pathway choice (Panier & Boulton 2014). The DSB proteins 53BP1 exerts its critical checkpoint function by stimulating ATM activity via an interaction between its C-terminal BRCT domains and the RAD50 component of MRN, which recruits ATM (Lee & Paull 2007).

Recent studies have shed light on how several histone PTMs direct 53BP1 recruitment specifically to chromatin adjacent to DNA DSBs. The E3 ubiquitin ligase ring finger 8 (RNF8), in association with the E2 conjugating enzyme UBC13 (and other
E2 enzymes), is recruited to the DSB via direct interaction with phosphorylated MDC1 (Huen et al. 2007, Kolas et al. 2007, Mailand et al. 2007). RNF8 then ubiquitinates an unknown substrate, which serves as a binding site for a second E3 ubiquitin ligase RNF168, which ubiquitinates H2AK13 and/or K15 in association with UBC13 (Gatti et al. 2012, Mattiroli et al. 2012). Recruitment of 53BP1 to sites of DNA damage requires the simultaneous recognition of H4K20me2 and RNF168-dependent H2AK13/15ub (Fradett-Turcotte et al. 2013). 53BP1 binds H4K20me2 via its tandem TUDOR domains (Botuyan et al. 2006, Huyen et al. 2004), and binds H2AK13/15ub via a small ubiquitination-dependent recruitment (UDR) motif (Fradett-Turcotte et al. 2013).

Generation of H4K20me2 occurs in a stepwise manner beginning with SETD8 (SET domain-containing protein 8)-dependent monomethylation of H4K20, which is required for MMSET (multiple myeloma SET domain-containing protein)-dependent generation of H4K20me2 (Hajdu et al. 2011, Oda et al. 2010, Pei et al. 2011). Proteins including the histone demethylase JMJD2A and the Polycomb protein L3MBTL1 also bind to H4K20me2 independently of DNA damage (Acs et al. 2011, Mallette et al. 2012). A current model for 53BP1 binding to DNA damage sites follows that JMJD2A and L3MBTL1 are released from chromatin adjacent to the DSB in an RNF8- and RNF168-dependent manner (Acs et al. 2011, Mallette et al. 2012). As a result, H3K20me2 is exposed, triggering 53BP1 recruitment.

53BP1 recruitment to DNA DSBs is also regulated by DNA damage-induced acetylation. Acetylation of H4K16 by TIP60 reduces the affinity of the 53BP1 Tudour domain for binding to H4K20me2 (Hsiao & Mizzen 2013, Tang et al. 2013). In addition, the histone deacetylases HDAC1 and HDAC2 are implicated in positively regulating 53BP1 recruitment by deacetylating H4K16 (Hsiao & Mizzen 2013, Tang et al. 2013, Miller et al. 2010).

53BP1 regulates DNA repair pathway choice and antagonizes BRCA1

The regulation of 53BP1 binding at DNA DSBs dictates whether NHEJ or HR is utilized for repair (Panier & Boulton 2014). The recently identified association of 53BP1 with the RIF1 (RAP1-interacting factor 1) effector protein appears to be crucial for blocking resection in G1, thus inhibiting HR and channeling DNA repair into the NHEJ pathway (Panier & Boulton 2014). RIF1 interacts (directly or indirectly) with multiple ATM-phosphorylated Ser/Thr-Gln sites in the N-terminus of 53BP1 (Chapman et al. 2013, Escribano-Diaz et al. 2013, Zimmerman et al. 2013, Di Virgilio et al. 2013). Another effector protein, PTIP, contains BRCT repeats that interact with phosphorylated Ser25 on 53BP1 in an ATM-dependent manner (Munoz et al. 2007). 53BP1 and RIF1 appear
to impact physiological DSB repair, such as class-switch recombination (CSR), and pathological DSB repair, such as joining dysfunctional telomeres (Panier & Boulton 2014). In contrast, PTIP only seems to influence the repair of pathological DSBs. Precisely how 53BP1, RIF1 and PTIP cooperate to inhibit resection during G1 remains largely speculative.

A currently held model follows that during G1, 53BP1-RIF1 bound to the DSB blocks the association of BRCA1 (Escribano-Diaz et al. 2013, Feng et al. 2013). Through an unclear mechanism, CDK-dependent phosphorylation of MRN-bound CtIP and BRCA1 is prevented, which ultimately blocks resection (Panier & Boulton 2014). During S and G2 phases, TIP60-dependent acetylation of H4K16 reduces the affinity of 53BP1-RIF1 for DSB-flanking chromatin, and CtIP and BRCA1 are phosphorylated by CDK. The subsequent assembly of a CtIP-BRCA1 complex promotes resection, which is enhanced by the SIRT6-dependent removal of a CtIP acetylation mark, thus committing the cell to repair via HR (Panier & Boulton 2014).

1.2.6. The RSC complex in the DNA damage response

RSC was first implicated in the DNA damage response (DDR) after the findings that deletion of several RSC subunits (Rsc1, Rsc2, Rsc7, Rsc30 and Htl1), and a temperature sensitive mutant of Sth1 conferred sensitivity to various DNA damaging agents, including methyl methane sulphonate (MMS), phleomycin, bleomycin, hydroxyurea (HU), UV and IR (Wilson et al. 2006, Cairns et al. 1999, Bennett et al. 2001, Koyama et al. 2002, Chai et al. 2005). Major advances in understanding how RSC functions in the DDR have been made using the mating-type switching HO system. Mating-type switching in *S. cerevisiae* involves induction of a DNA DSB at the *MAT* locus by HO endonuclease. Repair of this break and switching is achieved by intrachromosomal recombination between one of two silent donor cassettes termed *MATα* and *MATα*. The HO system relies on the ability to induce HO expression in a strain background in which the donor cassettes have been deleted. Thus, upon HO induction a persistent DSB is generated at a specific locus that can only be finally repaired by an error-prone NHEJ mechanism. Nevertheless, central HR and DNA damage checkpoint proteins are still recruited, along with the associated histone modifications. This allows the temporal and spatial accumulation of DNA repair factors and nucleosome remodelling activity to be monitored at the break by techniques such as ChIP and nucleosome accessibility experiments.
Recruitment of RSC to DNA DSBs

Recruitment of RSC to an HO-induced DSB was first monitored by ChIP using TAP-tagged Sth1. Enrichment of Sth1 relative to an uninduced sample was detected on both sides of the break after 10 minutes, placing RSC recruitment very early in the DNA damage response (Chai et al. 2005, Shim et al. 2005). Sth1 had returned to basal levels 2hrs after HO induction was terminated (Shim et al. 2005). Rsc8 and Rsc1 were also enriched in a temporally similar manner, suggesting that the entire RSC complex was recruited (Shim et al. 2005, Shim et al. 2007). In contrast, enrichment of the Snf5 subunit of SWI/SNF was only detected after 40 minutes following induction, indicating temporally distinct recruitment profiles between the two complexes (Chai et al. 2005).

In a strain in which H2A S129 cannot be phosphorylated Sth1 and Rsc1 recruitment was found to be normal. Also, recruitment was not affected by cell cycle phase (Shim et al. 2007, Liang et al. 2007).

Sth1 enrichment was not detected in the absence of Mre11 and was slightly delayed in the absence of Ku70 (Shim et al. 2005). Furthermore, Rsc1 and Rsc2 were found to physically interact with Mre11 and Ku80 in a yeast two-hybrid assay (Shim et al. 2005). However, chromatin remodelling by RSC was still observed at the break in the absence of Mre11 (discussed later), indicating that some RSC must be present. Importantly, these ChIP assays calculated the enrichment of RSC relative to an uninduced sample. Therefore the absolute level of RSC present before induction is not revealed and a lack of enrichment does not equate to an absence of RSC (Chambers & Downs 2012). Consistent with prior association before DSB formation, work in our lab showed that Rsc2 and Rsc7 function to establish a normal chromatin structure at MAT in the absence of a DSB (Kent et al. 2007).

Nucleosome remodelling by RSC at DSBs

DNA DSBs induce a rapid change in the surrounding chromatin structure. Changes in the positions of nucleosomes in chromatin extracted from MNase-treated permeabilized yeast can be visualized using indirect end labelling. Using this technique, the repositioning of 6 proximal nucleosomes away from the break and a slight increase in MNase cleavage efficiency immediately distal to a break at MAT was observed (Shim et al. 2007, Kent et al. 2007). Also, chromatin derived from cross-linked nuclei and subject to MNase digestion was more efficiently cleaved after DSB induction as measured by qPCR (Shim et al. 2007). This is consistent with enhanced accessibility of nucleosomal DNA after break induction (Shim et al. 2007). These
changes were observed within 30 minutes of DSB formation, are independent of Mre11 (as mentioned previously), and occur in G1, indicating that the event is distinct from subsequent histone eviction by MRX. Furthermore, this nucleosome repositioning is not restricted to the MAT locus; its also occurs at HO DSBs present in URA3 and LEU2 loci (Kent et al. 2007).

The chromatin remodelling event described above was found to be dependent on RSC but not on the other chromatin remodelling complexes SWI/SNF, INO80 or Rad54 (Kent et al. 2007). A strain in which Sth1 was conditionally repressed and an rsc2 null strain did not display significantly increased MNase sensitivity after break induction, suggesting that Sth1 and Rsc2 are important for the remodelling (Shim et al. 2007). Conversely, indirect end labelling showed that nucleosome repositioning occurred normally in an rsc2 null strain (as well as rsc7 and rsc30 null strains), but as mentioned previously these cells display altered chromatin structure prior to break induction (Kent et al. 2007). However, a defect in remodelling after break induction is observed in an rsc1 null strain in this assay. It is unclear where the discrepancy in Rsc2 remodelling in these two assays used arises. The MNase sensitivity assay might be more sensitive to occupancy changes within a population, whilst the end labeling might be more sensitive to positional changes. Thus, both Rsc1 and Rsc2 might be involved in break-induced remodelling. It should also be noted that rsc1 and rsc2 null strains both retain some RSC function. The relative contributions of each RSC isoform might depend on cell cycle, chromatin context or genomic location (Chambers & Downs 2012).

The effects of RSC on H2A S129 phosphorylation and resection

The very early recruitment of RSC to a DSB parallels that seen for phosphorylation of H2A S129, perhaps indicating that the two events are connected. Rsc1 recruitment was normal in a strain in which H2A S129 cannot be phosphorylated, but defective phosphorylation after a HO-induced DSB or MMS treatment is observed in rsc mutants. This places RSC upstream of H2A S129 phosphorylation in the DNA damage response (Shim et al. 2007, Liang et al. 2007, Kent et al. 2007). Consistent with reduced H2A S129 is the observations that Mec1 and Tel1 recruitment are reduced by ~2-fold in an rsc2 null strain (Liang et al. 2007). RSC is also required for efficient DSB-dependent methylation of H3K4 by Set1 (Faucher & Wellinger 2010), indicating that remodelling by RSC is important for downstream chromatin modifications.

Repression of Sth1 leads to reduced Mre11 and Ku70 accumulation at a DSB, suggesting that RSC-dependent remodelling facilitates their binding (Shim et al. 2007).
Reduced Mre11 at the break might lead to impaired MRX-stimulated resection. Consistently, a slight reduction in resection is observed in rsc mutants as measured by quantitative amplification of ssDNA (QAOS) and restriction site cleavage in dsDNA (Tsuchiya et al. 1992, Kent et al. 2007). In addition, enrichment of RPA adjacent to a DSB is reduced in Sth1-repressed or rsc2 null strains, whilst Rad51 recruitment was slightly delayed (Shim et al. 2007, Liang et al. 2007).

Together these data suggest a model for RSC action at a DSB. Upon break induction a small amount of Ku and Mre11 bind to the DSB ends, which facilitates RSC recruitment. RSC then remodels the chromatin adjacent to the break, which allows further enrichment of Ku and Mre11 and generates a positive feedback loop to achieve maximal accumulation of these repair factors.

**The involvement of RSC in NHEJ**

Rsc8 and Rsc30 were first identified in a genetic screen as factors required for wild-type levels of NHEJ activity in the error-prone repair of HO-induced DNA DSBs (Shim et al. 2005). rsc30 null cells also displayed DSB repair joint sequence alterations characteristic of other NHEJ mutants (Shim et al. 2005). In addition, rsc30 and htl1 null strains were also defective in NHEJ of a transformed linearised plasmid (Florio et al. 2007, Shim et al. 2005, Moscariello et al. 2010). In contrast, another study reported substantially elevated plasmid repair by NHEJ in rsc1 and rsc2 null and sth1 mutant strains (Chai et al. 2005). Nevertheless, these findings, along with the impaired recruitment of RSC in the absence of Mre11 and Ku70 (Shim et al. 2005), indicate that RSC is necessary for efficient NHEJ.

**The involvement of RSC in HR**

Defective DSB repair by HR in a plasmid gap repair assay has been reported in rsc1, rsc2, and htl1 null strains as well as sth1 mutant strains (Chai et al. 2005, Moscariello et al. 2010). Whilst an snf5 null mutant (Swi/Snf complex) was severely defective in synapsis during DSB repair via mating type switch gene conversion, rsc2 null cells were proficient in this step. Instead, the rsc2 null strain was found to be slightly defective in the post-synaptic ligation of DNA DSBs, suggesting a late role of RSC in the HR reaction (Chai et al. 2005). More recently, the RSC subunits Rsc2 and Rsc7 were found to be involved specifically in Rad59-dependent, Rad51-independent HR. In addition, Rsc1 and Rsc2 physically interacted with Rad59 in a yeast two-hybrid assay, whilst recruitment of Rad59 to a DSB was normal in the absence of RSC2 as shown by
ChIP (Oum et al. 2011). Deletion of RSC2 or RSC7 did not impair mating type switch gene conversion, in contrast to that reported by Chai et al. Furthermore, RSC was dispensable for non-allelic or heteroallelic recombination, SSA and BIR, however formation of SSA and BIR recombination intermediates was delayed in the rsc2 mutants. This might reflect the substantial growth defect reported in this strain and could explain the reduced post-synaptic ligation reported by Chai et al. (Oum et al. 2011).

In a spontaneous direct-repeat recombination assay using tandem repeats of the FLO1 gene deletion of RSC7 resulted in a highly elevated rate of recombination but rsc2 was not tested. Recombination in this assay can occur via replication slippage, unequal sister chromatid exchange or SSA. RSC was also shown to be required for recombination between sister chromatids. Firstly, rsc2 and rsc7 mutants were more severely defective in repair of MMS-induced DNA damage during G2 than G1. Second, rsc7 cells displayed a reduced rate of spontaneous unequal sister chromatid exchange, whilst again the rate in a rsc2 mutant was not shown. Finally, in the absence of RSC2 or RSC7 recruitment of the cohesin subunits Smc1 and Scc1 to a DSB was severely compromised (Oum et al. 2011).

1.2.7. Mammalian SWI/SNF complexes in the DNA damage response

H2A.X phosphorylation

Mammalian SWI/SNF complexes are recruited to sites of DNA DSBs (Park et al. 2006, Peng et al. 2009, Ogiwara et al. 2011), suggesting that mammalian SWI/SNF complexes play a role in DNA DSB repair like their yeast counterparts. Park et al. showed that tetracycline-induced expression of an ATPase-defective dominant-negative version of BRG1 (which compromises PBAF function and a subset of BAF complexes) resulted in reduced cell survival after IR, as well as reduced DNA repair as shown by comet assay (Park et al. 2006). The authors also reported that H2A.X phosphorylation was defective in these cells following IR, despite normal ATM activation. However, as discussed below, the finding that BRG1 is required for γ-H2A.X induction is contentious, and the subsequent follow-up studies by the Kwon lab made on this basis should be treated skeptically.

ATPase-defective BRG1-expressing cells and cells depleted of BRG1 and hBRM by siRNA did not show a gross defect in G2/M checkpoint activation after IR or treatment with adriamycin. Furthermore, defective activation of the S-phase checkpoint was also not observed in ATPase-defective BRG1-expressing cells after IR and
Adriamycin treatment. Interestingly, S-phase checkpoint activation was defective in these cells after treatment with the DNA interstrand crosslinking agent cisplatin, suggesting distinct roles for SWI/SNF S-phase checkpoint activation in response to different drugs (Park et al. 2006).

In support of a role of SWI/SNF in γ-H2A.X induction, Ray et al. found that siRNA depletion of SNF5 (a subunit found in all SWI/SNF complexes) led to reduced levels of γ-H2A.X after UV (Ray et al. 2009). Somewhat in contrast, however, were the findings that SNF5 depletion led to reduced phosphorylation of ATM (but not ATR) and reduced ATM recruitment (as measured by foci number) after UV, providing an explanation for the reduced γ-H2A.X levels. The authors similarly found that DNA damage checkpoint activation was intact after UV in SNF5-deficient cells, despite reduced γ-H2A.X, by showing that ATM/ATR-mediated phosphorylation of CHK1/CHK2 was normal (Ray et al. 2009).

In contrast to the report by Park et al., McKenna and co-workers reported that SNF5 did not co-localize with γ-H2A.X foci or relocalize within the nucleus following IR in MEFs (McKenna et al. 2008). In addition, they found that the affinity of SNF5 for chromatin remained unchanged after DNA damage by UV, IR and doxorubicin when comparing protein levels in soluble and chromatin-bound fractions. SNF5 depletion did not result in reduced γ-H2A.X foci formation (measuring % γ-H2AX positive cells rather than number of foci per cell) or total levels of γ-H2A.X after 5Gy IR. SNF5 depletion also did not lead to sensitivity to cisplatin, etoposide or UV, however the methodology used in these assays seems questionable. Firstly, proliferation (WST-1 absorption) was only measured 24 hours after addition of cisplatin, which seems early to measure an effect of this drug. Second, and more importantly, the positive control Rad18-/- MEFs did not show increased sensitivity to this drug compared to wild-type cells as has been previously reported (e.g. Wagner & Karnitz 2009) (McKenna et al. 2008).

Consistent with the report by Park et al. are the findings that following IR SNF5 deficiency led to normal ATM activation, and consequently p53 and CHK1 were also normally activated (McKenna et al. 2008). Activation of the G2/M DNA damage checkpoint (measured using phosphorylated H3 as a marker of mitotic cells) in response to IR was not defective in the SNF5-depleted cells. In addition, p53-dependent p21 expression (as measured by Western blot) was normal in the absence of SNF5, which is somewhat in contrast to the findings by Xia et al. and Burrows et al., in which BAF180 and BRD7 depletion leads to reduced p21 activation (McKenna et al. 2008, Xia et al. 2008, Burrows et al. 2010).
Notably, no independent data has been published that recapitulates the findings by Park et al. made eight years ago, in which BRG1 was reported to be necessary for γ-H2A.X induction. In addition, we do not see loss of γ-H2A.X following depletion of BRG1 or BAF180 (Q. Riballo, P. A. Jeggo, J. A. Downs and P. M. Brownlee, unpublished data). Together with the findings that another SWI/SNF subunit, SNF5, does not impair γ-H2A.X induction (McKenna et al. 2008), we conclude that mammalian SWI/SNF complexes are dispensable for γ-H2A.X induction.

Regulation of SWI/SNF recruitment to DSBs by histone acetylation

In the first of a series of contentious follow-up studies, the Kwon lab reported that BRG1 associates with γ-H2A.X nucleosomes via interaction between its bromodomain and acetylated H3 (Lee et al. 2010). In support for a role of histone acetylation in the recruitment of SWI/SNF complexes for efficient DNA repair Ogiwara et al. independently identified the HATs CBP and p300 as being important for NHEJ (Ogiwara et al. 2011). Depletion of these HATs using siRNA led to impaired repair of IR-induced DSBs as well as etoposide sensitivity in lung cancer cells. The authors showed that CBP and p300 were recruited to DSBs and were required for DSB-dependent acetylation of H3K18, as well as H4K5, 8, 12 and 16. Furthermore, Ku70 and Ku80 recruitment to the DSB site were reduced in the absence of these HATs, providing an explanation for the reduced NHEJ activity. As well as reduced Ku70 and Ku80 recruitment, CBP and p300 depletion led to reduced recruitment of the SWI/SNF ATPase hBRM (restricted to a subset of BAF complexes) (Ogiwara et al. 2011).

ATM-mediated phosphorylation of BRG1

More recently, a third study by the Kwon lab reported that phosphorylation of BRG1 by ATM serves as a critical modification to promote BRG1-dependent DNA repair (Kwon et al. 2014). Rapid and transient phosphorylation of BRG1 at S721 occurred in response to IR-induced DNA DSB induction. BRG1 bound to acetylated H3 peptides with a much greater affinity when S721 was phosphorylated after DNA damage, whilst the transcriptional and ATPase activity of BRG1 were not significantly altered by this modification (Kwon et al. 2014).

Regulation of SWI/SNF recruitment to DSBs by BRIT1 (MCPH1)
BRIT1 (also known as microcephalin, MCPH1) is a transcriptional repressor of human telomerase reverse transcriptase (hTERT), with additional roles in the early DDR and recruitment of DNA repair proteins to DNA lesions (Rai et al. 2006). Multiple core subunits of SWI/SNF, including BRG1, hBRM, BAF170, BAF155 and SNF5 were identified by mass spectrometry as BRIT1 binding partners. This BRIT1-SWI/SNF interaction was entirely abolished when BAF170 was depleted and was significantly reduced after BAF155 depletion (Peng et al. 2009). Upon DNA damage the interaction between BRIT1 and SWI/SNF was enhanced. Interestingly, this enhanced binding upon DNA damage, but not the basal level of binding, was reduced upon ATM and ATR depletion. BAF170 was found to contain S/TQ motifs common to ATM/ATR substrates, and could be pulled down with a phospho-S/TQ (p-S/TQ) antibody in a manner dependent on ATM/ATR. Mutation of BAF170 S969 specifically blocked the DNA-damage enhanced binding of BAF170 to BRIT1, suggesting that this enhanced binding is mediated by ATM/ATR-dependent phosphorylation of BAF170 (Peng et al. 2009).

The authors next examined the importance of the BRIT1-SWI/SNF interaction in DNA repair. BRIT1 depletion led to a significant repair defect in a comet assay, as well as a defect in DNA repair of an I-SceI-induced DSB by both HR and NHEJ mechanisms. In addition, BRIT1 depletion significantly reduced the levels of chromatin-bound BRG1, hBRM, BAF170, Rad51 and Ku70 in both undamaged cells and cells irradiated with 10Gy IR. Basal BRG1 localization to an I-SceI restriction site before break induction was reduced in the absence of BRIT1 as shown by ChIP. Furthermore, DNA damage-induced BRG1 and hBRM localization to an I-SceI-induced DSB were also reduced in BRIT1-depleted cells. In contrast, depletion of SWI/SNF subunits did not impair the recruitment of BRIT1 to chromatin or to the site of a DSB, placing SWI/SNF function downstream of BRIT1 (Peng et al. 2009).

BRIT1 and SWI/SNF depleted cells exhibited increased resistance to MNase digestion in the presence and absence of DNA damage, consistent with a role of SWI/SNF in chromatin relaxation to facilitate DNA repair factor recruitment. The role of BRIT1 in recruiting SWI/SNF for this purpose was confirmed using a version of BRIT1 in which a small (aa1-48) N-terminal deletion was made. This abolished the interaction with SWI/SNF but retains the ability of BRIT1 to form foci. The cells expressing this BRIT1 deletion were unable to restore the chromatin relaxation defect, indicating that SWI/SNF recruitment by BRIT1 is important for chromatin remodeling. Furthermore, RAD51 and phosphorylated-RPA (p-RPA) foci formation were impaired in BRIT1-depleted cells, and treatment of BRIT1-depleted cells with the chromatin relaxation
agent TSA reversed the defect in RPA foci formation and increased DSB repair efficiency by HR (Peng et al. 2009).

Finally, lymphoblastoid cell lines (LCLs) harbouring loss-of-function mutations in \textit{BRIT1} were found to be defective in DNA repair by comet assay, more sensitive to camptothecin and etoposide (which generate DSBs in S-phase and are repaired predominantly by HR), and more sensitive to IR in G1 phase (readout of NHEJ repair). In addition, RAD51 and RPA foci formation and recruitment after UV were reduced in the \textit{BRIT1}-defective cells compared to the corresponding controls. Furthermore, SWI/SNF binding to chromatin was substantially reduced in these cells, which also did not undergo chromatin relaxation after DNA damage (Peng et al. 2009).
1.3. Cohesin

1.3.1. The cohesin complex, cohesin loading, and cohesion establishment

Cohesin is a four-subunit, highly conserved complex that is able to entrap two DNA segments (Remeseiro & Losada 2013). Sister chromatid cohesion is when the two DNA segments are sister chromatids, and is essential for correct chromosome segregation during mitosis and DNA repair by homologous recombination. Two segments of DNA within the same sister chromatid can be held together by cohesin to form a loop. This looping is emerging as an important mechanism controlling interactions between promoters and enhancers to regulate transcription, in addition to organizing replication factories, recombination and chromosome condensation. Moreover, mutations in cohesin and regulatory factors are associated with cancer and developmental disorders, known as cohesinopathies (Remeseiro & Losada 2013).

Structure of the cohesin complex

Cohesin is a ring-shaped complex that consists of Smc1, Smc3, Scc1/Mcd1 and Scc3 in budding yeast (Remeseiro & Losada 2013) (Table 1.3). Smc1 and Smc3 are members of the structural maintenance of chromosomes (SMC) family, which also includes the condensin subunits Smc2 and Smc4, and the Smc5/6 subunits Smc5 and Smc6. Smc1 and Smc3 are long polypeptides that fold back upon themselves by intramolecular 50nm antiparallel coiled-coil interactions to yield a protein with a globular ATPase ‘head’ domain at one end and a dimerization ‘hinge’ domain at the other (Haering et al. 2002, Carretero et al. 2010). Heterotypic dimerization between the Smc1 and Smc3 hinge domains results in the formation of a large V-shaped structure. A bipartite cohesin ring is formed, at least transiently, when the two halves of the ABC-type ATPase ‘heads’ from Smc1 and Smc3 are bound in the presence of ATP. The Smc1 head domain binds ATP via its Walker A and Walker B motifs, which binds motifs in the Smc3 head domain. A second ATP molecule binds in a vice-versa manner between the two proteins. Interaction between the Smc1 and Smc3 head domains is stabilised through interaction with the Scc1/Mcd1 C- and N-terminal domains, respectively (Losada et al. 2000). An interaction between Scc3 and Scc1/Mcd1 reinforces the cohesin ring (Gruber et al. 2003).

A number of models have been proposed to explain the topological linkage of DNA molecules achieved by cohesin. A widely depicted, but perhaps speculative
presumption is that the SMC arms of a single cohesin complex embrace two DNA molecules. Support for this is lacking from DNA-protein mapping studies, and the observation that Smc1 and Smc3 heads remain closely apposed during anaphase (McIntyre et al. 2007, Rudra & Skibbens 2013). In addition, SMC heads are observed to reside near SMC hinges (Sakai et al. 2003, McIntyre et al. 2007), and cohesins have been shown to bind each sister chromatid oddly, at least at the HMR locus in budding yeast (Chang et al. 2005). Thus, an alternative scenario sees individual cohesins bound to individual DNA molecules being modified to stabilize inter-cohesin assemblies (Rudra & Skibbens 2013).

**Table 1.3. Functional domains and properties of cohesin proteins**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>S. cerevisiae</th>
<th>H. sapiens</th>
<th>Domains and properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesin core complex</td>
<td>Smc1</td>
<td>SMC1a</td>
<td>Forms heterodimer with Smc3 via interaction between hinge domains, head domain constitutes one half of a split ATPase domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smc3</td>
<td>SMC3</td>
<td>Forms heterodimer with Smc1 via interaction between hinge domains, head domain constitutes one half of a split ATPase domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scc1/Mdc1</td>
<td>RAD21</td>
<td>Stabilizes Smc1-Smc3 heterodimer; C-terminus binds Smc1 head domain, N-terminus binds Smc3 head domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesin loader components</td>
<td>Scc2</td>
<td>NIPBL</td>
<td>Forms heterodimer with Scc4, required for efficient topological loading of core complex onto DNA, stimulates Smc1-Smc3 ATPase activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scc4</td>
<td>MAU2</td>
<td>Forms heterodimer with Scc2, required for efficient topological loading of core complex onto DNA, stimulates Smc1-Smc3 ATPase activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment factors</td>
<td>Eco1/Ctf7</td>
<td>ESCO1 and ESCO2</td>
<td>Acetylates Smc3 on K112 and K113 (K105 and K106 in mammalian cells) during S-phase to establish cohesion; Esco2 specifically acetylates Smc3 in pericentric regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sgo1</td>
<td>SGO1</td>
<td>Protects centromeric cohesion from the prophase pathway until anaphase in mammalian cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-establishment factors</td>
<td>Scc3</td>
<td>SA1 and SA2</td>
<td>Component of anti-establishment complex; recruited to cohesin ring via interaction with Scc1, SA1 regulates cohesion at telomeres and is involved in transcriptional regulation, SA2 regulates centromere cohesion and DNA repair; both proteins are phosphorylated by Polo during execution of the prophase pathway in mammalian cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wap1/Rad61</td>
<td>WAPL</td>
<td>Component of anti-establishment complex; binds Pds5 via N-terminal FGF motifs, which are absent in yeast Wap1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pds5</td>
<td>PDS5A and PDS5B/APRIN</td>
<td>Component of anti-establishment complex; contains HEAT-repeats, recruited to cohesin ring via interaction with Scc1, Pds5 specifically regulates centromere cohesion and promotes DNA repair via interaction with BRCA2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cohesin loading dynamics**

Cohesin loading occurs on unreplicated chromatin in G1, whilst a substantial increase in the residence time of a proportion of the cohesin pool is observed during replication (Gerlich et al. 2006). During G1, a roughly equal proportion of soluble and dynamically bound cohesin (with a high dissociation constant) is found in the cell. The dynamically cycling pool of cohesin is present throughout interphase but not after late prophase, and might have important implications in replication and transcription (Terret et al. 2009, Fay et al. 2011). This cycling process is dependent on the cohesin regulatory proteins Wap1 (also known as Rad61) and Pds5, which have a cohesin unloading (anti-establishment) function (discussed later) (Gandhi et al. 2006, Kueng et al. 2006, Tedeschi et al. 2013). A steady increase in stably bound cohesin (with a
low dissociation constant) occurs concomitantly with replication, peaking at S/G2 and remaining until anaphase (Gerlich et al. 2006). This stably bound cohesin is thought to function in the process of sister chromatid cohesion and is achieved through a process known as establishment (discussed later).

The mechanism of cohesin loading

The heterodimeric cohesin loader components Scc2 and Scc4 are required for cohesin to associate with DNA (Table 1.3) (Kogut et al. 2009, Bernard et al. 2006, Ciosk et al. 2000, Furuya et al. 1998, Rollins et al. 2004, Seitan et al. 2006). Cohesin loading also depends on ATP hydrolysis by the Smc head domains (Arumugam et al. 2003, Weitzer et al. 2003) and a transient separation of the Smc hinge domains (Gruber et al. 2006). This latter observation is proposed to function as the DNA ‘entry’ gate and provides strong evidence that DNA becomes trapped within a single cohesin ring (Chan et al. 2012). Nevertheless, the molecular mechanism of action for how these events are coordinated to promote cohesin loading remains poorly understood. In addition, it is largely unclear where the sites of cohesin loading are. Once loaded cohesin is found at discrete sites along chromosome arms known as cohesin-associated regions (CARs) and is particularly enriched at pericentric regions (Onn et al. 2008). Cohesin loading is dependent on the formation of pre-replication factories in Xenopus, to which Scc2-Scc4 is recruited (Takahashi et al. 2008). However, in somatic cells Scc2-Scc4 is not recruited to pre-RCs and loading of cohesin occurs independently of pre-RC formation, suggesting alternative loading mechanisms (Guillou et al. 2010, MacAlpine et al. 2010). Interestingly, in budding yeast the cohesin complex does not colocalize with Scc2-Scc4, perhaps due to the ability of cohesin to translocate along the chromatin fibre following loading (Hu et al. 2011, Ocampo-Hafalla & Uhlmann 2011). In Drosophila and mouse embryonic stem cells cohesin and Scc2 are found together at transcriptionally active sites (Misulovin et al. 2008, Kagey et al. 2010). Thus, the open state of active euchromatin might facilitate cohesin loading, or cohesin might be more dynamically bound at these sites and requires more frequent reloading (Remeseiro & Losada 2013).

Recently, cohesin loading onto DNA in S. pombe was reconstituted using purified cohesin and Scc2-Scc4 (Murayama & Uhlmann 2014). Incubation of cohesin with DNA alone resulted in inefficient spontaneous topological loading. Incubation of the Scc2-Scc4 loader stimulated the ATPase activity of cohesin to improve the efficiency of topological loading. In addition, Scc2-Scc4 was found to contact the
cohesin ring at multiple sites, including via interaction with the enigmatic Scc3 component (Murayama & Uhlmann 2014).

Cohesion establishment and anti-establishment

Cohesion establishment is the process that converts chromatin bound cohesin into a state that is tethering-competent, or cohesive. Mechanistically this process is poorly understood and appears to be highly complex (Sherwood et al. 2010, Skibbens et al. 2011). Establishment of cohesion occurs during DNA replication and is critically dependent on the cohesin acetyltransferase Eco1 (also known as Ctf7) (Table 1.3). Eco1 interacts with a multitude of DNA replication factors in S-phase, including the clamp-like proliferating cell nuclear antigen (PCNA), replication factor C (RFC), the Chl1 helicase and the Okazaki fragment maturation flap endonuclease I Rad27 (also known as Fen1). Indeed, a widely held model is that cohesion is established immediately once nascent sister chromatids emerge behind the replication fork (Skibbens 2000, Rudra & Skibbens 2013). Establishment is also regulated by at least three other proteins known as Scc3, Pds5 and Wapl (Table 1.3). These three proteins have an important function in the prophase pathway (in mammalian cells), which serves to release cohesin from chromosome arms during mitosis (discussed later). Wapl binds to Pds5, which is a large HEAT-repeat-containing protein, and Pds5 and Scc3 are recruited to the cohesin ring via interaction with Scc1 (Hartman et al. 2000, Panizza et al. 2000, Shintomi & Hirano 2009). Wapl, Pds5 and Scc3 form a stable complex thought to promote ‘anti-establishment’ (Rowland et al. 2009).

During S-phase in budding yeast Eco1 acetylates Smc3 on two lysine residues, K112 and K113, located within the ATPase head domain. Individually mutating lysine 112 to a similar but non-acetylatable arginine does not impair viability or cohesion, in contrast to mutating lysine 113 to the same residue, which causes a cohesion establishment defect and inviability (Zhang et al. 2008, Unal et al. 2008, Rolef Ben-Shahar et al. 2008, Rowland et al. 2009). This suggests that acetylation of K113 is most crucial in this regard, however K112 acetylation does appear to regulate the cohesin-dependent process of chromosome condensation (discussed later). Strikingly, deletion of WAPL supresses the inviability conferred by the K113R mutation. K113R inviability is also suppressed by several pds5 and scc3 mutations, which cluster within specific domains within the N- and C-terminal regions of these two proteins (Rolef Ben-Shahar et al. 2008, Rowland et al. 2009, Unal et al. 2008, Zhang et al. 2008). Thus, a proposed model for the function of Smc3 acetylation is to counter the ‘anti-establishment’ activity of the Wapl-Pds5-Scc3 complex.
A critical issue is whether anti-establishment prevents the actual formation of cohesive cohesin during S-phase or destroys it after its establishment following S-phase. Chan et al. revealed that in cells lacking Eco1 destruction of cohesin upon Wapl expression occurred long after replication, providing support for the latter hypothesis (Chan et al. 2012). Importantly, Wapl was not able to destroy this post-replicative cohesion when Smc3 was acetylated. Using GFP-tagged proteins, Wapl was found to be ~4-fold less abundant than Pds5 and showed ~4-fold lower association with pericentric chromatin. Expression of Wapl-GFP in a wapl null haploid strain led to conditional lethality in an eco1-1 strain. This lethality was even observed when Wapl-GFP was heterozygous over wapl deletion in a diploid strain. Together, these results indicate that Wapl is able to destroy all cohesion in an Smc3 acetylation-compromised scenario despite its low abundance and substoichiometric chromatin association (Chan et al. 2012).

Wapl was found to very rapidly exchange between cohesin complexes located at different pericentric regions as measured by iFRAP in a manner largely independent of Eco1. In contrast, Pds5, which interacts with Wapl via its N-terminal domain, as well as Scc1 cycled much more slowly, and their cycling was increased in the absence of Eco1. Furthermore, in a wapl null strain Scc1 turnover was largely abolished, as was Smc3 turnover in a wapl eco1-1 strain incubated at the permissive temperature, indicating that cohesin turnover depends on Wapl. Strikingly, mutations in smc3, pds5 and scc3, which had been previously identified as suppressors of eco1 inviability, led to reduced cohesin turnover. Interestingly, only a subset of pds5 mutations, which were previously shown to disrupt the interaction between Pds5 and Wapl, reduced Wapl recruitment (Chan et al. 2012).

Collectively, these results indicate that unacetylated cohesin has an intrinsic ‘releasing activity’ that promotes its turnover on chromatin and promotes its anti-establishment by Wapl, Pds5 and Scc3. The ring model, in which two DNA molecules are entrapped within one cohesin ring, provides the simplest mechanistic explanation for this. If the ‘entry’ gate for cohesin loading occurs at the Smc1/Smc3 hinge domain, as described by Gruber et al., an ‘exit’ gate might be present at the Smc1/Smc3/Scc1 interface. The releasing activity of unacetylated cohesin, facilitated by Wapl, Pds5 and Scc3, might involve a transient dissociation of Scc1 from the Smc1/Smc3 interface to allow DNA exit. In support of this, Chan et al. showed that fusion of Scc1 to Smc3, but not to Smc1, suppressed eco1 null and eco1-1 conditional lethality. This was accompanied by reduced cohesin turnover and occurred despite normal Wapl recruitment. The authors propose that the function of Smc3 acetylation is to lock
cohesin onto DNA by stabilizing the interaction between Smc3 and Scc1 (Chan et al. 2012).

The model described above does not account for the observation that in Xenopus Smc3 can be readily acetylated after DNA replication and when replication is inhibited (Song et al. 2012). In addition, acetylation occurring outside of S-phase is unable to generate cohesion, suggesting that although Smc3 acetylation is critical for cohesion it must occur in context amongst other replication-associated factors (Song et al. 2012, Rudra & Skibbens 2013). In yeast, four alternative RFC complexes exist in yeast in which the largeRFC1 subunit can be replaced with Elg1, Ctf18 or Rad24. Interestingly, whilst most DNA replication components promote establishment, the Elg1-containing RFC complex antagonises Eco1 function (Maradeo & Skibbens 2009, Maradeo & Skibbens 2010, Parnas et al. 2009). This supports the notion that there exits a complex network of cohesion establishment regulation during S-phase. There are likely to be additional yet to be identified replication factors with roles in cohesion establishment. Notably, this might include proteins harbouring bromodomains (Rudra & Skibbens 2013), which bind acetylated lysine residues, such as BAF180 in mammalian cells.

**Smc3 acetylation as a precursor to the ‘cohesin code’**

Several studies have shown that the inviability of an eco1 null strain is rescued by deletion of Wapl (Feytout et al. 2011, Rowland et al. 2009, Skibbens et al. 1999, Sutani et al. 2009, Tanaka et al. 2001, Tóth et al. 1999). This would be predicted to be due to restoration of sister chromatid cohesion, but in fact eco1 wapl cells display a severe cohesion defect that is comparable to an eco1 single null strain (Guacci & Koshland 2012, Rowland et al. 2009, Sutani et al. 2009, Feytout et al. 2011). Expression of an Smc3 acetyl-mimic mutant, in which lysine 113 is mutated to glutamine (K113Q) in an smc3-42 ts strain, results in a severe cohesion establishment defect and inviability at the restrictive temperature. The same phenotype is observed when K112 and K113 together are mutated to glutamine (K112Q K113Q). Intriguingly, in an smc3-42 strain expressing K112R (rendering the residue non-acetylatable) together with K113, viability is restored, but the severe cohesion establishment defect remains.

The severe cohesion establishment defect in these strains did not severely impair accurate chromosome segregation, as would be predicted in cohesion-defective cells due to failed bipolar microtubule attachment. This is likely due to a
feature unique to yeast whereby a bipolar spindle forms in early S-phase and sister kinetochores achieve stable attachment during replication (McCarrol & Fangman 1988, Kitamura et al. 2007). Specifically, 75% of smc3-42 cells, ~74% of K113Q and ~82% of K112R K113Q cells exhibited disjunction of most chromatids. For comparison, ~98% of wild-type cells exhibited disjunction. This suggests that an alternative cohesin-mediated process exists to promote viability in these cells (Guachi & Koshland 2012). The authors found that whilst smc3-42 and K113Q cells were unable to perform condensation at the rDNA locus into discrete loops, the K112R K113Q and eco1 wapl double null cells were able to condense these structures, and that the degree of condensation correlated with viability. Therefore, the levels of Smc3 acetylation at K112 and K113 appear to represent a critical bifurcation step that dictates whether cohesin is utilized for cohesive or condensive purposes (Guachi & Koshland 2012). On this basis Rudra & Skibbens propose that Smc3 acetylation represents the beginning of a ‘cohesin code’ that is analogous to the familiar histone code (Rudra & Skibbens 2013). In addition to Smc3 acetylation, many other cohesin subunits are subject to numerous acetylation, phosphorylation and SUMOylation modifications. Deciphering such a code might provide essential insight into the increasingly diverse roles of cohesin in various cellular processes including ribosome biogenesis, transcription, cohesion, condensation and DNA repair (Rudra & Skibbens 2013).

1.3.2. Vertebrate cohesin

In vertebrates several cohesin proteins have undergone duplication and divergence and appear to regulate cohesion at specific chromosomal regions. These include the two versions of Scc3 known as SA1 and SA2, two versions of Eco1 known as ESCO1 and ESCO2, and two versions of Pds5 known as PDS5A and PDS5B (Table 1.3). In addition, SMC3 acetylation in mammalian cells is accompanied by binding of another protein known as Sororin, which might interact with cohesin through binding to PDS5 via its FGF motifs (Shintomi & Hirano et al. 2009, Nishiyama et al. 2010) (Table 1.3). Binding of Sororin is proposed to displace the binding of WAPL, which might also bind to PDS5 via its 3 N-terminal FGF motifs, to counter its anti-establishment activity (Dreier et al. 2011, Liu et al. 2013).

In vertebrate cells the bulk of cohesin along chromosome arms is removed during execution of the prophase pathway (Gandhi et al. 2006, Kueng et al. 2006). This requires polo-like kinase 1 (PLK1)-dependent phosphorylation of the SA subunit and the anti-establishment activity of WAPL and PDS5 (Shintomi & Hirano 2010).
This activity is enhanced once Sororin is removed upon phosphorylation of CDK1 (Nishiyama et al. 2010, Dreier et al. 2011). Disruption of the prophase pathway prevents chromosome resolution, most likely because the persistence of cohesin inhibits topoisomerase II-dependent processing of replication-generated DNA catenations (Farcas et al. 2011). A small population of cohesin is protected from the prophase pathway at pericentromeric regions until anaphase. This is dependent on Shugosin (SGO1) and the protein phosphatase 2A (PP2A), which removes the phosphorylation on SA to counter the activity of PLK1 (Gutierrez-Caballero et al. 2012) (Table 1.3). This pericentromeric cohesion has an essential role in chromosome biorientation and segregation.

The spindle assembly checkpoint (SAC) in metaphase prevents cell cycle entry into anaphase until all chromosomes have aligned with their kinetochores attached to the mitotic spindle (Nezi & Musacchio 2009, Musacchio & Salmon 2007, Kops 2008, Lara-Gonzalez et al. 2012). Aurora B plays an important role in sensing incorrect microtubule-kinetochore interactions and selectively destabilizing them, which results in SAC activation. This gives the cell an opportunity to correct the attachment (Lampson & Cheeseman 2011). Aurora B achieves this activity by phosphorylating a range of kinetochore substrates, and its localization to kinetochores depends on BUB1-mediated H2A threonine 120 phosphorylation and Haspin-mediated H3 threonine 3 phosphorylation at the inner centromere (Kelly et al. 2010, Wang et al. 2010, Wang et al. 2012, De Antoni et al. 2012). The mitotic checkpoint complex (MCC), consisting of BUB1, BUB3, MAD2 and CDC20, blocks the activation of APC/C until the SAC is satisfied. Once the SAC is satisfied the MCC is no longer generated and activated APC/C ubiquitilates Securin, which is bound to Separase. Ubiquitilated Securin is targeted for proteolytic cleavage, releasing active Separase that cleaves RAD21 present in the remaining pericentromeric population of cohesin (Lara-Gonzalez et al. 2012). This allows full separation of sister chromatids in concert with topoisomerase II activity (Shamu et al. 1992, Oliveira et al. 2010, Toyoda et al. 2006).

SA1 and SA2 differentially mediate telomeric and centromeric cohesion

The two versions of the Scc3 homologue in vertebrates, known as SA1 and SA2, share 75% sequence identity along the central region of the proteins and differ only in short regions of the C- and N-termini (Table 1.3). Despite displaying similar cell cycle loading and dissociation regulation (Losada et al. 2000), and both being expressed in all mouse tissues (Remeseiro et al. 2012), SA1 and SA2 do not function equivalently.
In human cells SA2 is several times more abundant than SA1, whilst in Xenopus eggs SA1 is the major form (Losada et al. 2000, Sumara et al. 2000). SA1, but not SA2, is known to bind to the telomeric Shelterin complex components TRF1 and TIN2 (Canudas et al. 2007). Shelterin negatively regulates telomere length by restricting the access of telomerase (van Steensel & de Lange 1997, Kim et al. 1999, Ancelin et al. 2002). Association of TRF1 and TIN2 with telomeres is negatively regulated by the activity of poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase tankyrase 1 (Smith et al. 1998), which when overexpressed dissociates TRF1 and TIN2 and allows telomere elongation by telomerase (Smith & de Lange 2000, Houghtaling et al. 2004). Tankyrase 1 is involved in the correct separation of sister chromatids after replication, and in tankyrase 1-depleted cells remain tethered at telomeres and suffer prolonged mitosis (Dynek et al. 2004). This prolonged telomeric association can be rescued by depletion of TIN2 or SA1 and is due to protein-protein interactions (Canudas et al. 2007, Hsiao & Smith 2009). This indicates that sister telomere association and separation is regulated by a unique mechanism.

Canudas and Smith addressed whether SA1 might play a role in regulating telomere cohesion. First, TIN2, SA1 or SA2 were singly depleted using siRNA in HeLa cells and mitotic cells were isolated using mitotic shake-off. These cells were subject to fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH) with a probe specific to the subtelomeric region of chromosome 16p (Canudas & Smith 2009). The distances between the two signals from each sister chromatid were then measured. Control cells transfected using GFP and SA2 siRNA showed comparable distributions of distances between the signals. In contrast, TIN2 and SA1-depleted cells showed substantial increases in the distances compared to the control cells. Therefore, depletion of TIN2 and SA1, but not SA2, leads to a substantial increase in the separation of sister chromatids at telomeres, consistent with a telomeric cohesion defect. Next, cells were subject to FISH using a probe specific to the centromere of chromosome 6. Whilst GFP, TIN2 and SA1-depleted cells showed comparable distributions of distances between the signals, the SA2-depleted cells showed substantial increases in the distances compared to the control cells. This suggests that SA2 specifically regulates cohesion at centromeres. Using a probe specific to the arm of chromosome 20 (20p12) revealed similar results to that shown with the telomere probe, in that TIN2 and SA1 depletion led to a cohesion defect, whilst SA2-depletion did not. This suggests that compromised telomere cohesion can influence arm cohesion (Canudas & Smith 2009).

FISH labeling of telomeres in BrdU-positive S-phase cells revealed that the telomere cohesion defect in TIN2 and SA1-depleted cells was evident in this phase of
the cell cycle. In addition, FISH analysis on cells synchronized in late S-phase using a double thymidine block revealed a similar defect. This suggests that there is a defect in either the establishment or maintenance of telomere cohesion after replication in TIN2 and SA1-depleted cells. Further analysis of metaphase chromosome spreads showed that TIN2 and SA1 depletion led to an increased frequency of cells showing an arm/telomere cohesion defect consistent with the FISH data. SA2-depleted cells did not show this defect in arm cohesion and instead showed a clear increase in the frequency of cells showing a centromere cohesion defect (Canudas & Smith 2009).

SA1, but not SA2, plays a role in gene regulation and development

Cohesin has an important function in transcriptional regulation by facilitating chromatin looping in concert with other factors including CTCF (Toyoda et al. 2006, Hou et al. 2010), estrogen receptor (ER) (Shmidt et al. 2010), Mediator (Miyanari et al. 2012) and Polycomb (Strubbe et al. 2011). SA1 null mouse embryos were found to exhibit several features characteristic of the cohesinopathy Cornelia de Lange syndrome (CdLS). These included reduced body size and various developmental abnormalities but no obvious cohesion defect (Kawauchi et al. 2009, Remeseiro et al. 2012). Analysis of SA1 and SA2 genome-wide binding revealed 25,737 SA1 binding sites and 7,741 SA2 binding sites. More importantly, SA1 was highly enriched ~1kb upstream from TSSs and within gene bodies, whilst SA2 enrichment largely occurred at intergenic regions (Remeseiro et al. 2012). In addition, SA1 was predominantly responsible for cohesin enrichment at promoters and at CTCF-bound sites. SA1 was required for regulating the expression of various development-associated genes that could not be compensated for by SA2. Thus, SA1 function in gene expression appears to underlie the molecular aetiology of CdLS (Remeseiro et al. 2012).

A specific role of SA1 in transcriptional regulation is supported by findings that in three isogenic sets of STAG2-corrected and STAG2 knockout tumour-derived cell lines the gene expression profiles between STAG2-proficient and –deficient cells were strikingly similar (Solomon et al. 2011). Specifically, only 16 of 28,869 genes (0.06%) were found to be modulated >1.5-fold in the STAG2-corrected glioblastoma cells compared to the STAG2-deficient control. In addition, the few genes that were misregulated by STAG2 were not misregulated in more than one cell line. Therefore STAG2 does not appear to be an important regulator of global gene expression (Solomon et al. 2011).
ESCO2 specifically regulates pericentromeric cohesion

Mammalian cells encode two forms of Eco1, known as ESCO1 and ESCO2, which both contain a divergent N-terminus, a C2H2 zinc finger and a highly conserved acetyltransferase domain (Hou & Zou 2005) (Table 1.3). Acetylation of human SMC3 on K105 and K106 (Zhang et al. 2008) and Sororin binding requires both ESCO1 and ESCO2 (Nishiyama et al. 2010), suggesting that they might function redundantly. Recently, homozygous Esco2 -/- mouse embryos were found to have terminated development at pre- and post-implantation stages, indicating a non-redundant role for Esco2 (Whelan et al. 2012). Cells from these embryos showed a marked centromeric cohesion and chromosome segregation defect (discussed later) that likely underlies the loss of viability phenotype. Esco2 was expressed transiently during mid to late S-phase and specifically localized to pericentromeric heterochromatin (PCH) as shown by immunofluorescence and ChIP. The localization and distribution of cohesin, Aurora B, Incenp and Sgo1, which are normally enriched in metaphase PCH, was disrupted in the absence of Esco2. Finally, levels of acetylated Smc3 were reduced from S-phase through to prometaphase, and Sororin levels at PCH were significantly reduced in Esco2 depleted cells. Taken together, it appears that Esco2 has a unique role in acetylating Smc3 and establishing and maintaining cohesion specifically at pericentromeric regions (Whelan et al. 2012).

PDS5B specifically regulates cohesion at centromeres

Two versions of Pds5 exist in mammalian cells, PDS5A and PDS5B (Sumara et al. 2000, Losada et al. 2005), which are both ~1400 amino acids in length and share ~72% sequence homology, including two HEAT repeat clusters (Table 1.3) The proteins differ in their C-terminal 300 amino acids. Both PDS5A and PDS5B associate with either SA1 or SA2 (Losada et al. 2005), and knockout Pds5A -/- and Pds5B -/- mice die perinatally with various developmental defects reminiscent of Cornelia de Lange Syndrome (CdLS) (Zhang et al. 2007, Zhang et al. 2009). In a more recent study, efforts to generate Pds5A -/- and Pds5B -/- knockout mice similarly resulted in embryonic lethality at late post-implantation stages. Whilst Pds5A -/- embryos that survived to E16.5 and 18.5 were considerably smaller than wild-type mice the Pds5B -/- showed less severe defects. Primary MEFs from both Pds5A -/- and Pds5B -/- also showed a proliferation defect (Carretero et al. 2013). Pds5A -/- and Pds5B -/- MEFs did not individually show altered levels of chromatin bound Rad21, Stag1 or Stag2. However, depletion of Pds5A and Pds5B using siRNA
in Pds5B -/- and Pds5A -/- MEFs resulted in a moderate but significant increase in the levels of chromatin bound cohesin as measured by IF, consistent with a role of Pds5 proteins in anti-establishment/unloading. The absence of both Pds5 proteins in metaphase cells similarly resulted in increased cohesin binding to chromatin. This indicates that Pds5A and Pds5B contribute to cohesin anti-establishment/unloading in interphase and mitosis (Carretero et al. 2013).

Levels of chromatin bound Wapl and acetylated Smc3, but not Sororin, were moderately reduced in Pds5A -/- MEFs. Pds5B -/- MEFs displayed similarly reduced levels of Wapl, unaffected levels of Sororin, and more severely reduced levels of acetylated Smc3. Double depletion of Pds5 proteins severely compromised the association of Wapl, acetylated Smc3 (consistent with recent yeast reports) (Vaur et al. 2012, Chan et al. 2013) and Sororin to chromatin. Next, the authors examined telomeric cohesion by measuring the frequency of telomere fragility using a telomeric FISH probe. Telomere fragility is visualized as an irregularly shaped or multimeric signal and results from defective telomere replication, which is dependent on telomere cohesion. Individually, Pds5A -/- and Pds5B -/- MEFs did not show increased telomere fragility, but depletion of both proteins slightly increased telomere fragility, suggesting that they are both required for telomere cohesion. In contrast, analysis of metaphase spreads showed a clear centromeric cohesion defect that was only apparent in the Pds5B -/- MEFs. Because of this centromere-specific cohesion defect, the recruitment of Esco2 (which is recruited to pericentromeric heterochromatin (PCH) in mid to late S-phase), and Sororin to PCH was monitored by IF. Reduced Esco2 accumulation at sites of PCH (labelled using PCNA IF) was observed in Pds5B -/- cells, and to a lesser extent in Pds5A -/- cells. In addition, Sororin levels at PCH foci in G2 cells and at the inner centromere were also strikingly reduced in Pds5B -/- cells. Thus, Pds5B appears to function in centromeric cohesion establishment or maintenance by promoting Esco2 and Sororin association at PCH. As a consequence, these cells were found have a chromosome segregation defect (discussed later) (Carretero et al. 2013).

Aurora B recruitment requires Bub1-mediated phosphorylation of H2A threonine 120 and Haspin-mediated phosphorylation of H3 threonine 3 (Kelly et al. 2010, Wang et al. 2010, 2012, De Antoni et al. 2012). Whilst Bub1 association was unaffected in the absence of Pds5B, H3 T3 phosphorylation and Aurora B enrichment was defective, suggesting impaired Haspin recruitment. As a consequence, correction of monastrol-induced syntelic attachments (Kapoor et al. 2010) was impaired in the Pds5B -/- cells. Furthermore, Pds5B -/- cells exited mitosis quicker than wild-type cells upon taxol treatment (microtubule destabilizing drug), suggesting a defect in
spindle assembly checkpoint (SAC) activation. Levels of activated Aurora B, which is phosphorylated at serine 232 (Yasui et al. 2004), were also reduced in the Pds5B-deficient cells. Therefore, Pds5B is required for centromere cohesion as well as the centromeric accumulation and activity of Aurora B (Carretero et al. 2013).

1.3.3. Cohesin in DNA repair

Cohesin in yeast DNA repair

A conserved role of cohesin in DNA repair is supported by studies from yeast to humans. Studies in yeast have indicated that deletion of cohesin genes results in reduced homologous recombination, leading to the hypothesis that cohesin promotes recombination through its ability to hold sister chromatids in proximity (Parisi et al. 1999, Klein et al. 1999, Nasmyth et al. 2001, Doll et al. 2008). The earliest study pointing to a role for a cohesin gene in DNA repair revealed that *S. pombe* cells containing an I67T mutation in Scc1/Mdc1 were rendered highly sensitive to IR (Birkenbihl & Subramani 1992). The first evidence that cohesin between sister chromatids is essential for DSB repair in mitotic cells was provided by Sjögren & Nasmyth in 2001. They showed that the presence of cohesin at the time of DSB induction in S-phase is essential for repair of DSBs in G2, and requires Scc2 as well as Eco1 (Sjögren & Nasmyth 2001). Subsequently, a 100kb domain of cohesin enrichment was found to occur surrounding a single DSB in conjunction with H2A S129 phosphorylation in budding yeast. Cohesin enrichment at this domain was dependent on Mre11 and Scc2 and also functioned in postreplicative DNA repair (Unal et al. 2004).

Indeed, sister chromatid cohesion is established *de novo* following DNA damage at the break site as well as genome-wide, and can occur in a replication-independent manner. Furthermore, phosphorylation of Mdc1 at S83 by phosphorylated Chk1 in response to Mec1 activation was important for the establishment of DSB-induced cohesion (Unal et al. 2008). Interestingly, separase-mediated cleavage of cohesin is required for efficient cohesin-mediated DNA repair, possibly by removing break site-proximal cohesin or by promoting its relocation (Nagao et al. 2004).
Evidence for a conserved role of cohesin in vertebrate DNA repair first came from the finding that deletion of RAD21 in DT40 cells compromised the repair of spontaneous and IR-induced chromatid breaks (Sonoda et al. 2001). Recruitment of cohesin to laser-induced DNA DSBs was observed immediately after damage induction. This was dependent on MRE11 and RAD50 but not ATM and NBS1, and MRE11/RAD50 interacted with cohesin predominantly in S and G2 when cohesin was recruited to DNA damage sites (Kim et al. 2002). In human cells SMC1α is phosphorylated at S957 and S966 following IR in an ATM-dependent manner (Kim et al. 2002, Yazdi et al. 2002). Mutation of these serine residues to a non-phosphorylatable form of SMC1α causes a defect in the S-phase DNA damage checkpoint, reduced cell survival, and an increased prevalence of chromosomal aberrations after IR (Kitagawa et al. 2004). Depletion of SMC1α and SMC3 also causes a defect in the G2 DNA damage checkpoints (Watrin & Peters 2009). Control siRNA-treated metaphase HeLa cells irradiated in early S-phase contained few broken chromosomes and RPA foci, in contrast to SMC1α and SMC3 depleted cells, which nearly all contained frequent breaks and RPA foci. This was due to failures in activating CHK2 and recruiting 53BP1 to the sites of DNA damage (Watrin & Peters 2009).

Enhanced genome-wide binding of Smc1 and Smc3 at pre-existing cohesin binding sites also occurs in human cells after IR (Kim et al. 2010). ATM was shown to phosphorylate SMC3 at S1083, and this modification is important for the DNA damage-induced reinforcement of cohesin. The same study showed that acetylation of SMC3 at K105 and K106 after IR required ATM and ATR as well as ESCO1 ESCO1. Furthermore, SMC3 acetylation was necessary for for the IR-induced intra-S phase DNA damage checkpoint and viability. Despite both requiring ATM, SMC3 acetylation and phosphorylation can occur independently, and both are required for DNA damage-induced cohesin establishment (Kim et al. 2010). HeLa cells depleted of cohesin showed reduced survival after X-rays and slower DSB repair kinetics as measured by persistence of γ-H2AX and 53BP1 foci in G2. Cohesin recruitment to DNA damage sites occurred in G2 but not in G1, supportive of a specific role in homologous recombination (Bauerschmidt et al. 2010).

Cancer and cohesin-mediated DNA repair by HR

Defective or inappropriate homologous HR appears to underlie the generation of oncogenic chromosomal aberrations, loss of heterozygosity and various other
structural chromosome alterations including deletions, inversions and translocations. In addition to aneuploidy, discussed later, such alterations are hallmark features of the vast majority of cancers (Bishop et al. 2003, Reliene et al. 2007). Moreover, mutations in genes encoding proteins involved in HR are frequently mutated in various cancer types, exemplified by breast cancer associated BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations (Hall et al. 1990, Wooster et al. 1994, Moynahan & Yasin 2010).

Rad21 +/− heterozygous mice show reduced frequencies of sister chromatid exchanges (Xu et al. 2010), and in human cells siRNA-mediated depletion of RAD21 increases intra-chromosomal recombination (Potts et al. 2006). In budding yeast a fourfold reduction in the dosage of Smc3 or Scc1/Mcd1 suppressed sister chromatid recombination but led to increased recombination between homologous chromosomes (Covo et al. 2010). Taken together, disruption of cohesin can lead to misregulation of physiological recombination pathways that might promote deleterious genomic instability (Xu et al. 2011).

1.3.4. Distinct roles for vertebrate centromere-specific cohesin variants in DNA repair

SA2 in DNA repair

Although not in response to induced DSBs STAG2 KO colorectal HCC116 cells recurrently harboured a unique structural chromosome karyotype that was not apparent in SA2 expressing control cells (Solomon et al. 2011). This suggests a role for SA2 in regulating structural chromosome stability. More recently, Kong et al. reported the intriguing finding that clustering of SMC1α to the sites of DNA damage is completely abolished in the absence of SA2 (Kong et al. 2014). Also, SA2 recruitment to these sites was abolished upon SMC1α or RAD21 depletion. Furthermore, a significant enrichment of SA2, but not SA1, was observed at both laser- and endonuclease-induced DSBs. Accumulation of NIPBL was abolished in the absence of SA2 but not in the absence of SA1. Together, these observations suggest that SA2-containing cohesin complexes, but not SA1-containing complexes are recruited to DNA DSBs (Kong et al. 2014). However, both SA1- and SA2-containing complexes co-immunoprecipitated with MRE11 in both undamaged and damaged cells, indicating that preferential SA2 association with DSBs is not due to a differential MRE11 interaction (Kong et al. 2014).

Both SA1 and SA2 contain an N-terminal Irf1 domain with >90% homology, within which the STAG domain is located. The central regions of the proteins share
70-90% homology, whilst the C-terminal regions share only 30-50% homology. Both full-length proteins, as well as the N-terminal and middle domains from each, interacted with RAD21. The N-terminal segments of the proteins that lacked the Irr1 domain weakly interacted with RAD21, whilst no interaction was observed with the SA1 and SA2 C-terminal regions. Therefore, the N-terminal Irr1/STAG domain is important for incorporation of both proteins into the cohesin complex (Kong et al. 2014). Interestingly, the nuclear localization signals (NLSs) of SA1 and SA2 are located in different domains of the proteins: the SA1 NLS is found in the N-terminus and contains the Irr1 region, and the SA2 NLS is found in the C-terminus. The critical differences in the SA1 and SA2 C-termini was highlighted by the finding that replacing the C-terminus of SA1 with the C-terminus of SA2 conferred damage site targeting ability to SA1 (Kong et al. 2014).

The SA2-specific role in DNA DSB repair was further confirmed by showing that SA2 depletion, but not SA1 depletion, led to a decrease in the frequency of DNA damage induced SCEs. Also, SA2 depletion enhanced DSB repair by NHEJ as seen in RAD21-depleted cells, likely due to a shift in repair pathway choice (Potts et al. 2006, Kong et al. 2014). Finally, the authors investigated the roles of SA1 and SA2 in the G2 DNA damage checkpoint. In contrast to previous reports, no defect in checkpoint enforcement was observed in SA1 or SA2 depleted cells, as measured by mitotic index after DNA damage with and without caffeine. In contrast, SMC1α phosphorylation, which is required for the intra-S DNA damage checkpoint, was comparable in SA1- and SA2-containing complexes after DNA damage. Consistently, SA1- and SA2-depleted cells both displayed increased radioresistant DNA synthesis (RDS), which is indicative of an intra-S DNA damage checkpoint defect (Kim et al. 2002, Luo et al. 2008, Yazdi et al. 2002). Both SA1- and SA2-depleted cells show reduced survival after IR, indicating an important role of both proteins in the DNA damage response. Also, double depletion of SA1 and SA2 reduced survival to a level comparable with RAD21-depleted cells. In conclusion, this study identifies a separate role of SA2 in DNA repair that is distinct from a role of both SA1 and SA2 in the intra-S DNA damage checkpoint (Kong et al. 2014).

_Pds5B interacts with BRCA2 and is required for genome stability_

Drosophila BRCA2 was found to interact with human PDS5B far more strongly than with human PDS5A (Brough et al. 2012). A strong interaction between human BRCA2 and PDS5B was observed following IR exposure, suggesting a role for this interaction in DNA repair. This interaction was dependent on a fragment of BRCA2.
encompassing amino acids 786-1909, and several BRCA2 missense variants identified from the Breast Cancer Information Core (BIC) impaired the BRCA2-PDS5B interaction and HR (Brough et al. 2012). Depletion of PDS5B using siRNA in 293T cells led to decreased survival in response to aphidicolin, hydroxyurea, mitomycin C, IR and PARP inhibitor. Furthermore, treatment with mitomycin C, which results in DSB formation after replication fork collapse in S-phase led to an increased prevalence of structural chromosome aberrations in PDS5B-depleted cells. Similarly, an increase in chromatid breaks after treatment with aphidicolin was observed in Pds5B−/− MEFs (Carretero et al. 2013). PDS5B silencing also reduced the number of IR-induced Rad51 and BRCA2 foci. In a GFP reporter assay PDS5B depletion led to reduced repair of an I-SceI-induced DSB by HR comparable to BRCA2 depletion, suggesting a direct role for PDS5B in HR. Treatment with mitomycin C, which results in DSB formation after replication fork collapse in S-phase led to an increased prevalence of structural chromosome aberrations in PDS5B-depleted cells. Similarly, an increase in chromatid breaks after treatment with aphidicolin was observed in Pds5B−/− MEFs (Carretero et al. 2013). PDS5B silencing also reduced the number of IR-induced Rad51 and BRCA2 foci. In a GFP reporter assay PDS5B depletion led to reduced repair of an I-SceI-induced DSB by HR comparable to BRCA2 depletion, suggesting a direct role for PDS5B in HR. Enrichment of PDS5B was also observed at the DSB as shown by ChIP. Collectively these data highlight a critical role of PDS5B in DSB repair by HR (Brough et al. 2012).

Further examination of the BRCA2-PDS5B interaction revealed that the two proteins preferentially interacted when the majority of cells were in the first half of S-phase. PDS5B also interacted with the BRCA2-interacting proteins RAD51 and PALB2 and in a temporally similar manner to the BRCA2-PDS5B interaction. These results are consistent with the hypothesis that PDS5B interaction with these proteins is associated with DSB formation generated by replication fork collapse. Treatment with an ATM inhibitor abolished the BRCA2-PDS5B interaction, supporting a function for ATM in the interaction. This is consistent with the identification of PDS5B as a potential ATM/ATR target (Matsuoka et al. 2007, Brough et al. 2012).

Like BRCA2, PDS5B was found to interact with the replication-associated proteins CDC45 (pre-replication complex component) and PCNA predominantly in S-phase. Both PDS5B and BRCA2 interacted with RAD21 and SMC3, and the association of BRCA2 with these replication and cohesin proteins in early S-phase required Pds5B. Depletion of PDS5B also reduced the binding of RAD51 and PALB2 to BRCA2. Collectively this suggests that PDS5B functions as a node for the interaction between replication and cohesin factors (Brough et al. 2012). Finally, PDS5B expression in a cohort of breast tumours revealed that 75/160 (46.9%) had reduced PDS5B expression, and six of these showed apparently no detectable expression. Furthermore, the frequency of low PDS5B expression correlated with histological grade as well as ER-negative and basal-like phenotypes. A statistically significant longer disease-free survival (DFS) was observed in low PDS5B expression ER-negative tumours treated with the DNA damage-inducing chemotherapeutic agent anthracycline. Altogether, these findings suggest that low PDS5B expression
correlates with chemotherapeutic outcome, at least in ER-negative breast tumours (Brough et al. 2012).

1.3.5. Disruption of centromeric cohesion as a cause of aneuploidy

Virtually all cancers are aneuploid, and in recent years the potential importance of aneuploidy as a driving mechanism in cancer has been exposed (discussed later). The mechanism whereby reduced centromere cohesion could lead to aneuploidy likely involves disruption of back-to-back sister kinetochore geometric constraint during metaphase alignment. This would in turn increase the frequency of erroneous kinetochore-microtubule attachment from opposing spindle poles, known as merotely (Compton 2011). Importantly, the SAC does not sense merotelic attachments because they do not compromise the total number of kinetochore-microtubule attachments (Cimini et al. 2001). Consequently, anaphase onset is not delayed and sister chromatids entering anaphase with uncorrected merotelic attachments become lagging chromosomes, which promote chromosome missegregation. Indeed, the most common cause of chromosome missegregation in CIN-positive cancer cells is lagging chromosomes (Thompson & Compton 2008). Lagging chromosomes and other chromosome segregation defects in mitosis could also cause cell-to-cell fusions and tetraploidy, which is thought to be a transitional state preceding the development of many near-tetraploid and triploid karyotypes (Ganem et al. 2007, Duelli & Lazebnik 2007).

An increasing number of studies point to a crucial role of centromeric cohesion in preventing aneuploidy in vertebrates. The frequency of aneuploidy in oocytes increases dramatically during maternal aging, suggesting an age-related reduction in oocyte quality (Hassold & Hunt 2001). More recently, oocytes from older, but not young mice displayed compromised centromeric cohesion during meiosis I and aneuploidy, which correlated with reduced chromosome-associated Rec8 (meiotic Rad21) (Chiang et al. 2011). In mitotic cells, Rad21 +/- mice displayed an increased frequency of aneuploidy but were not prone to tumourigenesis, suggesting a requirement for additional mechanisms to promote aneuploid-related tumour progression (discussed later) (Xu et al. 2010).

**SA2 and aneuploidy in human cancer**

Depletion of SMC1α, SMC3 and SA2 using siRNA resulted in the development of tetraploid and octaploid populations in colon carcinoma cells (Barber et al. 2008).
Analysis of metaphase chromosome spreads revealed that knockdown of all three genes resulted in the premature release of sister chromatid cohesion, when primary constriction cohesion at the centromere was assayed (Barber et al. 2008).

Solomon et al. provided further evidence for SA2-mediated centromeric cohesion preventing aneuploidy in human cancer (Solomon et al. 2011). Scoring of primary constriction cohesion revealed that STAG2-deficient glioblastoma cells prematurely release sister chromatids compared to cells in which the STAG2 mutation has been endogenously corrected. In addition, STAG2-deficient cells had an increased frequency of anaphase bridges, chromosomal translocations and displayed altered chromosome counts compared to the STAG2-proficient controls. Specifically, correction of the endogenous STAG2 mutation in a glioblastoma cell line changed the modal chromosome number from 90 to 85. Cre-mediated knockout of STAG2 in a colorectal cell line led to a modal chromosome increase of 1, from 45 to 46. Importantly, there are no details on how long after correction/depletion the karyotypes were analysed (Solomon et al. 2011).

More recently, 9 out of 12 urothelial carcinomas harbouring STAG2 mutations had overt aneuploidy as measured using Affymetrix CytoScan HD Arrays (Solomon et al. 2013). In a single tumour up to 35 clonal chromosomal aberrations were observed, whilst 3 STAG2-mutated samples showed no detectable aberrations. Thus, the majority of STAG2-mutated urothelial cancers do display aneuploidy, further supporting a role of STAG2 in preventing aneuploidy in various cancers. Furthermore, depletion of STAG2 using shRNA in urothelial carcinoma cells clearly altered the modal chromosome number from 89 to 88. Again, the time after STAG2 depletion before measuring the chromosome number is not stated (Solomon et al. 2013). Supportively, Guo et al. reported that tumours with STAG2 genetic alterations had significantly more aneuploidy ($P = 0.01$) from analysis of copy number changes on chromosome arms (Guo et al. 2013).

Contrary to these findings, Balbáz-Martinéz et al. found that loss of SA2 expression occurred predominantly in genomically stable, non-aggressive urothelial bladder cancers (UBCs). Amongst 11 tumours lacking SA2 expression 9 were karyotypically normal and 2 had lost one copy of chromosome 9. In addition, these authors found that shRNA-mediated depletion of SA2 in bladder cancer cells did not lead to aneuploidy (Balbáz-Martinéz et al. 2013). This is consistent with findings that frequent mutations in STAG2, SMC3, SMC1A and RAD21 were not associated with aneuploidy in acute myeloid leukemia (Welch et al. 2012, Walter et al. 2009). Specifically, normal karyotypes were observed in 12 AML cases harbouring cohesin
gene mutations, and 6 cases contained 3 or fewer abnormalities. Only one case displayed complex cytogenetics (Welch et al. 2012). Somewhat contrary to a role of cohesin in preventing aneuploidy in cancer are findings that amongst 43 cases of myeloid neoplasm harbouring cohesin mutations only 10 were aneuploid, and a further ten showed chromosome aberrations without aneuploidy. Amongst the 29 cases with a STAG2 mutation, 16 were karyotypically normal, 7 were aneuploid, and 6 had chromosome aberrations without aneuploidy. Therefore, aneuploidy is not ubiquitous amongst cancers with mutations in STAG2. This is perhaps surprising, and might be due to different levels of tolerance to aneuploidy in different cell types (Balbáz-Martinéz et al. 2013).

Chromosome missegregation and aneuploidy in cells lacking components that regulate the centromere-specific cohesion pathway

Esco2 -/- MEFs show a centromeric cohesion defect and severe chromosome segregation defects (Whelan et al. 2012). These included lagging chromosomes, anaphase bridges and chromosomes located near spindle poles, all of which are consistent with a centromere cohesion defect. Interphase nuclei were frequently multilobed and contained micronuclei, which are typical of cells that have experienced chromosome missegregation in the previous mitosis (Whelan et al. 2012). Carretero et al. reported a centromeric cohesion defect in Pds5B -/- MEFs, as well as increased cytokinesis failure, cell death and statistically significant increases in aneuploidy (Carretero et al. 2013). Specifically, the aneuploidy manifest as an increased range of chromosome counts per cell, indicating relatively equal chromosome gains and losses (Carretero et al. 2013). Overexpression of Separase, which is frequently observed in numerous human tumour types, was found to result in a centromeric cohesion defect in mouse mammary epithelial cells (Zhang et al. 2008). Moreover, Separase overexpression led to an increased frequency of lagging chromosomes and anaphase bridges, and the formation of aneuploid tumours in an in vivo mouse mammary transplant model (Zhang et al. 2008).

The SWI/SNF-related Alpha thalassemia/mental retardation X linked (ATRX) ATPase is highly enriched at PCH and is required for centromeric cohesion and congression (Ritchie et al. 2010). Mutations in ATRX give rise to various mental retardation syndromes characterized by developmental delay, cognitive defects and microcephaly (Ritchie et al. 2010). Depletion of ATRX in human cells caused a delay in the prometaphase to metaphase transition, increased interkinetochore distance,
defective SAC, increased frequencies of anaphase bridges and micronuclei (Ritchie et al. 2010).

Cells in which the potent tumour suppressor Rb is lacking or inactivated are prone to aneuploidy (Hernando et al. 2004, Iovino et al. 2006, Isaac et al. 2006, Mayhew et al. 2007, Srinivasen et al. 2007, Amato et al. 2009), but until recently the exact involvement of the protein in preventing aneuploidy was unclear (Manning et al. 2010). Loss of Rb might cause aneuploidy via a number of distinct mechanisms. First, Rb transcriptionally regulates several genes involved in mitosis and the SAC, including Aurora A, Astrin, CDC20, MAD2, NEK2 and NDC80 (Iovino et al. 2006, Chakraborty et al. 2007). Indeed, overexpression of MAD2 can compromise the SAC and cause aneuploidy (Sotillo et al. 2007). However, MAD2 levels are found to decrease rather than increase in cells depleted of Rb (Amato et al. 2009).

Manning et al. made the important finding that loss of Rb results in substantially elevated rates of chromosome missegregation that is not associated with a defective SAC (Manning et al. 2010). Moreover, Rb-depleted cells showed a statistically significant increase in the distance between sister centromeres, reduced centromeric sister chromatid cohesion, impaired chromosome congression, and an increase in the number of chromosomes displaying a centromeric distortion pattern characteristic of merotely (Cimini et al. 2003, Draviam et al. 2006, Manning et al. 2010). Loss of Rb compromised mitotic progression, leading to increased multipolar spindles and increased anaphase bridges. A minor reduction in chromatin-bound RAD21 and SMC3 was observed in Rb-depleted cells. However, centromere-localized cohesin only represents ~10% of all chromatin bound cohesin (Peters et al. 2008). Thus, loss of all cohesin from the centromere might not be obvious in a chromatin fractionation experiment. Consistent with a specific reduction in chromatin bound cohesin at the centromere were findings that in mitotic Rb-depleted cells the punctate pattern of RAD21 localization was conspicuously reduced (Manning et al. 2010). This study identifies a novel, potent role for Rb in promoting centromeric cohesion and preventing aneuploidy that is independent of transcriptional regulation (Manning et al. 2010).

1.3.6. Aneuploidy as a driver of tumourigenesis

Chromosomal abnormalities, including translocations, deletions, amplifications and aneuploidy, were known to be associated with cancer over a century ago. Aneuploidy is common in cancer and correlates with poor prognosis in many situations (Carter et
Some cancers are karyotypically stable but all cancers at least harbor multiple mutations and/or structural chromosome aberrations. A long-standing debate has focused on whether such genetic alterations and aneuploidy are a cause or a consequence of tumourigenesis (Gordon et al. 2012, Kolodner et al. 2011). Cancer cells accumulate mutations, rearrangements and aneuploidy during their development and progression, but the order and mechanisms by which these occur are largely unclear (Kolodner et al. 2011).

The ‘mutator’ hypothesis envisions that cancer cells must somehow acquire a phenotype that results in elevated rates of mutation and genetic alterations that drives the development of further alterations required for progression (Loeb 2001). This hypothesis has gained substantial support in recent years from findings that frequent mutations in diverse cancers occur in pathways that (might) regulate genome stability, including cohesin and chromatin remodeling complexes. In addition, numerous familial cancer predisposition syndromes are caused by defects in DNA damage repair and response pathways (Kolodner et al. 2011).

The effects of aneuploidy in cancer are less clear. Although aneuploidy is considered a hallmark of most cancers, the gain of single chromosomes can result in reduced cell growth in human and mouse cells (Torres et al. 2010, Williams et al. 2008), and is usually lethal in many organisms from Drosophila to human (Torres et al. 2008). Indeed, aneuploidy confers severe disadvantages to cells due to increased stress burdens from altered protein homeostasis and metabolism (Torres et al. 2007, Torres et al. 2010, Williams et al. 2008). In addition, the progression of some cancers is attenuated by aneuploidy but enhanced in others in mice (Weaver et al. 2007). Studies in yeast suggest that the effects of aneuploidy are likely to be highly complex and dependent on the altered expression of many genes and pathways (Rancati et al. 2008). Cancer cell lines with gross chromosomal instability (CIN) missegregate chromosomes at a substantially higher frequency than nontransformed cells (Thompson et al. 2008, Lengauer et al. 1997). Thus, aneuploidy in this context might simply represent a by-product of pre-existing genome instability.

More recently, a fascinating study by Sheltzer et al. showed that the engineered gain of single chromosomes in yeast resulted in modest but statistically significant increases in the rate of point mutation, spontaneous mitotic recombination and further aneuploidy (chromosome loss), as well as sensitivity to DNA damaging agents and increased spontaneous Rad52 foci (Sheltzer et al. 2011). Furthermore, the increased genomic instability was found to be due to stoichiometric protein imbalances rather than increased DNA content. This study indicates that aneuploidy can drive genomic
instability at least in yeast, and has important implications for aneuploidy in cancer. Aneuploidy occurring as an early event in a nontransformed precursor cell could be sufficient to drive the genomic instability required for the cell's development and progression towards cancer. This has profound implications given the recent findings that a high frequency of mutations occur in genes known to prevent aneuploidy, including \textit{STAG2} as a shining example.

\textbf{1.3.7. Cohesin and cancer}

\textit{Transcriptional misregulation as a functional consequence of cohesin dysfunction in cancer}

Cohesin is important for transcriptional regulation by forming loops within DNA to regulate promoter-enhancer interactions. A number of transcriptional programs associated with tumourigenesis appear to be regulated by cohesin. The Drosophila homologue of \textit{RAD21}, known as \textit{vtd}, is a member of the trithorax group (TrxG) protein family (Hallson \textit{et al.} 2008), which includes dominant suppressors of PcG and HH proteins. However, Drosophila \textit{vtd} is not a known functional homologue of \textit{RAD21}, and mutations in \textit{SMC1} or \textit{PDS5} did not mirror the TrxG phenotype (Xu \textit{et al.} 2011).

Cohesin also closely interacts with the transcriptional repressor CCCTC-binding factor (CTCF), which regulates interactions between \textit{trans}-acting factors with promoters and is a putative tumour suppressor (Wendt & Peters 2009, Nikolaev \textit{et al.} 2009). Potential tumour suppressor activities of cohesin/CTCF include protection of tumour suppressor gene promoters from methylation-dependent silencing, maintenance of genomic imprinting, regulation of \textit{MYC}, \textit{IGF2} (imprinting gene), interleukin-3 (\textit{IL-3}), granulocyte-macrophage colony stimulating factor 2 (\textit{CSF2}) and \textit{IFNG} transcription (Xu \textit{et al.} 2011). Loss of imprinting is common in many tumours and is often one of the first abnormalities to be observed (Filippova \textit{et al.} 2008). Cohesin-CTCF also appears to have a broad function in the global regulation of transcription, which if misregulated could lead to oncogene activation and tumour suppressor inactivation (Kagey \textit{et al.} 2010, Miele & Dekker 2008, Xu \textit{et al.} 2011).

\textit{Cancer-associated mutations in cohesin genes}

Barber \textit{et al.} performed a screen for mutations in human homologues of 102 known yeast chromosomal instability (CIN) genes in a panel of colorectal cancers and
identified four genes that regulate sister chromatid cohesion (Barber et al. 2008). Within the 132 cases analysed 10 mutations were identified, occurring in *SMC1A* (four mutations), *NIPBL* (four mutations), *SMC3* (1 mutation), *STAG3* (meiotic paralogue of yeast *SCC3*, 1 mutation). Collectively, cohesin mutations were identified in ~7.5% of all colorectal tumours analysed (Barber et al. 2008).

More recently, Soloman et al. performed single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) arrays on human glioblastoma cell lines to locate regions of DNA deletion and amplification (Solomon et al. 2011). One cell line (U138MG) contained a deletion at Xq25 that has been observed in other studies, and is a region that harbours the *STAG2* gene. Accordingly, *STAG2* protein expression was absent in U138MG, as well as in 42MGBA and H4 cell lines, which were found to contain nonsense and frameshift mutations, respectively. Further sequencing of 68 glioblastoma cases identified four additional *STAG2* mutations, and ten cell lines from a panel of 168 various cancer types showed complete loss of *STAG2* expression (Solomon et al. 2011). This suggests that *STAG2* represents an important tumour suppressor gene in various cancers types.

A very recent spate of exome sequencing studies revealed further frequent mutations in various cohesin genes in diverse cancer types (Welch et al. 2012, Solomon et al. 2013, Guo et al. 2013, Balbáz-Martinez et al. 2013, Kon et al. 2013, Kim et al. 2013). Four independent studies published together in *Nature Genetics* identified frequent truncating mutations in various cohesin genes, but particularly *STAG2*, in bladder cancer (Solomon et al. 2013, Guo et al. 2013, Balbáz-Martinéz et al. 2013) and myeloid neoplasms (Kon et al. 2013). Solomon et al. reported that 52 out of 295 urothelial carcinomas of the bladder (18%) showed complete loss of *SA2* expression. Loss of *SA2* expression was also occasionally observed in several other cancer types. In an independent cohort of 111 primary urothelial carcinomas 25 mutations were found in 23 cases. Amongst these, 21 mutations resulted in a truncated protein product, 5 of which were nonsense, 6 were splice-site and 10 were frameshift mutations. Three missense mutations were found to retain *SA2* expression as shown by immunohistochemistry. 5 out of 32 urothelial carcinoma cells lines also harboured truncating mutations, and concurrent p53 overexpression or mutation was frequently found in tumours and cell lines with *SA2* mutations (Solomon et al. 2013).

Balbáz-Martinéz et al. sequenced the exomes of 17 urothelial bladder cancer samples with matched normal leukocyte DNA. A total of 2,927 mutations were identified, of which 798 were predicted to be damaging (i.e. to have a functional effect). Importantly, the study identified recurrent, previously unreported mutations in
DNA repair genes, including ATM, ERCC2 and FANCA, and the cohesin subunit genes STAG2, STAG1, SMC1A and SMC1B (Balbáz-Martinéz et al. 2013)

The authors next focused on SA2 because of its high mutation rate in a collection of bladder cancer studies (damaging somatic mutations in 12 out of 77 tumours (15.6%)). Amongst these, 5 were nonsense, 4 were exon junction, 2 were missense and 1 was an insertion and deletion (indel) mutation. Expression of SA2 was reduced or not detected in 6 out of 7 (85%) urothelial bladder cancers with damaging mutations and 3 out of 34 (9%) tumours with wild-type SA2. Tissue microarray analysis of incident tumours found loss of SA2 expression (histoscore ≤50 with detectable stromal expression) in 197 of 671 tumours (29.3%). In these samples loss of SA2 expression correlated significantly with multicentricity, tumour size, low stage and low grade.

The third study to report frequent alterations in cohesin genes performed whole exome sequencing of 99 samples of transitional cell carcinoma (TCC, the predominant form of bladder cancer) (Guo et al. 2013). Amongst 13 newly identified TCC genes STAG2 ranked most significantly mutated. Specifically, 11 cases (11%) had STAG2 mutations, 9 of which were truncating (3 small frameshift indels, 4 nonsense, 2 splice-site). STAG2 genomic deletions were observed in 5 of the 99 cases. Sequencing of a further 50 matched tumour samples revealed 5 somatic mutations in 4 tumours. Also, examination of the STAG2 promoter in 30 TCCs showed hypermethylation in 7 cases (23%). Kaplan-Meier survival analysis showed that individuals with STAG2 mutations had a much worse prognosis compared to wild-type STAG2 individuals. Frequent genetic alterations were also observed in other cohesin genes, including NIPBL (4% of tumours), SMC1A (3%) and SMC3 (2%). Interestingly, frequent mutations were also found in ESPL1 (6%), which encodes separase (Guo et al. 2013).

Whole exome sequencing of 24 acute myeloid leukemia (AML) cancers identified a total of 19 mutations in STAG2, SMC3, SMC1A and RAD21. 11 of these were loss of function mutations (nonsense, splice site or gene deletion) (Welch et al. 2012). A more recent exome sequencing study of myeloid neoplasms found 54 recurrent, usually mutually exclusive mutations and deletions in STAG2, SMC3, SMC1A and RAD21. Again, the majority of the mutations (33; 61.1%) were found in STAG2, whilst 12 (22.2%), 5 (9.3%) and 4 (7.4%) occurred in RAD21, SMC3 and SMC1A, respectively (Kon et al. 2013). The authors showed that leukemic cells harbouring cohesin mutations had reduced levels of chromatin-bound cohesin proteins. In addition, forced expression of RAD21 and SA2 in leukemic cell lines with
reduced RAD21 and SA2 expression suppressed cell growth, suggesting an important role for reduced cohesin in myeloid leukemogenesis (Kon et al. 2013).

A study by Kim et al. sought to determine if the centromere cohesion-specific putative tumour suppressor genes SGO1 and PDS5B were mutated or misexpressed in gastric and colorectal cancer (Kim et al. 2013). The genes encoding both proteins contain mononucleotide repeats in coding sequences that were considered possible mutation sites in microsatellite unstable cases of these cancers. Analysis of 91 gastric and 100 colorectal cancers identified a total of 21 SGO1 frameshift mutations in 21 cases and 18 PDS5B frameshift mutations in 16 cases (Kim et al. 2013). Amongst 112 microsatellite unstable cancers 26.6% and 20.3% contained SGO1 and PDS5B mutations, respectively. In addition, out of all cancers (microsatellite stable and unstable) 19% and 47% had lost expression of PDS5B and SGO1, respectively, as measured by immunohistochemistry. Thus, this study suggests that frameshift mutation and loss of expression of PDS5B and SGO1 is a feature of gastric and colorectal cancer and might function in cancer pathogenesis (Kim et al. 2013).

Deregulated expression of cohesin genes in cancer

The studies described above provide fascinating new evidence that various cohesin genes are mutated at a previously unknown high frequency in diverse cancers. STAG2 mutations appear to be particularly frequent. This might reflect a particularly critical role of SA2 in preventing tumourigenesis, or alternatively might be due to the fact that the STAG2 gene resides on the X chromosome. Therefore, inactivation of STAG2 would only require one mutational hit (Balbáź-Martinéz et al. 2013).

In addition to the high frequency of mutation, numerous cohesin subunits are misregulated in cancer. At present, the mechanisms underlying the cases of misregulation described below are largely unclear (Xu et al. 2011). In particular, RAD21 was consistently overexpressed preferentially in undifferentiated, usually aneuploid cancer types including ovarian, breast, brain, bladder, and lung cancers (Rhodes et al. 2004). More recently, in a large cohort of sporadic breast cancers RAD21 expression was elevated in high-grade tumours from various subtypes and was associated with poor prognosis (Xu et al. 2011, van ‘t Veer et al. 2002). Also, RAD21 is overexpressed in 30-40% of hormone-refractory prostate cancers (Porkka et al. 2004) and in mesothelioma (Roe et al. 2009). SMC3 overexpression has been observed in colon carcinoma tissue and adenomatous polyps and adenocarcinomas with β-catenin overexpression (Ghiselli & Iozzo 2000, Ghiselli et al. 2003).
Cohesin-associated proteins are also overexpressed in many cancers. *PTTG1*, which encodes Securin, is overexpressed in breast, thyroid, brain, oesophagus, and colon and hepatocellular cancers. This overexpression is correlated with tumour stage and survival in many of these cancers (Salehi *et al.* 2008). Other cohesin-associated proteins that are overexpressed include PDS5A in high-grade gliomas (Hagemann *et al.* 2011), Separase in prostate, 70% of breast cancers and osteosarcoma specimens (Zhang *et al.* 2008, Meyer *et al.* 2009), WAPL in cervical dysplasia and carcinoma (Oikawa *et al.* 2004), and ESCO2 in aggressive melanomas (Ryu *et al.* 2007).

Interestingly, depletion of many cohesin proteins in various cancers has an antiproliferative effect, including Securin (Salehi *et al.* 2008), and WAPL in cervical cancer (Oikawa *et al.* 2004), suggesting that cohesin might regulate proliferation. In grade III invasive breast ductal carcinomas genome-wide integrated analysis of array-based genomic hybridization and microarray expression profiling showed that RAD21 expression levels are correlated with DNA copy number (Xu *et al.* 2011). Therefore, copy number variation (CNV) might at least partially contribute to the altered cohesin protein expression levels in cancer (Xu *et al.* 2011). In summary, the mechanisms underlying the cases of misregulation described above are largely unclear (Xu *et al.* 2011). Many cohesin genes are upregulated in diverse cancers, however the importance of these changes in tumour progression remains to be determined.

### 1.3.8. Rsc1 and Rsc2 are required for establishing sister chromatin cohesion

In 2004 two studies published a month apart implicated RSC in sister chromatid cohesion. Baetz *et al.* employed a genomic haploinsufficiency modifier screen to identify genes that affect chromosome transmission (Baetz *et al.* 2004). A haploid *MATα* deletion mutant array (DMA) was mated with wild-type *CTF13* and mutant *ctf13-30 MATα* haploids. *CTF13* encodes a subunit of the essential inner kinetochore protein CBF3, and the *ctf13-30* mutant is both temperature and microtubule destabilizing drug-sensitive (Doheny *et al.* 1993, Spencer *et al.* 1990). The resulting heterozygous deletion diploids that displayed altered temperature and/or drug sensitivity to the *CTF13/ctf13-30* heterozygous diploid were identified. Further screening isolated both *RSC1* and *RSC2* as mediators of chromosome segregation, however only the *rsc2* mutant had a detectable change in the rate of chromosome loss (Baetz *et al.* 2004). Deletion of *RSC2* was synthetically lethal with mutants of the inner kinetochore gene *NCD10*, as well as being conditionally synthetic lethal (CSL) (by increased temperature) with *cse4-1, okp1-5* and *ctf13-30* kinetochore mutants. In contrast, deletion of *RSC1* only resulted in CSL with the *NCD10* mutants (Baetz *et al.*
Next, ChIP was used with tagged Ndc10, Cse4 (inner kinetochore) and Ct3 (central kinetochore) to show that localization of these proteins to the centromere was normal in the rsc2 mutant.

The possibility that the chromosome missegregation defect in rsc2 might be due to a defect in sister chromatid cohesion was also tested. Deletion of RSC2 caused CSL with scc1-73, smc3-4 mutants and reduced the permissive growth temperature with ctf8, ctf18 and scc2-4 mutants. The rsc2 mutant was then shown to have a defect in sister chromatid cohesion using a strain that expresses a Tet repressor-green fluorescent protein (GFP) fusion protein. Tet operator repeats were integrated 35kb from the centromere of chromosome V (Michaelis et al. 1997), and by scoring the number of nocodazole-arrested cells that show two GFP signals readout of cohesion is given (Baetz et al. 2004). 7% of wild-type cells had two GFP signals whilst rsc2 and rsc1 had 22% and 14% respectively. Furthermore, the association of the cohesin subunits Smc3 and Scc1 with chromatin were not affected by deletion of RSC2, indicating that Rsc2 is involved in either the establishment or maintenance of sister chromatid cohesion. Finally, wild-type, rsc2 and scc1-73 cells were arrested in α-factor, released into nocodazole until >90% of cells had undergone DNA replication, before shifting to 37°C and scoring GFP signals over a time-course. Whilst the scc1-73 mutant showed a steady increase in two GFP signals over time, both the wild-type and rsc2 did not show an increase, indicating that establishment and not maintenance of cohesion is defective in rsc2.

Huang et al. also reported an involvement of RSC in sister chromatid cohesion. Initially, the authors reported that a temperature-sensitive bromodomain mutant of Sth1, sth1L1346A, was defective in 2µ plasmid maintenance but not CEN plasmid maintenance (Huang et al. 2004). Previously it had been shown that Rsc2 mutants are also defective in maintaining 2µ plasmids (Wong et al. 2002). The yeast 2µ plasmid is maintained at about 60 copies in a haploid cell and undergoes a process known as partitioning, important for high fidelity segregation the plasmid. Partitioning involves the localization of the proteins Rep1 and Rep2, which are encoded by the plasmid, to the STB (Malik 2006). It has since been shown that 2µ plasmid segregation depends on the recruitment Cse4 to the STB locus (Hajra et al. 2006). In the absence of Cse4 it was shown that Rep2 fails to localize to the STB, Rsc2-dependent remodelling of Cse4-containing nucleosomes does not occur, and consequently cohesin is not recruited (Hajra et al. 2006).

Next, it was shown that rsc2 and sth1L1346A displayed an increased rate of minichromosome loss, whilst only the sth1-3ts mutant showed an increased rate of
minichromosome non-disjunction. The *sth1-3ts* mutant was previously shown to be defective in kinetochore function and *CEN* plasmid segregation (Hsu *et al.* 2003), highlighting separate chromosome transmission functions of *sth1L1346A* and *rsc2* compared to *sth1-3ts* (Huang *et al.* 2004). Consistently, both Sth1 and Rsc8 subunits localized only to the *STB* locus on 2µ plasmids and in a cell-cycle dependent manner similar to that of Mcd1 as shown by ChIP. Like Mcd1, recruitment of Sth1 occurred in late G1, before dissociating in late G2, however association and dissociation occurred 15 minutes preceding Mcd1 (Huang *et al.* 2004). An identical pattern of Sth1 recruitment was also observed at four chromosome arm loci, whilst its association with the centromere was constitutive.

Intriguingly, the temperature sensitivity of an *scc1-73* mutant was rescued by additionally mutating *sth1L1346A* or *rsc2*, whilst the *scc1-73 sth1-3ts* double mutant conferred no growth advantage, again separating the *sth1L1346A* and *rsc2* mutations from *sth1-3ts*. In addition, Sth1 co-immunoprecipitated with Mcd1 and Scc3. Importantly, in the *sth1L1346A* and *rsc2* mutants Mcd1 failed to associate with chromosome arm loci and the *STB* locus but remained associated with centromeres. Furthermore, *rsc2* cells arrested in hydroxyurea also displayed this Mcd1 localization pattern, suggesting that the cohesion defect occurs before replication (Huang *et al.* 2004). Finally, the authors demonstrated that the *rsc2* and *sth1L1346A* mutants separate sister chromatids prematurely. Using the same Tet repressor-GFP reporter assay described previously, *rsc2* cells showed between 3 and 7-fold increases in the number of mother cells with separated sister chromatids (35kb from centromere) compared to wild-type cells. The *sth1L1346A* mutant showed premature release of sister chromatid cohesion at two arm loci (35 and 284kb from the centromere) but not at the centromere itself. Curiously, cohesion at the centromere in *rsc2* was not tested (Huang *et al.* 2004).
1.4. The BAF180 tumour suppressor

1.4.1. Binding and activity of the BAF180 tumour suppressor

BAF180 is one of three proteins that are unique to the PBAF (SWI/SNF-B) complex, along with BRD7 and ARID2, which distinguish the complex from the BAF (SWI/SNF-A) complex (Wilson & Roberts 2011) (Table 1.1). At present very little is known about the specific functions BAF180. Considerably more research has been done on subunits common to both BAF and PBAF. As described previously, these include SNF5, which is implicated in the transcriptional regulation of Rb and E2F target gene pathways, and BRG1, which has a role in DNA repair.

BAF180 is mutated at a strikingly high frequency in certain cancer types, but is also mutated at a lower frequency in an increasingly diverse range of other cancers. Thus, BAF180 is considered an important tumour suppressor, but only a few potential tumour suppressor functions have been identified. As described previously, the currently held belief is that BAF180 enforces its tumour suppressor activity by regulating the transcriptional activity of specific tumour suppressor genes, such as p21. However, the actual importance of this activity in tumour suppression has not been demonstrated. Valuable insight into other potential tumour suppressor functions of BAF180 can be gained from studies on the highly conserved yeast homologues of BAF180. These include Rsc1, Rsc2 and Rsc4, which have many well-characterized roles that might directly equate to tumour suppressor activities in mammalian cells. In this section we provide an overview of the binding targets, known functions, and current mutation spectrum of BAF180 in cancer.

Binding targets of the BAF180 bromodomains and BAH domains

BAF180 appears to be an evolutionarily conserved fusion of the RSC subunits Rsc1, Rsc2 and Rsc4, containing six bromodomains, two BAH domains and an HMG domain (involved in DNA binding) (Xue et al. 2000) (Figure 1.2). At present very little is known about the binding targets of the BAF180 bromodomains and BAH domains. Two studies have tested the ability of BAF180’s six individually expressed and purified bromodomains to bind specific acetyl-lysine histone peptides, however each study came to very different conclusions. Chandrasekaran and Thompson generated dissociation constants using fluorescence anisotropy with H3 peptides acetylated at K4, K9, K14, K18 and K23. They found that the first five individual bromodomains
showed a distinct pattern of affinity for each different acetylated peptide. Specifically, BD1 preferentially bound to K4Ac, BD2 and BD3 bound to K9Ac, BD4 bound to K23Ac, and BD5 bound to K14Ac. Interestingly, BD6 showed no obvious preference for any of the acetylated H3 peptides tested (Chandrasekaran & Thompson 2007).

The second study by Charlop-Powers and co-workers used a dot-blot assay to assess binding of the six BAF180 bromodomains to monoacetylated peptides from all four core histones (Charlop-Powers et al. 2011). Again, each bromodomain showed a distinct pattern of binding preference to specific acetylated peptides, however none of the top ‘hits’ matched those found in the study by Chandrasekaran and Thompson. The acetylated peptides that scored as ‘high’ binding affinity were H3K36Ac for BD1, H3K14Ac and H2BK116Ac for BD2, H3K115Ac, H4K12Ac, H2BK15Ac and H2BK120Ac for BD3, H3K14Ac and H3K11Ac for BD4, H3K36Ac for BD5 and H2BK24Ac and H2BK116Ac for BD6. Notably, the entire top ‘hits’ from the previous study scored as ‘negative’ in terms of binding affinity (Charlop-Powers et al. 2011).

Thus, the true binding targets of the BAF180 bromodomains are yet to be conclusively identified (Brownlee et al. 2012). Recent work in our lab showed that the BAH domain of Rsc2 and the homologous proximal BAF180 BAH domain (BAH2) bind to unmodified H3 (Chambers et al. 2013). Therefore it seems reasonable to assume that the BAF180 bromodomains recognise acetylated lysine residues on the same or neighbouring histones. It is also entirely possible that the bromodomains bind to other non-histone acetyl-lysine residues.

Figure 1.2. BAF180 is homologous to a fusion of the RSC subunits Rsc1, Rsc2 and Rsc4, containing 6 homologous bromodomains (BDs) and 2 bromo-adjacent homology (BAH) domains.
**BAF180 is required for the replication of damaged DNA**

A recent study by Niimi et al. identified a role for BAF180 and the yeast homologue Rsc2 in repriming stalled replication forks at site of DNA damage (Niimi et al. 2012). Replicative polymerases encountering a damaged base, such as cyclic pyrimidine dimers (CPDs) induced by UV, are unable to progress past the lesion. In this situation, the replicative polymerase is substituted by translesion synthesis (TLS) polymerases, which can bypass the lesion (Yang & Woodgate 2007, Lehmann et al. 2007). Proliferating cell nuclear antigen (PCNA) regulates the switch from replicative to TLS polymerase. PCNA is ubiquitinated by the E2 ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme Rad6 and the E3 ubiquitin ligase Rad18 in the presence of single-stranded DNA at the blocked replication fork (Hoege et al. 2002, Kannouche et al. 2004, Davies et al. 2008). TLS polymerases have a high affinity for ubiquitinated PCNA, and therefore PCNA ubiquitination provides a mechanism for the polymerase switching (Bienko et al. 2005, Plosky et al. 2006, Kannouche et al. 2004).

Deletion of RSC2, but not RSC1, resulted in reduced PCNA ubiquitination after treatment with UV, MMS and HU. Similarly, depletion of BAF180 using siRNA resulted in a similar reduction of ubiquitinated PCNA after UV. Moreover, BAF180-depleted cells showed reduced levels of chromatin-bound unmodified PCNA and Rad18. Because PCNA ubiquitination is required for post-replicative DNA repair the authors next analysed fork progression after UV. Consistently, a modest reduction in fork progression was observed in the BAF180-depleted cells, however these cells did not show reduced survival after UV. In addition, untreated BAF180-depleted cells did not display any obvious alteration in cell cycle progression (Niimi et al. 2012). Rsc2 was recruited to replication forks during S-phase as shown by ChIP, and by extrapolation this was considered to be the case with BAF180.

A proposed model based on these observations follows that BAF180 promotes the repriming of replication downstream from blocked replication forks preceding TLS. Each repriming event at subsequent stalled forks involves recruitment of a new PCNA molecule, which requires BAF180. In the absence of BAF180 there is less PCNA loading and replication through damaged DNA is delayed (Niimi et al. 2012).

**A role for BAF180 and PBAF at centromeres**

Both the human BAF and PBAF complexes displayed ATP-dependent nucleosome disruption activity in a remodelling assay (Xue et al. 2000). In the same study the intracellular localization of human PBAF was analysed by immunofluorescence using a
BAF180 antibody. Interphase nuclei showed uniform BAF180 staining, whilst in prometaphase BAF180 co-stained with cytoplasmic dynein (kinetochore marker) at some kinetochores. This localization was only observed in prometaphase and not in metaphase, anaphase or telophase. Interestingly, BAF180 also localized to spindle poles, which persisted into metaphase. The localization of BAF180 to the kinetochores of mitotic chromosomes implies that BAF180 plays a role there during mitosis (Xue et al. 2000).

More recently, Bourgo et al. showed that Cre-mediated depletion of Brg1 in primary mouse adult fibroblasts (MAFs) led to a dramatic disruption of DAPI-dense heterochromatic domain structure (Bourgo et al. 2009). Importantly, depletion of Snf5 did not cause the same defect, indicating a phenomenon that is specific to the Brg1 ATPase subunit. Brg1-depleted cells also showed a disrupted nuclear pattern of H3K9me3 and H4K20me3, which are characteristic modifications in pericentromeric heterochromatin (Bourgo et al. 2009). Interestingly, these modifications are not required for the formation of these heterochromatin domains (Peters et al. 2001, Gonzalo et al. 2005). Therefore, the finding that Brg1 is required for correct heterochromatin structure and distribution of these modifications reveals that Brg1 underlies a hierarchical maintenance of heterochromatin function.

Brg1 depletion also resulted in a striking increase in micronuclei formation, dramatically reduced proliferation, and an increased number of cells with 4N and >4N DNA content, indicative of polyploidy (Bourgo et al. 2009). There was also a strong selection against Brg1 loss. Furthermore, >70% of Brg1-depleted mitotic cells displayed some form of abnormal mitotic division, and the few cells that entered anaphase frequently showed anaphase bridges, lagging chromosomes or mitotic catastrophe. In summary, this study identifies Brg1 as being important for the maintenance of pericentromeric heterochromatin and genome stability. However, the underlying mechanism was not identified, and it remains to be determined if other subunits of PBAF are similarly required for this unique function.

**BAF180 mutation spectrum in human cancer**

PBRM1 was first identified as harbouring multiple truncating mutations in breast cancer in a screen for novel breast cancer tumour suppressor genes (Xia et al. 2008). 3 out of 26 breast cancer cell lines harboured truncating mutations that abolished protein expression, and showed strong evidence of loss of heterozygosity (LOH). In addition, mutational screening of 52 primary breast tumours identified one other truncating
mutation, and 25 of these samples (48.1%) showed BAF180 LOH without a mutation (Xia et al. 2008).

An important study by Varela et al. initially sequenced the protein coding exomes of 7 clear cell renal cell carcinomas (ccRCCs) and found truncating PBRM1 mutations in 4 cases (Varela et al. 2011). Sequencing of an additional 257 RCCs identified truncating mutations in a striking 34% of cases, as well as two in-frame deletions and nine missense mutations. These mutations are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5. In cases where SNP array data was available PBRM1 mutations all occurred in the context of 3p21 loss of heterozygosity (LOH) (38/38 cases). Further sequencing of 727 cancer cell lines from various histologies identified 5 homozygous PBRM1 truncating mutations. These included 3 frame-shifting deletions in a RCC, a small-cell lung cancer, and a gall bladder cell line, and 2 nonsense mutations in a squamous-cell lung cancer and a pancreatic adenocarcinoma cell line. In addition, 6 nonsense, 3 frameshift, 1 in frame deletion and 22 missense heterozygous PBRM1 mutations were found in various other cell lines. Potentially more interesting is the identification of 6 homozygous missense mutations. These included an E1287Q mutation (BAH2) in a breast cancer cell line, Y893C mutation (BD6) in a lung cancer cell line, G340A in (occurs in region between BD2 and BD3) in a skin cancer cell line, I233T (BD2) in a kidney cancer cell line, R66G (BD1) in a colon cancer cell line, and T56A (BD1) in a central nervous system cancer cell line. Intriguingly, the Y893C mutation also occurred as a heterozygous mutation in two other cancer samples suggests that heterozygous PBRM1 mutations are also important in tumourigenesis.

A significant enrichment of insertion events in mouse Pbrm1 was observed from several transposon insertional mutagenesis screens, providing further support that PBRM1 can act as a tumour suppressor gene. Insertions were found in pancreatic dysplasia, intraductal, and high-grade invasive tumours, suggesting that inactivation of Pbrm1 in this model is an early event (Varela et al. 2011). BAF180 depletion using siRNA in 4/5 RCC cell lines resulted in significantly increased proliferation, colony formation and cell migration, indicating an increase in transformed phenotype. Inspection of gene expression microarrays showed that BAF180 knockdown resulted in statistically significant changes ($P < 0.05$) in the expression of 62 genes in all three RCC cell lines analysed. Amongst these, only three genes associated with genome
stability and replication were significantly misregulated. These included ATM, which was upregulated following BAF180 loss ($P = 0.011$), GINS4 (GINS complex subunit 4, which is required for DNA replication initiation in budding yeast), was upregulated ($P = 0.024$), and SKA1 (spindle and kinetochore associated complex subunit 1, $P = 0.038$), which was also upregulated (Varela et al. 2011). Therefore, BAF180 depletion does not appear to result substantial downregulation of genes involved in genome stability. This is consistent with the findings that amongst the 371 genes found to be significantly misregulated following BRG1 depletion, only 2 of these were involved in DNA repair (NER and BER) (Park et al. 2006).

More recently, in a cohort of 68 diffuse large B-cell lymphomas 2 PBRM1 mutations were identified (Lohr et al. 2012, Pasqualucci et al. 2011, Morin et al. 2011). A small number of PBRM1 mutations have also been also found in head and neck cancers (Stransky et al. 2011, Agrawal et al. 2011), multiple myelomas (Chapman et al. 2011), chronic lymphocytic leukemia (Quesada et al. 2011, Wang et al. 2011), and pancreatic cancer (Jones et al. 2008). Even more recently, 5 truncating PBRM1 mutations were identified in 5 out of 32 intrahepatic cholangiocarcinomas (17%), which consisted of 1 nonsense and 4 frameshift mutations (Jiao et al. 2013).

In summary, PBRM1 mutations occur a frequency that is likely to represent an important tumour suppressor activity in diverse cancers. Certain cancer types harbour PBRM1 mutations at a strikingly high frequency. Whilst the vast majority of mutations result in a truncated protein, many missense and a few in-frame deletion mutations have been identified. Intriguingly, most of these occur in the bromodomains or BAH domains of BAF180, and therefore might provide crucial insight into the mechanistic activity of these domains in BAF180 function.
1.5. Synthetic lethality and HDAC inhibitors in cancer therapy

1.5.1. Identifying and utilizing synthetic lethal interactions for anticancer therapy

Standard chemotherapies frequently result in side effects, including hair loss, nausea and immunosuppression. This is due to their relatively nonspecific inhibition of rapidly dividing normal cells in addition to cancer cells (Druker 2002, Hellman & Vokes 1996). Recent cancer research has led to the identification and targeting of traits characteristic of cancer cells, such as DNA repair deficiency and aberrant cell signaling. Much effort has subsequently been made to develop therapies that specifically target these pathways with fewer side effects, leading to some very promising treatments. Some of these treatments have received regulatory approval, and have led to increased survival in patients with previously intractable cancers (Chan & Giaccia 2011).

Exploitation of synthetic lethality in cancer cells

Exploiting synthetic lethal interactions in cancer cells is a particular promising strategy for developing tailored cancer therapies. The concept of synthetic lethality, originally described in yeast models, follows that mutating two cooperating genes in an essential process causes cell death, whilst the single mutations retain viability (Guarente 1993, Hartman et al. 2001, Chan & Giaccia 2011). Therefore, administering an inhibitor of a gene product in cancer cells that contain a mutation in an interacting gene would induce synthetic lethality specifically in those cells.

This forms the basis of one aspect of tailored cancer therapy, which requires prior identification and validation of the synthetic lethal interaction before developing a suitable targeting drug (Chan & Giaccia 2011). Predictions on synthetic lethal interactions can be made where sufficient data exists on the function of genes in an essential process, for example in DNA repair. However, unexpected and complex interactions exist that might hold great promise for cancer therapy. Such interactions can be identified using synthetic lethal screens, either using RNA interference libraries or small-molecule compound libraries (Chan & Giaccia 2011). Identifying synthetic lethal interaction with genes that are frequently mutated in cancer would prove most useful for developing tailored therapies.
Examples of clinically relevant synthetic lethal interactions

Inhibitors of (Poly (ADP-ribose) (PARP) are amongst the first class of small molecule inhibitors that have been developed to interact in a synthetic lethal manner with DNA repair factors (Rouleau et al. 2010). As described previously, BRCA1 and BRCA2 promote DNA DSB repair by HR, and mutations in BRCA1 and BRCA2 are associated with various hereditary breast and ovarian cancers (Hall et al. 1992, Casey et al. 1993, Wooster et al. 1994, Parikh & Advani 1996). PARP functions as a single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) break sensor and facilitates the recruitment of ssDNA break repair factors (Petermann et al. 2005). Synthetic lethality has been reported with BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations and PARP inhibition in normal cells and breast cancer xenografts (Bryant et al. 2005, Farmer et al. 2005). Mechanistically, ssDNA lesions that cannot be repaired because of PARP inhibition lead to replication fork collapse and the generation of DNA DSBs. In the absence of BRCA1 or BRCA2 HR is defective, leading to unrepaired DSBs that trigger apoptosis. As a consequence of these studies PARP inhibitors are being evaluated in clinical trials with BRCA-deficient breast and ovarian cancer patients (Tutt et al. 2010, Fong et al. 2009, Hutchinson et al. 2010). This example demonstrates proof of principle regarding synthetic lethality in cancer therapy.

Another example of potential synthetic lethal interactions involving DNA repair factors includes colorectal carcinoma-associated mutations in MSH1 and MSH2, which are involved in DNA mismatch repair, and silencing of Polymerase β and γ, involved in base excision repair (Martin et al. 2010, Martin et al. 2011). Thus, simultaneous inhibition of these mismatch repair and base excision repair proteins leads to DNA damage accumulation that ultimately leads to cell death (Chan & Giaccia 2011).

Several synthetic lethal interactions have also been identified in factors involved in cell signaling. Mutations in VHL occur frequently in a specific subset of cancers, particularly renal carcinomas. Strikingly, >80% of renal carcinoma cases show loss of VHL expression, either through mutation or epigenetic silencing (Gnarra et al. 1994, Herman et al. 1994, Young et al. 2009). In addition, renal cancers are particularly intractable because of a lack of symptoms preceding metastasis (Ritchie & Chisholm 1983). Thus, treatments that target VHL deficiency are likely to be of great importance for improving renal carcinoma therapy. VHL functions by targeting HIF (hypoxia-inducible factor) for degradation, and loss of VHL results in HIF accumulation and activation of hypoxia-inducible genes under normoxic conditions. Three kinases were identified as synthetic lethal VHL interaction partners in an shRNA library screen and included cyclin-dependent kinase 6 (CDK6), hepatocyte growth factor receptor (also known as MET),
and dual specificity mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAP2K1) (Bommi-Reddy et al. 2008). A small molecule screen found that STF-62247, involved in Golgi trafficking, induced synthetic lethality with VHL mutation (Turcotte et al. 2008). A synthetic lethal interaction between PTEN mutations and mTOR inhibition has also been demonstrated (Neshat et al. 2001, Podsypanina et al. 2001, Thomas et al. 2006). Several compounds have also been identified that selectively inhibit cells with activated KRAS (Torrance et al. 2001), in addition to a number of synthetic lethal interaction genes (Sarthy et al. 2007, Puyol et al. 2010). Synthetic lethal interactions with MYC overexpression have also been identified. In summary, these studies show that clinically relevant synthetic lethal interactions involving commonly mutated signaling factors can be discovered using small compound and RNA interference screens.

1.5.2. Histone deacetylase (HDAC) inhibitors in cancer therapy

HDACs represent a promising class of small molecules that display potent anti-tumour activity in vitro. Many of these of these inhibitors are in clinical trials with haematological and solid cancers, although results are mixed depending on the cancer type (Chan & Giaccia 2011). Nevertheless, two inhibitors, Vorinostat (suberoylanilide hydroxamic acid (SAHA)) and Depsipeptide (romidepsin), have been granted approval from the US FDA for the treatment of cutaneous T-cell lymphoma, and more recently Depsipeptide has been approved for treating peripheral T-cell lymphoma (Chan & Giaccia 2011). Despite these advances, there are major issues confounding our understanding of how HDAC inhibitors exert their anti-cancer effects. In particular, most HDAC inhibitors simultaneously inhibit multiple HDACs, which constitute a diverse group of proteins that regulate a myriad of cell processes. Therefore, the impacts of HDAC inhibition on cancer cells are likely to be highly complex and far-reaching. In addition, the in vivo targets of individual HDAC enzymes are largely unidentified. More systematic approaches aiming to identify the genetic and epigenetic interactions involved in HDAC-mediated tumour cytotoxicity are necessary. These might include synthetic lethal screens as described previously. Indeed, unidentified synthetic lethal interactions might actually underlie the efficacy observed for HDAC inhibitors in certain cancers.

Classification of mammalian HDACs

Human cells contain 18 HDACs that are grouped into four classes. Class I, II and IV HDACs represent the classic Zn^{2+}-dependent HDACs, whilst class III HDACs are
metal-independent. Class I HDACs are closely related to budding yeast Rpd3 (Yang & Seto 2008) and include HDAC1, HDAC2 HDAC3 and HDAC8. Class I HDACs are expressed ubiquitously and localize in the nucleus, where they regulate diverse processes including transcription and DNA repair. Class II HDACs are related to budding yeast Hda1 and are subdivided into two groups. Class IIa HDACs include HDAC4-7 and HDAC9, whilst class IIb HDACs includes HDAC6 and HDAC10. The class II HDACs display tissue-specific expression and localize predominantly to the cytoplasm, although class IIa HDACs can shuttle between the cytoplasm and the nucleus (Martin et al. 2007). Class III HDACs are NAD-dependent proteins known as Sirtuins and are closely related to budding yeast Sir2 (Haigis and Sinclair 2010). These include SIRT1-7, which can localize to the nucleus and cytoplasm and are involved in various processes including metabolism, transcription, DNA repair and cell cycle control (Haigis and Sinclair 2010). HDAC11 is the only member of class IV and has poorly understood functions.

**Biological consequences of HDAC inhibition**

HDACs remove acetylation marks on histone N-terminal tails made by histone acetyltransferases (HATs) (Smith and Denu 2009, Bernstein et al. 2007). Histone acetylation induces chromatin relaxation by weakening interactions with DNA, and is broadly associated with active transcription. Histone acetylation promotes the recruitment of transcription factors via interaction with domains such as bromodomains. Human cancers frequently display reduced histone acetylation, which is associated with cancer progression. In particular, loss of H4K16ac (and H4K20me3) is considered a hallmark of cancer (Fraga et al. 2005). Thus, the hyper-acetylation resulting from HDAC inhibition could restore the transcription of inappropriately silenced tumour suppressor genes, representing a potential mechanism for HDAC-mediated cancer cell cytotoxicity. However, a global increase in transcription does not necessarily result from HDAC inhibition, and amongst the small fraction of genes (20%) actually affected by HDAC inhibition around half are activated and half are repressed (Minucci & Pelicci 2006). Nevertheless, HDAC inhibitors are known to upregulate p21 transcription (Richon et al. 2001, Sandor et al. 2000) and reduce cyclin transcription in cancer cells, the latter of which results in Rb dephosphorylation to indirectly affect E2F transcription (Zhao et al. 2005). Therefore, HDAC inhibitor-mediated transcriptional modulation might explain some of the antiproliferative effects of these drugs on cancer cells.
In addition to regulating histone acetylation, HATs and HDACs also affect more than 50 non-histone protein substrates, which extends their involvement beyond far transcriptional regulation (Ocker 2010). These include factors involved in transcription, signal transduction, DNA repair and chaperoning. The effects of acetylating these non-histone proteins range from altering DNA binding affinity, transcriptional activity, protein stability and protein-protein interactions (Ververis et al. 2013).

Relatively recent reports indicate that HDAC inhibitors enhance DNA damage caused by DNA damaging agents. One explanation is that the induction of a more relaxed chromatin structure increases the exposure and sensitivity of DNA to damage (Karagiannis et al. 2007). A study by Miller et al. demonstrated a specific function of HDAC1 and 2 in deacetylating H3K56, which is required for efficient DNA DSB repair principally via NHEJ (Miller et al. 2010). Therefore, HDAC inhibitors that target HDAC1 and 2 could exert anticancer activity by impairing DSB repair. Transcriptional down-regulation of various DNA repair proteins, including Ku80, BRCA1 and RAD51 has also been reported following HDAC inhibition (Adimoolam et al. 2007, Zhang et al. 2007). HDAC inhibitors are also known to induce apoptosis via transcription-dependent and – independent mechanisms (Minucci & Pelicci 2006, Bolden et al. 2006), as well as reducing angiogenesis by reducing HIF and VEGF expression (Kim et al. 2001). In summary, HDAC inhibitors target traits associated with cancer cells via multiple transcription-dependent and –independent mechanisms, which may have relevance to their anticancer activity.

**HDAC3 is required for centromeric cohesion**

A growing body of evidence indicates that HDAC inhibitors might exert a transcription-independent antiproliferative effect by disrupting centromeric cohesion. An intriguing study by Eot-Houllier et al. demonstrated a specific role for HDAC3 in promoting centromeric sister chromatid cohesion by deacetylating H3K4. Depletion of HDAC3 led to an increased mitotic index, chromosome congression defects and a pronounced centromeric cohesion defect, whilst SAC activity was unaffected (Eot-Houllier et al. 2008). Furthermore, HDAC3 depletion led to impaired centromeric Sgo1 localization and Haspin-mediated H3T3 phosphorylation. Mitotic centromeres show a distinct H3K4me2-enriched inner centromere domain adjacent to a CENP-A domain. Surrounding these domains is a large pericentromeric region characterized by H3K9me2-enriched chromatin (Sullivan & Karpen et al. 2004). HDAC3 was required for deacetylating H3K4 prior to mitosis in order to allow H3K4 methylation (Eot-Houllier et al. 2008). The authors propose that centromeric H3K4ac impairs Sgo1 recruitment,
which might be dependent on H3K4me2. This study reveals a novel transcription-independent function for a HDAC in promoting centromeric cohesion.

Another relationship between HDACs and cohesin exists between HDAC8 and SMC3. HDAC8 was found to be the HDAC responsible for deacetylating SMC3 once cohesion dissolution occurs after execution of the prophase pathway (Deardorff et al. 2012). Consequently, in the absence of HDAC8 cohesin renewal was impaired, which ultimately led to decreased cohesin loading. These findings might have potential implications for HDAC3- and HDAC8-specific inhibitors in targeting cancers with mutated cohesin genes.

Classification of HDAC inhibitors

HDAC inhibitors can be broadly classified into groups based on their chemical structure, and include hydroxamic acids, cyclic peptides, bibenzimides and short-chain fatty acids (Ververis et al. 2013). Most hydroxamic acids predominantly inhibit class I and II HDACs, and include Vorinostat (SAHA) and TSA. Cyclic peptides and benzimides such as Depsipeptide and Etinostat selectively inhibit class I HDACs, and fatty acids such as butyrate inhibit class I and II HDACs (Ververis et al. 2013). Inhibitors that target single HDAC enzymes are becoming increasingly available, and these would prove most useful for elucidating the functions of the individual proteins. There is substantial debate regarding whether enzyme- or class-specific inhibitors are more useful than broad-spectrum inhibitors from a clinical perspective. It is likely that inhibiting specific combinations of HDACs in different cancer types or genetic and epigenetic backgrounds leads to favoured outcomes. A major goal for the advancement of HDAC inhibitor-based cancer therapy is to integrate biological and genetic data with chemistry techniques to develop purpose-designed inhibitors.
1.6. Thesis experimental research goals

The work presented in the following sections comprises three broad research goals. First, we perform an investigation into the roles of the two isoforms of the RSC complex in the DNA damage response in budding yeast. Substantial literature has shown that RSC is involved in a range of DNA damage response processes, including DSB-induced chromatin remodelling, NHEJ, and HR. However, the differential involvement of the two isoforms of RSC in these processes has not been comprehensively tested.

A second major goal is to explore whether the BAF180 subunit of PBAF in mammalian cells functions to promote cohesion. There are several important reasons for addressing this question. Firstly, the homologous Rsc2 subunit of RSC is known to be important for cohesion establishment, thus in one respect we aim to determine if BAF180 shares a conserved function. Secondly, recent exome sequencing studies have revealed that the gene encoding BAF180 and various genes that regulate cohesion are frequently mutated in diverse cancers. Recent literature has also shown that defects in centromere cohesion causes aneuploidy in cancer, and that aneuploidy can drive genome instability. Taken together, a conserved role for BAF180 in cohesion might represent a novel and important tumour suppressive function. We then extend this investigation to assess the importance of the role of BAF180 in promoting cohesion with respect to tumourigenesis. We also set out to explore the possibility that this function is distinct from its well-characterized role in transcriptional regulation.

Finally, we test whether there is a conserved synthetic lethal interaction between BAF180 and HDACs, as has been demonstrated between Rsc2 and HDACs in budding yeast. Because BAF180 is frequently mutated in cancer, a conserved synthetic lethal interaction with HDAC loss could be exploited as a potential therapeutic strategy using HDAC inhibitors.
CHAPTER 2: MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. DNA manipulations

Yeast expression plasmids

All plasmids used in this study are shown in Table 2.1. pRSC2-myc was altered by site-directed mutagenesis to generate pRSC2-T67P-myc, pRSC2-M280I-myc, and pRSC2-H458P-myc.

Table 2.1. Plasmids used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasmid</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pRS415</td>
<td>pRS415</td>
<td>Yeast expression vector, AMP&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;, CEN/ARS, LEU&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;, F&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; origin</td>
<td>Stratagene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pRSC1</td>
<td>Rsc1 coding sequence plus 700 bp upstream sequence and 200 bp downstream sequence in Not&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; site of pRS415</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pRSC2</td>
<td>pJD587</td>
<td>Rsc2 coding sequence plus 700 bp upstream sequence and 200 bp downstream sequence in Not&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; site of pRS415</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pRSC2&lt;sup&gt;BD1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>pJD588</td>
<td>BD1 from Rsc1 swapped into Rsc2 in pRSC2</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pRSC2&lt;sup&gt;BD2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>pJD589</td>
<td>BD2 from Rsc1 swapped into Rsc2 in pRSC2</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pRSC2&lt;sup&gt;BAH&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>pJD590</td>
<td>BAH from Rsc1 swapped into Rsc2 in pRSC2</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pRS416</td>
<td>pJD629</td>
<td>RSC2 with 13-myc C-terminal tag under the control of its own promoter with TRP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; marker in pRS416 backbone</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pRSC2-T67P-myc</td>
<td>pJD750</td>
<td>As pJD629 with T67P substitution</td>
<td>Brownlee et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pRSC2-M280I-myc</td>
<td>pJD751</td>
<td>As pJD629 with M280I substitution</td>
<td>Brownlee et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pRSC2-H458P-myc</td>
<td>pJD752</td>
<td>As pJD629 with H458P substitution</td>
<td>Brownlee et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pEGFP-C3</td>
<td>pJD775</td>
<td>Mammalian expression vector, EGFP under the control of the CMV promoter, KAN&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Brownlee et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pEGFP-BAF180&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>pJD776</td>
<td>siRNA resistant BAF180 isoform 8 with EGFP N-terminal tag in pJD775 backbone</td>
<td>Brownlee et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pEGFP-BAF180&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;-T232P</td>
<td>pJD777</td>
<td>As pJD776 with T232P substitution</td>
<td>Brownlee et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pEGFP-BAF180&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;-M538I</td>
<td>pJD778</td>
<td>As pJD776 with M538I substitution</td>
<td>Brownlee et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mammalian expression plasmids

BAF180 complete cDNA (clone MGC:156155, IMAGE:40082629) was purchased from Source BioScience and cloned into the Hind<sub>III</sub>/K<sub>pn</sub> I sites of pEGFP-C3 (Clontech) to generate pEGFP-BAF180 (performed by Queti Riballo). This clone contains a N122S substitution relative to the published sequence. To create the siRNA resistant construct pEGFP-BAF180<sup>R</sup> site-directed mutagenesis was performed using the primer BAF180-RNAI<sup>R</sup> (performed by Anna Chambers) Site-directed mutagenesis was performed on pEGFP-BAF180<sup>R</sup> to generate siRNA resistant plasmids expressing EGFP-tagged BAF180 containing substitutions identified in tumour samples: pEGFP-BAF180<sup>R</sup>-T232P and pEGFP-BAF180<sup>R</sup>-M538I (performed by Anna Chambers).
Primers

Primers used in this study for cloning, site-directed mutagenesis and yeast strain construction are shown in Table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer name</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2T67P-F</td>
<td>CCTGTATCTTTCAATCCATTTAAGCGATTTCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2T67P-R</td>
<td>GAATACGCTTTTTTAATGGATGAAAGATACAGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2M280I-F</td>
<td>GTATATTTAAGTAAAAATGTATGAAAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2M280I-R</td>
<td>CTTTCATAACATTATTTTAATTCTTGTGAAATATAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2H458P-F</td>
<td>CGAACAAACTGTGCCAAGAGTGATGATGATTCAGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2H458P-R</td>
<td>CAATATCCACTCTTGACAGTTTGGTTCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2+1080</td>
<td>ACCTCTGTGCAGAAATTCTAAAGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2-588</td>
<td>CAACCACAGTATCAAAGCCGCGAGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2-03</td>
<td>GAACCATATATTTCACCCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsc2N76A-F</td>
<td>GAATGCGCAAGCTTTGCAACCCACAGGATTCAGGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T232P-F</td>
<td>CCTATAGATCTCAAGGCAATGGCCAGGATAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T232P-R</td>
<td>GTATCTCTTGGGCAAATGGATGATGGATATAGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M538I-F</td>
<td>CATAGAAGGAGCAATCAAAATCTTTGCAAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M538I-R</td>
<td>CATGGAATAAGATTTGGATGCTGCTTTTTTATG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAF180-R</td>
<td>CTTGTCAGATGATATG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGFPC</td>
<td>CATGGTCCTGGAGATTTTCTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAF180-RNAiR</td>
<td>GAGAAATCTTTGAGACAGCAGAAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Antibodies and immunoblotting

Custom made and commercially available antibodies used in this study are as follows: Myc (9E10 clone, CRUK), BAF180 (A301-590A, Universal Biologicals Cambridge), SMC1 (A300-055A, Universal Biologicals Cambridge), SMC3 (ab155587, Abcam), SA1 (ab4457, Abcam), SA2 (ab4463, Abcam), β-actin (ab8226, Abcam), H3 (Abcam), α-tubulin (ab7750, Abcam), CENPF (ab108483, Abcam), GFP (A6455, Life Technologies), H2A (Downs et al. 2000). Samples for Western blot analysis were prepared from yeast by glass-bead disruption and TCA precipitation. For mammalian cell samples, cells were lysed by resuspension in Laemmli buffer and sonicated using a Diagenode Bioruptor sonication waterbath for 10 min using 30s on/30s off pulses. Samples were electrophoresed and immobilized on nitrocellulose membrane. Alice Shia provided breast cancer cell line pellets.
2.3. Yeast experiments

Yeast strains

Yeast strains used in this study are shown in Table 2.3. RSC2 was deleted in the DMY3010, W1479-11C and W1490-16A strains via standard gene-disruption methods using a cassette amplified by PCR.

Table 2.3. Yeast strains used in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain name</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JKM179</td>
<td>Δho Δhml::ADE1 Δhmr::ADE1 ade1-100 leu2-3,112</td>
<td>Lee et al. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YNK179-177</td>
<td>Δrsc1::KanMX in JKM179</td>
<td>Kent et al. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YNK179-191</td>
<td>Δrsc2::KanMX in JKM179</td>
<td>Kent et al. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPF17</td>
<td>Δmata::hisG ade1 lys5 trp1::hisG ura3-52 leu2::Hocs Δho Δhml::ADE1 Δhmr::ADE1 ade3::GAL::HO</td>
<td>Paques et al. 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YNK17-20</td>
<td>Δrsc1::KanMX in YPF17</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YNK17-24</td>
<td>Δrsc2::KanMX in YPF17</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMY2804</td>
<td>RDN1-NTS1::mURA3 in W303a</td>
<td>Huang et al. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDY789</td>
<td>Δrsc1::KanMX in DMY2804</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDY790</td>
<td>Δrsc2::KanMX in DMY2804</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMY3010</td>
<td>RAD5 RDN1::ADE2 in W303a</td>
<td>Huang et al. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDY964</td>
<td>Δrsc2::KanMX in DMY3010</td>
<td>Brownlee et al. 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1479-11C</td>
<td>MAT::HIS3 leu2Δ::EcoRI::URA3-Hocs::leu2ΔBstEII</td>
<td>Smith &amp; Rothstein 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1490-16A</td>
<td>MAT::HIS3 RAD5 leu2Δ::BstEII::URA3-Hocs::leu2ΔEcoRI</td>
<td>Smith &amp; Rothstein 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Rsc1 and Rsc2 complex composition (Anna Chambers)

Rsc1-TAP and Rsc2-TAP were purified by two-step affinity purification. 1 litre of yeast was grown to mid-late log phase, pelleted and popcorn made in liquid nitrogen. Yeast were lysed by grinding and the powder was resuspended in 4 pellet volumes of IgG binding buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH8, 300 mM NaCl, 0.1% NP40, 100 µg/ml PMSF, 1 µM leupeptin, 1 µg/ml pepstatin A, 0.5 µg/ml aprotinin). Lysate was centrifuged at 15,000 rpm for 10 min at 4°C before the supernatant was incubated with 200 ul of IgG Sepharose beads for 2 hours at 4°C. Beads were washed with 3 X with 1 ml IgG binding buffer, followed by 2 X 1 ml TEV cleavage buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH8, 150 mM NaCl, 0.1% NP40, 0.5 mM EDTA, 1 mM DTT100 µg/ml PMSF, 1 µM leupeptin, 1 µg/ml pepstatin A, 0.5 µg/ml aprotinin). Beads were resuspended in 1 ml TEV cleavage buffer, 10 ul TEV protease were added to the samples, which were incubated overnight.
at 4°C. 3 ml CaM binding buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH8, 150 mM NaCl, 10 mM beta-
mercaptoethanol, 1 mM magnesium acetate, 1 mM imidazole, 2 mM CaCl2, 0.1% 
NP40, 100 µg/ml PMSF, 1 µM leupeptin, 1 µg/ml pepstatin A, 0.5 µg/ml aprotinin) and 3 µl 1 M CaCl2 were added, and beads collected by centrifugation. The supernatant was bound to 50 µl calmodulin beads for 1 hour at 4°C, washed with 4 X 1 ml CaM wash buffer (CaM binding buffer with 300 mM rather than 150 mM NaCl), and eluted in 1 ml elution buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH8, 150 mM NaCl, 10 mM beta-mercaptoethanol, 1 mM magnesium acetate, 1 mM imidazole, 2 mM CaCl2, 0.1% NP40, 30 mM EGTA, 100 µg/ml PMSF, 1 µM leupeptin, 1 µg/ml pepstatin A, 0.5 µg/ml aprotinin). 20% ice-
cold acetone was used to precipitate proteins and the pellet was resuspended in 20 µl 
10 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5. A mock purification was performed from lysate created from an 
isogenic untagged strain. Gel slices were analyzed in the University of Sussex 
Proteomics Centre.

qPCR analysis of transcriptional induction (Anna Chambers)

For analysis of RNR induction, cultures of JKM179, rsc1, rsc2 and mec1 mutant strains 
were grown to mid-log in YPAD. Cultures were then incubated for a further 3 hours at 
30°C in the absence or presence of 0.05% MMS. RNA was reverse transcribed using 
Qiagen QuantiTech RT kit. For each sample, qPCR reactions were performed using 
primers within RNR2, RNR3 and results were normalized to the ACT1 locus. The 
transcript level of the normalized wild type undamaged sample is set to 1 and all other 
values are shown relative to this. For analysis of HXT7 transcription, cultures of rsc2 
DMY3010 containing cancer mutation plasmids were grown to mid-log phase in SC 
lacking tryptophan and RNA extracted using an RNeasy kit (Qiagen). 1µg of RNA was 
reverse transcribed into cDNA for analysis by qPCR using primers specific to the HXT7 
locus.

G2/M checkpoint analysis by fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS) (Anna 
Chambers)

Cultures of wild-type, rsc1 and rsc2 JKM179 cells were grown to mid-log in YPAD and 
an asynchronous sample taken at the outset of the assay. Cells were arrested in G2/M 
by incubation with 15mg/ml nocodazole for 1hr 45 minutes. Cultures were incubated for 
a further 45 minutes (with nocodazole still present) in the presence or absence of 0.1% 
MMS. Yeast were washed and resuspended in fresh YPAD and fixed in ethanol at 0, 
30, 60, 90, 120, 150, 180 and 210 minutes after release. Cells were harvested and
incubated in 1mg/ml RNase A for 4 hours at 37°C, followed by incubation for 1 hour at 50°C in 2mg/ml proteinase K solution. Yeast cells were collected by centrifugation and resuspended in FACS buffer (200mM Tris-HCl pH7.5, 200mM NaCl, 78mM MgCl₂). Cells were added to 50µg/ml propidium iodide in 50mM Tris-HCl pH7.5, sonicated and analysed using a FACS Calibur.

**G1 checkpoint analysis by fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS)**

Cultures of wild-type, *rsc1* and *rsc2* DMY2804 cells were grown to mid-log in YPAD and an asynchronous sample taken at the outset of the assay. Cells were arrested in G1 by incubation with 4µg/ml α-factor for 1hr followed by an additional 2µg/ml for another hour. Cultures were incubated for a further 1hr with a final 2µg/ml dose of α-factor in the presence or absence of 0.1% MMS. Samples were taken at 0 and 30 minutes following addition of MMS and fixed in ethanol before washing and resuspending the remaining culture in fresh YPAD. Subsequent samples were taken at 60, 90, 120, 150, 180, 210, 240 and 270 minutes. Cells were harvested and incubated in 1mg/ml RNase A for 4 hours at 37°C, followed by incubation for 1 hour at 50°C in 2mg/ml proteinase K solution. Yeast cells were collected by centrifugation and resuspended in FACS buffer (200mM Tris-HCl pH7.5, 200mM NaCl, 78mM MgCl₂). Cells were added to 50µg/ml propidium iodide in 50mM Tris-HCl pH7.5, sonicated and analysed using a FACS Calibur.

**Genomic NHEJ assays**

Mid-log phase cultures of JKM179 or YPF17 were grown in YPAD or, when plasmids were used, SC lacking leucine, serially diluted and plated onto YPAD or SC lacking leucine containing both 2% glucose and 2% galactose. Colonies were counted after 4 days incubation at 30°C and repair efficiency was calculated as survival on galactose relative to survival on glucose. Experiments were performed at least in triplicate. Repair junctions of colonies surviving on galactose were analysed by sequencing.

**Spot tests**

Mid-log phase cultures of wild-type, *rsc1* and *rsc2* JKM179 containing plasmids were grown in SC lacking leucine, and cultures of *rsc2* DMY3010 containing plasmids were grown in SC lacking tryptophan. Cultures were diluted to OD₆₀₀=0.2 and 5-fold serial dilutions were spotted onto YPAD or YPAD containing the stated dose of drug. Cells
were grown for 2 days at 30°C and spot tests were performed multiple independent times.

*Cell cycle survival assays*

Exponentially growing cultures of wild-type, *rsc1*, *rsc2* and *rad52* JKM179 in YPAD were arrested in nocodazole, treated with MMS, centrifuged and resuspended in fresh YPAD as for G2 checkpoint analysis by FACS. Serial dilutions were plated onto YPAD and colonies were counted 3 days after incubation at 30°C. Experiments were performed in duplicate by Anna Chambers. For G1 survival assay, exponentially growing cultures of wild-type, *rsc1* and *rsc2* DMY2804 in YPAD were arrested in α-factor, treated with MMS, centrifuged and resuspended in fresh YPAD as for G1 checkpoint analysis by FACS. Serial dilutions were plated onto YPAD and colonies were counted 3 days after incubation at 30°C. Experiments were performed in triplicate.

*Indirect end-label analysis (Sam Durley and Tracey Beacham)*

Chromatin digestion using micrococcal nuclease (MNase) was performed exactly as described by Kent et al. 2007. Yeast cultures were grown in 1% peptone, 1% yeast extract plus 2% D(+)-raffinose. Cells were grown at 30 °C to densities of $\sim 2.0 \times 10^7$ nucleated cells/ml (determined by hemocytometry). Cells were sampled just before (“HO 0 min” samples) and at time points after HO induction by the addition of D(+)-galactose to 2%. Spheroplasts were created by digestion in 1 ml of 10 mg/ml *Arthrobacter luteus* yeast lytic enzyme in 1M sorbitol, 5 mM β-mercaptoethanol for 4 min at 22 °C. Samples containing $2.0 \times 10^8$ nucleated cells were digested with between 75 and 300 units/ml MNase at 37 °C for 3 min or processed for purification of deproteinized DNA. Deproteinized DNA samples were digested with 5 units/ml MNase at 22 °C for 10 s to create “DNA” control digests. Purified DNA samples were digested to completion with *BglII* or *BspEI* (for analysis of the LEU2 and MAT loci, respectively) and separated on 1.5% agarose gels. Southern blots of the gels were hybridized to 400-bp indirect end label probes, which abut the relevant restriction sites.

*Yeast survival and rDNA recombination assays*

Wild-type and *rsc2* DMY3010 strains were grown to mid-log in YPAD before diluting to OD$_{600}$=0.2 and serial dilutions plated onto SC plates containing 10µg/ml adenine. *rsc2*
DMY3010 cells containing plasmids were grown in SC lacking tryptophan and plated onto SC plates lacking tryptophan containing 10µg/ml adenine. Plates were incubated at 30°C for 3-4 days before being placed at 4°C to intensify the red colouration. The percentage rate of ADE marker loss was calculated by dividing the number of half red/white sectored colonies with the total number of colonies per plate, excluding red colonies. Counts for each experiment were from six individual colonies per strain. Standard deviations are given ± the mean from three separate experiments. Between 10,000 and 20,000 colonies were counted for each strain in total.

**LEU2 direct-repeat recombination assay**

Wild-type and rsc2 colonies from W1479-11A and W1490-16A strains grown on YPAD were resuspended in water and plated onto SC plates and SC plates lacking leucine. Colonies were counted after incubation at 30°C for 3-4 days. The rate of LEU+ prototroph formation in each experiment was calculated using the method of the median (Lea & Coulston 1949) from eight individual colonies. Standard deviations are given ± the mean from three separate experiments.

**Yeast growth curves (Anna Chambers)**

Cultures of rsc2 DMY3010 containing cancer mutation plasmids were grown to mid-log phase in SC lacking tryptophan and diluted to OD_{600}=0.05 into fresh media. The OD_{600} was measured every hour for 9 hrs.

**2.4. Mammalian cell experiments**

**Cell culture**

Mouse ES cells (mESCs) were cultured at 37°C in a 5% CO₂ incubator in Knockout™ DMEM (Gibco), supplemented with 15% ES-Cult FBS (Stemcell Technologies), 1% penicillin/streptomycin, 1% NEAA, 1% L-glutamine, 0.1 μM β-mercaptoethanol and 1000 U/ml LIF (Millipore). Cells were seeded into gelatin-coated dishes. 1BR-hTERT and U2OS cells were cultured at 37°C in a 5% CO₂ incubator in DMEM (Gibco) supplemented with 15% FBS, 1% penicillin/streptomycin and 1% L-glutamine. MRC5 CV1 cells were cultured at 37°C in a 5% CO₂ incubator in MEM (Gibco), supplemented with 10% FBS, 1% penicillin/streptomycin and 1% L-glutamine.
siRNA knock-downs

1BR-hTERT and MRC5 CV1 cells were plated at 1x10^5 cells per 6cm dish and knock-downs performed according to Niimi et al., 2012. Cells were transfected with 20 nM BAF180, SA2 or non-targeting control siRNA (ON-TARGET plus SMART pool, Dharmacon) using HiPerFect transfection reagent (Qiagen), and then again with the same siRNAs 24h later. Cells were treated or sampled 72h after the first transfection.

Metaphase spreads

To arrest in metaphase, mES, 1BR-hTERT, MRC5 CV1 and U2OS cells were arrested in 0.1 µg/ml colcemid for 3hrs, trypsinized, swollen in 75 mM KCl for 30 min at room temperature and fixed in Carnoy’s fixative (methanol:acetic acid 3:1). Cells were spotted onto a slide floating in a 37°C waterbath and dried overnight at room temperature. DNA staining was performed using ProLong® Gold Antifade Reagent with DAPI. For the mESC cohesion assays, 200 spreads were analyzed for each genotype. Centromeric cohesion was scored as ‘normal’ when fewer than three chromosomes showed gaps between sister chromatid centromeres, or ‘defective’ when more than two chromosomes showed gaps. Arm cohesion was scored as ‘normal’ when fewer than three chromosomes showed fully separated chromosome arms, or ‘defective’ when more than two chromosomes showed fully separated chromosome arms. For chromosome counts, 100 cells were analyzed for each cell type, with and without treatment with 0.04 µg/ml MMC for 40 hr prior to metaphase arrest. The same conditions were used for analysis of structural chromosome aberrations, with 2,033 and 2,133 chromosomes analyzed for +/+ and -/- mESCs, respectively. Stable U2OS cells were incubated with 0.04 µg/ml MMC for 48 hr prior to metaphase arrest, and a total of 2862 and 2741 chromosomes were analysed for shControl and shBAF180 cells, respectively.

Fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH)

1BR-hTERT cells transfected with siControl or siBAF180 siRNA were treated with 0.1 µg/ml colcemid for 3h to arrest in metaphase before firmly tapping dishes against a bench 14 times to dislodge mitotic cells. Cells were washed with PBS and fixed in Carnoy’s fixative. Cells were spotted onto a slide and dried overnight at room temperature. Ross Cloney performed FISH essentially as in Canudas & Smith 2009.
Cells were hybridized overnight with either DNA probes against arm and centromere regions of chromosome 10 (DiGeorge II probe, Cytocell LPU015) or subtelomeric region of chromosome 16 (Chromosome 16ptel05 probe, Cytocell LPT16R) as per the manufacturer's protocol. Nuclei were stained with ProLong® Gold Antifade Reagent with DAPI.

Transcript analysis

RNA was extracted from 1BR-hTERT and U2OS cells using an RNeasy kit (Qiagen). 1µg of RNA was reverse transcribed into cDNA for analysis by qPCR using primers specific to the indicated locus using QuantiTect Primer Mix (Qiagen) (performed by Anna Chambers). In experiments examining p21 induction nutlin-3a (Sigma) was added to 8µM for 6 hours prior to cell sampling.

Chromatin fractionation

U2OS cells were arrested in G1/S by incubation with 0.05 µg/ml aphidicolin for 16h, and released into fresh media following extensive washes with PBS. Cells were collected for chromatin fractionation 0, 3 and 6 hr after release into fresh media. An asynchronous sample was also taken for FACS. Cells were harvested and resusupended in 75 µl low salt lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8, 2 mM EDTA, 2 mM EGTA, 150 mM NaCl, 0.2% Triton, 0.3% NP40, containing protease inhibitors) before incubation on ice for 5 min. Samples were spun at 3000 rpm at 4°C for 4 min and supernatant kept as the soluble fraction. The pellet was washed with ice-cold PBS before resuspension in 50 µl nuclease buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8, 20 mM NaCl, 2 mM MgCl2). 2.5 µl of benzonase (Novagen) was added and samples incubated on ice for 30 min. NaCl and Triton were adjusted to final concentrations of 1M NaCl and 0.2% Triton. Samples were sonicated in Diagenode Bioruptor sonicating waterbath for 15 min using 30s on/30s off pulses. Samples were spun at 13,000rpm at 4°C for 5 min and supernatant was taken as the chromatin fraction. Protein content of the fractions was measured by Bradford assay. Laemmli buffer was added to permit analysis of 50 µg of each fraction by Western blotting (fractionation and blotting performed by Anna Chambers).

Mammalian cell FACS

FACS was performed essentially as described by the Salk Institute for Biological
Sciences (http://www.salk.edu/fccf/protocols/cellcycle.php). Cells were harvested, washed twice in PBS containing 0.1% BSA. 3ml ice-cold ethanol was added dropwise whilst vortexing gently to 1ml of suspension containing 1-2X10^6 cells and fixed overnight at 4°C. Cells were washed twice with PBS and resuspended in 1ml propidium iodide (PI) staining solution (3.8mM sodium citrate, 40µg/ml (PI) in PBS) containing 0.5µg/ml RNase A, and incubated at 37°C for 20 min. Cells were passaged through a fine-gauge needle immediately prior to FACS sampling on a FACS Canto.

**Immunofluorescence (IF)-FISH**

For IF-FISH, 4 X 10^5 U20S cells were plated onto glass coverslips and transfected with 40 nM BAF180 single siRNA (Invitrogen) or non-targeting control siRNA using HiPerFect transfection reagent (Qiagen). After 19 hr, cells were treated with 2.5 mM thymidine for 17 hr before being released. At 9 hr after release, cells were transfected with the siRNA-resistant plasmids using NanoJuice Core transfection reagent (Merck Chemicals). After 5 hr, the cells were washed with PBS and subjected to a second thymidine block using 2.5 mM thymidine for a further 17 hr. At 8 hr after release, the cells were fixed with 3% paraformaldehyde (PFA).

For IF, cells were blocked in blocking solution (3% BSA, 0.1% Triton X-100, 1 mM EDTA pH 8.0 in PBS) for 30 min at room temperature, and subjected to antibody incubation in blocking solution. Immunostained cells were fixed in 3% PFA for 10 min at room temperature. Ross Cloney performed the subsequent DNA FISH according to Chaumeil et al. 2008. Cells were washed twice in 2X SSC for 5 min, permeabilized in 0.1M HCl/0.7% Triton for 10 min on ice, and washed twice in 2X SSC for 5 min. Cells were denatured in 50% formamide/2X SSC pH7.2 for 30 min at 80°C. Cells were washed several times in ice-cold 2X SSC before hybridization with the FISH probe overnight at 42°C in a dark, humid chamber with paper tissues soaked in 50% formamide/2X SSC. Cells were washed 3 times in 50% formamide/2X SSC pH7.2 for 5 min each at 42°C, washed three times in 2X SSC for 5 minutes each at 42°C and mounted with ProLong Gold Antifade Reagent with DAPI.

**Analysis of micronuclei and abnormal mitoses**

For mESCs, spontaneous micronuclei were counted in interphase cells from two independent experiments (total counts=983 for WT, 1043 for BAF180-/-). For 1BR-hTERT cells, three separate knockdown experiments were analyzed (total counts=2629 for siControl, 2716 for siBAF180). 1324 and 1291 cells were counted for
shControl and shBAF180 lines, respectively. In experiments to analyze the effect of mitomycin C on micronuclei formation, 563 WT cells and 676 BAF180-/- cells were counted 40 hr after treatment with 0.04 µg/ml MMC. 1596 and 1781 cells were counted for shControl and shBAF180 lines, respectively, 48 hr after treatment with 0.04 µg/ml MMC. DNA staining was performed using ProLong® Gold Antifade Reagent with DAPI. Analysis of aberrant mitoses in was performed on 183 WT and 207 BAF180-/- anaphase cells from two independent experiments.

**Viability assays**

Viability assays following drug treatments were performed in 96-well format in triplicate at the stated doses. 1x10^4 mouse ES and 5x10^3 1BR-hTERT cells were plated per well. For mitomycin C viability was measured 4 days following treatment, and for HDAC inhibitors viability was measured 2 days following treatment using cell-titre glow reagent (Promega).
CHAPTER 3: RSC1 AND RSC2 DIFFERENTIALLY MEDIATE DNA DAMAGE RESPONSES

3.1. Results

Introduction

Cairns et al. reported that there are two separate isoforms of the RSC complex defined by the presence of either Rsc1 or Rsc2 (Cairns et al. 1999). A degree of functional redundancy is likely to exist between the two complexes because deletion of either RSC1 or RSC2 does not cause lethality, whilst deletion of both genes is lethal (Cairns et al. 1999). However, rsc1 and rsc2 mutant strains have overlapping but not identical cellular phenotypes, indicating that they do not act entirely redundantly (Cairns et al. 1999, Rossio et al. 2010, Baetz et al. 2004, Bungard et al. 2004). These differences might relate to differences in dosage of each protein, with Rsc2 being approximately ten-fold more abundant than Rsc1 (Cairns et al. 1999). Alternatively, Rsc1 and Rsc2 might display differences in transient and dynamic binding to chromatin.

Both Rsc1 and Rsc2 have been implicated in DNA repair. Strains lacking either RSC1 or RSC2 are hypersensitive to a range of DNA damaging agents (Kent et al. 2007, Chai et al. 2005, Shim et al. 2005) and have reported defects in HR (Chai et al. 2005). Strains lacking subunits common to both complexes also displayed impaired NHEJ (Shim et al. 2005), suggesting that at least one of the two RSC isoforms is important for this activity. In addition, the catalytic RSC subunit is enriched at DSB sites following induction as shown by ChIP (Chai et al. 2005, Shim et al. 2005), indicating that at least one of the isoforms is recruited to breaks.

Following DSB induction RSC activity is required for a chromatin remodeling event adjacent to the break (Kent et al. 2007, Shim et al. 2007). Previous work in our lab showed that this remodeling event is dependent on Rsc1, whilst Rsc2 is important for establishing the correct chromatin structure prior to break induction (Kent et al. 2007). In contrast, Shim et al. showed that the DSB-induced remodeling event is dependent on Rsc2, however the dependence of this on Rsc1 was not tested (Shim et al. 2007). Therefore, it is possible that both isoforms function in remodeling after DSB formation. No studies to date have comprehensively compared the contributions of the Rsc1- and Rsc2-containing isoforms of the RSC complex in DNA damage responses. Therefore, we sought to address whether Rsc1 and Rsc2 play distinct roles in mediating DNA damage responses.
Rsc1 and Rsc2 define two separate isoforms of RSC

Previously Cairns et al. reported the existence of two RSC isoforms that contain either Rsc1 or Rsc2, however the subunit composition of these two complexes was not determined (Cairns et al. 1999). To examine whether the subunit composition of the two complexes is otherwise identical, affinity purifications from cell extracts containing C-terminally TAP-tagged Rsc1, Rsc2 or an untagged wild-type control were performed (Figure 3.1A, Anna L. Chambers). The purified complexes were then analysed by mass spectroscopy (Figure 3.1B, Anna L. Chambers). Rsc2 was not identified in the Rsc1-TAP complex, and Rsc1 was not identified in the Rsc2-TAP complex, consistent with previous findings (Cairns et al. 1999). Furthermore, all of the other RSC subunits (except Htl1 and Ldb2, which are amongst the smallest RSC subunits at 9.1 and 19.7kDa, respectively) were identified in both complexes, indicating that the two complexes are otherwise identical in subunit composition (Chambers et al. 2012). However, it has been reported that the heterodimer-forming Rsc3 and Rsc30 subunits preferentially associate with Rsc1 (Campsteijn et al. 2007). This is consistent with our findings that fewer Rsc3 and Rsc30 peptides were recovered from the Rsc2-TAP purification compared to the Rsc1-TAP purification (Figure 3.1B), although Rsc3 and Rsc30 clearly associate with both complexes (Chambers et al. 2012).

Rsc1 and Rsc2 are dispensable for DNA damage checkpoint activation

DNA damage checkpoint activity had not yet been directly tested in any RSC mutants despite reported defects in resection, Mec1 recruitment and phosphorylation of H2A and Rad53 (Kent et al. 2007, Liang et al. 2007, Shim et al. 2007). We first tested the ability of rsc1 and rsc2 null mutant strains to induce the transcription of RNR2 and RNR3 genes, which is Mec1- and Rad53-dependent (Harrison & Haber 2006), in response to DNA damage. The levels of RNR2 and RNR3 mRNA relative to ACT1 control mRNA were quantitated using qPCR after treatment with MMS. Whilst the mec1 mutant strain was severely defective in RNR2 and RNR3 induction as expected, both the rsc1 and rsc2 strains were able to induce transcription of these genes to levels comparable to wild-type cells (Figure 3.2A, Anna L. Chambers). This suggests that Mec1-dependent DNA damage checkpoint activation is intact in these strains (Chambers et al. 2012).

To examine this further, we monitored cell cycle re-entry in wild-type, rsc1 and rsc2 strains arrested in G2/M or G1 after MMS treatment. Cells were arrested in G2/M
Figure 3.1. Rsc1 and Rsc2 define two separate isoforms of the RSC complex. (A) Tandem-affinity purification from a strain containing TAP-tagged Rsc1, TAP-tagged Rsc2, or from an untagged strain were analysed by mass spectrometry. (B) Results from the mass spectroscopy analysis of the purified RSC complexes from (A).
using nocodazole, one set was treated with MMS, and the cultures were released into fresh media (performed by Anna L. Chambers). Cell cycle re-entry was monitored by FACS. In the wild-type strain treated with MMS cell cycle re-entry was delayed by 30-60 minutes compared to untreated cells (Figure 3.2B). The FACS profile of the rsc1 strain closely resembled that of wild-type, indicating normal checkpoint activation in this strain (Figure 3.2B). The rsc2 strain re-entered the cell cycle normally in the absence of DNA damage and also did not show premature cell-cycle re-entry after MMS treatment compared to wild-type, indicating a robust checkpoint response in these cells (Figure 3.2B). In fact, the rsc2 cells were unable to subsequently re-enter the cell cycle following DNA damage in G2/M, indicating a prolonged G2/M arrest.

To determine whether rsc1 and rsc2 mutants are required for activation of the G1 DNA damage checkpoint cells were arrested in α-factor, one set was treated with MMS, and cultures were released into fresh media. In the wild-type strain treated with MMS cell cycle re-entry was delayed by approximately 180 minutes compared to untreated cells (Figure 3.2C). Similar to cells arrested in G2/M, premature cell cycle re-entry from G1 was not observed in either the rsc1 or rsc2 mutants after DNA damage, suggesting that neither strain is defective in G1 DNA damage checkpoint activation (Figure 3.2C). Altogether, these data demonstrate that despite defects in resection and H2A phosphorylation, sufficient Mec1 is recruited to allow robust activation of the G2/M and G1 DNA damage checkpoints in rsc1 and rsc2 mutants in response to MMS.

Both Rsc1 and Rsc2 facilitate NHEJ activity

We next sought to determine whether Rsc1 and Rsc2 make distinct contributions in DNA repair. Because RSC is known to function in the repair of DNA DSBs by non-homologous end-joining (NHEJ) (Shim et al. 2005), we first decided to examine the contributions of Rsc1 and Rsc2 in this pathway. We measured survival following an HO-induced DNA DSB at the MAT locus in a strain where the HML and HMR silent mating cassettes have been deleted. Survival is therefore a measure of NHEJ because the cells cannot repair the DSB by HR. rsc2 cells had substantially decreased NHEJ activity relative to wild-type, whilst rsc1 cells might be only slightly defective (Figure 3.3A). This suggests that Rsc2 has a greater role than Rsc1 in NHEJ at this locus. NHEJ-defective mutants including ku70, lig4, mre11, rad50 and rsc30 exhibit large deletion repair events at DSB repair junctions that are a feature of NHEJ deficiency (Boulton et al. 1996, Moore et al. 1996, Wilson et al. 1997, Shim et al. 2005). Sequence analysis of the repair junctions from wild-type, rsc1 and rsc2 strains showed that both the rsc1 and rsc2 mutant strains had a very different pattern of repair events.
The cultures were arrested in G2/M using nocodazole, one set was treated with MMS, and the cultures were released into fresh media. Under these conditions, the wild-type strain delays cell cycle re-entry by approximately 30–60 min after treatment with damage (Figure 2B). The FACS profile of the rsc1 mutant strain closely resembled that of the wild-type strain, with a cell cycle re-entry delay in the MMS-treated sample (Figure 2B), indicating that the checkpoint activation is normal in this strain. For reasons that are not entirely clear, the rsc2 mutant population was unable to fully arrest following nocodazole treatment. Nevertheless, the majority of cells arrested in G2/M and, in the absence of damage, these reentered the cell cycle after the nocodazole was removed (Figure 2B). Importantly, we found that the rsc2 mutant strain did not show premature reentry into the cell cycle following DNA damage, as one would expect for a checkpoint deficient strain. Instead, the MMS-treated cells showed a very prolonged G2/M arrest, with cells only beginning to reenter the cell cycle at the final time point of the assay (Figure 2B). This prolonged arrest may be due in part to the recently identified role of Rsc2 in promoting mitotic exit under certain conditions [5]. Nonetheless, these data indicate that the rsc2 mutant cells are able to activate the G2/M checkpoint in response to DNA damage.

H2A phosphorylation contributes to G1 checkpoint responses and we and others found H2A phosphorylation is reduced in both rsc1 and rsc2 mutant cells under certain conditions [8,11,13]. We therefore examined the G1 checkpoint by arresting cells with...
compared to wild-type. Specifically, the majority of repair events in the wild-type strain had insertions (65.4%), whilst both rsc1 and rsc2 had fewer insertions (31.5% and 16.1%, respectively). In addition, there was an increased frequency of deletions in the rsc1 and rsc2 cells (61.4% and 68% respectively, compared to 32.7% for wild-type) (Figure 3.3B). Whilst the majority of wild-type deletion events were 1bp (56% of total deletions), the majority of rsc1 and rsc2 deletion events were 3bp (54% and 52% of total deletions, respectively) (Figure 3.3B). Interestingly, there were only very subtle differences in the pattern of repair events between rsc1 and rsc2 cells, suggesting that the two proteins contribute equally to NHEJ.

*Defects due to loss of RSC1 or RSC2 cannot be rescued by additional copies of the other gene*

The Rsc2 isoform of RSC is 10-fold more abundant than Rsc1, and it might be predicted that the relative hypersensitivity of the two mutants to DNA damaging agents is reflected by their relative abundance. Interestingly, whilst rsc2 cells are more severely hypersensitive to MMS than rsc1 cells, both mutants are similarly hypersensitive to phleomycin, CPT and 4NQO (Anna, L. Chambers, unpublished observations). To test whether Rsc1 and Rsc2 might function redundantly in DNA damage responses additional centromeric copies of RSC1 and RSC2 were transformed into the rsc2 and rsc1 mutants, respectively. These additional gene copies do not rescue the hypersensitivity of the strains to phleomycin, suggesting that the two proteins are unable to compensate for each other in the repair of phleomycin-induced DNA damage (Figure 3.4A, Anna L. Chambers). Importantly, plasmids expressing RSC1 and RSC2 do rescue the respective rsc1 and rsc2 hypersensitivities to this drug (Figure 3.4B, Anna L. Chambers).

*Rsc1 and Rsc2 make distinct contributions to DNA repair*

We noted that rsc2 cells exhibit a prolonged G2/M arrest when treated with MMS in G2, whilst rsc1 cells are able to re-enter the cell cycle after a short delay (Figure 3.2B). This raises the possibility that Rsc1 and Rsc2 might have cell cycle-specific roles in DNA damage repair. To test this, we assayed survival of wild-type, rsc1 and rsc2 strains in G1 and G2 phases of the cell cycle after treatment with MMS. When arrested in G2, the rsc2 strain shows substantially reduced survival, whilst the rsc1 strain shows survival levels comparable to wild-type (Figure 3.4C). In contrast, when arrested in G1, both the rsc1 and rsc2 strains show reduced survival compared to wild-type (Figure 3.4D).
Figure 3.3. Both Rsc1 and Rsc2 contribute to wild-type levels of NHEJ and show a similar spectrum of repair junctions. (A) Survival of wild-type wild-type, \textit{rsc1} and \textit{rsc2} following chronic HO endonuclease cleavage at the \textit{MAT} locus. Survival is a measure of NHEJ activity as the \textit{HML} and \textit{HMR} donor cassettes have been deleted and is calculated as the number of colonies surviving in continued HO expression relative to conditions where HO is not expressed. Wild-type (wt) repair rates are set to 100% and mutant strains are shown relative to wt. Data are means ± s.d., \(n > 3\). (B) Sequenced repair events of survivors from a HO-induced DSB break from Wt, \textit{rsc1} and \textit{rsc2} strains. Percent of total repair events shown in parenthesis.
Together, these data suggest that Rsc1 has a greater role in promoting survival after MMS-induced DNA damage in G1 compared to in G2, and that Rsc2 is important for survival in both cell cycle phases.

Because the MAT locus is a highly specialized chromatin environment that functions to facilitate efficient gene conversion (Kent et al. 2007, Haber et al. 1998) we next tested NHEJ activity in a strain in which the HO cleavage site has been moved to the LEU2 open reading frame. We find that the rsc1 strain shows similar survival levels at this locus to the levels seen at MAT (Figure 3.4E). In contrast, rsc2 cells display greater survival levels at LEU2 compared to MAT, suggesting that the dependence on Rsc2 for promoting survival is context specific.

**DSB-dependent nucleosome sliding requires Rsc1 but not Rsc2**

Previous work showed that immediately following a HO-induced DNA DSB at the MAT locus six distal nucleosomes are repositioned away from the break in a manner dependent on Rsc1 (Kent et al. 2007). In contrast, rsc2 cells exhibit a nucleosome-positioning defect at MAT before HO induction. This suggests that Rsc1 and Rsc2 provide distinct functions in DSB repair. To determine whether this isoform specificity also exists at DSBs at other loci we tested the ability of wild-type, rsc1 and rsc2 cells to remodel chromatin in a strain where the HO cleavage site exists in the LEU2 gene. We found that 40 minutes after DSB induction there is a movement of nucleosomes away from the break in wild-type cells (Figure 3.5A; inferred nucleosome positions before and after break induction are shown as white circles in Figure 3.5B; assays performed by S. Durley & T. Beacham). This is similar to the remodelling event seen at the MAT locus in wild-type cells (Kent et al. 2007). Moreover, this remodelling is entirely dependent on Rsc1 as has been previously observed in this assay at the MAT locus (Kent et al. 2007). Thus, despite a requirement for both Rsc1 and Rsc2 for maximal NHEJ activity at MAT and LEU2, these data indicate that only Rsc1 is required for the nucleosome sliding observed at these loci. This supports the notion that Rsc1 and Rsc2 do not function redundantly in DNA DSB responses.

**The BAH domain of Rsc1 is a critical determinant for the ability of Rsc1 to remodel nucleosomes**

We next sought to investigate whether specific domains of Rsc1 and Rsc2 might be particularly important in dictating the specificity of these proteins in DNA damage responses. Plasmids where the two bromodomains (BDs) and bromo-adjacent
Figure 3.4. Rsc1 and Rsc2 have distinct roles in mediating DNA damage hypersensitivity. (A) and (B) Serial dilutions of strains transformed with the indicated plasmids were plated onto YPAD or YPAD plates containing the indicated dose of phleomycin. (C) Wt, rsc1, rsc2 or rad52 strains arrested in G2/M using nocodazole and treated with 0.1% MMS for 1hr were plated onto YPAD. Survival is measured relative to untreated cells in G2/M. (D) Strains arrested in G1 using α-factor and treated with 0.1% MMS for 1hr were plated onto YPAD. Survival is measured relative to untreated cells in G1. (E) Survival of JKM179 (in which the HO cleavage site is in the MAT locus) and YPF17 strains (in which the HO cleavage site is in the LEU2 locus) following chronic HO endonuclease cleavage. Wild-type (Wt) repair rates are set to 100% and mutant strains are shown relative to wt. Data are means ± s.d., n > 3.
Figure 3.5. Loss of Rsc1 function, but not that of Rsc2, abolishes DSB-dependent nucleosome sliding at an HO site within the LEU2 gene. (A) Indirect-end-label-analysis of MNase digested DNA from yeast strains of the YPF17 background using a probe abutting \textit{BglII} site as shown. Deproteinized DNA and chromatin samples were analysed before (HO, 0 min) and 40 min after HO induction by addition of galactose to growth media. Wedges above chromatin samples indicate increasing amounts of MNase. Deproteinized DNA control samples show that that the banding patterns in the chromatin samples are representative of nucleosome positioning as opposed to DNA sequence-specific MNase cleavage. The lack of signal in the deproteinized DNA samples in the \textit{rsc1} gel of figure 3.5 is likely to reflect MNase over-incubation. The HO-induced DSB appears as the strong band in HO 40 min samples at 1830bp. (B) Inferred nucleosome positions superimposed over the wild-type MNase cleavage data from (A) to illustrate DSB-dependent nucleosome sliding associated with the HO cleavage site.
homology (BAH) domain from RSC2 that have been individually replaced with the analogous domains from RSC1 (Figure 3.6A) were transformed into rsc2 and rsc1/rsc2 strains. None of the three domain swap constructs confer DNA damage hypersensitivity to MMS compared to the wild-type RSC2 construct in the rsc2 background (Figure 3.6B, Anna L. Chambers). Similarly, none of the constructs confer DNA damage hypersensitivity to MMS compared to the wild-type RSC2 construct in the rsc1/rsc2 background (Figure 3.6C, Anna L. Chambers).

Furthermore, the same constructs were examined in our NHEJ assay at the MAT locus, and similarly no additional defects were observed in either the rsc2 or rsc1/rsc2 backgrounds compared to the wild-type RSC2 construct (Figure 3.6D and E). Together, these data suggest that the analogous domains of Rsc1 and Rsc2 are interchangeable in DNA damage responses.

Rsc1 and Rsc2 have clearly distinct roles in DSB-dependent nucleosome sliding and establishing a nuclease-resistant chromatin structure at MAT, respectively. We therefore tested the ability of the domain swap constructs to perform these functions. Analysis of MAT before HO induction in wild-type cells revealed a normal nuclease-resistant chromatin structure upstream of the DSB site, consistent with previous results (Kent et al. 2007; Figure 3.7A, grey oval indicates nuclease-resistant region, assays performed by S. Durley & T. Beacham). In contrast, the rsc1/rsc2 strain transformed with a pRSC1 plasmid displays increased nuclease sensitivity at this site but is able to remodel nucleosomes distal to the break upon HO induction (Figure 3.7B). The rsc1/rsc2 strain transformed with the pRSC2BD1, pRSC2BD2 or pRSC2BAH domain swap constructs display normal MAT structure but defective remodelling, suggesting that all three of these Rsc2 domains are either dispensable for Rsc2 function or can be substituted with the analogous domains of Rsc1 (Figure 3.7C and data not shown). Strikingly, however, the pRSC2BAH construct was able to perform some of the Rsc1-dependent remodelling after DSB-induction (Figure 3.7D). This suggests that the BAH domain of Rsc1 provides some of the specificity of Rsc1 in DSB-induced chromatin remodelling.

Cells lacking RSC2 display elevated rates of unequal sister chromatid exchange and direct-repeat recombination

The histone deacetylase Sir2 is required for silencing at all three heterochromatic loci, including at telomeres, HML/R loci, and at the rDNA repeats. At telomeres and HML/R loci Sir2 associates with the BAH-domain containing Sir3 protein, whilst at the rDNA it
Consistent with our previous results [8], the wt strain had normal chromatin structure upstream of the HO cleavage site prior to double-strand break induction (indicated by a grey oval at the side of the MNase panel; Figure 7A), and the nucleosomes on the downstream side of the HO cleavage site are remodeled after DSB induction (indicated by the open circles with arrows; Figure 7A). Also as expected, the \(rsc1/rsc2\) strain had altered chromatin structure upstream of the HOcs prior to induction of the DSB, but remodeling after DSB induction was normal (Figure 7B). Strains carrying either pRSC2BD1 or pRSC2BD2 showed normal chromatin structure at the MAT locus immediately upstream of the HOcs prior to DSB induction but were unable to support substantial remodeling activity after DSB induction (Figure 7C and data not shown), similar to the pattern seen with wt Rsc2. Replacing the BAH domain of Rsc2 with that of Rsc1 also had no

Figure 6. Rsc1 domains can functionally compensate for Rsc2 domains in DNA damage survival assays.

(A) Cartoon of domain swapped constructs used in the assays. Bromodomain 1 (BD1), bromodomain 2 (BD2) or the bromoadjacent homology (BAH) domain of Rsc2 was replaced with the analogous domain from Rsc1. (B) Serial dilutions of mid-log cultures of wt with vector alone or \(rsc2\) mutant strain containing vector alone (pRS415), pRSC2, or domain swap expression plasmids were plated onto media containing the indicated dose of MMS. (C) Serial dilutions of mid-log cultures of wt with vector alone, \(rsc1\) with vector alone, or \(rsc1/rsc2\) mutant strain with pRSC2 or domain swap expression plasmids were plated onto media containing the indicated dose of MMS. (D) Survival of strains as in (B) in the presence of continued transcriptional induction of the HO endonuclease. Survival is calculated as the number of colonies surviving in continued HO expression relative to conditions where HO is not expressed. (E) Survival of strains as in (C) in the presence of continued transcriptional induction of the HO endonuclease. Survival is calculated as the number of colonies surviving in continued HO expression relative to conditions where HO is not expressed.
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Fig. 3.6. Rsc1 domains can functionally compensate for Rsc2 domains in DNA damage survival assays. (A) Schematic of domain swap constructs used in the assays. Bromodomain 1 (BD1), bromodomain 2 (BD2) or the bromoadjacent homology (BAH) domain of Rsc2 was replaced with the analogous domain from Rsc1. (B) Serial dilutions of mid-log cultures of wild-type containing vector alone (pRS415) or rsc2 mutant strain containing pRSC2 or domain swap expression plasmids were plated onto YPAD or YPAD plates containing the indicated dose of MMS. (C) Serial dilutions of mid-log cultures of wild-type containing vector alone (pRS415), rsc1 with vector alone, or rsc1/rsc2 mutant strain with pRSC2 or domain swap expression plasmids were plated onto YPAD or YPAD plates containing the indicated dose of MMS. (D) Survival of strains as in (B) following chronic HO endonuclease cleavage at the MAT locus. Survival is calculated as the number of colonies surviving in continued HO expression relative to conditions where HO is not expressed. Wild-type repair rates are set to 100% and mutant strains are shown relative to wild-type. Data are means ± s.d., n=3 (E) Survival of strains as in (C) following chronic HO endonuclease cleavage at the MAT locus. Survival is calculated as the number of colonies surviving in continued HO expression relative to conditions where HO is not expressed. Wild-type repair rates are set to 100% and mutant strains are shown relative to wild-type. Data are means ± s.d., n=3
Figure 3.7. Replacing the BAH domain of Rsc2 with the Rsc1 BAH domain allows Rsc2 to remodel chromatin at DNA DSB. (A) Indirect-end-label-analysis of MNase digested DNA from wild-type JKM179 yeast using a probe abutting BspEI site as shown. Deproteinized DNA and chromatin samples were analysed before (HO, 0 min) and 40 min after HO induction by addition of galactose to growth media. Wedges above chromatin samples indicate increasing amounts of MNase. Deproteinized DNA control samples show that the banding pattern in the chromatin samples is representative of nucleosome positioning as opposed to DNA sequence-specific MNase cleavage. The lack of signal in the deproteinized DNA HO 0 min sample is likely to reflect MNase over-incubation. The position of the HO-induced DSB is marked on the gene map and across the figure with a dotted line. The nuclease-resistant structure characteristic of the normal MATα locus on the MAT-proximal side of the HO site is marked with a grey oval to the right of the blot. The region of DSB-dependent nucleosome sliding in the region distal to the HO site is marked with circles (representing nucleosomes) and arrows (representing the apparent direction of sliding). (B) Indirect-end-label-analysis of the rsc1/rsc2 strain containing pRSC1 showing normal DSB-dependent nucleosome sliding but loss of the nuclease-resistant structure on the MAT-proximal side of HO (characterized by MNase cleavage sites within this region). (C) Indirect-end-label-analysis of the rsc1/rsc2 strain containing pRSC2BD1 showing that the Rsc2-dependent nucleosome-resistant structure is present as in normal cells normal DSB-dependent nucleosome sliding is defective. (D) Indirect-end-label-analysis of the rsc1/rsc2 strain containing pRSC2BAH showing normal nucleosome-resistant structure and normal DSB-dependent nucleosome sliding despite the absence of Rsc1.
is part of the RENT complex that comprises Sir2, Net1 and Cdc14 (Gartenberg 2000). Other work in our lab recently showed that an rsc2 mutant is defective in rDNA silencing and appears to function in the same pathway as Sir2 (Chambers et al. 2013). The structure of transcriptionally silenced chromatin at the rDNA array is thought to suppress recombination because many rDNA silencing protein mutants, including sir2, have a hyper-recombination phenotype (Gottlieb & Esposito 1989, Huang et al. 2006). A proposed model links rDNA repeats to cohesin via a cohesin-associated clamp complex. Mutation of clamp complex components results in increased rates of marker loss by unequal sister chromatid exchange at the rDNA because of the consequent loss of sister chromatid cohesion (Huang et al. 2006).

Because rsc2 is defective in rDNA silencing and cohesion (Huang et al. 2004, Baetz et al. 2004), we sought to test whether rsc2 also has a hyper-recombination phenotype. RSC2 was deleted in a strain that contains an ADE2 marker in the rDNA array. Cells that have lost the ADE2 marker by unequal sister chromatid exchange are red when grown on media with a low adenine concentration (Figure 3.8A). The rate of unequal sister chromatid exchange can be measured by counting the number of half red/white sectored colonies, which represent marker loss in the first division upon plating, compared to the total number of colonies (Kaerberlein et al. 1999). As predicted, the rsc2 mutant shows a considerably higher rate of unequal sister chromatid exchange compared to wild-type (Figure 3.8B).

We also determined the rate of spontaneous direct-repeat recombination in the absence of Rsc2. The strain used in this assay contains a duplication of a mutated LEU2 locus, and the two configurations of the strain, proximal and distal, differ only in the distance between the mutated sites (Smith & Rothstein 1999). Generation of LEU⁺ prototrophs can result from replacement, deletion and triplication events via various intra- and interchromatid recombination mechanisms. Interestingly, the rsc2 mutant shows a substantially elevated rate of LEU⁺ prototroph formation in both configurations compared to wild-type (Figure 3.8C). Together, these data demonstrate that loss of Rsc2 results in increased rates of spontaneous recombination by unequal sister chromatid exchange and direct-repeat recombination. Altered rates of recombination might reflect the role of Rsc2 in sister chromatid cohesion and is likely to contribute to genome instability.
Figure. 3.8. Cells lacking RSC2 display elevated rates of marker loss by unequal sister chromatid exchange and direct-repeat recombination. (A) Representative images of wild-type and rsc2 colonies grown on SC media with low adenine. Cells that have lost the ADE2 marker through unequal sister chromatid exchange give rise to red colonies, whilst ADE2-positive cells are white. Half red/white sectored colonies represent marker loss during the first cell division upon plating. (B) Percent ADE2 marker loss in wild-type and rsc2 cells. Data are means ± s.d., n = 3 experiments. (D) Rates of spontaneous LEU prototroph formation in wild-type and rsc2 strains in the proximal and distal configurations. Data are means ± s.d., n = 3 experiments.
3.2. Discussion

In this section we showed that Rsc1 and Rsc2 exist in two separate isoforms of the RSC complex that are otherwise identical in subunit composition. We found that the two isoforms of the complex provide both overlapping and distinct functions in DNA repair, which is consistent with what has been found for other RSC-dependent cellular processes (Cairns et al. 1999, Baetz et al. 2004, Bungard et al. 2004). A summary of the phenotypes associated with loss of RSC1 and RSC2 is shown in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cellular process/activity</th>
<th>Assay description</th>
<th>Δrsc1</th>
<th>Δrsc2</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>This work, unpublished observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature sensitivity (37°C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oum et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA damage hypersensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>This work, unpublished observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>This work, unpublished observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phleomycin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>This work, unpublished observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>This work, unpublished observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4NQO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>This work, unpublished observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UV</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Niimi et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checkpoint activity</td>
<td>MMS-induced G1 DNA damage checkpoint activation</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MMS-induced G2/M DNA damage checkpoint activation</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MMS-induced RNR2 and RNR3 expression</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival after DNA damage</td>
<td>MMS-induced DNA damage in G1</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MMS-induced DNA damage in G2</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHEJ activity</td>
<td>NHEJ activity at MAT locus</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NHEJ activity at LEU2 locus</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR activity</td>
<td>Plasmid gap repair assay</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chai et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSB-induced nucleosome remodeling</td>
<td>HO-induced nucleosome sliding at MAT and LEU2</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister chromatid cohesion</td>
<td>Basal nucleosome positioning at MAT</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chambers et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replication of damaged DNA</td>
<td>PCNA ubiquitination (UV, MMS and HU)</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baetz et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Normal" indicates no defect, yellow indicates slight defect, orange indicates moderate defect, and red indicates severe defect

Overlapping and distinct roles for Rsc1 and Rsc2 in DNA damage responses

Directly comparing the phenotypes of rsc1 and rsc2 mutant strains reveals that they are very similar. Both are able to activate the G1 and G2/M DNA damage checkpoints, are hypersensitive to DNA damaging agents and have reduced NHEJ activity, and show a very similar spectrum of repair junctions in survivors of a sustained HO-induced DSB that is distinct from the wild-type repair spectrum. In addition, replacing either bromodomain or the BAH domain of Rsc2 with the analogous domains of Rsc1 does not impair the ability of Rsc2 to promote survival following DNA damage. This suggests that the domains are interchangeable for at least some functions.

However, the data presented here indicate that the two isoforms are not functionally redundant in DNA damage responses. Increasing the dosage of one of the two genes cannot compensate for loss of the other gene in DNA damage hypersensitivity assays with MMS. Moreover, we find that the dependence of NHEJ on the presence of either Rsc1 or Rsc2 appears to be context dependent, arguing for
distinct contributions. We also found that Rsc1 has a unique role in sliding DSB-distal nucleosomes away from HO-induced DSBs at two genomic loci. In contrast, Rsc2 has a specific role in establishing a nuclease-resistant DSB-proximal nucleosome arrangement at the MAT locus prior to DSB induction. Interestingly, Rsc2 has been implicated in organising chromatin adjacent to DSBs using other approaches (Shim et al. 2007). Taken together with the findings that both Rsc1 and Rsc2 contribute to DNA repair by NHEJ, and show a similar pattern of NHEJ repair junctions, these data suggest that Rsc1 and Rsc2 function at a DSB via two distinct remodelling events. These events might occur sequentially in the same linear pathway, and might be reflected by different recruitment timing to the DSB. The differential requirements for Rsc1 and Rsc2 in the repair of DNA lesions induced by different DNA damaging agents suggests that certain lesions are more dependent on one of these remodelling events than others for repair. The same might be true for lesions occurring at different genomic locations with different chromatin environments. Alternatively, Rsc1 and Rsc2 might be differentially enriched following DNA damage at different lesions or genomic locations.

Combinatorial binding of Rsc1 and Rsc2 bromodomains and BAH domains as a mechanism for regulating the DNA repair activity of the two proteins

Surprisingly, we found that replacing the BAH domain of Rsc2 with the BAH domain of Rsc1 allows Rsc2 to both establish chromatin structure at MAT and perform Rsc1-dependent chromatin remodelling. This suggests that the BAH domain dictates the specificity of Rsc1 in this chromatin remodelling events. Recently, other work in our lab established that the BAH domains of Rsc1 and Rsc2 both bind to unmodified H3 (Chambers et al. 2013). Therefore, it is unlikely that the differences in remodelling activity between Rsc1 and Rsc2 are due to different binding targets of their BAH domains. Instead, this specificity is likely to be dictated by combinatorial binding of the BAH domains and the bromodomains from both proteins. The idea that the domains of Rsc1 and Rsc2 bind in a combinatorial manner to mediate their activity seems likely, because in higher eukaryotes there are not two separate isoforms of the homologous complex, termed PBAF. Instead, the Rsc1, Rsc2 and Rsc4 subunits of RSC appear to have fused during evolution to produce the BAF180 subunit of PBAF, which contains 6 bromodomains and 2 BAH domains (Mohrmann & Verrijzer 2005). These numerous domains could contribute to the functional specificity of the protein in a modular fashion, and this might be particularly important because there are numerous
alternative splice transcripts of BAF180 that contain different combinations of domains (Horikawa & Barrett 2002).

Predictions made on the binding partners of the Rsc1 and Rsc2 bromodomains are currently speculative given data showing their extremely weak binding to a selection of acetyl-lysine-containing histone peptides (Zhang et al. 2010). It is therefore possible that these bromodomains in fact bind other non-histone acetylproteins. Alternatively, simultaneous binding of both bromodomains to their targets might be required to strengthen the interaction. Indeed, this is known to occur for the tandem bromodomains of TAF1, which has a much higher affinity for doubly acetylated H4 tails than mono-acetylated peptides (Jacobson et al. 2000). Identifying the true interaction partners of the Rsc1 and Rsc2 bromodomains is of high importance in order to fully understand the similarities and differences between the two proteins. Moreover, given the high conservation of these proteins with the mammalian BAF180 homologue, identifying the Rsc1 and Rsc2 bromodomain binding partners could shed light on how BAF180 functions as a tumour suppressor.

*Rsc2 is important for maintaining repeat stability that likely reflects its role in cohesion*

We showed that deletion of RSC2 results in a ~4-fold increase in the rate of spontaneous unequal sister chromatid exchange at the rDNA repeats. This increase in unequal sister chromatid exchange is most likely to result from compromised cohesion in the rsc2 null cells. This is somewhat in contrast to a study that reported substantially decreased unequal sister chromatid exchange in a rsc7 null mutant, although a different assay was used (Oum et al. 2011). Rsc7 is a component of both isoforms of the RSC complex and therefore represents 100% of all RSC complexes. Because the Rsc2-containing complex represents ~90% of this total, it is perhaps difficult to reconcile how deleting subunits common to the vast majority of the RSC present can have such opposite effects on the same process. Perhaps Rsc2 and Rsc7 do indeed antagonise each other in RSC-mediated unequal sister chromatid exchange. Another alternative is that the increased rate of USCE that we observe in the rsc2 null strain is a phenomenon unique to the association of RSC at the rDNA repeats. An ability of RSC to both repress and enhance recombination at different genomic loci might be analogous to its ability to both repress and activate the transcription of different genes. It would be useful to measure the effects of deleting RSC2 and RSC7 in the same unequal sister chromatid exchange assay to clarify this.

In contrast, our findings that a rsc2 null mutant displays ~5-fold increase in the rate of direct-repeat recombination are in agreement with findings by Oum et al., in
which an rsc7 null strain showed a massively elevated rate of direct-repeat recombination (189-fold change in the rate of recombination compared to wild-type cells). Recombination in this assay can occur via replication slippage, unequal sister chromatid exchange or SSA. In our direct-repeat recombination assays recombination can occur via multiple intra- and interchromatid recombination mechanisms, including gene conversion, replication slippage, SSA, sister strand slippage, unequal sister chromatid exchange and intrachromatid crossovers. Therefore it is not appropriate to directly compare the differences between the two strains in the two assays. Nevertheless, these data collectively indicate that subunits of RSC play an important role in regulating appropriate levels of recombination in repetitive DNA sequences. Misregulated recombination is a known cause of genomic instability and loss of heterozygosity (LOH), which are important drivers of tumourigenesis. This has potentially important implications given that the mammalian homologue of Rsc2, BAF180, is a tumour suppressor gene.
CHAPTER 4: BAF180 PROMOTES COHESION AND PREVENTS GENOME INSTABILITY AND ANEUPLOIDY

4.1. Results

Introduction

A convergence of observations made in our lab with findings from a range of studies, both old and recent, prompted us to examine the possibility that BAF180 functions in sister chromatid cohesion. Firstly, the yeast homologues of BAF180, Rsc1 and in particular Rsc2, are required for sister chromatid cohesion (Huang et al. 2004, Baetz et al. 2004). Therefore BAF180 might play a conserved role in cohesion. Second, we observe an increased rate of unequal sister chromatid exchanges and direct-repeat recombination in rsc2 null cells, suggesting that loss of Rsc2 results in misregulation of physiological recombination pathways (see chapter 3). Increased rates of unequal sister chromatid exchange is thought to be a consequence of impaired cohesion (Huang et al. 2006), and might also underlie an increased rate of direct-repeat recombination. Moreover, misregulation of homologous recombination pathways because of defective cohesion might be responsible for deleterious genomic instability, which is associated with tumourigenesis (Xu et al. 2011). Thirdly, a spate of exome sequencing studies revealed that numerous cohesin genes are frequently mutated in cancer (Barber et al. 2008, Solomon et al. 2011, 2013, Guo et al. 2013, Balbáz-Martínéz et al. 2013, Kon et al. 2013, Kim et al. 2013). In parallel, a substantial number of similar studies identified strikingly frequent mutations in members of mammalian SWI/SNF complexes, including BAF180 (Shain & Pollack 2013). In an effort to to unify these observations we set out to test the following: does BAF180 play a conserved role in sister chromatid cohesion, and if so, does any role of BAF180 in cohesion represent a tumour suppressor function?

Analysis of cohesion in BAF180 +/- mouse embryonic stem cells

To test whether BAF180 functions in sister chromatid cohesion we first utilized mouse embryonic stem cells (mESCs) that were wild-type (+/+) or contained a homozygous BAF180 mutation (-/-) that abolishes all BAF180 expression (Wang et al. 2004). We next prepared metaphase chromosome spreads from each genotype and scored chromosomes for sister chromatid cohesion. We based our scoring assay on those
from previously published studies (e.g. Barber et al. 2008, Carretero et al. 2013), in which a clearly resolved gap between DAPI stained sister chromatids at the centromere represents a centromeric cohesion defect (Fig. 4.1A). Cells were categorized as having defective centromere cohesion when 3 or more chromosomes showed a defect, or as having normal centromere cohesion when less than 3 chromosomes showed a defect. Quantification of 200 spreads from each genotype revealed that there was a statistically significant increase in the number of BAF180-/- cells with defective centromere cohesion compared to wild-type (Fig. 4.1B; \( P < 0.001 \), Fisher’s exact test).

In vertebrate cells the two versions of yeast Scc3, known as SA1 and SA2, differentially regulate arm and centromere cohesion, respectively (Canudas & Smith 2009). To determine if BAF180 also mediates arm cohesion we analysed arm cohesion in the same metaphase mESCs. Chromosomes were described as having a defect in arm cohesion when sister chromatids were clearly separated along the whole length of the arms (Fig. 4.1A). Similarly, cells were categorized as having defective arm cohesion when 3 or more chromosomes showed a defect, or as having normal arm cohesion when less than 3 chromosomes showed a defect. In contrast to cohesion at the centromere, we did not observe a significant difference in the number of BAF180-/- cells displaying defective arm cohesion (Fig. 4.1C; \( P = 0.59 \), Fisher’s exact test). Collectively, these results suggest that BAF180 is important for promoting sister chromatid cohesion specifically at centromeres in mESCs (Brownlee et al. 2014)

*Fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH) analysis on mitotic BAF180-depleted 1BR-hTERT and U2OS cells*

To examine the cohesion defect in BAF180-deficient cells in more detail, and to determine if it is also apparent in human cells, we first depleted BAF180 in 1BR-hTERT cells using siRNA. Western blotting confirmed efficient BAF180 depletion in these cells (Fig. 4.2A). Next, we performed (FISH) on mitotic cells isolated by shake-off from asynchronously growing cultures (performed by Ross Cloney). Using a probe directed against the centromeric region of chromosome 10 (Fig. 4.2B (green)), we found that the siBAF180-treated cells displayed a statistically significant increase in the distribution of distances between the two signals from the sister chromatids compared to siControl cells (Fig. 4.2C and D; \( P < 0.001 \), Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). In contrast, when the distances between the arm signals of chromosome 10 (Fig. 4.3A (red)) were measured, we found no significant shift in the distribution of measurements between siControl- and siBAF180-treated cells (Fig. 4.3B and C; \( P = 0.586 \), Kolmogorov-Smirnov test).
Figure 4.1. BAF180 promotes centromeric sister chromatid cohesion in mESCs (A) Representative WT (+/+) and BAF180 knockout (-/-) mESC metaphase spreads. Cells were analysed according to whether cohesion was defective at centromeres (open arrows) or arms (open and closed arrows). (B) Cells were scored as ‘normal’ when two or fewer chromosomes showed centromeric cohesion defects, or ‘defective’ when three or more chromosomes showed a defect ($P<0.0001$ between +/+ and -/- cells; Fisher’s exact test) (C) Cells were scored as ‘normal’ when two or fewer chromosomes showed arm cohesion defects, or ‘defective’ when three or more chromosomes showed a defect ($P=0.59$ between +/+ and -/- cells; Fisher’s exact test). 200 cells were scored per genotype from two independent experiments.
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Figure 4.2. siRNA-mediated depletion of BAF180 in 1BR-hTERT cells results in defective centromeric cohesion (A) Analysis of BAF180 depletion efficiency in 1BR-hTERT cells by Western blotting. α-tubulin was used as a loading control. (B) Representative images of siControl- (left panel) and siBAF180-treated (right panel) mitotic cells probed with a mixture of FISH probes directed against the centromere (green) and arm (red) of chromosome 10. (C) FISH analysis on cells from (B). The distances between signals from the sister chromatid centromeres (green) were measured from two independent experiments (>400 measurements in total) and the distributions plotted as a histogram ($P<0.001$, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). (D) Data from (C) presented as a cumulative plot.
Figure 4.3. siRNA-mediated depletion of BAF180 in 1BR-hTERT cells does not cause defective cohesion at chromosome arms

(A) Representative images of siControl- (left panel) and siBAF180-treated (right panel) mitotic cells probed with a mixture of FISH probes directed against the centromere (green) and arm (red) regions of chromosome 10. (B) FISH analysis on cells from (A). The distances between signals from the sister chromatid arms (red) were measured from two independent experiments (>400 measurements in total) and the distributions plotted as a histogram ($P=0.586$, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). (C) Data from (B) presented as a cumulative plot.
Smirnov test). Similarly, using a probe directed against the subtelomeric region of chromosome 16 (Fig. 4.4A) there was no significant change in the distribution of distances between sister chromatid telomeres following BAF180 depletion (Fig. 4.4B and C; \( P=0.877 \), Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). Together, these data indicate that depletion of BAF180 in human cells also leads to a cohesion defect that is specific to the centromere, similar to that seen for SA2-depleted cells (Canudas & Smith 2009).

We also created a BAF180 small hairpin RNA (shRNA) stable cell line in U2OS cells and a corresponding control cell line (created by Suzanna Hopkins). Western blotting confirmed efficient BAF180 depletion in these cells (Fig. 4.5A). Mitotic cells isolated by shake-off from asynchronous cells were probed using the centromere 10-specific FISH probe and the distances between signals from the sister chromatids were measured. Consistent with the data from the 1BR-hTERT cells, BAF180 depletion in the U2OS cells led to a statistically significant increase in the distribution of measurements (Fig. 4.5B and C; \( P<0.001 \), Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). Therefore, the centromeric cohesion defect in BAF180-depleted cells appears to be a conserved function in mammalian cells (Brownlee et al. 2014).

**Depletion of BAF180 and SA2 results in a comparable defect in centromeric cohesion**

The centromeric cohesion defect that we observe upon BAF180 depletion appears relatively modest compared to the defect observed in SA2-depleted HeLa cells reported by Canudas & Smith (Canudas & Smith 2009). This might be due to differences in cell type, or that SA2 depletion indeed leads to a more severe cohesion defect. In order to compare the SA2 cohesion defect with that of BAF180 more directly we individually depleted SA2 and BAF180 using siRNA in 1BR-hTERTs and analysed centromere separation by FISH as described. We confirmed efficient knockdown of SA2 by Western blot (Fig. 4.6A, Anna L. Chambers). The shift in the distribution of distances between the centromeres was slightly greater in SA2-depleted cells compared to that of BAF180 (Fig. 4.6B and C; \( P=0.001 \) for BAF180, \( P<0.001 \) for SA2 compared to siControl cells, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). Therefore, the cohesion defect following BAF180 depletion is comparable to that in cells lacking SA2 (Brownlee et al. 2014).
Figure 4.4. siRNA-mediated depletion of BAF180 in 1BR-hTERT cells does not cause defective cohesion at telomeres (A) Representative images of siControl- (left panel) and siBAF180-treated (right panel) mitotic cells probed with a FISH probe directed against the subtelomeric region of chromosome 16 (red). (B) FISH analysis on cells from (A). The distances between signals from the sister chromatid telomeres were measured from two independent experiments (>400 measurements in total) and the distributions plotted as a histogram ($P=0.877$, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). (C) Data from (B) presented as a cumulative plot.
Figure 4.5. Stable shBAF180-depleted U2OS cells show defective centromeric cohesion

(A) Western blot analysis of BAF180 depletion in U2OS cells stably expressing BAF180 shRNA and control shRNA. α-tubulin was used as a loading control. (B) FISH analysis on mitotic cells probed with a FISH probe directed against the centromere of chromosome 10. The distances between signals from the sister chromatids were measured from two independent experiments (>400 measurements in total) and the distributions plotted as a histogram ($P<0.001$, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). (D) Data from (C) presented as a cumulative plot.
Figure 4.6. Depletion of BAF180 and SA2 results in a comparable defect in centromeric cohesion

(A) Western blot analysis of siRNA-treated 1BR-hTERT cells using antibodies directed against SA2 or α-tubulin. (B) FISH analysis on mitotic cells probed with a FISH probe directed against the centromere of chromosome 10. The distances between signals from the sister chromatids were measured from two independent experiments (>200 measurements in total) and the distributions plotted as a histogram ($P=0.001$ between siControl and siBAF180 cells, $P<0.001$ between siControl and siSA2 cells; Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). (D) Data from (C) presented as a cumulative plot.
Defects in cohesion could be caused by a number of different mechanisms, such as lower levels of cohesins, inappropriate loading onto chromatin, or an inability to establish cohesion once loaded. One possible mechanism by which BAF180 mediates cohesion is transcriptional regulation of cohesin genes. In argument against this possibility, microarray data from the report by Varela et al. did not identify any significantly misregulated cohesin genes following BAF180 depletion in 3 renal cell carcinoma cell lines (Varela et al. 2011). Nevertheless, we first examined the levels of Smc1α, Smc3, Stag1 and Stag2 proteins from asynchronous BAF180 +/+ and -/- mESC whole-cell extracts by Western blot (Anna L. Chambers). There were no gross changes in the levels of these proteins in BAF180 -/- cells compared to BAF180 +/+ cells, suggesting that these proteins are not grossly downregulated in the absence of BAF180 in these cells (Fig. 4.7A).

We also examined the mRNA levels of the core cohesin genes SMC1A, SMC3, STAG1, STAG2 and RAD21 in siBAF180-treated 1BR-hTERT cells and the stable shBAF180 U2OS cells, and compared the controls using quantitative RT-PCR (qRT-PCR, Anna L. Chambers). BAF180 depletion did not lead to significantly reduced levels of these transcripts in either cells line (Fig. 4.7B and C). In fact, in the shBAF180 U2OS cells the RAD21 transcript, and to a lesser extent the STAG1 and SMC3 transcripts, were upregulated (Fig. 4.7C). Collectively, these data suggest that the cohesion defect in BAF180-depleted mouse and human cells is unlikely to be due to direct transcriptional effects.

One mechanism by which BAF180 might function as a tumour suppressor is in positively regulating p53-dependent p21 transcription in response to oncogenic and replicative stresses (Burrows et al. 2010, Xia et al. 2008). Recently, p21 was implicated in mitotic control by regulating Cyclin B1, and reduction of p21 levels led to an extended mitosis and impaired Aurora B activity in human cells (Kreis et al. 2013). Thus, the cohesion defect we observe in BAF180-depleted cells might be a consequence of reduced p21-dependent mitotic activity. We examined p21 transcription levels in BAF180-depleted 1BR-hTERT cells and found that, consistent with previous studies, basal levels of p21 were reduced in siBAF180 cells (Fig. 4.7D). Treatment with the MDM2 inhibitor nutlin-3a, which alleviates p53 inhibition, led to lower p21 levels in siBAF180 cells compared to siControl cells (Fig. 4.7E). In contrast, and of great importance to this study, we found that basal p21 levels in shBAF180 U2OS cells were actually ~3-fold higher than the shControl cells (Fig. 4.7D), suggesting
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Figure 4.7. BAF180 is not required for transcription of cohesin genes and has tissue-specific roles in regulating p53-dependent p21 transcription (A) Western blot analysis of cohesin subunits in whole-cell extracts (WCE) prepared from WT (+/+) and BAF180 knockout (-/-) mESCs. (B) Transcription of cohesin subunits in BAF180-depleted 1BR-hTERT cells. Transcript levels from three independent experiments were analysed by qPCR and normalized to α-tubulin transcript. Data for BAF180-depleted cells are shown relative to siControl cells. (C) Transcription of cohesin subunits in shBAF180 U2OS cells. Transcript levels from three independent experiments were analysed by qPCR and normalized to α-tubulin. Data for shBAF180 cells are shown relative to shControl cells. (D) Transcription of basal p21 in BAF180-depleted 1BR-hTERT and U2OS cells. Transcript levels from three independent experiments were analysed by qPCR and normalized to β-actin. Data for BAF180-depleted cells are shown relative to control cells. (E) Transcription of nutlin-3a-induced p21 in BAF180-depleted 1BR-hTERT and U2OS cells. Transcript levels from three independent experiments were analysed by qPCR and normalized to β-actin.
that p53-dependent transcriptional activation of p21 is BAF180-independent in these cells. A similar increase in p21 transcription in the shBAF180 cells compared to the shControl cells was observed after treatment with nutlin-3a (Fig. 4.7E). Thus, the centromeric cohesion defect in the shBAF180 U2OS cells cannot be attributed to p21-dependent mitotic regulation.

Analysis of cohesin loading dynamics during S-phase in BAF180 depleted U2OS cells

Whilst cohesin is loaded onto chromatin during G1, levels of stably bound cohesin increase concomitantly with replication in S-phase (Gerlich et al. 2006). To investigate whether BAF180 depletion leads to a defect in cohesin loading stable shBAF180 U2OS cells were arrested at G1/S using aphidicolin. Cells were harvested for chromatin fractionation 0, 3, and 6hrs after release into fresh media to allow passage into S-phase. We confirmed efficient G1/S arrest and timely progression through S-phase in both shControl and shBAF180 cells by FACS (Fig. 4.8A). At 0hrs, when cells were in G1/S, the levels of chromatin-bound SMC1 were low as expected in the shControl cells (Fig. 4.8B). 6hrs after release a substantial increase in chromatin-bound SMC3 was observed as the bulk of cells were progressing through S-phase. Interestingly, there were increased levels of chromatin-bound SMC1 at 0 and 3hrs in the shBAF180 cells compared to the shControl cells (Figure 4.8B). Nevertheless, after 6hrs the levels of chromatin-bound SMC1 was comparable in the shControl and shBAF180 cells, suggesting that cohesin loading during S-phase is not grossly impaired in the absence of BAF180. However, because centromere-localized cohesin only represents ~10% of all chromatin bound cohesin (Peters et al. 2008) reduced loading only at the centromere might not be obvious in this assay. Further investigation is required to determine the molecular basis of the centromeric cohesion defect in cells lacking BAF180.

Abnormal chromosome morphology in BAF180-depleted MRC5CV1 cells

Performing siRNA depletion of BAF180 in MRC5CV1 cells (Fig. 4.5A) reproducibly led to the appearance of short, squat chromosomes with wider chromosome arms compared to control cells (Fig. 4.5B). To quantify this, we measured the length of the longest chromosome in each metaphase spread from siControl and siBAF180 cells. We found a significant reduction in the mean length of the longest chromosome measured in the siBAF180-treated cells compared to the siControl cells (Fig. 4.5C; P=0.002, two-tailed unpaired t-test). This might reflect a role for BAF180 in mediating
Figure 4.8. The cohesion defect in BAF180-depleted U2OS cells is not due to reduced levels of total chromatin-bound cohesin (A) FACS analysis of shControl and shBAF180 U2OS cells arrested in G1/S using aphidicolin. Samples were collected for FACS 0, 3 and 6hrs after release into fresh media. (B) Samples of the same cells treated as in (A) were collected for chromatin fractionation. The soluble and chromatin fractions were analysed by Western blot using antibodies against SMC1, histone H3 and α-tubulin.
Figure 4.9. siRNA-mediated depletion of BAF180 in MRC5CV1 cells leads to altered chromosome morphology

(A) Analysis of BAF180 depletion efficiency in MRC5CV1 cells by Western blotting. α-tubulin was used as a loading control. (B) Representative siControl (top) and siBAF180 (bottom) metaphase chromosome spreads. Red line indicates the length of the longest chromosome in the spread. (C) Dot plot showing the length of the longest chromosomes from 96 siControl and siBAF180 metaphase chromosome spreads. Red line indicates the median chromosome length, upper and lower blue lines represent the upper and lower quartiles. $P = 0.002$, two-tailed unpaired t-test.
the largely unclear chromosome condensation function of cohesin. Indeed, it has been reported that siRNA depletion of ATRX and HDAC3, which, like BAF180, are required for centromeric cohesion, similarly results in chromosomes of this morphology (Ritchie et al. 2008, Eot-Hollier et al. 2008).

Cells lacking BAF180 are aneuploid and show evidence of chromosome instability (CIN)

Strikingly frequent inactivating mutations and deletions in the gene encoding SA2, as well as other centromere-specific cohesin genes, were recently found in a diverse range of tumour types, suggesting that loss of centromeric cohesion contributes to tumourigenesis (Solomon et al. 2011, 2013, Guo et al. 2013, Balbáz-Martinéz et al. 2013, Kon et al. 2013, Kim et al. 2013). Furthermore, disruption of centromeric cohesion causes aneuploidy in both normal and cancer cells (Barber et al. 2008, Zhang et al. 2008, Ritchie et al. 2010, Manning et al. 2010, Solomon et al. 2011, 2013, Guo et al. 2013, Carretero et al. 2013). We next sought to determine if loss of BAF180 similarly leads to aneuploidy. We found that in metaphase spreads of mESCs lacking BAF180 there is a modal gain of two chromosomes in the cell population compared to wild-type cells (Figure 4.10A), suggesting that loss of BAF180 does indeed cause aneuploidy. Micronuclei can arise in cells as a consequence of chromosome missegregation, which is a prerequisite for the generation of aneuploidy, and are often observed in cells with defective cohesion (e.g. Ritchie et al. 2008). We observed a significant increase in the frequency of micronuclei present in asynchronous BAF180-/- mESCs compared to wild-type cells (Fig. 4.10B, upper panel; $P=0.03$, Fisher’s exact test). A similar increase was also observed in 1BR-hTERT cells depleted of BAF180 using siRNA (Fig. 4.10B, middle panel; $P=0.015$, Fisher’s exact test) and U2OS cells stably depleted of BAF180 using shRNA (Fig. 4.10B, bottom panel; $P=0.034$, Fisher’s exact test). In addition, analysing anaphase cells from BAF180-/- and wild-type mESCs revealed a significantly higher frequency of abnormal anaphase events in the BAF180-/- cells (Fig. 4.10C and D; $P=0.006$, Fisher’s exact test). These were most commonly lagging chromosomes, which are thought to arise through merotelic kinetochore-microtubule attachments, whilst anaphase bridges were less common. Collectively these data suggest that loss of BAF180 leads to an increased rate of chromosome missegregation and aneuploidy.
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Figure 4.10. Loss of BAF180 results in aneuploidy, increased frequencies of micronuclei and abnormal anaphase events. (A) Chromosome counts from WT (+/+) and BAF180 knockout (-/-) MES cell metaphase spreads plotted as distribution curves. Chromosomes from 100 cells were counted for each genotype. (B) Representative image of a MES cell with a micronucleus (arrowed). (C) Quantification of micronuclei present in wt (+/+) and BAF180 knockout (-/-) MES cells. A minimum of 900 cells from two independent experiments were counted. (D) Quantification of micronuclei present in siControl- and siBAF180-treated 1BR hTERT cells. A minimum of 2600 cells from three independent experiments were counted.
Loss of BAF180 leads to hypersensitivity to DNA damage, increased frequency of chromosome aberrations and dynamic CIN

In addition to a role in preventing chromosome missegregation, cohesion is important for facilitating repair of DNA damage by homologous recombination. Intriguingly, a recent study showed that the enrichment of cohesin surrounding DSBs is specifically regulated by SA2-containing cohesin complexes (Kong et al. 2014). Other studies also suggest that components of the centromeric cohesion pathway, including PDS5B, specifically facilitate DNA repair by HR (Brough et al. 2012, Carretero et al. 2013). To determine if BAF180 is required for DNA repair we performed viability assays with BAF180 -/- and wild-type mESCs using the DNA interstrand crosslinking agent mitomycin C. This drug causes replication fork collapse and generates DSBs in S-phase that are repaired by HR in a cohesin-dependent manner, and cells with defective cohesion are rendered hypersensitive to this drug. The BAF180 -/- cells were substantially more sensitive to MMC than the wild-type cells (Fig. 4.11A), suggesting that BAF180 is required for DNA repair by HR.

It has been reported that aneuploidy can sensitise cells to genotoxic agents, at least in yeast (Sheltzer et al. 2011). Because the BAF180 -/- cell line is aneuploid one possibility is that the MMC hypersensitivity we observe is a consequence of aneuploidy. To test this, we depleted BAF180 using siRNA in 1BR-hTERT cells and performed viability assays with MMC. Importantly, we do not see obvious changes in ploidy in this cell line within the timescale of this experiment following BAF180 depletion (data not shown). We find that BAF180-depleted 1BR-hTERT cells were also more sensitive to MMC than the corresponding control cells (Fig. 4.11B), indicating that BAF180 loss, and not aneuploidy, is indeed the cause of MMC sensitivity. We also performed the same viability assay with MMC in the stable shBAF180 U2OS cells. As mentioned previously, p21 levels in these cells are elevated rather than reduced in the absence of BAF180. Because p21 has diverse roles in many cell processes, including DNA repair (Kreis et al. 2013), this cell line provides us with an opportunity to measure the effects of BAF180-dependent DNA repair when p21 is not downregulated. We found that the shControl U2OS cells were considerably more resistant to MMC than wild-type mESCs and siControl 1BR-hTERT cells (Fig. 4.11C). Nevertheless, we detected reduced viability at lower doses of MMC in the shBAF180 cells compared to the shControl cells (Fig. 4.11C). Altogether, we find that mESCs, 1BR-hTERT and U2OS cells are more sensitive to MMC in the absence of BAF180, suggesting a conserved role for BAF180 in HR-dependent DNA repair in mammalian cells.
Figure 4.11. Loss of BAF180 leads to hypersensitivity to MMC (A) Viability curves of WT (+/+) or BAF180 knockout (-/-) mESCs (B) control and BAF180-depleted 1BR-hTERT cells and (C) control and BAF180-depleted U2OS cells following exposure to mitomycin C.
Failure to repair DNA double-strand breaks induced by MMC can result in chromosomal instability (CIN) in the form of structural chromosome aberrations, which are a hallmark of cancer cells and thought to contribute to tumourigenesis. Analysis of BAF180 -/- and wild-type mESC metaphase spreads treated with MMC revealed significantly increased frequencies of chromatid and chromosomal unrepaired breaks, as well as chromosomal fusions, in the BAF180 -/- cells (Fig. 4.12A and B and Table 4.1). Interestingly, the most significant difference in aberration frequency between wild-type and BAF180 -/- cells was observed for chromosomal breaks, which predominantly appeared to occur adjacent to or at the centromeres. We did not observe a significant increase in the frequency of radial chromosome structures in the BAF180 -/- cells; however the frequency of these was very low in both genotypes (Fig. 4.12B). We also analysed the prevalence of structural chromosome aberrations in the stable shBAF180 and shControl U2OS cells treated with MMC. Although we did not find significantly increased frequencies of fusion and radial chromosomes in the BAF180-depleted cells we did observe a significant increase in breaks (chromatid and chromosome) (Fig. 4.12C and D). These data suggest that BAF180 is important for the repair of MMC-induced DSBs to prevent the formation of structural chromosome aberrations in both mice and human cells.

Micronuclei can arise from the missegregation of whole chromosomes or from chromosome fragments. Also, chromosomes harbouring structural aberrations such as fusions and radials in metaphase might be more likely to missegregate than normal chromosomes during anaphase. Consistently, we found a highly significant increase in the frequency of micronuclei in BAF180 -/- cells compared to wild-type after MMC exposure (Fig. 4.13A; \( P<0.001 \), Fisher’s exact test). A significant increase in micronuclei frequency was also observed in shBAF180 U2OS cells compared to shControl cells (Fig. 4.13B; \( P=0.005 \), Fisher’s exact test).

Whilst there was a negligible effect on chromosome number in the wild-type cells (Fig. 4.13B), MMC exposure in the BAF180-/- cells caused in striking effect on aneuploidy manifest as chromosome loss (Fig. 4.13C), providing evidence of dynamic CIN in these cells. The loss of chromosomes in BAF180-/- cells after DNA damage mirrors the increased frequency of micronuclei and might be due to failed segregation of damaged or structurally abnormal chromosomes during anaphase. In conclusion, loss of BAF180 leads to rapid and dynamic chromosomal instability (CIN) after treatment with MMC and this might be related to its role in promoting sister chromatid cohesion.
Figure 4.12. BAF180-deficient mESC and U2OS cells show increased frequencies of structural chromosomal aberrations after treatment with MMC (A) Representative images of each category of aberration. B) The presence of structural chromosome aberrations in metaphase spreads prepared from WT (+/+) or BAF180 knockout (-/-) mESCs following exposure to MMC was analysed and presented as frequency of aberrations per 100 chromosomes. (C) Representative images of chromatid and chromosome breaks (acentric fragments) from U2OS cells treated with MMC. (D) Analysis of the total number of breaks (chromatid and chromosome) in control or BAF180-depleted U2OS cells treated with MMC.
Figure 4.13. BAF180-deficient mESCs show increased frequencies of micronuclei and dynamic chromosomal instability following treatment with MMC. (A) Quantification of micronuclei present in WT (+/+) and BAF180 knockout (-/-) mESCs after treatment with MMC. (B) Quantification of micronuclei present in shControl and shBAF180 U2OS cells after exposure to MMC. (C) Distribution curves showing chromosome numbers from WT (+/+) (left panel) and BAF180 knockout (-/-) (right panel) mESCs following exposure to MMC.
4.2. Discussion

In this section we identified a novel role of BAF180 in promoting centromeric sister chromatid cohesion. This defect was apparent in BAF180 knockout mouse embryonic stem cells (mESCs), immortalized human fibroblasts depleted of BAF180 using siRNA, and an osteosarcoma cell line stably depleted of BAF180 using shRNA or shRNA. Thus, this function of BAF180 appears to be highly conserved in mammals. Importantly, we showed that the centromeric cohesion defect is not due to transcriptional misregulation of cohesin genes in these cells, and is independent of p21 status.

Disrupted centromeric cohesion is known to compromise mitotic fidelity, and consistent with this we found that BAF180-depleted cells showed significant increases in micronuclei and abnormal mitotic events. Moreover, we found that BAF180 knockout mESCs were aneuploid, which has important implications for its role as a tumour suppressor gene. We also explored the consequences of impaired cohesion in DNA repair. Cells lacking BAF180 were hypersensitive to DNA damage, displayed increased frequencies of structural chromosome aberrations in metaphase, and showed evidence of dynamic chromosomal instability when treated with DNA damaging agents. These phenotypes are all readily explained by a defect in cohesion, which is likely to represent an important tumour suppressor function of BAF180.

**Impaired centromeric cohesion in mammalian cells depleted of BAF180**

We first analysed cohesion in chromosome spreads from BAF180 knockout mESCs. Although statistically significant differences in the number of cells showing defective centromeric cohesion in the BAF180 -/- cell line were observed, the defect did not appear perhaps as striking as that reported in cells lacking other centromere-specific
cohesion components. In ~65% of Pds5B -/- MEF metaphase cells >5 chromosomes displayed a sister chromatid cohesion defect (Carretero et al. 2013). Although not directly comparable because of different scoring criteria, in ~40% of BAF180 -/- mESCs 3 or more chromosomes displayed a sister chromatid cohesion defect in our assay. Thus, the defect appears less severe in the BAF180 -/- cells. Similarly, in 20% of Esco2 -/- two-cell embryo metaphase cells all of the chromosomes exhibited a marked centromeric cohesion defect (Whelan et al. 2012). This describes a more severe defect than that observed in BAF180 -/- mESCs. In addition, the Esco2 -/- anaphase cells apparently all showed >5 lagging chromosomes, which is a far greater frequency than we saw in the BAF180 -/- mESCs.

A relatively mild centromeric cohesion defect might actually be fundamental to explaining why BAF180 is such a potent tumour suppressor gene in human cancer. Complete loss of centromeric cohesion defect would have catastrophic consequences for the cells because of overwhelming problems with chromosome segregation. This would in turn severely inhibit the ability of these cells to proliferate. In contrast, a more modest defect is likely to maintain the proliferative capacity of the cells but undermine mitotic fidelity, leading to low levels of aneuploidy that might ultimately lead to a growth advantage (Figure 4.14). Indeed, this has been proposed to be the case with Rb, which has a relatively mild centromeric cohesion defect that is accompanied with lower levels of chromosome missegregation (Manning et al. 2010).

The idea that the severity of the cohesion defect might correlate with proliferation appears to be true when comparing proliferation in BAF180-depleted cells with cells lacking Pds5B and Esco2. shRNA-mediated depletion of BAF180 in primary BJ fibroblasts leads to increased proliferation (Burrows et al. 2010), and re-expression of BAF180 in a breast cancer cell line harbouring a truncating BAF180 mutation significantly suppressed colony formation (Xia et al. 2008). In addition, siRNA-mediated depletion of BAF180 in 4/5 RCC cell lines resulted in significantly increased proliferation, colony formation and cell migration. Therefore, BAF180 depletion appears to actually increase proliferation, at least in human cancer cells. In contrast, Pds5B -/- MEFs showed reduced proliferation compared to wild-type MEFs (Carretero et al. 2013), and only 5% of Esco2 -/- homozygous embryos reached the 8-cell stage of development (Whelan et al. 2012). This most likely results from the massive chromosome missegregation problems observed in these cells.

There are no reports describing a cohesion defect in Stag2-depleted mouse cells, so we were not able to compare this with our BAF180 -/- mESC cohesion defect. However, we were able to compare the SA2-dependent cohesion defect with that of BAF180 in human cells. We found that the SA2-depleted cells showed a comparable,
Figure 4.14. Model describing the consequences of BAF180 inactivation and the drive towards tumourigenesis. An early event following mutational inactivation of BAF180 might be chromosome 3p LOH, resulting from misregulation of cohesin-dependent recombination. During DNA replication, the absence of BAF180 leads to a defect in establishing centromeric cohesion. The inability to efficiently repair DNA DSBs arising during replication might contribute to further structural chromosome rearrangements. Chromosome segregation errors occurring during anaphase due to impaired centromeric cohesion generates low levels of aneuploidy and micronuclei. Micronuclei could contribute to further genome instability by re-integrating damaged DNA into the genome. The simultaneous inactivation of tumour suppressor pathways regulating senescence and proliferation, such as p21, might increase the tolerance of aneuploidy in these cells. Ultimately, such cells acquire a selective advantage and undergo transformation.
but slightly more severe defect than the BAF180-depleted cells. Therefore, loss of SA2 might not result in a severe cohesion defect as might be predicted from its physical interaction with the core cohesin ring. However, the molecular function of SA2 is unclear in human cells, and its yeast homologue (Scc3) actually appears to promote anti-establishment. A mild cohesion defect in SA2-depleted cells is also consistent with the findings that SA2 is very frequently mutated in cancer. As described, a mild defect would maintain the proliferative capacity of the cells but compromise mitotic fidelity, leading to low levels of aneuploidy. In contrast, a severe defect is unlikely to be advantageous because it would compromise proliferation from excessive chromosome missegregation. This might also explain why mutational inactivation of the core cohesin subunits, which would probably result in a severe cohesion defect, is observed at a much lower frequency in human cancers (e.g. Kon et al. 2013).

Possible mechanisms for BAF180-dependent centromere cohesion

We found that BAF180 -/- mESCs and 1BR-hTERT fibroblasts depleted of BAF180 showed a cohesion defect that was only apparent at the centromere. This is consistent with findings that in mammalian cells centromeric and arm/telomere cohesion are regulated by different versions of proteins in different pathways. Thus, BAF180 might cooperate with components of the centromere-specific cohesion pathway, including SA2, PDS5B and ESCO2. A centromere-specific role for BAF180 is also consistent with previous finding that BAF180 localizes to kinetochores of mitotic chromosomes (Xue et al. 2000), and that Brg1 is required for maintaining the structure of pericentromeric heterochromatin (Bourgo et al. 2009).

How might BAF180 function mechanistically in promoting centromeric sister chromatid cohesion? One possibility is that BAF180 regulates the recruitment of PBAF to pericentromeric heterochromatin. This seems likely because of the multiple bromodomains present in BAF180, which might bind to acetylated lysines on histones. In addition, the second BAH domain of BAF180 is known to bind to unmodified H3 (Chambers et al. 2013). In this scenario, BAF180 would recognise a specific set of histone modifications that would dictate its preferential binding to pericentromeric heterochromatin. The heterochromatin-associated H3K9me3 and H4K20me3 modifications are unlikely to contribute to this binding because in their absence Brg1-dependent heterochromatin structure is normal (Bourgo et al. 2009). Once recruited, chromatin remodelling facilitated by BRG1 would create a chromatin environment that favours cohesin loading or establishment.
Alternatively, the bromodomains of BAF180 might bind to other non-histone acetyl-lysine residues. Possible candidates include lysines K105 and K106 in SMC3, perhaps acetylated specifically by ESCO2. In this scenario, a certain BAF180 bromodomain or pair of bromodomains would bind to these acetylated residues. The remaining bromodomains might simultaneously bind to acetylated lysines present on histones. Thus, BAF180 would serve to bridge chromatin and cohesin together. Rigorous testing to identify the true binding targets of the BAF180 bromodomains is crucial for understanding how the protein might function mechanistically.

BAF180 does not exert its effect on cohesion through transcriptional regulation

It is currently thought that SWI/SNF subunits exert their tumour suppressor activity by regulating the transcription of tumour suppressor genes. In this study we made the novel and important finding that BAF180 has a direct structural role in promoting cohesion independently of transcriptional regulation. Whole-cell levels of the core cohesin subunits and the regulatory SA proteins were not grossly reduced in the mESCs lacking BAF180. Similarly, there were no significant reductions in the mRNA levels of these subunits in BAF180-depleted 1BR-hTERT cells and U2OS cells. In fact, we observed increased SMC3, SA1 and RAD21 mRNA levels in the U2OS cells stably depleted of BAF180. This was particularly striking for RAD21, which displayed a 3-fold increase in transcript levels compared to control cells. Interestingly, a recent report showed that RAD21 is particularly sensitive to depletion of other cohesin subunits in human cells (Kong et al. 2014). This adds support to our findings that BAF180 is an important protein involved in cohesion, and suggests that BAF180 functions closely with other cohesin subunits. The transcriptional upregulation of cohesin subunits in BAF180-depleted cells might represent a compensatory mechanism in response to impaired cohesion.

Evidence for tissue-specific roles of BAF180 in controlling p21 transcription

We found that the U2OS cells stably depleted of BAF180 displayed a clear defect in centromeric cohesion that was independent of p21 mitotic activity. Depletion of BAF180 in these cells led to increased rather than decreased basal and induced p21 expression. This is in contrast to our data from BAF180-depleted 1BR-hTERT cells, and previous studies using primary BJ fibroblasts and breast cancer cells, in which BAF180 depletion results in reduced p21 expression (Xia et al. 2008, Burrows et al. 2010). Interestingly, microarray data from the report by Varela et al. did not identify p21
as being significantly misregulated following BAF180 depletion in 3 BAF180-positive renal cell carcinomas (Varela et al. 2011). In fact, the gene encoding p21, CDKN1A, did not even appear in the top 250 misregulated genes. This further supports the idea of tissue-dependent regulation of p21 transcription by BAF180. Whilst this might be a phenomenon specific to transformed cells, it would be interesting to more comprehensively analyse p21 transcription in other cell types. It would be especially interesting to determine the effect of BAF180 depletion on p21 transcription in non-transformed renal cells. Exome sequencing has shown that this cell type appears to be particularly prone to transformation following BAF180 mutational inactivation. This might shed light on the actual importance of BAF180-dependent p21 transcription in tumourigenesis. Intriguingly, p21 -/- null mice do not show increased aneuploidy or chromatid breaks compared to wild-type cells, but p21 -/- ATM -/- mice exhibit more aneuploidy and chromatid breakage than ATM -/- cells (Shen et al. 2005). This suggests that p21 is able to enhance aneuploidy in a genome instability background, and that the aneuploidy we observe in BAF180 -/- cells cannot be due to defective p21 activity alone. We propose that the defect in cohesion provides the genome instability necessary to drive aneuploidy, perhaps in cooperation with impaired p21 activity in the BAF180 -/- cells (Figure 4.14).

**Loss of BAF180 impairs mitotic fidelity and leads to aneuploidy and micronuclei**

Compromised centromeric cohesion impairs mitotic fidelity, most likely by increasing the chance of merotelic microtubule-kinetochore attachment (Compton et al. 2011). The most frequent consequence of merotelic attachment in anaphase is a lagging chromosome. Other abnormal anaphase events such as anaphase bridges have also been reported in cells lacking centromeric cohesin components (e.g. Solomon et al. 2011). We observed a modest but statistically significant increase in the frequency of abnormal mitotic events in BAF180 -/- mESCs compared to wild-type cells. This is consistent with a centromeric cohesion defect and the associated increase in chromosome missegregation. In addition, a modest but significant increase in the frequency of spontaneously arising micronuclei was observed in BAF180 -/- mESCs, 1BR-hTERTs depleted of BAF180 using siRNA, and U2OS cells stably depleted of BAF180 using shRNA. Micronuclei are thought to arise from missegregation of whole chromosomes or chromosomal fragments. Recently, chromosomal DNA contained in micronuclei from lagging chromosomes was found to replicative defectively, generating DNA damage, extensive chromosome fragmentation and rearrangements (Crasta et al. 2012). Importantly, the damaged chromosomal material inside the micronucleus was
able to re-integrate into the genome. Therefore, the increased micronuclei observed in BAF180-deficient cells could contribute to further genome instability (Figure 4.14).

Strikingly, we found that the BAF180 -/- mESCs were aneuploid, with a modal gain of two chromosomes compared to wild-type cells. Because we did not generate the BAF180 -/- mESCs, we do not know exactly how and over what timescale this aneuploidy developed. However, because the population of cells as a whole had this aneuploidy it suggests that it occurred early and conferred a selective advantage. We also do not know whether all of the BAF180 -/- aneuploid cells have gained the same two chromosomes. Nevertheless, the gain of a small number of chromosomes is very similar to the pattern of aneuploidy observed following SA2 depletion in several cell types. Knockout of SA2 in a colorectal cell line resulted in a modal gain of 1 chromosome (Solomon et al. 2011), and shRNA-mediated depletion of SA2 in an urothelial carcinoma cell line similarly led to a modal gain of 1 chromosome (Solomon et al. 2013).

The pattern of aneuploidy in BAF180 -/- mESCs is reminiscent of the hyperdiploid karyotype found in a subset of ccRCCs

Concurrent loss of PBRM1, VHL and SETD2 appears to be the major driving mechanism for clear cell renal cell carcinoma (ccRCC) development (Varela et al. 2011). Loss of VHL leads to HIF accumulation and activation of hypoxia-inducible target genes under normal conditions. SETD2 is a methyltransferase that specifically methylates H3K36, which is associated with active transcription. All three of these genes reside on chromosome 3p21, and multiple ccRCCs harbour mutations in all three genes, indicating that they provide non-redundant functions. The physical linkage and likely interaction of these genes is thought to be the key driver for the very frequent 3p LOH observed in ccRCCs (Varela et al. 2011). Indeed, loss of chromosome 3 or 3p is observed in 80-98% of sporadic ccRCCs (Kovacs 1993, Gunawan et al. 2001, Höglund et al. 2004).

Subsequent ccRCC progression occurs via at least two distinct genetic pathways that are characterized by a specific pattern of aneuploidy (Höglund et al. 2004). The first pathway (80% of ccRCCs) involves losses of whole chromosomes and partial chromosomes through unbalanced translocations to result in a hypodiploid karyotype. Chromosome 3p is often lost in an unbalanced translocation between chromosomes 3 and 5 in this pathway. Interestingly, we found that BAF180 -/- cells treated with MMC rapidly lose chromosomes in a manner reminiscent of this aneuploidy route. The second pathway (18% of ccRCCs) involves gains of whole
chromosomes (commonly chromosomes 7 (18-30%), 16 (11%), 20 (10%), 12 (10-15%), and 2 (9-14%)) to produce a hyperdiploid karyotype. This is very similar to the hyperdiploid karyotype of BAF180 -/- mESCs, which have a modal gain of two chromosomes. It would be very interesting to identify the actual chromosomes gained in these cells, and compare them with those frequently gained in this pathway of ccRCC development. It would also be of interest to see if these cells have 3p LOH. Altogether, our findings strongly suggest that loss of BAF180 alone is sufficient for the development of aneuploidy in mESCs. Furthermore, the patterns of aneuploidy observed in the BAF180 -/- mESCs is very similar to the two common patterns of aneuploidy in ccRCC, suggesting that BAF180 loss alone might be sufficient for causing aneuploidy in ccRCC.

Evidence for a role of BAF180 in cohesin-dependent DNA repair via HR

We found that the BAF180 -/- mESCs, 1BR-hTERT cells depleted of BAF180 using siRNA, and U2OS cells stably depleted of BAF180 using shRNA were hypersensitive to the DNA interstrand crosslinking agent MMC. The repair of an interstrand crosslink (ICL) is initiated when two replication forks converge on the lesion (Raschle et al. 2008). The leading strands extend to the crosslink before it is cleaved from one sister strand by dual incisions made by the structure specific endonucleases factors XPF and Mus81. This uncouples the sister strands and generates a DSB. TLS across the adducted lesion initiates extension of the nascent strand beyond the lesion. Ultimately, the adducted lesion is removed by NER and RAD51-dependent HR repair of the DSB (Raschle et al. 2008, Long et al. 2011).

Therefore, sensitivity to MMC could potentially reflect a role for BAF180 in any of these steps. There have been no reports describing a role for BAF180 or its budding yeast homologues in promoting endonuclease activity or TLS. In contrast, several studies have reported defects in HR-dependent DNA repair in the budding yeast BAF180 homologues Rsc1 and Rsc2 (Chai et al. 2005, Oum et al. 2012). In addition, the defective sister chromatid HR in rsc2 cells at DSBs was due to impaired accumulation of DSB-induced cohesin at the DSB site (Oum et al. 2012). Although we did not directly explore the role of BAF180 in HR using a specific HR assay, we found that BAF180 is important for promoting cohesion. Therefore it seems most likely that the role of BAF180 in maintaining viability after MMC stems from a function in cohesin-dependent HR. In addition, very recent reports also suggest that members of the centromere-specific cohesion pathway, including PDS5B and SA2, are involved in promoting the enrichment of cohesin at DNA DSBs (Brough et al. 2012, Carretero et al.
Thus, BAF180 might cooperate with these centromere-specific cohesion factors to facilitate cohesin-dependent HR.

Sensitivity to DNA damage can also result from impaired DNA damage checkpoint activity. We rigorously tested the ability of rsc1 and rsc2 null strains to enact G1 and G2/M DNA damage checkpoint activation in response to MMS in the previous chapter, and found that both strains were able to activate these checkpoints. Depletion of BRG1 did not lead to G2/M or intra-S checkpoint defects in response to IR or adriamycin (Park et al. 2006). Similarly, depletion of SNF5 did not cause checkpoint defects in response to UV (Ray et al. 2009) or IR (McKenna et al. 2008). Collectively, data from the BAF180 homologues in yeast and other subunits of the PBAF complex suggest that BAF180 is unlikely to function in checkpoint activation in response to various DNA lesions. However, BRG1 depletion did lead to a defect in the intra-S checkpoint specifically after treatment with cisplatin (Park et al. 2006). Therefore we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that BAF180 also has a role in intra-S checkpoint activity in response to certain types of lesion, and that this might underlie the MMC sensitivity seen in BAF180-depleted cells. Intriguingly, a currently held idea is that a major function of the intra-S checkpoint is to protect replication forks from inappropriate recombination (Labib & De Piccoli 2011). Because cohesin is important for preventing inappropriate recombination, a role for BAF180 in the intra-S checkpoint might actually stem from its role in cohesion.

We also found that mESCs lacking BAF180 showed statistically increased frequencies of structural chromosome aberrations after treatment with MMC. Treatment with MMC also led to significantly increased chromatid and chromosome breaks in BAF180-depleted U2OS cells, and a striking increase in micronuclei after MMC treatment in both cells types. Furthermore, BAF180 -/- mESCs rapidly exhibited further dynamic aneuploidy after MMC treatment. These phenotypes are consistent with the increased MMC sensitivity of these cells, and likely reflect a defect in cohesin-dependent DNA repair by HR. Moreover, a role for BAF180 in HR-dependent DNA repair is likely to represent a novel tumour suppressor function. Such a role could underlie the initiating LOH at 3p observed in PBRM1-mutated ccRCCs (Figure 4.14).
CHAPTER 5: MUTATIONS IDENTIFIED IN BAF180 FROM CANCER SAMPLES IMPAIR COHESIN-DEPENDENT FUNCTIONS IN YEAST AND MAMMALS

5.1. Results

Introduction

Whilst the vast majority of mutations found in BAF180 from various cancer types result in a truncated protein product, a number of in-frame deletions and missense mutations that might not result in complete loss of protein have been identified. Intriguingly, 9 out of 11 missense mutations in a cohort of renal cell carcinomas occurred in the bromodomains or BAH domains. Out of an additional 6 homozygous missense mutations subsequently identified from a range of different cancer types, 4 of these occurred in the bromodomains, and one occurred in the second BAH domain (Varela et al. 2011). Thus, these mutations might not only provide crucial insight into the roles of BAF180 in tumourigenesis but also the specific roles of these domains. In the previous chapter we identified and characterized a novel role of BAF180 in promoting centromeric sister chromatid cohesion, which likely represents an important tumour suppressor function. BAF180 has also been ascribed with several other tumour suppressor functions that relate to transcriptional regulation. However, the importance of this activity in tumourigenesis has not been demonstrated. In this section we analysed the effects of a set of conserved missense mutations identified in renal cell carcinomas, expressed in both yeast and human cells. By measuring the impact of these mutations on distinct transcription- and cohesion-related processes we might gain insight into the importance of each in tumour suppression.

Predicted consequences of cancer associated BAF180 missense mutations on BAF180 folding and stability

Of the 9 missense mutations identified in the cohort of renal cell carcinomas 3 were previously assessed for having a functional impact using a scoring system calibrated with protein domain alignments from Pfam (Varela et al. 2011). All three of these mutations (T232P in BD2, A597D in BD4 and H1204P in BAH2) were predicted to be deleterious, with a significantly lower mean score than a randomly generated set of in silico missense mutations occurring in scorable parts of the gene (Varela et al. 2011).
We extended this analysis to predict the effects of all the bromodomain and BAH domain missense mutations on the stability of full-length BAF180 using a combination of techniques. These included manual inspection of structures, amino acid sequence threading (Kelley & Sternberg 2009), and use of the publicly available webserver ‘Site Directed Mutator’ (Worth et al. 2011). Of the 10 missense mutations occurring in the bromodomains, 7 were predicted to be slightly destabilizing or highly destabilizing, consistent with a functionally inactivating impact on BAF180 (Brownlee et al. 2012). Potentially more interesting are the 3 bromodomain mutations that were predicted to be neutral in terms of BAF180 folding and stability. These included M523I and R540S in BD4, and F840L in BD6. Intriguingly, the R540S mutation is located in the acetyl-lysine-binding ZA loop of the bromodomain. Thus, mutation of this residue might affect the acetyl-lysine binding affinity or substrate specificity of this bromodomain (Brownlee et al. 2012).

Cancer associated mutations of BAF180 are conserved in the yeast homologues

For further analysis we focused on 3 of these BAF180 missense cancer mutations that had different predicted effects on the stability of full length BAF180, and were conserved in the homologous S. cerevisiae RSC proteins (Table 5.1). The first mutation, T232P, occurs in the αA helix of BAF180 BD2 and is equivalent to T67P in BD1 of Rsc2 (Fig. 5.1A and B). This mutation was predicted to be slightly destabilizing in the context of full-length BAF180 (Table 5.1). The second mutation, M523I (M538I in BAF180 isoform 8; used herein), occurs in the αZ helix of BAF180 BD4 and corresponds to M280I in BD2 of Rsc2 (Fig. 5.1A and B). This mutation was predicted to be neutral in terms of BAF180 stability (Table 5.1). The third mutation, H1204P, resides in BAH2 of BAF180 and corresponds to H458P in the BAH domain of Rsc2 (Fig 5.1A and C). This mutation was predicted to have a destabilizing effect when expressed in BAF180 (Table 5.1).
Two of these mutations (T232P and H1204P) were also conserved in Rsc1 (Figure 5.1B and C). However, Rsc2 has a greater effect on DNA damage responses and cohesion (Chambers et al. 2013, Baetz et al. 2004, see also Chapter 3), so we created the equivalent mutations solely in the conserved residues of Rsc2 using site-directed mutagenesis. We first analysed the effect of these mutations on Rsc2 protein stability. Wild-type and mutant Rsc2 myc-tagged expression constructs were transformed into rsc2 null yeast and Western blotting was performed on whole-cell extracts. The Rsc2-T67P mutation slightly reduces protein levels, consistent with a slightly destabilizing effect as predicted by the SDM analysis (Figure. 5.1D). Interestingly, expression of the Rsc2-M280I mutation appears to result in slightly higher levels of Rsc2 compared to wild-type, suggesting that it might be a stabilizing mutation (Figure. 5.1D). Levels of Rsc2 expression were severely reduced when the Rsc2-H458P mutation was expressed, consistent with a highly destabilizing effect (Figure. 5.1D).

**BAF180 missense cancer mutations expressed in yeast do not compromise a transcription-related subset of Rsc2 functions**

Cells lacking RSC2 are hypersensitive to a number of agents that cause DNA damage, replication stress, and microtubule destabilization, reflecting the widespread roles of the protein in DNA repair, replication and mitotic spindle function. rsc2 null cells are also temperature sensitive and hypersensitive to DMSO, which likely reflects transcriptional misregulation of cell wall biosynthesis genes (Angus-Hill et al. 2001). To determine whether BAF180 cancer mutations impair the ability of Rsc2 to regulate transcriptional activity we performed spot tests with DMSO. The Rsc2-H458P mutation severely sensitizes cells to both agents to levels comparable to the rsc2 null, consistent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COSMIC</th>
<th>Mutation</th>
<th>Secondary structure domain</th>
<th>BAF180 domain</th>
<th>Predicted effect of mutation*</th>
<th>Rsc2 residue</th>
<th>Rsc2 domain</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52807</td>
<td>T232P</td>
<td>αA</td>
<td>BD2</td>
<td>Slightly destabilizing1</td>
<td>T67P</td>
<td>BD1</td>
<td>Mutation is likely to disrupt αA helix and protein fold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52844</td>
<td>M538I</td>
<td>αZ</td>
<td>BD4</td>
<td>Neutral2</td>
<td>M280I</td>
<td>BD2</td>
<td>Mutation places a hydrophobic residue into solvent, likely to be tolerated in terms of protein stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52780</td>
<td>H1204P</td>
<td>BAH2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highly destabilizing3</td>
<td>H458P</td>
<td>BAH</td>
<td>Mutation occurs in hydrophobic core of BAH domain, likely to affect/disrupt protein fold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SDM analysis
1PDB code 3LJW (Charlop-Powers et al. 2011)
2Phyre model
Figure 5.1. Conservation and expression of BAF180 renal cell carcinoma missense mutations in yeast Rsc2. (A) Illustration of domain organization and relative position of cancer-associated mutations in Rsc2 and BAF180. BDs and BAH domains are numbers sequentially. (B) Pileup of all six bromodomains of BAF180 with the bromodomains of Rsc1 and Rsc2. The cancer associated mutations of BAF180 are indicated (M523 corresponds to M538 of BAF180 isoform 8, used in our assays). (C) Pileup of the two BAH domains of BAF180 with the BAH domains from Rsc1 and Rsc2. The cancer associated H-P mutation (M523 corresponds to M538 of BAF180 isoform 8, used in our assays). (D) Analysis of WT and mutant Rsc2 expression levels in total protein preparations by Western blotting. Loading control: H2A
with greatly reduced protein levels (Figure. 5.2A). Neither the Rsc2-T67P nor the Rsc2-M280I mutations had any obvious sensitizing effect on DMSO, suggesting that these mutations are at least partly functional in vivo (Figure. 5.2A). To quantify these observations, we next performed survival assays with DMSO. We found that expression of the Rsc2-T67P and Rsc2-M280I mutations did not cause a significant decrease in survival on DMSO, whilst the Rsc2-H458P significantly reduced survival (Figure. 5.2B).

We also quantified the levels of survival of the mutant Rsc2 plasmids at the non-permissive temperature of 37°C, which may reflect Rsc2-dependent transcriptional activity, and found that neither the Rsc2-T67P or Rsc2-M280I mutations led to reduced survival (Figure 5.2C). In contrast, the Rsc2-H458P mutation actually led to a more severe growth defect at 37°C compared to the rsc2 strain carrying an empty vector. This suggests that this mutation might have a dominant-negative effect in this context. Rsc2 facilitates the transcriptional activation and repression of many genes, including genes involved in nitrogen and carbon metabolism (Du et al. 1998, Angus-Hill et al. 2001). Next, we assessed the ability of the cancer-associated mutations to repress the Rsc2-dependent transcription of the high-affinity glucose transporter gene HXT7. Using RT-qPCR we found that the rsc2 strain carrying the wild-type Rsc2 plasmid significantly reduced HXT7 transcript levels as expected (Figure 5.2D). Both the Rsc2-T67P and Rsc2-M280I mutant plasmids were also able to repress HXT7 transcription to the same level as wild-type, whilst the H458P mutation showed levels comparable to the empty-vector cells (Figure 5.2D). Collectively, these results suggest that two of the cancer-associated mutations do not compromise a transcription-related subset of Rsc2 functions in vivo.

**BAF180 missense cancer mutations expressed in yeast result in impaired cohesin-dependent Rsc2 functions**

In contrast to the results obtained with DMSO, the Rsc2-T67P mutation reproducibly appeared to slightly sensititize cells to MMS, whilst the M280I reproducibly seemed to exhibit slight MMS resistance compared to wild-type (Figure. 5.3A). We found that these changes in survival in response to MMS were statistically significant when quantified using survival assays (Figure 5.3B). Although the MMS resistance in the Rsc2-M280I construct was unexpected, these results suggest that both the T67P and M280I cancer mutations affect the function of Rsc2 in the response to MMS-induced DNA damage. In the previous section we showed that cells lacking RSC2 display elevated rates of marker loss by unequal sister chromatid exchange and direct-repeat
Figure 5.2. BAF180 missense cancer mutations expressed in yeast do not compromise a transcription-related subset of Rsc2 functions (A) Serial dilutions of mid-log cultures of rsc2 cells containing the indicated Rsc2 expression constructs were plated onto YPAD media with and without DMSO. (B) Hypersensitivity to DMSO as a readout of Rsc2-dependent transcriptional activity was quantified by plating serial dilutions of the indicated mid-log cultures from (A) onto YPAD media with or without 2% DMSO. (C) Hypersensitivity to 37°C (ts phenotype) was analysed by plating serial dilutions of the indicated mid-log cultures onto YPAD media and incubating at 30°C or 37°C. Wild-type survival levels are set to 100% and mutant strains are shown relative to wild-type. Data are means ± s.d., n=3; statistical significance was indicated as *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001, unpaired two-tailed t test. (D) Quantitative RT-PCR analysis of HXT7 transcription in rsc2 cells transformed with the indicated plasmids.
recombination (see Chapter 3). This reflects decreased DNA repeat stability and is characteristic of cells with compromised cohesion (Huang et al. 2006, Smith & Rothstein 1999). Importantly, misregulation of homologous recombination pathways because of defective cohesion might be responsible for genomic instability, which is associated with tumourigenesis (Xu et al. 2011). We therefore tested the cancer-associated mutations using the unequal sister chromatid exchange assay. Strikingly, ADE2 marker loss at the rDNA was significantly higher than wild-type when all three of the mutations were expressed (Figure 5.3C). This suggests that these mutations impair the ability of Rsc2 to repress spontaneous recombination at the rDNA repeats. In addition, none of the cancer-associated mutations were able to fully complement the growth defect associated with rsc2 null cells (Figure 5.3D). This growth defect might reflect the known defects in cohesion and chromosome segregation in cells lacking RSC2. Collectively, these data are consistent with the idea that some cancer-associated mutations do not compromise all functions of Rsc2, but do compromise the cohesion-related functions of Rsc2 and result in genome instability (Brownlee et al. 2014).

BAF180 missense cancer mutations expressed in human cells result in defective centromeric cohesion

We next sought to determine whether these cancer mutations have an effect on centromeric sister chromatid cohesion in mammalian cells, as shown in cells lacking BAF180 in the previous chapter. Because expression of the H458P mutation (H1204P in BAF180) in Rsc2 severely reduced protein levels, we chose not to include it and concentrated on the two mutations that were expressed at reasonable levels. We first created siRNA resistant wild-type EGFP-tagged BAF180 construct and constructs containing either the T232P or M538I mutations. We next depleted BAF180 using siRNA in U2OS cells, synchronised the cells in G2 using double thymidine block, and transiently transfected with -EGFP, wild-type BAF180-EGFP, T232P BAF180-EGFP or M538I BAF180-EGFP constructs (Figure. 5.4A). BAF180 depletion by siRNA was confirmed by Western blotting (Figure. 5.4B). We found that expression of the mutants was comparable to that of the wild-type construct, as measured by quantifying GFP immunofluorescence (Figures 5.4C and 5.5C). Successful synchronization in G2 was confirmed by immunostaining for CENPF, a marker for G2 (Figure. 5.4D).

Cells were immunostained for GFP and probed using the same FISH probe as in Chapter 4 (Figure. 4.2B), directed against the centromeric region of chromosome 10. As expected, the siBAF180 cells transfected with the -EGFP construct displayed a
Figure 5.3. BAF180 missense cancer mutations expressed in yeast result in impaired cohesin-dependent Rsc2 functions (A) Serial dilutions of mid-log cultures of rsc2 cells containing the indicated Rsc2 expression constructs were plated onto YPAD media with and without 0.015% MMS. (B) Hypersensitivity to MMS was quantified by plating serial dilutions of the indicated mid-log cultures from (A) onto YPAD media with or without 0.02% MMS. (C) Frequency of unequal rDNA crossover events in rsc2 yeast strains containing the indicated Rsc2 expression construct. Data are means ± s.d., n=3; statistical significance was indicated as *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001, unpaired two-tailed t test. (D) Growth curves of rsc2 yeast strains containing the indicated Rsc2 expression construct.
Figure 5.4. Complementation of BAF180-depleted U2OS cells with BAF180 missense cancer mutations. (A) Schematic of protocol used to deplete BAF180 using siRNA, transfct with –pEGFP or –pEGFP-BAF180R expression plasmids and synchronize cells in G2. (B) Analysis of BAF180 depletion efficiency in U2OS cells by Western blotting. α-tubulin was used as a loading control. (C) Expression of –pEGFP and pEGFP-BAF180R constructs in siBAF180 U2OS cells. Cells were treated as in (A) and processed for IF-FISH using a probe directed against the centromere of chromosome 10. IF using anti-GFP antibody shows GFP or GFP-BAF180 in the red channel. (D) Cells treated as in (A) were immunostained with CENPF as a marker of G2 and % CENPF-positive cells is shown underneath images.
significant increase in the distribution of distances between the two signals from the sister chromatids compared to siControl cells (Figure 5.5A; compare green and black bars, and B). Importantly, siBAF180-treated cells transfected with the wild-type BAF180-EGFP construct showed clear rescue of the cohesion defect to levels very similar to the siControl cells transfected with the -EGFP construct (Figure 5.5A; compare grey and black bars, and B). Strikingly, both the T232P BAF180-EGFP and M538I BAF180-EGFP constructs are unable to even partially rescue the cohesion defect, showing distributions of distances between signals comparable to the siBAF180 cells transfected with -GFP (Figure 5.5A; compare green, red and blue bars, and B). Interestingly, the T232P BAF180-GFP construct actually appeared to show a greater defect than the –GFP construct in siBAF180-depleted cells (Figure 5.5A; compare red and green bars, and B). These data indicate that both the T232P and M538I cancer mutations completely impair the ability of BAF180 to promote centromeric sister chromatid cohesion. Furthermore, this strongly suggests that this function of BAF180 is important in tumour suppression.

5.2. Discussion

In this section we analysed the effects of three conserved BAF180 missense mutations identified in ccRCCs, expressed in the budding yeast Rsc2 homologue and in human cells. This study is the first to our knowledge that has explored the cellular consequences of BAF180 cancer mutations. We found that Rsc2 protein levels correlated well with the predicted effects of these mutations on BAF180 stability. Interestingly, we showed that the two mutations that maintained relatively high Rsc2 protein levels did not compromise a subset of Rsc2-dependent phenotypes, including regulation of transcriptional activity. In contrast, these mutations consistently impaired or altered the activity of Rsc2 in processes relating to cohesion. This provides strong evidence that these cancer-associated mutations impair a subset of Rsc2-dependent activities that relates specifically to cohesion. Furthermore, we showed that expression of these two cancer mutations in human cells completely impairs the ability of BAF180 to promote centromeric sister chromatid cohesion, identifying a novel, cancer-relevant tumour suppressor function.

BAF180 missense cancer mutations expressed in yeast do not impair Rsc2-dependent transcriptional activity
Figure 5.5. BAF180 missense mutations expressed in human cells result in a defect in centromeric cohesion. (A) FISH analysis of G2 phase U2OS cells transfected with the indicated BAF180 expression construct using a probe directed against the centromere of chromosome 10. The distances between the signals between sister chromatids were measured and the distribution of measurements was plotted as a histogram. (B) The data in (A) are presented as a cumulative plot to further illustrate the defect in cohesion in cells transfected with cancer-associated mutants. Statistical analysis of the data presented in (A) and (B) showed that rescue of the cohesion defect by reintroduction of WT BAF180 (siBAF180 + GFP-BAF180) was significant ($P < 0.001$, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). In contrast, centromeric cohesion in cells expressing the cancer mutants was not significantly different from that in BAF180-depleted cells containing empty vector (siBAF180 + GFP; $P = 0.06$ for T232P and $P = 0.37$ for M538I), but was significantly different from that in cells with WT BAF180 reintroduced ($P < 0.001$ for both mutants compared with WT).
We showed that the T67P and M280I mutations expressed in Rsc2 did not sensitise cells to DMSO or non-permissive temperature, and did not impair the ability of Rsc2 to repress transcription of the HXT7 gene. These results strongly suggest that these mutations do not impair a transcriptional subset of Rsc2-related functions. This has very important implications for the role of BAF180 as a tumour suppressor, because BAF180 (and other SWI/SNF subunits) are widely believed to exert their tumour suppressor activity through transcriptional regulation. Taken with our other observations that p21 transcription does not appear to be strictly controlled by BAF180 in all cell types, these data argue for additional, more important roles of BAF180 in tumour suppression. Evidence from another study examining the effect of SWI/SNF cancer-associated mutations supports the idea that additional functions of SWI/SNF exist in tumour suppression. The study by Vries et al. showed that a selection of cancer-derived SNF5 mutations were able to initiate p16INK4A-dependent G1 arrest, senescence and apoptosis (Vries et al. 2005). Therefore, other processes other than transcriptional regulation of proliferation might underlie the cancer association of these mutations.

**BAF180 missense cancer mutations have different effects on protein stability but completely impair cohesion in mammalian cells**

The T67P mutation expressed in budding yeast Rsc2 destabilized the protein, suggesting that limiting amounts of BAF180 in human cells might underlie its tumourigenic effect. In support of this idea, the majority of BAF180 mutations in various cancers result in a truncated protein product. However, we found that when this mutation was overexpressed in human cells, in which protein levels were comparable to wild-type BAF180-expressing cells, the T232P mutation completely impaired the ability of BAF180 to restore centromere cohesion. In addition, the rate of unequal sister chromatid exchange when this mutation was expressed in Rsc2 was very similar to rsc2 null cells. These findings suggest that the T232 residue and BD2 of BAF180 are critically important for cohesion, and that changes in protein levels are perhaps a secondary consequence of its mutation to proline. The T232 residue occurs in the αA helix of BD2, and therefore might be directly involved in acetyl-lysine binding or regulating the architecture of this bromodomain.

Expression of the M538I mutation in BAF180 was also completely unable to rescue the cohesion defect, and expression of the equivalent M280I mutation in Rsc2 led to a very similar increase in unequal sister chromatid exchange. This mutation resides in the αZ helix of BAF180 BD4 and did not compromise the stability of Rsc2.
Therefore this residue and BAF180 BD4 also appear to be critical for BAF180-dependent cohesion. Although we did not examine the effect of the H1204P mutation on cohesion in human cells, we found that it increased levels of unequal sister chromatid exchange to rates comparable to rsc2 null cells and cells expressing T67P and M280I. Moreover, this mutation appeared to impair all functions of Rsc2 to levels comparable to an rsc2 null, which is consistent with its highly destabilizing effect. Therefore, we predict that expression of this mutation in human cells is also very likely to severely disrupt centromeric cohesion.

Distinct effects of BAF180 missense cancer mutations suggest different functions for individual bromodomains

Although the three BAF180 cancer mutations had very similar effects in some assays, they were also seen to behave very differently in others. Firstly, expression of the M280I mutation in Rsc2 reproducibly led to increased resistance to the alkylating agent MMS. Because this mutation appeared to slightly stabilize the Rsc2 protein, this resistance might simply represent limiting amounts of Rsc2 in wild-type cells. An alternative explanation comes from a report showing that whilst rad53 null cells rapidly lose viability after MMS, due to the inability to activate the DNA damage checkpoint, reduced levels of Rad53 results in resistance to MMS (Cordón-Preciado et al. 2006). An explanation follows that cells with reduced amounts of Rad53 are able to maintain fork stability, but cannot initiate an intra-S phase checkpoint (Cordón-Preciado et al. 2006). The finding that the M280I mutation in Rsc2 has a similar effect suggests a previously undiscovered role for Rsc2 in the intra-S checkpoint. However, this possibility is difficult to reconcile with findings by us and from other labs showing that Rsc2 is not required for G1 or G2/M DNA damage checkpoint activation (See chapter 3, Chambers et al. 2012, Oum et al. 2011). Nevertheless, this does not necessarily rule out a specific function of Rsc2 in the intra-S checkpoint, which has not been specifically tested. The H548P mutation also behaved in a manner that was not entirely expected. Expression of this mutation, which led to a severe reduction in levels of Rsc2 protein, actually led to worse survival than the rsc2 null strain when grown at the non-permissive temperature. This suggests that this mutation somehow functions in a dominant negative manner under certain conditions. Because haploid yeast was used in these assays (in which the only Rsc2 present is the mutant form), one possibility is that the small amount of Rsc2 expressing this mutation inhibits the activity of Rsc1. This is conceivable because rsc1 null cells are also temperature sensitive, but to a lesser extent than rsc2 cells (Oum et al. 2011). In addition, the BAH domains of Rsc1
and Rsc2 both bind to H3 (Chambers et al. 2013). Therefore, alteration of the structure of the Rsc2 BAH domain could conceivably interfere with the binding of the Rsc1 BAH domain to chromatin. Such an effect on the conserved BAF180 BAH domains is likely to further compromise the normal function of the protein and might have relevance in tumourigenesis.
CHAPTER 6: NOVEL HDAC INHIBITORS SENSITIZE CELLS LACKING BAF180

6.1. Results

Introduction

The high-throughput screening technology known as heterozygote diploid-based synthetic lethality analysis with microarrays (dSLAM) is often used to identify synthetic lethal interactions in budding yeast. dSLAM essentially examines genome-wide synthetic lethality using a query mutation, which is introduced into a large scale population of ~6000 haploid-convertible heterozygote diploid yeast knockout mutants via integrative transformation (Pan et al. 2007). The resulting heterozygous diploid double mutants are sporulated to generate single and double mutant haploid strains, which are examined for synthetic growth defects. Using this technique, Lin et al. examined 38 query genes involved in histone (de)acetylation, and identified synthetic lethal interactions between Rsc2 and components of the Hda1 and Rpd3 HDAC complexes (Lin et al. 2008). This finding promoted us to address whether loss of BAF180, which is the mammalian homologue of Rsc2, also results in synthetic lethality with loss of HDACs. Moreover, because BAF180 is frequently mutated in cancer, a conserved synthetic lethal interaction with HDAC loss could be exploited as a potential therapeutic strategy using HDAC inhibitors.

BAF180 protein expression is lost or reduced in 50% of a panel of breast cancer cell lines

It is now well established that BAF180 is an important tumour suppressor gene, given its frequency of mutation in cancer as described in previous sections. However, the full scale of BAF180 involvement in cancer is likely to be underappreciated because relatively few whole-exome sequencing studies have been performed. In order to further examine the involvement of BAF180 in cancer we screened a panel of 16 breast cancer cells lines for BAF180 protein levels using Western blotting. Strikingly, we found that 8 out of 16 cell lines showed severely reduced or completely absent BAF180 expression (Figure 6.1). Intriguingly, two of the cell lines that have had their genomes fully sequenced and lacked BAF180 expression (red asterisks) did not contain mutations in PBRM1. These findings suggest that BAF180 expression might
Figure 6.1. BAF180 protein expression is lost or reduced at high frequency in breast cancer cells. Analysis of BAF180 expression in a panel of 16 breast cancer cell lines by Western blotting. α-tubulin was used as a loading control. Red asterisks indicate genome-sequenced cell lines that do not contain a mutation in the gene encoding BAF180.
be lost at an unappreciated frequency via mechanisms other than mutation of the *PBRM1* gene.

*Screening a panel of novel and commercially available HDAC inhibitors for synthetic lethality in BAF180 -/- mESCs*

Our observation that BAF180 expression can be lost via mutation-independent mechanisms suggests that BAF180 mutation spectrums underrepresent the true frequency of BAF180 loss in cancer. We realized that exploiting BAF180 loss could provide an important means to develop treatments for BAF180-deficient cancers. Because Rsc2 is synthetic lethal with HDACs in budding yeast, and HDAC inhibitors are a very promising class of small molecules for cancer therapy, we set out to test whether HDAC inhibitors would specifically sensitize mammalian cells lacking BAF180.

We first procured a panel of 7 commercially available and 10 novel HDAC inhibitors, the latter of which were synthesized by the John Spencer lab. The novel HDAC inhibitors are structurally similar to SAHA, which consists of an aryl cap, a flexible linker and a zinc-binding motif (Figure 6.2A). Originally these compounds were synthesized using ‘click’ chemistry, which alters the zinc-binding motif and the conformational restriction of the linker region (Spencer et al. 2012). The resulting set of structurally distinct HDAC inhibitors display varied entropy upon enzyme binding, altered enzyme selectivity, and pharmacokinetics (Spencer et al. 2012). An example of the chemical structure of two ferrocene-based HDAC inhibitors, JAHA and JA125, which were produced using SAHA ‘click’ chemistry, are shown in Figure 6.2A.

Next, we performed viability assays on wild type (+/+) and BAF180 knockout (-/-) mESCs using these 17 HDAC inhibitors. The full list of HDAC inhibitors is shown in Table 6.3. The BAF180 -/- cells were no more sensitive to SAHA than the wild-type cells (Figure 6.2B). The ferrocene-based SAHA analogue JAHA also did not lead to increased sensitivity in the BAF180 -/- cells. In contrast, JA125 reproducibly led to substantially reduced viability in the BAF180 -/- cells compared to WT (Figure 6.2B). The complete viability assay dataset for all of the HDAC inhibitors is shown in Appendix I. The inhibitors JA234 and Scriptaid, and to a lesser extent JA224 and KD5170 also reproducibly sensitized the BAF180 -/- cells (Appendix I and Table 6.1).

We calculated the IC50 viability ratio for BAF180 +/- and BAF180 -/- cells for each drug as a measure of the BAF180 -/- fold-sensitivity (Table 6.1). JA125, JA234 and Scriptaid sensitized the BAF180 -/- mESCs 3.1-, 2.3-, and 1.8-fold, respectively.
Figure 6.2. Novel HDAC inhibitors specifically sensitize BAF180 -/- mESCs
(A) Chemical structures of SAHA and its analogues JAHA and JA125 generated by click chemistry. (B) Viability curves of WT (+/+) or BAF180 knockout (-/-) mESCs following exposure to SAHA, JAHA and JA125.
The remaining drugs all showed fold-sensitivities of less than 1.4 (Table 6.1 and Appendix I). Where available, the activity of each HDAC inhibitor (IC50, µM) against the 11 human HDAC enzymes is shown in Table 6.1 and colour coded by efficacy. Intriguingly, JA125, JA234 and Scriptaid, which sensitize the BAF180 -/- cells to the greatest extent, differ from the other drugs in that they strongly inhibit HDACs 1, 2, 6, and also show the strongest inhibition of HDAC8 (Table 6.1). Furthermore, JA125 and JA234 are the only two drugs that show strong inhibition of HDAC3. Collectively, these results suggest that properties unique to the novel HDAC inhibitors JA125 JA234 confer an ability to induce synthetic lethality in mESCs lacking BAF180.

6.2. Discussion

In this section we extended our findings from previous chapters to consider a possible therapeutic option for the treatment of BAF180-deficient cancers. We first screened a set of breast cancer cell lines for BAF180 protein expression and found that an unexpected number showed loss of or reduced BAF180. This suggests that BAF180 loss might be much more widespread in cancer than is currently realised. Furthermore, it suggests that successfully exploiting BAF180 deficiency in cancer could be particularly fruitful as a therapeutic strategy. To this end, we evaluated whether HDAC inhibitors could be of potential use to specifically sensitize BAF180-deficient cells. Tantalizingly, two novel HDAC inhibitors with unique pharmacophore properties substantially sensitized mESCs lacking BAF180 compared to wild-type mESCs. Further research using these inhibitors is necessary to assess their full potential for the treatment of BAF180-deficient cancers.

*Mutation-independent mechanisms contribute to loss of BAF180 expression in breast cancer*

We found that in 8 out of 16 breast cancer cell lines BAF180 protein expression was reduced or lost, and 2 of these 8 cell lines that have had their genomes fully sequenced did not contain mutations in *PBRM1*. Thus, alternative mechanisms might contribute to reduced BAF180 protein expression in breast cancer. Xia et al. reported *PBRM1* LOH in 25 out of 52 (48.1%) primary breast tumours, and only one of these tumours contained a *PBRM1* mutation (Xia et al. 2008). Although BAF180 protein levels were not assessed in these cases, *PBRM1* LOH could conceivably reduce
Table 6.1. Profile of HDAC inhibitors and their effects on BAF180 +/+ and BAF180 -/- mESCs. BAF180 sensitivity values are calculated as the IC50 ratio of IC50 BAF180 +/+ and BAF180 -/- cells. A value greater than 1 indicates that BAF180 -/- cells are inhibited more effectively than BAF180 +/+ cells. Activity of each inhibitor against the 11 human HDAC enzymes (IC50, µM) is provided and colour coded by efficacy (dark red is very strong inhibition (<1 x 10⁻³ µM), red is strong inhibition (<1 x 10⁻² µM), orange is moderate inhibition (<1 x 10⁻¹ µM), yellow is weak inhibition (<1.0 µM), pale green is very weak inhibition (<20 µM), IA is inactive, and ? Means the data is unavailable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HDAC inhibitor</th>
<th>BAF180 sensitivity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JA125¹</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.5 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>9.5 x 10⁻¹</td>
<td>7.2 x 10⁻¹</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2.6 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA234¹</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>3.7 x 10⁻¹</td>
<td>4.1 x 10⁻¹</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>1.4 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scriptaid²</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.4 x 10⁻⁰</td>
<td>1.4 x 10⁻¹</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>3.4 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.5 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA224¹</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD5170³</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>8.0 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>3.0 x 10⁻³</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>1.4 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>8.5 x 10⁻⁰</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.8 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBHA²</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC1568³</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA245¹</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA246¹</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAHA¹</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>1.1 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>1.4 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>8.0 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHA¹</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.0 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>9.0 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>6.7 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>1.9 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-H 106²</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA³</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>2.0 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>1.0 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>2.2 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>1.6 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>2.0 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>8.1 x 10⁻³</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>8.0 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>2.8 x 10⁻²</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Spencer et al. 2012
²Richon et al. 1998
³Hassig et al. 2008
⁴Huber et al. 2011
⁵Duong et al. 2008
BAF180 protein levels by at least 50%. Therefore, PBRM1 LOH could underlie the reduced BAF180 expression we observe in the non-mutated breast cancer cell lines. Alternatively, the PBRM1 gene could be epigenetically silenced. In support of this possibility, Brough et al. reported that reduced PDS5B expression in 75 out of 160 (46.9%) breast tumours was correlated with promoter methylation status rather than genomic loss (Brough et al. 2013). Again, the PDS5B protein loss frequency of 46.9% is remarkably similar to that which we observe for BAF180. In addition, the loss of STAG2 expression in 27% of gastric cancers, 23% of colorectal carcinomas, and 30% of prostate carcinomas was not associated with mutations in the STAG2 gene (Kim et al. 2012). Therefore, the expression of proteins that regulate centromeric cohesion, including BAF180, appears to be reduced or lost in cancer at a far higher frequency than that represented by their mutation frequency. Moreover, these findings add further weight to the notion that disruption of centromere cohesion contributes to tumourigenesis.

*mESCs lacking BAF180 are hypersensitive to novel HDAC inhibitors*

We utilized a panel of commercially available and novel HDAC inhibitors to broadly test the hypothesis that loss of BAF180 is synthetic lethal with loss of HDACs, as is the case with its yeast homologue, Rsc2. This approach has advantages and limitations over using alternative synthetic screening techniques such as siRNA library screens. Because the panel HDAC inhibitors used generally displayed broad HDAC specificity, we were unable to firmly identify whether BAF180 is synthetic lethal with a single HDAC or a combination of HDACs. However, because some HDAC inhibitors already represent a very promising class of small molecule for cancer therapy, this approach potentially allows us to bypass the drug development process. We found that two novel HDAC inhibitors, JA125 and JA234, were particularly effective at reducing viability in mESCs lacking BAF180, suggesting that loss of BAF180 is indeed synthetic lethal with HDAC inhibition. These two inhibitors display pharmacological activity that is distinct from all of the other HDAC inhibitors tested. Essentially, they target HDACs 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8 with the same relative activity as SAHA, but with ~10-fold higher efficacy. Because SAHA did not sensitize the BAF180 +/- mESCs, it seems that the improved inhibition of these particular HDACs is a critical property of these HDAC inhibitors.
A limited group of HDACs might be responsible for the synthetic lethality with BAF180 loss

The subtle differences in activity of some of the other inhibitors might shed light on which HDACs are particularly relevant for the synthetic lethality with loss of BAF180. For example, JAHA displays the same inhibition as SAHA for HDACs 1, 2, 3 and 8, but inhibits HDAC6 with ~24-fold greater efficiency. However, JAHA does not sensitize the BAF180 -/- mESCs any better than SAHA. Therefore, HDAC6 inhibition alone can perhaps be ruled out as being responsible for the synthetic lethality with loss of BAF180. HDAC6 is a cytoplasmic deacetylase that regulates cellular motility, adhesion and chaperone function through its targeting of tubulin, cortactin and HSP90 (Valenzuela-Fernandez et al. 2008). To date, BAF180 has not been directly implicated in these processes, suggesting that a synthetic lethal interaction with HDAC6 is unlikely. A second example is with Scriptaid, which sensitized the BAF180 -/- mESCs, but to a lesser extent than JA125 and JA234. The main difference between Scriptaid and these two inhibitors is that it displays ~150-fold weaker inhibition of HDAC3. Therefore, inhibiting HDAC3 might be important for inducing synthetic lethality with loss of BAF180. Intriguingly, both of these proteins are required for centromeric cohesion (Brownlee et al. 2014, Eot-Hollier et al. 2008), thus it is conceivable that simultaneous loss of BAF180 and HDAC3 reduces viability by severely disrupting chromosome segregation.

Synthetic lethality with loss of BAF180 and inhibition of HDACs 1, 2 and 8 can also be interpreted in the context of our results from previous chapters. HDACs 1 and 2 are involved in DNA repair via NHEJ, and to a lesser extent via HR, by deacetylating H3K56 (Miller et al. 2010). We showed that BAF180 is important for maintaining viability and promoting DNA repair after treatment with MMC, which likely reflects a function in cohesion-dependent DNA repair by HR. Although we did not directly test the involvement of BAF180 in NHEJ, a role for BAF180 in this pathway seems likely because both of its budding yeast homologues, Rsc1 and Rsc2, are required for NHEJ (Chambers et al. 2012). Therefore, simultaneous inhibition of HDACs 1 and 2 with loss of BAF180 might lead to synthetic lethality because the repair of endogenous DNA damage is severely compromised.

Finally, JA125, JA234 and Scriptaid were further distinguished from the other HDAC inhibitors in that they most strongly inhibited HDAC8. In the absence of HDAC8, SMC3 is not deacetylated, ultimately leading to reduced cohesin loading (Deardorff et al. 2012). Thus, in a manner that might be similar to inhibiting HDAC3,
inhibition of HDAC8 in cells lacking BAF180 might lead to synthetic lethality because of a severe cohesion defect and overwhelming chromosome segregation errors. In summary, these findings suggest that strongly inhibiting a discrete combination of HDACs preferentially leads to synthetic lethality in cells lacking BAF180. It is compelling that the two drugs, namely JA125 and JA234, which bring about the greatest synthetic lethal effect, most strongly inhibit a combination of four HDACs that function in the same pathway as BAF180 relating to cohesion. In order to explore the full potential of these HDAC inhibitors testing will need to extend to relevant human cancer cell lines.
Appendix I. HDAC inhibitors viability assays
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