

Chromatin Modifiers Alter Recombination Between Divergent DNA Sequences

Ujani Chakraborty, Beata Mackenroth, David Shalloway, and Eric Alani¹

Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853-2703

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5011-9339 (E.A.)

ABSTRACT Recombination between divergent DNA sequences is actively prevented by heteroduplex rejection mechanisms. In baker's yeast, such antirecombination mechanisms can be initiated by the recognition of DNA mismatches in heteroduplex DNA by MSH proteins, followed by recruitment of the *Sgs1-Top3-Rmi1* helicase–topoisomerase complex to unwind the recombination intermediate. We previously showed that the repair/rejection decision during single-strand annealing recombination is temporally regulated by MSH (*MutS* homolog) protein levels and by factors that excise nonhomologous single-stranded tails. These observations, coupled with recent studies indicating that mismatch repair (MMR) factors interact with components of the histone chaperone machinery, encouraged us to explore roles for epigenetic factors and chromatin conformation in regulating the decision to reject vs. repair recombination between divergent DNA substrates. This work involved the use of an inverted repeat recombination assay thought to measure sister chromatid repair during DNA replication. Our observations are consistent with the histone chaperones CAF-1 and *Rtt106*, and the histone deacetylase *Sir2*, acting to suppress heteroduplex rejection and the *Rpd3*, *Hst3*, and *Hst4* deacetylases acting to promote heteroduplex rejection. These observations, and double-mutant analysis, have led to a model in which nucleosomes located at DNA lesions stabilize recombination intermediates and compete with MMR factors that mediate heteroduplex rejection.

KEYWORDS heteroduplex rejection; homologous recombination; mismatch repair; histone chaperones; chromatin modifiers

HOMOLOGOUS recombination (HR) is a conservative DNA repair pathway that is critical for repairing DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs). This process is regulated to prevent recombination between divergent DNA sequences [reviewed in George and Alani (2012)]. Such regulation, which can prevent deleterious chromosomal rearrangements, is initiated through the recognition of mismatches in heteroduplex DNA that form during strand invasion steps involving single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) from a broken chromosome and a divergent duplex donor. In the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *MutS* homolog (MSH) *Msh2-Msh6* mismatch repair (MMR) complexes recognize mismatches in heteroduplex DNA and recruit the RecQ family helicase–topoisomerase complex *Sgs1-Top3-Rmi1* to unwind

the recombination intermediate in a process known as heteroduplex rejection (Datta *et al.* 1996; Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1999; Nicholson *et al.* 2000; Myung *et al.* 2001; Spell and Jinks-Robertson 2004; Sugawara *et al.* 2004; Goldfarb and Alani 2005; Chakraborty *et al.* 2016; Hum and Jinks-Robertson 2019). If rejection does not occur, MSH complexes initiate repair of the mismatches in heteroduplex DNA after/while the break is repaired. We refer to this regulation as the repair/rejection decision.

An important aspect of the repair/rejection decision is that tolerating multiple mismatches in heteroduplex DNA formed from divergent substrates can lead to chromosomal rearrangements, but a highly efficient rejection system can result in DSBs that are not repaired. Various factors are likely to influence this decision [reviewed in Chakraborty and Alani (2016)]. For example, we found that MSH protein levels influence the repair/rejection decision during single-strand annealing (SSA) (Chakraborty *et al.* 2016). During SSA, HR is initiated by a DSB located between two closely spaced repeat sequences. Resection of the DSB promotes annealing of homologous sequences, followed by the clipping of 3' non-homologous tails that must be excised before repair steps

Copyright © 2019 by the Genetics Society of America
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.119.302395>

Manuscript received April 4, 2019; accepted for publication June 18, 2019; published Early Online June 20, 2019.

Supplemental material available at FigShare: <https://doi.org/10.25386/genetics.8292140>.

¹Corresponding author: Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, 459 Biotechnology Bldg., Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-2703. E-mail: eea3@cornell.edu

are completed. During SSA involving divergent repeat sequences, modest overexpression of *Msh6* results in a significant increase in heteroduplex rejection due to a decrease in the availability of *Msh2-Msh3* to clip the 3' tails. Thus 3' tail clipping during SSA serves as a regulatory step, with rejection favored prior to 3' tail removal. Consistent with these findings, Anand *et al.* (2017) showed in a break-induced repair recombination system that 3' nonhomologous tails promote heteroduplex rejection, and that the absence of such tails prevents it. These observations indicate cross talk between the rejection machinery and the local environment that likely occurs prior to steps in HR that involve repair DNA synthesis.

Recent studies have indicated that chromatin structure can influence HR outcomes. Several nucleosome remodeling complexes have been shown to be recruited to DSBs in steps thought to increase chromatin accessibility, and allow strand resection and presynaptic filament formation [reviewed in Hauer and Gasser (2017)]. Such chromatin remodelers were shown to promote chromatin mobility during DSB formation and the increased mobility correlated to more efficient repair by HR (Dion *et al.* 2012; Miné-Hattab and Rothstein 2012; Neumann *et al.* 2012; Hauer *et al.* 2017). Also, histone chaperones, which act in DNA replication-dependent nucleosome assembly, have been implicated in DNA repair. These chaperones include CAF-1, *Asf1*, and *Rtt106*, which are all involved in DNA replication-dependent nucleosome assembly (Tyler *et al.* 1999; Tagami *et al.* 2004; Huang *et al.* 2005). For example, nucleosome assembly mediated by CAF-1 during DNA repair is coupled with DNA synthesis and requires an interaction with PCNA (Gaillard *et al.* 1996; Tyler *et al.* 1999; Linger and Tyler 2005; Polo *et al.* 2006; Pietrobon *et al.* 2014), and CAF-1 and *Asf1* play roles in restoring chromatin after DNA repair in budding yeast at repair sites by turning off the DNA damage checkpoint (Chen *et al.* 2008; Kim and Haber 2009; Diao *et al.* 2017).

Histone modifications have also been shown to affect genome stability. For example, deacetylation of an acetylated lysine residue at amino acid 56 in histone 3 (H3K56) by *Hst3* and *Hst4* is required for the suppression of mutations and gross chromosomal rearrangements, and acetylation of H3K56 by *Rtt109* is also required for the suppression of mutations (Kadyrova *et al.* 2013). In contrast, histone deacetylases such as Rpd3L and *Hda1* promote trinucleotide repeat expansions associated with various neurodegenerative diseases (Debacker *et al.* 2012). Thus, histone acetylation and deacetylation are likely to play important roles in various stages of HR. In support of roles for acetylases and deacetylases in HR, Tamburini and Tyler (2005) showed that histone acetyltransferases such as *Gcn5* and *Esa1* are recruited to a HO (homothallism) endonuclease-induced DSB in *S. cerevisiae*, followed at a later stage by recruitment of histone deacetylases such as *Sir2*, *Hst1*, and *Rpd3*. Furthermore, they showed that mutating acetylable lysine residues in histone subunit 4, or deleting *Gcn5* or *Rpd3*, caused inviability in response to HO endonuclease-induced lesions repaired

primarily by HR. These observations suggest that, after DSB formation, histone acetylases participate in nucleosome removal in the vicinity of the break and “open up” the chromatin structure, increasing the accessibility of the underlying DNA to repair factors. Once DNA repair is underway, histone deacetylases likely modify the chromatin to a “closed” conformation that serves as a commitment step to complete the repair process and restore chromatin to its original state.

The NAD-dependent histone deacetylase *Sir2*, known for its role in transcriptional silencing and heterochromatin formation, also plays direct roles in forming a repressive local chromatin environment around most euchromatic replication origins (Gartenberg and Smith 2016; Hoggard *et al.* 2018). *Sir2* is also involved in DNA repair pathways such as nonhomologous end joining and nucleotide excision repair (Tsukamoto *et al.* 1997; Boulton and Jackson 1998; Guintini *et al.* 2017). *sir2* mutants are hypersensitive to DNA-damaging agents, and a number of studies have reported that in response to DNA DSBs, a significant fraction of the histone-bound SIR complex was displaced from subtelomeric regions and relocated to sites of DSBs in a DNA checkpoint-dependent manner, suggesting that the recruitment of SIR complexes reflects the assembly of a repressed chromatin state following DNA repair (Martin *et al.* 1999; McAinsh *et al.* 1999; Mills *et al.* 1999).

A number of studies have shown that nucleosome assembly on newly synthesized DNA during replication and MMR are mutually inhibitory processes. MMR during DNA replication is thought to be restricted to the short time window between the formation of the mismatch and the chaperone-assisted assembly of nucleosomes on the newly replicated DNA (Li *et al.* 2009; Kadyrova *et al.* 2011; Schöpf *et al.* 2012; Rodrigues Blanco *et al.* 2016). The human MSH2-MSH6 complex has been shown to interact with CAF-1 *in vitro* (Schöpf *et al.* 2012). Additionally, human MSH2-MSH6 inhibits CAF-1 and ASF1A-dependent packaging of a DNA mismatch into a nucleosome, and deposition of the (H3-H4)₂ tetramers on DNA protects the discontinuous daughter strand from unnecessary degradation during MMR (Rodrigues Blanco *et al.* 2016). Moreover, Pietrobon *et al.* (2014) have shown in fission yeast that CAF-1 stabilizes D-loops in an HR pathway, by counteracting their disassembly mediated by the RecQ family helicase Rqh1 when cells replicate a damaged template.

How is the balance between heteroduplex rejection and repair through HR maintained? We tested roles for histone acetylases, deacetylases, and chaperones in regulating the repair/rejection decision in baker's yeast. To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine roles for epigenetic factors and chromatin modifiers in modulating heteroduplex rejection. We show that histone chaperones CAF-1 and *Rtt106* suppress heteroduplex rejection in steps dependent on mismatch recognition. Additionally, the histone deacetylase *Sir2* appears to act in a common pathway with CAF-1 and/or *Rtt106* to suppress rejection. However, other factors involved

in nucleosome assembly during DNA replication, such as *Asf1* and *Rtt109*, do not affect rejection efficiency. Similarly, histone acetylases such as *Gcn5*, which assemble early at recombination sites, and other histone deacetylases such as *Hst1* do not affect the efficiency of rejection. However, mutants lacking the *Rpd3*, or *Hst3* and *Hst4* histone deacetylases show defects in rejection. Taken together, these results are consistent with the idea that nucleosomes at DNA lesions, which are likely to be localized independently of DNA synthesis, stabilize recombination intermediates and thus prevent access/unwinding by antirecombination factors.

Materials and Methods

Yeast strains and plasmids

Yeast strains used in this study are listed in Table 1, and were constructed and grown using standard techniques (Rose *et al.* 1990). Gene disruptions used to make the strains are described in Table 1 and Table 2 (*geneXΔ::KANMX*), and were obtained by PCR amplification (details provided upon request) of chromosomal DNA derived from the yeast knockout collection (Brachmann *et al.* 1998). PCR products, linear DNA fragments obtained from pEAI98 (*msh2Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG*) and pEAA633 (*pol30-8::KANMX*, see below), and 2μ vectors (see below) were introduced into yeast strains using standard transformation procedures (Gietz and Schiestl 1991). The presence of mutant alleles was confirmed by PCR analysis of chromosomal DNA, and in some cases DNA sequencing of the amplified DNA fragments.

The mutations comprising the *pol30-8* allele (R61A, D63A) were introduced into pEAA578 (*POL30::KANMX*) by Q5 site-directed mutagenesis (New England Biolabs, Beverly, MA) to create the single-step integrating vector pEAA633 (*pol30-8::KANMX*). Plasmids pRS426 (2μ , *URA3*) (Christianson *et al.* 1992) and pEAM272 (*MSH2*, *MSH6*, 2μ , *URA3*) (Chakraborty *et al.* 2018) were used in the MSH overexpression experiments presented in Table 2.

Inverted repeat recombination assay

Strains used to measure HR and divergent recombination are listed in Table 1. Strains lacking plasmids were initially struck onto synthetic complete plates and those containing 2μ plasmids were struck onto minimal dropout media plates (Rose *et al.* 1990). A total of 10–117 single colonies per strain were then inoculated into 5 ml of synthetic complete or minimal dropout medium containing 4% galactose and 2% glycerol, and grown to saturation for ~2 days at 30°. Appropriate dilutions of cells were plated onto minimal media (2% galactose and 2% glycerol) plates lacking histidine and the amino acid required to maintain the 2μ plasmid (selective), and onto minimal media (2% glucose) plates lacking the amino acid required to maintain the 2μ plasmid (permissive). Plates were incubated for 4 days at 30° (5 days for experiments

involving *rpd3Δ*) and then scored for frequency of His⁺ colonies. Rates of HR and divergent recombination were calculated as described below.

Analysis of mutation rates

Asteris and Sarkar (1996) showed that Bayesian estimators of mutation rates from fluctuation experiments are more accurate than even the maximum likelihood estimator. We used an extension of their approach to calculate the posterior distribution of the mutation rate per cell division, $\mu = m/N_t$, where m is the estimated mean number of mutations and N_t is the total number of cells in the culture. This permitted credible intervals of the mutation rate ratios to be accurately calculated. Posterior distributions were calculated using the Ma–Sandri–Sarkar likelihood function (Ma *et al.* 1992) for the Lea–Coulson model (Lea and Coulson 1949) with a noninformative (constant) prior over $\log \mu$. The results were insensitive to the choice of prior: Changing to a constant prior over μ or to a $1/\mu^2$ prior changed the estimated mutation rate ratios by < 10% of the distance to the credible interval boundaries (Root-Mean-Square (RMS) deviation = 4%).

Depending on the mutation rates estimated in pilot experiments, fractions f , ranging between 0.005 and 0.4 of the cultures, were plated on nonpermissive medium and counted. The total number of cells in the culture, N_t , was measured in parallel in each case by plating a small aliquot on permissive medium. The likelihood function was calculated independently for each culture using the number of His⁺ colonies, N_t , and f . The statistical error introduced by the partial plating with fraction f was included using the method of Zheng (2008); the statistical error in determining each N_t was included assuming Poisson sampling.

The variation of mutation rates between transformants of the same genotype, except for *hst3Δ hst4Δ*, were modest (Supplemental Material, Table S1). Therefore, the data for these genotypes were pooled, and the mutation rates (Figure 3 and Table 2) were computed from the overall posterior distributions $p(\log \mu_H)$ and $p(\log \mu_D)$ using a quadratic loss function. The 95% credible intervals were computed using the highest posterior density. Figure 2 displays the geometric means of the HR rate (H)/divergent recombination rate (D) ratios computed using the marginal posterior distribution of $p(\log \mu_H - \log \mu_D)$, which was computed by integration over the joint distribution $p(\log \mu_H) \times p(\log \mu_D)$ (Gelman *et al.* 2014). The corresponding 95% credible intervals for $\log(\mu_H/\mu_D)$ were computed from the highest posterior density over $p(\log \mu_H - \log \mu_D)$. The posterior distributions were very close to normal; the Hellinger distances between them and the best-fit normal distributions were 0.04; therefore, integrals were approximated using this assumption.

The *hst3Δ hst4Δ* data displayed anomalies that required special treatment. About 17% of the histidine dropout plates in which independent cultures of *hst3Δ hst4Δ* mutants were

Table 1 Strains used in this study

Strain	Description
SJR328	<i>MATα</i> , <i>ade2-101</i> , <i>his3Δ200</i> , <i>ura3-Nhe</i> , <i>lys2ΔRV::hisG</i> , <i>leu2-R</i>
SJR769	SJR328, <i>cβ2/cβ2::LEU2</i> , homologous 350-bp substrates
GCY615	SJR328, <i>cβ2/cβ2-ns::LEU2</i> , predicted to form four, base–base mismatches in the 350-bp <i>cβ2</i> substrates
GCY559	SJR328, <i>cβ2/cβ2-4L::LEU2</i> , predicted to form four 4-nt loops in the 350-bp <i>cβ2</i> substrates
EAY1605,1606	SJR769, <i>msh2Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG</i>
EAY1609,1610	GCY615, <i>msh2Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG</i>
EAY3853-3856	SJR769, <i>hst3Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3857-3860	GCY615, <i>hst3Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3865-3868	SJR769, <i>hst4Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3869-3872	GCY615, <i>hst4Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3877-3880	SJR769, <i>hst3Δ::KANMX hst4Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY3881-3884	GCY615, <i>hst3Δ::KANMX hst4Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY3964-3967	SJR769, <i>hst1Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3968-3971	GCY615, <i>hst1Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3841-3844	SJR769, <i>sir2Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3845-3848	GCY615, <i>sir2Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3849-3852	GCY559, <i>sir2Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY4002-4005	SJR769, <i>rpd3Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY4006-4009	GCY615, <i>rpd3Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY4047-4050	SJR769, <i>gcn5Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY4051-4054	GCY615, <i>gcn5Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3889-3892	SJR769, <i>cac1Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3893-3896	GCY615, <i>cac1Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3897-3900	GCY559, <i>cac1Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3972,3974,3975	SJR769, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3976-3978	GCY615, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3901-3904	SJR769, <i>asf1Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3905-3908	GCY615, <i>asf1Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3909-3912	GCY559, <i>asf1Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY4127-4129	SJR769, <i>pol30-8::KANMX</i>
EAY4130-4132	GCY615, <i>pol30-8::KANMX</i>
EAY3925, 3926	SJR769, <i>cac1Δ::KANMX asf1Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY3929, 3930	GCY615, <i>cac1Δ::KANMX asf1Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY3933, 3934	GCY559, <i>cac1Δ::KANMX asf1Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY4018-4021	SJR769, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX asf1Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY4022-4025	GCY615, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX asf1Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY3913-3916	SJR769, <i>rtt109Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY3917-3920	GCY615, <i>rtt109Δ::KANMX</i>
EAY4010-4013	SJR769, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX cac1Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY4014-4017	GCY615, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX cac1Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY4027-4029	SJR769, <i>sir2Δ::KANMX cac1Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY4030-4033	GCY615, <i>sir2Δ::KANMX cac1Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY4034-4037	SJR769, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX sir2Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY4038-4041	GCY615, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX sir2Δ::NATMX</i>
EAY4042-4044	SJR769, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX cac1Δ::NATMX sir2Δ::HYGMX</i>
EAY4045,4046	GCY615, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX cac1Δ::NATMX sir2Δ::HYGMX</i>
EAY4069-4072	SJR769, <i>cac1Δ::KANMX msh2Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG</i>
EAY4073-4076	GCY615, <i>cac1Δ::KANMX msh2Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG</i>
EAY4077-4080	SJR769, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX msh2Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG</i>
EAY4081-4084	GCY615, <i>rtt106Δ::KANMX msh2Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG</i>
EAY4216-4218	SJR769, <i>sir2Δ::KANMX msh2Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG</i>
EAY4220,4222,4223	GCY615, <i>sir2Δ::KANMX msh2Δ::hisG-URA3-hisG</i>

SJR328, SJR769, GCY615, and GCY559 were obtained from Sue Jinks-Robertson and are described in Nicholson *et al.* (2000).

plated (both homologous and divergent strains) had zero colonies, or one colony in one case, that were extremely inconsistent ($P < 10^{-6}$) with the Lea–Coulson model (Lea and Coulson 1949) that provides the basis for the analysis (the median number of colonies in the other cultures were > 100 .) They were omitted since these outliers (eight homologous and seven divergent independent cultures) would distort the analysis and yield extreme recombination rate outliers. This strain

displays extremely high levels of genetic instability (Kadyrova *et al.* 2013), and thus the lack of His⁺ colonies on these plates likely resulted from this phenotype. Even when these values were included, the ratio of HR /divergent recombination rates increased by less than twofold, presumably because the events that caused these unusual values were similar in the two strains.

Because of the above issue and possibly related twofold variation in mutation rates of the different homologous

Table 2 Recombination rates as measured in the inverted repeat reporter assay

Genotype	Cβ2/Cβ2 His ⁺ homologous recombination rate (×10 ⁻⁶)	Cβ2/Cβ2-ns His ⁺ divergent recombination rate (×10 ⁻⁶)	Cβ2/Cβ2 rate/Cβ2/Cβ2-ns rate ^a
Wild-type	0.52 (0.48–0.56) ^b	0.027 (0.024–0.029) ^b	20 (17–22) ^b
<i>msh2Δ</i>	0.92 (0.70–1.15)	2.55 (2.31–2.80)	0.36 (0.28–0.47)
<i>cac1Δ</i>	1.19 (1.00–1.38)	0.030 (0.021–0.040)	40 (28–57)
<i>rtt106Δ</i>	1.87 (1.55–2.20)	0.028 (0.018–0.038)	68 (46–101)
<i>asf1Δ</i>	3.96 (3.30–4.61)	0.27 (0.22–0.32)	15 (11–19)
<i>rtt109Δ</i>	3.59 (2.93–4.24)	0.22 (0.16–0.27)	16 (12–23)
<i>cac1Δ asf1Δ</i>	0.60 (0.32–0.89)	0.093 (0.059–0.13)	6.4 (3.5–12)
<i>rtt106Δ asf1Δ</i>	1.98 (1.65–2.31)	0.14 (0.097–0.18)	14 (10–20)
<i>cac1Δ rtt106Δ</i>	2.33 (1.85–2.80)	0.018 (0.0095–0.027)	134 (78–229)
<i>pol30-8</i>	0.74 (0.61–0.87)	0.026 (0.020–0.033)	28 (21–39)
<i>hst3Δ</i>	1.67 (1.44–1.89)	0.090 (0.066–0.11)	19 (14–25)
<i>hst4Δ</i>	5.31 (4.29–6.34)	0.36 (0.29–0.43)	15 (11–19)
<i>hst3Δ hst4Δ</i>	11.3 (8.66–14.8)	4.53 (3.79–5.42)	2.5 (1.8–3.5)
<i>hst1Δ</i>	1.34 (1.13–1.55)	0.047 (0.033–0.063)	29 (20–41)
<i>sir2Δ</i>	2.12 (1.93–2.31)	0.050 (0.040–0.059)	43 (35–53)
<i>rpc3Δ</i>	0.25 (0.22–0.29)	0.026 (0.020–0.033)	9.7 (7.4–13)
<i>gcn5Δ</i>	0.98 (0.86–1.10)	0.068 (0.054–0.082)	15 (11–19)
<i>sir2Δ cac1Δ</i>	4.44 (3.77–5.11)	0.030 (0.015–0.046)	151 (87–264)
<i>sir2Δ rtt106Δ</i>	5.40 (4.36–6.43)	0.12 (0.089–0.16)	44 (31–62)
<i>sir2Δ cac1Δ rtt106Δ</i>	6.32 (5.26–7.37)	0.18 (0.13–0.24)	35 (25–50)
<i>msh2Δ cac1Δ</i>	3.18 (2.58–3.78)	5.61 (5.01–6.20)	0.57 (0.45–0.70)
<i>msh2Δ rtt106Δ</i>	4.07 (3.49–4.65)	3.35 (2.98–3.67)	1.2 (1.0–1.4)
<i>msh2Δ sir2Δ</i>	4.87 (4.23–5.50)	3.58 (3.05–4.11)	1.4 (1.1–1.7)
Wild-type-2μ empty vector ^c	0.74 (0.63–0.85)	0.034 (0.022–0.048)	22 (15–33)
Wild-type-2μ MSH2-MSH6 ^c	5.69 (4.82–6.54)	0.061 (0.043–0.080)	94 (67–132)
<i>sir2Δ</i> -2μ empty vector	4.35 (3.58–5.13)	0.067 (0.045–0.089)	66 (45–96)
<i>sir2Δ</i> -2μ MSH2-MSH6	4.55 (3.52–5.59)	0.040 (0.027–0.053)	116 (77–173)
<i>rtt106Δ</i> -2μ empty vector	2.01 (1.59–2.43)	0.044 (0.028–0.061)	46 (30–71)
<i>rtt106Δ</i> -2μ MSH2-MSH6	2.49 (2.01–2.97)	0.15 (0.10–0.20)	17 (12–25)
		Cβ2/Cβ2-4L rate (×10 ⁻⁶)	Cβ2/Cβ2 rate/Cβ2/Cβ2-4L rate
Wild-type		0.057 (0.042–0.072)	9.2 (7.0–12.1)
<i>cac1Δ</i>		0.070 (0.048–0.093)	17 (12–25)
<i>asf1Δ</i>		0.61 (0.48–0.74)	6.5 (4.9–8.6)
<i>cac1Δ asf1Δ</i>		0.25 (0.17–0.32)	2.4 (1.4–4.3)
<i>sir2Δ</i>		0.15 (0.12–0.18)	14 (11–17)

Recombination rates were calculated as described in the *Materials and Methods*. The genotypes of the parental strains are shown in Table 1. Cβ2/Cβ2, homologous substrate; Cβ2/Cβ2-4L = 4-nt loop mismatch substrate; Cβ2/Cβ2-ns, base–base mismatch substrate.

^a Homologous rate (Cβ2-Cβ2)/divergent rate for strains with the same genotype or overexpression plasmid.

^b Numbers in parentheses indicate 95% credible intervals.

^c Data obtained from Chakraborty *et al.* (2018).

transformants, we computed the mutation rates for each *hst3Δ hst4Δ* transformant separately. The weighted (inverse-variance) means and SD of the transformant log μ values were computed. The ratio and 95% credible intervals were computed using the normal approximation to the posterior distribution.

Repetition of experiments

The inverted repeat recombination assays were repeated on a minimum of two separate days, with roughly an equal number of repetitions per day, and two to four independent transformants were analyzed for each genotype.

Data availability

Strains and plasmids are available upon request. The authors affirm that all data necessary for confirming the conclusions of the article are present within the article, figures, and tables. Table S1, variation in recombination rate between transformants,

can be found at the GSA FigShare portal. Supplemental material available at FigShare: <https://doi.org/10.25386/genetics.8292140>.

Results

Rationale for the experiments performed in this study

CAF-1 was shown to stabilize D-loops in *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* that occur as the result of template switching at replication forks (Pietrobon *et al.* 2014). This observation encouraged us to test whether the histone chaperones CAF-1 and *Rtt106* play roles in stabilizing recombination intermediates during HR, and in turn in suppressing rejection. If these factors play such a role, heteroduplex rejection would occur more frequently in *cac1Δ* (deletion of the large subunit of CAF-1) and *rtt106Δ* mutants; however, heteroduplex rejection functions in these mutant backgrounds should remain dependent on mismatch recognition functions if CAF-1 and

Rtt106 affect the stabilization of recombination intermediates, but not the mechanisms of antirecombination mediated by heteroduplex rejection factors through mismatch recognition.

We also tested roles for other histone chaperones and chromatin-modifying enzymes associated with DNA replication. These included *Asf1*, which binds to newly synthesized H3/H4 dimers that are then acetylated at H3K56 by *Rtt109* (Tyler *et al.* 1999; Driscoll *et al.* 2007; Han *et al.* 2007), and *Rtt109*, which mediates histone modification that promotes binding of H3 to the histone chaperones CAF-1 and *Rtt106*, and, subsequently, the binding of CAF-1 to PCNA, facilitating histone deposition near the replication fork (Li *et al.* 2008). We were encouraged to study the above factors because much is known about the interactions, and cross talk, between the replication apparatus and nucleosome assembly machinery. For example, CAF-1 interacts with the replication processivity clamp PCNA and *Asf1* interacts with RFC, which loads PCNA, and the (Minichromosome Maintenance) helicase (Franco *et al.* 2005; Groth *et al.* 2007). In addition to their roles in nucleosome assembly, *Asf1* and *Rtt109* indirectly promote nucleosome disassembly through H3K56 acetylation (Adkins *et al.* 2004; Adkins and Tyler 2004; Korber *et al.* 2006; Schwabish and Struhl 2006). The multifunctional roles of *Asf1* and *Rtt109* (promoting nucleosome disassembly as well as binding of H3 to CAF-1 and *Rtt106*) thus make it difficult to predict what roles these factors might play in modulating heteroduplex rejection.

Finally, we were encouraged to test roles for the silencing factor *Sir2* and related deacetylases (additional rationale provided below) based on work showing that *Sir2* is recruited by CAF-1 and *Rtt106* to sites of chromatin formation (Huang *et al.* 2007). In the model outlined above, histone chaperones would act in steps that involve the stabilization of recombination intermediates; *Sir2* would act in conjunction with CAF-1 and *Rtt106* to stabilize recombination intermediates. Thus, *Sir2* would be predicted to provide additional steps to stabilize recombination intermediates, and *sir2* Δ mutants would be predicted to increase the frequency of heteroduplex rejection, perhaps to levels similar to that seen in *cac1* Δ and *rtt106* Δ mutants.

We used an inverted repeat recombination assay in baker's yeast to study roles for chromatin modifiers in regulating the repair/rejection decision (Nicholson *et al.* 2000; Figure 1). Specifically, this assay measures spontaneous recombination events between homologous or divergent repeat sequences, which reorient *HIS3* and intron sequences to yield a functional *HIS3* gene. Such events, thought to be initiated by DNA lesions that occur during or shortly after the replication of the recombination substrates, are consistent with repair through sister chromatid gene conversion (Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1998). For each genotype, we calculated the ratio of recombination rates (\pm 95% credible intervals) in a strain containing identical inverted repeat DNA substrates to those seen in a strain containing divergent inverted repeats (*Materials and Methods*). In the divergent strains,

heteroduplex recombination intermediates would form four single-nucleotide mismatches or four 4-nt loop mismatches in a 350-bp substrate (Figure 1). In wild-type cells, this ratio is \sim 20 for single-nucleotide mismatches; in strains containing deletions in *MSH2* or *SGS1* the ratio \sim 1, indicating that HR and divergent recombination rates are similar, whereas deletions in *PMS1* and *MLH1* confer more modest effects (Figure 2 and Table 2; Nicholson *et al.* 2000; Myung *et al.* 2001; Spell and Jinks-Robertson 2004). Similar genetic dependencies have been seen in other assays that measured recombination between divergent DNA substrates (Selva *et al.* 1995; Sugawara *et al.* 2004). These observations have led to heteroduplex rejection models in which MSH proteins recognize mismatches in heteroduplex DNA and recruit the Sgs1-Top3-Rmi1 complex to unwind the recombination intermediate (Myung *et al.* 2001; Spell and Jinks-Robertson 2004; Sugawara *et al.* 2004).

The absence of histone chaperones CAF-1 and Rtt106, but not Asf1 and Rtt109, improves antirecombination

As shown in Figure 2 and Table 2, the *cac1* Δ mutation (deletion of the large subunit of CAF-1) increased the rejection ratio by twofold, compared to wild-type, in recombination assays involving base-base or 4-nt loop mismatches. The *rtt106* Δ mutation conferred a three-to-fourfold increase in this ratio, as measured in the base-base mismatch recombination assay. *msh2* Δ *cac1* Δ and *msh2* Δ *rtt106* Δ mutants showed rejection ratios similar to *msh2* Δ strains, indicating that the increases in the rejection ratios in *cac1* Δ and *rtt106* Δ strains were dependent on the rejection machinery. Interestingly, the *cac1* Δ *rtt106* Δ double mutant showed a rejection ratio significantly higher (sevenfold increase compared to wild-type) than the single mutants, suggesting a redundant function for these two factors analogous to redundant roles for these proteins in DNA replication (Li *et al.* 2008). Together, these observations suggested that deposition of histones by CAF-1 and *Rtt106* during DSB repair stabilized recombination intermediates, making them less accessible to heteroduplex rejection factors.

In contrast, deleting *Asf1* or *Rtt109*, factors thought to act upstream of CAF-1 and *Rtt106*, did not confer an effect on heteroduplex rejection (Table 2). These factors are required to acetylate histone H3 at K56, and the resulting H3K56ac-H4 dimers are then transferred to histone chaperones such as CAF-1 and *Rtt106* (Schneider *et al.* 2006; Driscoll *et al.* 2007; Han *et al.* 2007; Tsubota *et al.* 2007). Interestingly, the *asf1* Δ mutation suppressed the increase in rejection seen in *cac1* Δ or *rtt106* Δ mutants, and for *cac1* Δ *asf1* Δ mutants the rejection ratio was lower than in wild-type cells. Additionally, we performed recombination assays in 4-nt loop mismatch strains where heteroduplex rejection depends primarily on the Msh2-Msh3-complex (Nicholson *et al.* 2000). We found that the *asf1* Δ mutation had a minimal, if any, effect on rejection and that it suppressed the increased rejection seen in *cac1* Δ strains (to lower than wild-type), in agreement with observations from base-base mismatch strains (Figure 2 and




Figure 1 Schematic of an intron-based recombination assay involving inverted repeat sequences that form a functional *HIS3* reporter following homologous recombination [adapted from Nicholson *et al.* (2000)]. (A) Repeat sequences depicted by the green boxes are either identical in sequence (homologous substrate), or differ (divergent) by four SNPs ($c\beta 2/c\beta 2$ -ns) or four 4-nt insertions ($c\beta 2/c\beta 2$ -4L). The $c\beta 2/c\beta 2$ -ns and $c\beta 2/c\beta 2$ -4L substrates are predicted to form base–base and 4-nt loop mismatches in heteroduplex DNA, respectively. In this assay, spontaneous His^+ colonies result from recombination between the 350-bp repeat sequences that reorient *HIS3* (white boxes) and intron (purple boxes) sequences to yield

a full-length *HIS3::intron* gene. (B) A model of how His^+ recombinants arise in this system (Chen and Jinks-Robertson 1998). His^+ recombinants are thought to result from gene conversion events between inverted repeat sequences present on sister chromatids that reorient *HIS3* and intron sequences. In this example, divergent sequences are represented by different shades of green and the length of the gene conversion tract is shown. Homologous and divergent recombination rates for base–base and 4-nt loop substrates were calculated as described in the *Materials and Methods*, and the ratio of homologous to divergent recombination rates is presented as a measure of heteroduplex rejection efficiency.

Table 2). This observation also indicates that the effects on heteroduplex rejection seen in chromatin modifier mutants in the base pair mismatch strains (where heteroduplex rejection is primarily dependent on *Msh2-Msh6*) were not specific to a particular MSH complex.

Previous studies have shown that mutants defective in the CAF-1 complex are sensitive to DNA-damaging agents, and have suggested that during DNA repair, CAF-1 is recruited by the replication processivity clamp PCNA to facilitate DNA synthesis repair steps (Moggs *et al.* 2000; Linger and Tyler 2005). The Stillman group identified an allele of *POL30* [gene encoding PCNA; *pol30-8* (R61A, D63A)] in baker's yeast that displayed reduced binding to CAF-1 and compromised the recruitment of CAF-1 to replicating DNA (Shibahara and Stillman 1999; Zhang *et al.* 2000), and Linger and Tyler (2005) showed that *pol30-8* mutant yeasts were similarly sensitive to DNA-damaging agents as *cac2 Δ* (subunit of the heterotrimeric CAF-1 complex) and *cac2 Δ pol30-8* mutants. As shown in Figure 2 and Table 2, the *pol30-8* allele, which conferred sensitivity to MMS, increased heteroduplex rejection by slightly (1.4-fold), although the 95% credible interval of the ratio was large (0.8–2.7), indicating a significant overlap between the rejection ratios for wild-type and *pol30-8*.

Deletion of the *Sir2* silencing factor increases antirecombination

The silencing factors *Sir2* and *Sir3* are recruited by the histone chaperones CAF-1 and *Rtt106* to sites of heterochromatin formation. In the absence of CAF-1 and *Rtt106*, *Sir* proteins are mislocalized (Huang *et al.* 2007). These observations encouraged us to test whether the histone deacetylases

Hst1, *Hst3*, *Hst4*, or *Sir2* are involved in the regulation of rejection efficiency. We were further encouraged to test these factors because Tamburini and Tyler (2005) showed in *S. cerevisiae* that the histone acetylases *Gcn5* and *Esa1* (essential for viability), and the histone deacetylases *Rpd3*, *Sir2*, and *Hst1*, were recruited to an HO endonuclease-induced lesion during HR. We were also interested in *Hst3* and *Hst4*, which act to remove H3K56ac marks from newly generated chromatin in G2/M, because studies from Muñoz-Galván *et al.* (2013) have suggested that acetylation and deacetylation of H3K56 are important for selecting the sister chromatid as a template for the repair of DSBs that occur during DNA replication. As shown in Figure 2 and Table 2, the *sir2 Δ* mutation increased the efficiency of heteroduplex rejection by 2.2- (1.7–2.8, 95% credible intervals) and 1.5-fold (1.1–2.1, 95% credible intervals) in the nucleotide substitution and 4-nt loop strains, respectively. The *sir2 Δ msh2 Δ* mutant displayed a homoduplex/divergent recombination ratio similar to *msh2 Δ* , indicating that the increased rejection ratios seen in *sir2 Δ* strains required the heteroduplex rejection machinery. Compared to wild-type cells, deletion of *HST3* or *HST4* conferred no significant effect on the rejection ratio. However, the *hst3 Δ hst4 Δ* double mutant showed an eightfold reduction in antirecombination of base–base mismatches compared to wild-type strains, but the strain also showed variation in recombination rates between transformants (unrelated to whether the strain contains the HR or divergent recombination substrate; see *Materials and Methods*) that is likely due to the high genomic instability (Kadyrova *et al.* 2013) seen in this mutant. Thus, there is a need for caution in interpreting the *hst3 Δ hst4 Δ* results.




Figure 2 Recombination rates as measured in the inverted repeat reporter assay. Homologous and divergent recombination rates (calculated as described in the *Materials and Methods*, with 95% credible intervals, see Table 2) are shown in a bar graph for base–base mismatches for wild-type (WT) and the indicated mutant strains. (A) Analysis of the effect of mutations in chromatin remodelers on the homologous rate/divergent rate ratio. (B) Analysis of the effect of mutations in histone acetylases and deacetylases on the homologous rate/divergent rate ratio.

The increased heteroduplex rejection phenotype observed in *sir2Δ* strains and the opposite phenotype seen in *hst3Δ hst4Δ* strains encouraged us to test if deletion mutations in the histone deacetylase *Hst1*, the acetylase *Gcn5*, and *Rpd3* (a modifier of *Sir2* function) affected rejection. As shown in Figure 2 and Table 2, *hst1Δ* and *gcn5Δ* mutations did not confer an effect. We then tested a strain deleted for *Rpd3*, which encodes a subunit of both the Rdp3S and Rpd3L histone deacetylase complexes that act in chromatin remodeling. Several studies have reported that *Rpd3* and *Sir2* have antagonistic effects on silent chromatin propagation and replication timing (Zhou *et al.* 2009; Ehrentraut *et al.* 2010; Yoshida *et al.* 2014; Thurtle-Schmidt *et al.* 2016). The *rpd3Δ* mutation decreased rejection twofold in the nucleotide substitution strain. Together, these observations provide evidence that chromatin modifiers can suppress and enhance heteroduplex rejection (see *Discussion*).

SIR2, CAC1, and RTT106 may act in similar steps

To determine if CAF-1 and *Rtt106* function in similar steps as *Sir2* to prevent heteroduplex rejection, we examine the phenotypes of double mutants. *rtt106Δ sir2Δ* mutant strains exhibited rejection ratios similar to those of *rtt106Δ* or *sir2Δ* single mutants, whereas *cac1Δ sir2Δ* showed a higher ratio compared to *cac1Δ* or *sir2Δ* (Figure 2 and Table 2). Curiously, the rejection ratio was lower or similar for *sir2Δ cac1Δ rtt106Δ* mutants compared to any of the single mutants, indicating a more complex genetic interaction (see below).

Previously, we showed that cooverexpression of the *Msh2* and *Msh6* MMR proteins in wild-type strains increased the frequency of heteroduplex rejection in the inverted repeat assay by 3.5-fold, and hypothesized that this was due to the increased availability of functional MSH complexes acting in heteroduplex rejection (Chakraborty *et al.* 2016, 2018). Because both the *sir2Δ* mutation, and *Msh2* and *Msh6* cooverexpression increased rejection, we asked if the increased rejection seen in *sir2Δ* strains would rise to an even higher level in the presence of pEAM272 (2 μ , *MSH2, MSH6* plasmid). Such an experiment tests if the increases in rejection seen in the two conditions reflect common or distinct regulatory steps. In wild-type strains bearing pEAM272, the *Msh2-Msh6* complex is overexpressed by around eightfold (Chakraborty *et al.* 2018). Wild-type strains containing pEAM272 display a 4.3-fold increase, compared to those containing the empty vector pRS426, in the rejection ratio, consistent with an increased concentration of *Msh2-Msh6* resulting in improved rejection by increasing the likelihood of mismatch recognition in heteroduplex DNA (Table 2). *sir2Δ* strains containing pEAM272 display a higher rejection ratio [1.8-fold (1.1–3.1, 95% credible intervals) higher than *sir2Δ* with empty vector, but with some overlap in 95% credible intervals], suggesting that the *SIR2* effect on antirecombination may not be similar to that seen in the wild-type strain containing pEAM272. One interpretation of this observation is that the *Sir2* effect on rejection occurs in steps that compete with mismatch recognition. Curiously, *rtt106Δ* strains containing pEAM272 showed a rejection ratio that was similar to the wild-type lacking pEAM272 (Table 2), indicating a more complex phenotype reminiscent of the decreased rejection ratio seen in *sir2Δ cac1Δ rtt106Δ* triple mutants.

Altered recombination rates in chromatin remodeling mutants do not correlate with their heteroduplex rejection phenotypes

The inverted repeat assay detects spontaneous recombination events. *msh2Δ* mutants, which are defective in heteroduplex rejection, display elevated levels of HR (Table 2; Datta *et al.* 1997; Nicholson *et al.* 2000). Previously the Jinks-Robertson group hypothesized that the increased HR seen in *msh2Δ* reflects the fact that the length of perfect homology required to avoid heteroduplex rejection (610 bp) is larger than the

length of the 350-bp repeats present in the inverted repeat substrate (Datta *et al.* 1997). However, for other mutants, increased HR could be due to increases in the formation of DNA lesions that increase the initiation of such events. As shown in Figure 3 and Table 2, the rates of recombination between homologous sequences in the mutants analyzed in this study vary, but do not appear to correlate to changes in their repair/rejection ratios. For example, *asf1Δ* and *rtt109Δ* mutants show recombination levels higher than that of *msh2Δ*, but an HR/divergent recombination ratio similar to wild-type cells. In contrast, *cac1Δ* and *rtt106Δ*, which show HR levels between wild-type and *msh2Δ*, and *sir2Δ*, which shows recombination levels similar to *msh2Δ*, displayed HR/divergent recombination ratios higher than wild-type. A similar lack of correlation was seen for the double-mutant combinations presented. This information suggests that overall levels of HR do not impact the rejection ratio.

Discussion

This study focused on understanding roles for chromatin structure and modifications in regulating the heteroduplex rejection/DNA repair decision. Improving repair at the cost of reduced fidelity can lead to gene conversion, chromosomal rearrangement, and loss of heterozygosity, whereas high fidelity can compromise repair efficiency [reviewed in Chakraborty and Alani (2016)]. We found that the histone chaperones CAF-1 and Rtt106, and the deacetylase Sir2, act to suppress heteroduplex rejection. In contrast, a large set of factors involved in nucleosome assembly during DNA replication or in modifying histones (Rtt109, Hst1, and Gcn5) do not affect rejection efficiency. These results are consistent with repair pathways in which the presence of nucleosomes at DNA lesions acts to stabilize recombination intermediates and inhibit antirecombination (Figure 4).

The model presented in Figure 4 outlines a recombination event involving divergent sequences initiated by a DSB. DNA mismatches in heteroduplex DNA that form during strand invasion are recognized by MMR proteins, which in turn recruit the Sgs1-Top3-Rmi1 helicase-topoisomerase complex to unwind and reject the recombination intermediate. In this model, heteroduplex rejection is repressed by the presence of nucleosomes in a process regulated by CAF-1 and Rtt106, representing a regulatory step in the repair/rejection decision. The maintenance of nucleosomes by the histone chaperones CAF-1 and Rtt106 acts to stabilize heteroduplex DNA. This is followed by Sir2 deacetylating newly deposited histones, creating a closed chromatin structure that prevents rejection but promotes the completion of repair through DNA synthesis steps [see the access-repair-restore model of Tamburini and Tyler (2005)]. In other words, a closed chromatin structure, particularly in later stages in repair, would promote the completion of HR and prevent access to MMR factors that can act in heteroduplex rejection. Thus, the window for heteroduplex rejection would occur prior to the formation of closed chromatin.

The model presented in Figure 4 is supported by the following observations:

1. Deleting *CAC1* or *RTT106* resulted in increased heteroduplex rejection. Furthermore, *cac1Δ rtt106Δ* strains showed an even greater increase in heteroduplex rejection, consistent with CAF-1 and Rtt106 acting redundantly in nucleosome assembly (Table 2; Li *et al.* 2008).
2. A number of studies have shown that MMR and nucleosome assembly during replication are mutually inhibitory processes, and that human MutS α interacts physically with CAF-1 (Li *et al.* 2009; Kadyrova *et al.* 2011; Schöpf *et al.* 2012; Rodrigues Blanco *et al.* 2016). Thus, in a manner analogous to their interaction during postreplicative MMR, nucleosome deposition could suppress MMR-mediated heteroduplex rejection, forcing the latter process to occur in the time window after strand invasion and before nucleosome deposition.
3. Various studies have shown in fission yeast and humans that RecQ helicases (Rqh1 in *S. pombe*, and BLM and WRN in humans) physically interact with the large subunit of CAF-1 (Jiao *et al.* 2004, 2007; Pietrobon *et al.* 2014). Additionally, Pietrobon *et al.* (2014) showed that CAF-1 suppresses D-loop disassembly by Rqh1 during template switching. Based on these observations, it is possible that CAF-1 physically interacts with Sgs1 in budding yeast and counteracts its unwinding activity during heteroduplex rejection.
4. The removal of 3' nonhomologous tails during SSA acts as a temporal switch; rejection is favored before tail removal, prior to DNA synthesis steps, and repair is favored after (Chakraborty *et al.* 2016). Thus, analogous to 3' nonhomologous tail removal during SSA, nucleosome maintenance by CAF-1 and Rtt106, followed by nucleosome deacetylation by Sir2 during HR, could provide another type of temporal commitment step that regulates the rejection vs. repair decision. In support of this idea, Tamburini and Tyler (2005) showed that Sir2 localizes to sites of DSBs after histone acetylases such as Gcn5 and Esa1, suggesting that Sir2 is likely to localize to sites of HR at later stages of repair, likely after the deposition of nucleosomes, to modify histones by deacetylating them and further compacting the repair substrates, making it harder for the rejection machinery to act.

Together, these observations support the idea that CAF-1 and Rtt106 function redundantly to deposit nucleosomes on recombination intermediates that stabilize the DNA heteroduplex and suppress rejection.

***asf1Δ* mutation suppresses the hyper-rejection phenotype seen in *cac1Δ* and *rtt106Δ* strains**

Curiously, the *asf1Δ* and *rtt109Δ* mutations did not alter heteroduplex rejection ratios, and *asf1Δ* suppressed the increased ratio seen in *cac1Δ* and *rtt106Δ* strains (both base-base and 4-nt loop mismatch substrates). This was surprising, given that Asf1 and Rtt109 act upstream of CAF-1 and Rtt106




Figure 3 Roles for histone chaperones, acetylases, and deacetylases in regulating heteroduplex rejection efficiency. Homologous and divergent recombination rates (calculated as described in the *Materials and Methods*) are shown for base–base mismatches, for wild-type and mutant strains presented in this study. The data in Table 2 were plotted to represent the least squared mean of the \log_{10} -transformed recombination rates (*Materials and Methods*). Error bars represent the 95% credible interval. The red dashed line represents a hypothetical homologous/divergent recombination ratio of 1, as seen in mutants defective in heteroduplex rejection. The blue dashed line represents a homologous/divergent recombination rate of 20, as seen in wild-type. Mutants that deviate from wild-type are shown with red fonts indicating a reduced heteroduplex rejection ratio and purple fonts indicating an increased ratio.

in the nucleosome deposition pathway. *Asf1* and *Rtt109* have been implicated in nucleosome removal during DNA replication and transcriptional activation (Adkins *et al.* 2004; Adkins and Tyler 2004; Korber *et al.* 2006; Schwabish and Struhl 2006; Groth *et al.* 2007; Ransom *et al.* 2010). Such a nucleosome removal activity could also act during DNA recombination and, in its absence, lead to chromatin acting to stabilize strand invasion intermediates that are refractory to heteroduplex rejection. In this model, a lack of, or delay in, nucleosome deposition in *cac1Δ* or *rtt106Δ* mutants resulting in increased rejection could be compensated for by the lack of nucleosome removal in *asf1Δ* mutants. Such a scenario is supported by recent *in vivo* and *in vitro* findings indicating that histones are present at ssDNA (Adkins *et al.* 2017; Huang *et al.* 2018). Adkins *et al.* (2017) also showed *in vitro* that histones remain bound to ssDNA as resection proceeds for longer distances.

We recognize that testing the effect of *H3K56Q* and *H3K56R* mutations, which mimic histone H3 acetylation

and a lack of acetylation at lysine 56, respectively [summarized in Kadyrova *et al.* (2013)], in the inverted repeat assay could provide additional insights into the unexpected finding that *asf1Δ* suppresses the elevated rejection phenotype seen in *cac1Δ* and *rtt106Δ* mutants. However, H3K56 acetylation is required for both histone disassembly by *Asf1*, and for histone assembly by CAF-1 and *Rtt106* (Tyler *et al.* 1999; Driscoll *et al.* 2007; Han *et al.* 2007; Li *et al.* 2008; Williams *et al.* 2008). Thus, similar to what was seen in an *asf1Δ* mutant, histone modifications would likely inhibit or promote (depending on the mutant) both histone disassembly and assembly, and thus a test of histone mutant alleles in heteroduplex rejection assays may not provide additional insights. More detailed analyses are planned to understand the *asf1Δ* suppression phenotype, as well as to determine if any of the phenotypes that we observed are the results of indirect effects of mutations in chromatin-modifying factors on recombination between divergent DNA sequences (*e.g.*, genome-wide effects on transcription).

Does CAF-1 regulation of heteroduplex rejection depend on its interaction with PCNA?

CAF-1 has been implicated in DNA synthesis-coupled nucleosome deposition via its interaction with PCNA (Shibahara and Stillman 1999; Zhang *et al.* 2000; Krawitz *et al.* 2002). We found that strains bearing the *pol30-8* allele, which significantly weakens the PCNA-CAF-1 interaction, showed heteroduplex rejection ratios only slightly higher than wild-type (Figure 2 and Table 2). One explanation for this phenotype is that CAF-1 regulation of heteroduplex rejection does not depend, or only partially depends, on its interaction with PCNA. In support of the former possibility, Hoek *et al.* (2011) found that a mutation in human CAF-1 that causes a defect in PCNA interactions (N-terminal truncation of the p150 subunit of CAF-1) does not affect the recruitment of CAF-1 to sites of DNA damage or confer sensitivity to DNA-damaging agents. They also showed direct interactions between CAF-1, and the KU complex and 14-3-3 proteins, both of which are involved in DNA damage responses. In addition, during baker's yeast meiosis, CAF-1 is recruited independently of its interaction with PCNA to meiotic DSBs at a step prior to strand invasion, though deletion of the large subunit of CAF-1 did not affect meiotic DSB repair or crossover formation (Brachet *et al.* 2015). Finally, Huang *et al.* (2018) have suggested that CAF-1 and *ASF1* are involved in chromatin assembly on ssDNA prior to *Rad51* nucleoprotein filament formation, implying that it occurs in a PCNA-independent manner, as PCNA might be expected to localize much later during DNA synthesis steps.

MMR factors are likely to associate with sites of recombination early in the process

Our data suggest that the deposition of nucleosomes and their subsequent modification are likely to suppress rejection, and limit the time window during which the rejection machinery can act to unwind recombination intermediates involving




Figure 4 A model outlining possible steps during homologous recombination where chromatin modifiers regulate the repair/rejection decision. We hypothesize that factors promoting nucleosome assembly/maintenance, such as CAF-1 and Rtt106, deposit nucleosomes at DNA lesions independent of DNA synthesis on ssDNA prior to strand invasion (1). Such deposition/maintenance, coupled with the formation of Sir2-dependent chromatin marks that promote a closed chromatin state, stabilizes D-loops to suppress rejection. Additionally, we hypothesize that CAF-1 physically interacts with Msh6, and possibly Sgs1, to inhibit the rejection factors from unwinding heteroduplex substrates (2). Finally, DNA synthesis-coupled nucleosome deposition by CAF-1 and Rtt106, combined with Sir2-dependent modifications of these nucleosomes (negatively regulated by Rpd3), are likely to stabilize heteroduplex D-loop intermediates, making it more difficult for rejection factors to unwind the intermediates (3). In this model, MSH proteins are recruited to a DSB either directly or through specific histone marks, and nucleosome maintenance limits the time frame in which antirecombination can be performed, and promotes repair of the broken chromosome and ultimately mismatch repair steps (see text for additional details). Factors/steps that promote rejection are highlighted in pink boxes and those that promote repair are highlighted in yellow boxes. DSB, double-strand break; ssDNA, single-stranded DNA; MSH, *MutS* homolog; STR, *Sgs1-Top3-Rmi1*.

divergent substrates. Previously, we showed that during SSA, removal of 3' nonhomologous tails serves a similar role with respect to providing a limited time frame for rejection to occur (Chakraborty *et al.* 2016). Several studies also support this idea. For example, Li *et al.* (2013) showed in mammalian cells that MSH2-MSH6 is recruited via a PWWP motif in MSH6 to H3K36me3 histones before or during early S phase. In the context of rejection, this would ensure that mismatch recognition proteins are localized to chromatin before replication fork stalling-related recombination events occur. Although yeast Msh6 and human MSH3 proteins do not have PWWP motifs, one can imagine that these proteins may be recruited by other histone marks to chromatin. Additionally, MSH proteins have been shown to localize rapidly to DSBs, even in the absence of a donor template, and act in the DNA damage response (Evans *et al.* 2000; Hong *et al.* 2008; Lyndaker *et al.* 2008; Burdova *et al.* 2015). Interestingly,

overexpression of Msh2 and Msh6 increased, albeit weakly, the rejection ratio further in *sir2Δ* strains, suggesting that mismatch recognition effects on rejection are distinct and are likely to precede changes in chromatin structure (Table 2). Taken together, these data suggest that mismatch recognition proteins localize to sites of recombination either before DSBs are formed or soon afterward, and that the chromatin environment could alter this localization and thus impact heteroduplex rejection.

Why do *rpd3Δ* strains display defects in heteroduplex rejection?

A large-scale screen for mutants defective in trinucleotide repeat instability identified a mutation in *Sin3*, which is a subunit of the histone deacetylases Rpd3L and Rpd3S (Debacker *et al.* 2012). In the analysis, *sin3* mutants displayed significant reductions (9–18-fold) in expansion rates

for a trinucleotide repeat reporter. Trinucleotide repeat expansions are also suppressed by the disruption of factors involved in heteroduplex rejection such as *Msh2* and *Msh3*; such MSH factors are hypothesized to promote trinucleotide repeat expansions by stabilizing slipped-strand intermediates or through altered MMR (McMurray 2010). Based on these observations, the defect in heteroduplex rejection observed in *rpd3Δ* strains could reflect the downregulation of MSH factors that act in mismatch recognition. Alternatively, the *rpd3Δ* phenotype results from improved localization of *Sir2* to an initiating DSB site, thus lowering rejection. The latter explanation fits with observations obtained from Zhou *et al.* (2009), who showed that, in the absence of *Rpd3*, increased localization was seen for *Sir2* at telomeres and homologous mating type loci, leading to an extension of silent chromatin in these areas.

Can the heteroduplex rejection machinery be saturated?

As shown in Figure 2 and Table 2, the *hst3Δ hst4Δ* double mutant appears strongly compromised for antirecombination and displays high rates of HR. Kadyrova *et al.* (2013) showed that *hst3Δ hst4Δ* mutants display very high mutation rates that result from base substitutions, 1-bp insertions/deletions, and spontaneous gross chromosomal rearrangements. The rate of mutations in *hst3Δ hst4Δ*, as measured in forward mutation and reversion assays, was similar to that seen in MMR-defective strains, and *msh2Δ hst3Δ hst4Δ* triple mutants displayed greater than additive mutation rates compared to *msh2Δ* and *hst3Δ hst4Δ*. Based on these and other observations, they proposed that *Hst3* and *Hst4* participate in genetic stability mechanisms, which work with MMR and replicative polymerase proofreading mechanisms to suppress spontaneous mutagenesis. In this framework, the decreased rejection seen in *hst3Δ hst4Δ* strains could result from high rates of mutagenesis saturating the MMR machinery and thus reducing the pool of MSH proteins available to participate in heteroduplex rejection. Another possibility is that the lack of *Hst3* and *Hst4* leads to higher levels of H3K56 acetylation, which in turn favors nucleosome deposition by CAF-1 and *Rtt106* factors that selectively bind to H3K56-acetylated histones. Such a situation could stabilize the strand invasion intermediate and suppress antirecombination. In contrast, the presence of *Hst3* and *Hst4* would promote rejection by deacetylating H3K56, and thus suppress nucleosome deposition by CAF-1 and *Rtt106*. In support of this idea, Celic *et al.* (2006) showed that H3K56 sites are hyperacetylated in yeast lacking *Hst3* and *Hst4*. Additional studies will be required to distinguish between these models.

Do chromatin modification factors have indirect effects on heteroduplex rejection?

Studies in yeast showed that the *Fun30*, RSC, and *INO80* chromatin remodelers promote resection of DNA DSB ends (Chen *et al.* 2012; Daley *et al.* 2015; Lademann *et al.* 2017), and studies in human cells showed that ASF1 protects such ends from excessive resection (Huang *et al.* 2018). Could

changes in resection rates impact heteroduplex rejection? Resection of DNA DSB ends is a critical initiating step in HR because it generates 3' single-strand tails that participate in the formation of heteroduplex DNA. Thus, changes in resection rates could impact the stability of recombination intermediates by altering heteroduplex tract lengths. Consistent with this idea, a recent study in yeast showed that defects in resection, as well as increased amounts of the single-strand-binding protein RPA, enhanced the efficiency of repair through an ectopic donor locus (Lee *et al.* 2016). We were unable to test effects on resection because *His⁺* recombinants result from the repair of spontaneous DNA lesions. However, Datta *et al.* (1997) estimated, in the system that we used, the length of perfect homology required to initiate stable heteroduplex formation (20 bp) and avoid heteroduplex rejection (610 bp, which is larger than the 350-bp repeat). These estimates, the work of Lee *et al.* (2016), and our finding that HR is not decreased in the chromatin remodeling mutants analyzed suggest to us that the increased rejection seen in *cac1Δ*, *rtt106Δ*, and *sir2Δ* mutants is not likely due to alterations in resection rates, though we cannot exclude the possibility that greater resection could lead to longer heteroduplex tract intermediates with more mismatches that are substrates for rejection. Also, we cannot exclude the possibility that the decreased rejection seen in *hst3Δ hst4Δ* and *rpd3Δ* mutants resulted from severely limited resection if only short heteroduplex tracts form that contain perfect homology tracts, without branch migration steps that would lead to the formation of mismatches.

We also recognize that the HR/divergent recombination ratio cannot tell us if chromatin-modifying mutations affect the utilization of specific recombination pathways that have different sensitivities to heteroduplex rejection. For example, Spell and Jinks-Robertson (2003, 2004) showed that *Rad51*-dependent recombination had more stringent requirements for homology between recombination substrates than *Rad51*-independent pathways. Using the same assay that we used here, they found that a null mutation in the *Srs2* helicase, which acts to prevent *Rad51*-dependent recombination, conferred an increase in the HR/divergent recombination ratio, a phenotype similar to what we observed in *cac1Δ* and *rtt106Δ* mutants (Krejci *et al.* 2003; Spell and Jinks-Robertson 2003, 2004; Veaute *et al.* 2003). Based on these observations, Spell and Jinks-Robertson (2004) suggested that increased rejection occurred in *srs2Δ* because *Rad51*-dependent recombination is favored in such an environment, leading to more stringent homology requirements. Interestingly, they found that the increased rejection seen in *srs2Δ* mutants was suppressed by the *msh2Δ* mutation, suggesting that “much of the prevention of hyperrecombination between divergent recombination substrates is dependent on mismatch recognition, which also would be expected for *RAD51*-dependent recombination.” We observed similar suppression in *cac1Δ msh2Δ* and *rtt106Δ msh2Δ* mutants (Table 2), suggesting that even if different recombination pathways are utilized in *rtt106Δ* and *cac1Δ* strains, the heteroduplex rejection machinery in

these strains responds to mismatch recognition. The above concerns will need to be further explored in recombination systems where heteroduplex rejection can be monitored through DSB events induced at specific sites (e.g., HO and I-SceI).

Acknowledgments

We thank members of the Alani laboratory, Jessica Tyler, Mike Fasullo, Michael Lichten, and Scott Keeney for helpful comments and advice; Sue Jinks-Robertson for providing us with the inverted repeat recombination strains SJR769, GCY615, and GCY559; and Deniz Akdemir (Cornell Statistical Consulting Unit) for his advice on the statistical analysis. U.C., B.M., and E.A. were supported by National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant GM-53085. The funders had no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences or the NIH.

Literature Cited

- Adkins, M. W., and J. K. Tyler, 2004 The histone chaperone Asf1p mediates global chromatin disassembly *in vivo*. *J. Biol. Chem.* 279: 52069–52074. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M406113200>
- Adkins, M. W., S. R. Howar, and J. K. Tyler, 2004 Chromatin disassembly mediated by the histone chaperone Asf1 is essential for transcriptional activation of the yeast *PHO5* and *PHO8* genes. *Mol. Cell* 14: 657–666. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2004.05.016>
- Adkins, N. L., S. G. Swygert, P. Kaur, H. Niu, S. A. Grigoryev *et al.*, 2017 Nucleosome-like, single-stranded DNA (ssDNA)-histone octamer complexes and the implication for DNA double-strand break repair. *J. Biol. Chem.* 292: 5271–5281. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M117.776369>
- Anand, R., A. Beach, K. Li, and J. Haber, 2017 Rad51-mediated double-strand break repair and mismatch correction of divergent substrates. *Nature* 544: 377–380. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22046>
- Asteris, G., and S. Sarkar, 1996 Bayesian procedures for the estimation of mutation rates from fluctuation experiments. *Genetics* 142: 313–326.
- Boulton, S. J., and S. P. Jackson, 1998 Components of the Ku-dependent non-homologous end-joining pathway are involved in telomeric length maintenance and telomeric silencing. *EMBO J.* 17: 1819–1828. <https://doi.org/10.1093/emboj/17.6.1819>
- Brachet, E., C. Béneut, M.-E. Serrentino, and V. Borde, 2015 The CAF-1 and Hir histone chaperones associate with sites of meiotic double-strand breaks in budding yeast. *PLoS One* 10: e0125965. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125965>
- Brachmann, C. B., A. Davies, G. J. Cost, E. Caputo, J. Li *et al.*, 1998 Designer deletion strains derived from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* S288C: a useful set of strains and plasmids for PCR-mediated gene disruption and other applications. *Yeast* 14: 115–132. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0061\(19980130\)14:2<115::AID-YEA204>3.0.CO;2-2](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0061(19980130)14:2<115::AID-YEA204>3.0.CO;2-2)
- Burdova, K., B. Mihaljevic, A. Sturzenegger, N. Chappidi, and P. Janscak, 2015 The mismatch-binding factor MutS β can mediate ATR activation in response to DNA double-strand breaks. *Mol. Cell* 59: 603–614. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2015.06.026>
- Celic, I., H. Masumoto, W. P. Griffith, P. Meluh, R. J. Cotter *et al.*, 2006 The sirtuins hst3 and Hst4p preserve genome integrity by controlling histone h3 lysine 56 deacetylation. *Curr. Biol.* 16: 1280–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2006.06.023>
- Chakraborty, U., and E. Alani, 2016 Understanding how mismatch repair proteins participate in the repair/anti-recombination decision. *FEMS Yeast Res.* 16: fow071. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsyr/fow071>
- Chakraborty, U., C. M. George, A. M. Lyndaker, and E. Alani, 2016 A delicate balance between repair and replication factors regulates recombination between divergent DNA sequences in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* 202: 525–540. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.115.184093>
- Chakraborty, U., T. A. Dinh, and E. Alani, 2018 Genomic instability promoted by overexpression of mismatch repair factors in yeast: a model for understanding cancer progression. *Genetics* 209: 439–456. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.118.300923>
- Chen, C. C., J. J. Carson, J. Feser, B. Tamburini, S. Zabaronek *et al.*, 2008 Acetylated lysine 56 on histone H3 drives chromatin assembly after repair and signals for the completion of repair. *Cell* 134: 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2008.06.035>
- Chen, W., and S. Jinks-Robertson, 1998 Mismatch repair proteins regulate heteroduplex formation during mitotic recombination in yeast. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 18: 6525–6537. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.18.11.6525>
- Chen, W., and S. Jinks-Robertson, 1999 The role of the mismatch repair machinery in regulating mitotic and meiotic recombination between diverged sequences in yeast. *Genetics* 151: 1299–1313.
- Chen, X., D. Cui, A. Papusha, X. Zhang, C. D. Chu *et al.*, 2012 The Fun30 nucleosome remodeler promotes resection of DNA double-strand break ends. *Nature* 489: 576–580. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11355>
- Christianson, T. W., R. S. Sikorski, M. Dante, J. H. Shero, and P. Hieter, 1992 Multifunctional yeast high-copy-number shuttle vectors. *Gene* 110: 119–122. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1119\(92\)90454-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1119(92)90454-W)
- Daley, J. M., H. Niu, A. S. Miller, and P. Sung, 2015 Biochemical mechanism of DSB end resection and its regulation. *DNA Repair (Amst.)* 32: 66–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dnarep.2015.04.015>
- Datta, A., A. Adjiri, L. New, G. F. Crouse, and S. Jinks-Robertson, 1996 Mitotic crossovers between diverged sequences are regulated by mismatch repair proteins in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 16: 1085–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.16.3.1085>
- Datta, A., M. Hendrix, M. Lipsitch, and S. Jinks-Robertson, 1997 Dual roles for DNA sequence identity and the mismatch repair system in the regulation of mitotic crossing-over in yeast. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 94: 9757–9762. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.94.18.9757>
- Debacker, K., A. Frizzell, O. Gleeson, L. Kirkham-McCarthy, T. Mertz *et al.*, 2012 Histone deacetylase complexes promote trinucleotide repeat expansions. *PLoS Biol.* 10: e1001257. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001257>
- Diao, L. T., C. C. Chen, B. Dennehey, S. Pal, P. Wang *et al.*, 2017 Delineation of the role of chromatin assembly and the Rtt101Mms1 E3 ubiquitin ligase in DNA damage checkpoint recovery in budding yeast. *PLoS One* 12: e0180556. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0180556>
- Dion, V., V. Kalck, C. Horigome, B. D. Towbin, and S. M. Gasser, 2012 Increased mobility of double-strand breaks requires Mec1, Rad9 and the homologous recombination machinery. *Nat. Cell Biol.* 14: 502–509. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncb2465>
- Driscoll, R., A. Hudson, and S. P. Jackson, 2007 Yeast Rtt109 promotes genome stability by acetylating histone H3 K56 on

- lysine 56. *Science* 315: 649–652. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1135862>
- Ehrentraut, S., J. M. Weber, J. N. Dybowski, D. Hoffmann, and A. E. Ehrenhofer-Murray, 2010 Rpd3-dependent boundary formation at telomeres by removal of Sir2 substrate. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 107: 5522–5527. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0909169107>
- Evans, E., N. Sugawara, J. E. Haber, and E. Alani, 2000 The *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Msh2 mismatch repair protein localizes to recombination intermediates *in vivo*. *Mol. Cell* 5: 789–799. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1097-2765\(00\)80319-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1097-2765(00)80319-6)
- Franco, A. A., W. M. Lam, P. M. Burgers, and P. D. Kaufman, 2005 Histone deposition protein Asf1 maintains DNA replisome integrity and interacts with replication factor C. *Genes Dev.* 19: 1365–1375. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.1305005>
- Gaillard, P. H., E. M. Martini, P. D. Kaufman, B. Stillman, E. Moustacchi *et al.*, 1996 Chromatin assembly coupled to DNA repair: a new role for chromatin assembly factor I. *Cell* 86: 887–896. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674\(00\)80164-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674(00)80164-6)
- Gartenberg, M. R., and J. S. Smith, 2016 The nuts and bolts of transcriptionally silent chromatin in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* 203: 1563–1599. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.112.145243>
- Gelman, A., J. B. Carlin, H. S. Stern, D. B. Dunson, A. Vehtari *et al.*, 2014 *Bayesian Data Analysis*, Ed. 3. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- George, C. M., and E. Alani, 2012 Multiple cellular mechanisms prevent chromosomal rearrangements involving repetitive DNA. *Crit. Rev. Biochem. Mol. Biol.* 47: 297–313. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10409238.2012.675644>
- Gietz, R. D., and R. H. Schiestl, 1991 Applications of high efficiency lithium acetate transformation of intact yeast cells using single-stranded nucleic acids as carrier. *Yeast* 7: 253–263. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yea.320070307>
- Goldfarb, T., and E. Alani, 2005 Distinct roles for the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* mismatch repair proteins in heteroduplex rejection, mismatch repair and nonhomologous tail removal. *Genetics* 169: 563–574. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.104.035204>
- Groth, A., W. Rocha, A. Verreault, and G. Almouzni, 2007 Chromatin challenges during DNA replication and repair. *Cell* 128: 721–733. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2007.01.030>
- Guintini, L., M. Tremblay, M. Toussaint, A. D'Amours, R. E. Wellinger *et al.*, 2017 Repair of UV-induced DNA lesions in natural *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* telomeres is moderated by Sir2 and Sir3, and inhibited by yKu-Sir4 interaction. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 45: 4577–4589. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx123>
- Han, J., H. Zhou, B. Horazdovsky, K. Zhang, R. M. Xu *et al.*, 2007 Rtt109 acetylates histone H3 lysine 56 and functions in DNA replication. *Science* 315: 653–655. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1133234>
- Hauer, M. H., and S. M. Gasser, 2017 Chromatin and nucleosome dynamics in DNA damage and repair. *Genes Dev.* 31: 2204–2221. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.307702.117>
- Hauer, M. H., A. Seeber, V. Singh, R. Thierry, R. Sack *et al.*, 2017 Histone degradation in response to DNA damage enhances chromatin dynamics and recombination rates. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* 24: 99–107. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nsmb.3347>
- Hoek, M., M. P. Myers, and B. Stillman, 2011 An analysis of CAF-1-interacting proteins reveals dynamic and direct interactions with the KU complex and 14–3–3 proteins. *J. Biol. Chem.* 286: 10876–10887. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M110.217075>
- Hoggard, T. A., F. Chang, K. R. Perry, S. Subramanian, J. Kenworthy *et al.*, 2018 Yeast heterochromatin regulators Sir2 and Sir3 act directly at euchromatic DNA replication origins. *PLoS Genet.* 14: e1007418. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1007418>
- Hong, Z., J. Jiang, K. Hashiguchi, M. Hoshi, L. Lan *et al.*, 2008 Recruitment of mismatch repair proteins to the site of DNA damage in human cells. *J. Cell Sci.* 121: 3146–3154. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.026393>
- Huang, S., H. Zhou, D. Katzmman, M. Hochstrasser, E. Atanasova *et al.*, 2005 Rtt106p is a histone chaperone involved in heterochromatin-mediated silencing. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 102: 13410–13415. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0506176102>
- Huang, S., H. Zhou, J. Tarara, and Z. Zhang, 2007 A novel role for histone chaperones CAF-1 and Rtt106p in heterochromatin silencing. *EMBO J.* 26: 2274–2283. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.emboj.7601670>
- Huang, T. H., F. Fowler, C. C. Chen, Z. J. Shen, B. Sleckman *et al.*, 2018 The histone chaperones ASF1 and CAF-1 promote MMS22L-TONSL-mediated Rad51 loading onto ssDNA during homologous recombination in human cells. *Mol. Cell* 69: 879–892.e5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2018.01.031>
- Hum, Y. F., and S. Jinks-Robertson, 2019 Mismatch recognition and subsequent processing have distinct effects on mitotic recombination intermediates and outcomes in yeast. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 47: 4554–4568. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkz126>
- Jiao, R., C. Z. Bachrati, G. Pedrazzi, P. Kuster, M. Petkovic *et al.*, 2004 Physical and functional interaction between the Bloom's syndrome gene product and the largest subunit of chromatin assembly factor 1. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 24: 4710–4719. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.24.11.4710-4719.2004>
- Jiao, R., J. A. Harrigan, I. Shevelev, T. Dietschy, N. Selak *et al.*, 2007 The Werner syndrome protein is required for recruitment of chromatin assembly factor 1 following DNA damage. *Oncogene* 26: 3811–3822. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.onc.1210150>
- Kadyrova, L. Y., E. R. Blanko, and F. A. Kadyrov, 2011 CAF-I-dependent control of degradation of the discontinuous strands during mismatch repair. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 108: 2753–2758. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1015914108>
- Kadyrova, L. Y., T. M. Mertz, Y. Zhang, M. R. Northam, Z. Sheng *et al.*, 2013 A reversible histone H3 acetylation cooperates with mismatch repair and replicative polymerases in maintaining genome stability. *PLoS Genet.* 9: e1003899. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1003899>
- Kim, J. A., and J. E. Haber, 2009 Chromatin assembly factors Asf1 and CAF-1 have overlapping roles in deactivating the DNA damage checkpoint when DNA repair is complete. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 106: 1151–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0812578106>
- Korber, P., S. Barbaric, T. Luckenback, A. Schmid, U. J. Schermer *et al.*, 2006 The histone chaperone Asf1 increases the rate of histone eviction at the yeast *PHO5* and *PHO8* promoters. *J. Biol. Chem.* 281: 5539–5545. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M513340200>
- Krawitz, D. C., T. Kama, and P. D. Kaufman, 2002 Chromatin assembly factor I mutants defective for PCNA binding require Asf1/Hir proteins for silencing. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 22: 614–625. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.22.2.614-625.2002>
- Krejci, L., S. Van Komen, Y. Li, J. Villemain, M. S. Reddy *et al.*, 2003 DNA helicase Srs2 disrupts the Rad51 presynaptic filament. *Nature* 423: 305–309. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01577>
- Lademann, C. A., J. Renkawitz, B. Pfander, and S. Jentsch, 2017 The INO80 complex removes H2A.Z to promote presynaptic filament formation during homologous recombination. *Cell Rep.* 19: 1294–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2017.04.051>
- Lea, D. E., and C. A. Coulson, 1949 The distribution of the numbers of mutants in bacterial populations. *J. Genet.* 49: 264–285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02986080>
- Lee, C.-S., R. W. Wang, H.-H. Chang, D. Capurso, M. R. Segal *et al.*, 2016 Chromosome position determines the success of double-

- strand break repair. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 113: E146–E154. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1523660113>
- Li, F., L. Tian, L. Gu, and G. M. Li, 2009 Evidence that nucleosomes inhibit mismatch repair in eukaryotic cells. *J. Biol. Chem.* 284: 33056–33061. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M109.049874>
- Li, F., G. Mao, D. Tong, J. Huang, L. Gu *et al.*, 2013 The histone mark H3K36me3 regulates human DNA mismatch repair through its interaction with MutS α . *Cell* 153: 590–600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2013.03.025>
- Li, Q., H. Zhou, H. Wurtele, B. Davies, B. Horazdovsky *et al.*, 2008 Acetylation of histone H3 lysine 56 regulates replication-coupled nucleosome assembly. *Cell* 134: 244–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2008.06.018>
- Linger, J., and J. K. Tyler, 2005 The yeast histone chaperone chromatin assembly factor 1 protects against double-strand DNA-damaging agents. *Genetics* 171: 1513–1522. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.105.043000>
- Lyndaker, A. M., T. Goldfarb, and E. Alani, 2008 Mutants defective in Rad1-Rad10-Slx4 exhibit a unique pattern of viability during mating-type switching in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* 179: 1807–1821. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.108.090654>
- Ma, W. T., G. H. Sandri, and S. Sarkar, 1992 Analysis of the Luria-Delbrück distribution using discrete convolution powers. *J. Appl. Probab.* 29: 255–267. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3214564>
- Martin, S. G., T. Laroche, N. Suka, M. Grunstein, and S. M. Gasser, 1999 Relocalization of telomeric Ku and SIR proteins in response to DNA strand breaks in yeast. *Cell* 97: 621–633. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674\(00\)80773-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674(00)80773-4)
- McAinsh, A. D., S. Scott-Drew, J. A. Murray, and S. P. Jackson, 1999 DNA damage triggers disruption of telomeric silencing and Mec1p-dependent relocation of Sir3p. *Curr. Biol.* 9: 963–966. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-9822\(99\)80424-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-9822(99)80424-2)
- McMurray, C. T., 2010 Mechanisms of trinucleotide repeat instability during human development. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 11: 786–799 (erratum: *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 11: 886). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2828>
- Mills, K. D., D. A. Sinclair, and L. Guarente, 1999 MEC1-dependent redistribution of the Sir3 silencing protein from telomeres to DNA double-strand breaks. *Cell* 97: 609–620. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674\(00\)80772-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674(00)80772-2)
- Miné-Hattab, J., and R. Rothstein, 2012 Increased chromosome mobility facilitates homology search during recombination. *Nat. Cell Biol.* 14: 510–517. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncb2472>
- Moggs, J. G., P. Grandi, J. P. Quivy, Z. O. Jónsson, U. Hübscher *et al.*, 2000 A CAF-1-PCNA-mediated chromatin assembly pathway triggered by sensing DNA damage. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 20: 1206–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.20.4.1206-1218.2000>
- Muñoz-Galván, S., S. Jimeno, R. Rothstein, and A. Aguilera, 2013 Histone H3K56 acetylation, Rad52, and non-DNA repair factors control double-strand break repair choice with the sister chromatid. *PLoS Genet.* 9: e1003237. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1003237>
- Myung, K., A. Datta, C. Chen, and R. D. Kolodner, 2001 SGS1, the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* homologue of BLM and WRN, suppresses genome instability and homeologous recombination. *Nat. Genet.* 27: 113–116. <https://doi.org/10.1038/83673>
- Neumann, F. R., V. Dion, L. R. Gehlen, M. Tsai-Pflugfelder, R. Schmid *et al.*, 2012 Targeted INO80 enhances subnuclear chromatin movement and ectopic homologous recombination. *Genes Dev.* 26: 369–383. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.176156.111>
- Nicholson, A., M. Hendrix, S. Jinks-Robertson, and G. F. Crouse, 2000 Regulation of mitotic homeologous recombination in yeast: functions of mismatch repair and nucleotide excision repair genes. *Genetics* 154: 133–146.
- Pietrobon, V., K. Fréon, J. Hardy, A. Costes, I. Iraqui *et al.*, 2014 The chromatin assembly factor 1 promotes Rad51-dependent template switches at replication forks by counteracting D-loop disassembly by the RecQ-type helicase Rqh1. *PLoS Biol.* 12: e1001968. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001968>
- Polo, S. E., D. Roche, and G. Almouzni, 2006 New histone incorporation marks sites of UV repair in human cells. *Cell* 127: 481–493. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2006.08.049>
- Ransom, M., B. K. Dennehey, and J. K. Tyler, 2010 Chaperoning histones during DNA replication and repair. *Cell* 140: 183–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2010.01.004>
- Rodríguez Blanco, E., L. Y. Kadyrova, and F. A. Kadyrov, 2016 DNA mismatch repair interacts with CAF-1- and ASF1A-H3-H4-dependent histone (H3-H4)₂ tetramer deposition. *J. Biol. Chem.* 291: 9203–9217. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M115.713271>
- Rose, M. D., F. Winston, and P. Hieter, 1990 *Methods in Yeast Genetics*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, NY.
- Schneider, J., P. Bajwa, F. C. Johnson, S. R. Bhaumik, and A. Shilatifard, 2006 Rtt109 is required for proper H3K56 acetylation: a chromatin mark associated with the elongating RNA polymerase II. *J. Biol. Chem.* 281: 37270–37274. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.C600265200>
- Schöpf, B., S. Bregenhorn, J.-P. Quivy, F. A. Kadyrov, G. Almouzni *et al.*, 2012 Interplay between mismatch repair and chromatin assembly. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 109: 1895–1900. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1106696109>
- Schwabish, M. A., and K. Struhl, 2006 Asf1 mediates histone eviction and deposition during elongation by RNA polymerase II. *Mol. Cell* 22: 415–422. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2006.03.014>
- Selva, E. M., L. New, G. F. Crouse, and R. S. Lahue, 1995 Mismatch correction acts as a barrier to homeologous recombination in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* 139: 1175–1188.
- Shibahara, K., and B. Stillman, 1999 Replication-dependent marking of DNA by PCNA facilitates CAF-1-coupled inheritance of chromatin. *Cell* 96: 575–585. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674\(00\)80661-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674(00)80661-3)
- Spell, R. M., and S. Jinks-Robertson, 2003 Role of mismatch repair in the fidelity of RAD51- and RAD59-dependent recombination in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* 165: 1733–1744.
- Spell, R. M., and S. Jinks-Robertson, 2004 Examination of the roles of Sgs1 and Srs2 helicases in the enforcement of recombination fidelity in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* 168: 1855–1865. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.104.032771>
- Sugawara, N., T. Goldfarb, B. Studamire, E. Alani, and J. E. Haber, 2004 Heteroduplex rejection during single-strand annealing requires Sgs1 helicase and mismatch repair proteins Msh2 and Msh6 but not Pms1. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 101: 9315–9320. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0305749101>
- Tagami, H., D. Ray-Gallet, G. Almouzni, and Y. Nakatani, 2004 Histone H3.1 and H3.3 complexes mediate nucleosome assembly pathways dependent or independent of DNA synthesis. *Cell* 116: 51–61. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674\(03\)01064-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674(03)01064-X)
- Tamburini, B. A., and J. K. Tyler, 2005 Localized histone acetylation and deacetylation triggered by the homologous recombination pathway of double-strand DNA repair. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 25: 4903–4913. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.25.12.4903-4913.2005>
- Thurtle-Schmidt, D. M., A. E. Dodson, and J. Rine, 2016 Histone deacetylases with antagonistic roles in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* heterochromatin formation. *Genetics* 204: 177–190. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.116.190835>
- Tsubota, T., C. E. Berndsen, J. A. Erkmann, C. L. Smith, L. Yang *et al.*, 2007 Histone H3-K56 acetylation is catalyzed by

- histone chaperone-dependent complexes. *Mol. Cell* 25: 703–712. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2007.02.006>
- Tsukamoto, Y., J. Kato, and H. Ikeda, 1997 Silencing factors participate in DNA repair and recombination in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Nature* 388: 900–903. <https://doi.org/10.1038/42288>
- Tyler, J. K., C. R. Adams, S. R. Chen, R. Kobayashi, R. T. Kamakaka *et al.*, 1999 The RCAF complex mediates chromatin assembly during DNA replication and repair. *Nature* 402: 555–560. <https://doi.org/10.1038/990147>
- Veaute, X., J. Jeusset, C. Soustelle, S. C. Kowalczykowski, E. Le Cam *et al.*, 2003 The Srs2 helicase prevents recombination by disrupting Rad51 nucleoprotein filaments. *Nature* 423: 309–312. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01585>
- Williams, S. K., D. Truong, and J. K. Tyler, 2008 Acetylation in the globular core of histone H3 on lysine-56 promotes chromatin disassembly during transcriptional activation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 105: 9000–9005. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0800057105>
- Yoshida, K., J. Bacal, D. Desmarais, I. Padiou, O. Tsaponina *et al.*, 2014 The histone deacetylases Sir2 and Rpd3 act on ribosomal DNA to control the replication program in budding yeast. *Mol. Cell* 54: 691–697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2014.04.032>
- Zhang, Z., K. Shibahara, and B. Stillman, 2000 PCNA connects DNA replication to epigenetic inheritance in yeast. *Nature* 408: 221–225. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35041601>
- Zheng, Q., 2008 A note on plating efficiency in fluctuation experiments. *Math. Biosci.* 216: 150–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2008.09.002>
- Zhou, J., B. O. Zhou, B. A. Lenzmeier, and J. Q. Zhou, 2009 Histone deacetylase Rpd3 antagonizes Sir2-dependent silent chromatin propagation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 37: 3699–3713. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkp233>

Communicating editor: J. Nickoloff