Suppression of a -1 Frameshift Mutation by a Recessive tRNA Suppressor Which Causes Doublet Decoding[†]

DANIEL J. O'MAHONY,^{1,2} DIARMAID HUGHES,¹[‡] SHAHLA THOMPSON,¹ and JOHN F. ATKINS^{2,3}*

Department of Genetics, Trinity College, Dublin 2.¹ and Department of Biochemistry, University College, Cork,² Ireland, and Howard Hughes Medical Institute and Department of Human Genetics, University of Utah Medical Center, Salt Lake City, Utah 84132³

Received 30 January 1989/Accepted 1 April 1989

sufS was found to suppress the only known suppressible -1 frameshift mutation, trpE91, at a site identified as GGA and mapped within the single gene of the only tRNA that can decode GGA in *Escherichia coli*. It mapped to the same gene in *Salmonella typhimurium*. sufS alleles were recessive, and dominant alleles could not be isolated. This is in contrast to all other tRNA structural gene mutations identified thus far that cause frameshift suppression. The recessiveness implies that all sufS alleles are poor competitors against their wild-type tRNA₂^{Gly} counterparts. The base G immediately 5' of the GGA suppression site influenced the level but was not critical for suppression by sufS601. From this result, it is inferred that sufS601 causes frameshifting by doublet decoding.

Numerous tRNA structural gene mutations that cause +1 frameshifting are known. These were either isolated directly as suppressors of +1 frameshift mutations (for a compilation, see references 28 and 50) or isolated in other selections and later shown to have this property (2; S. D. Tucker, E. J. Murgola, and F. T. Pagel, Biochimie, in press). In contrast, only two categories of -1 frameshift mutation suppressors are known to have alterations in tRNA structural genes. hopR and hopE, members of one category, are mutations of the four-copy gene for $tRNA_1^{Val}$ (28) and cause a single amino acid, valine, to be inserted at the five-base sequence GUGUG by a mechanism suggested not to involve quintuplet codon-anticodon base pairing (16). The other category is sufS, which, as shown here, comprises most of the original set of external suppressors (42) for the Salmonella typhimurium -1 frameshift mutation trpE91 (3). Protein sequencing established that sufS does not lead to quintuplet translocation. It causes a -1 shift at the zero-frame sequence CAG GGA GUG (16), resulting in insertion of the amino acids Gln Gly Ser, with the Ser being decoded from the underlined AGU. This paper shows that *sufS* suppressors are alleles of the gene for $tRNA_2^{Gly}$, which decodes GGG and GGA.

Not all known -1 frameshift mutation suppressors are alleles of tRNA structural genes. The *supK* class of *trpE91* suppressors (4) is probably in the gene *prfB*, for polypeptide chain release factor 2 (31, 32), although a tRNA methylase deficiency is also found in *supK* mutants (39, 40). The other known class of -1 suppressors consists of alleles of either gene (*tufA* or *tufB*) for elongation factor Tu (27).

Many of the natural high-level reading frame shifts in normal decoding involve shifts to the -1 frame (6, 9, 15, 29, 51). The determinants known for specification of the shifts are programmed in the mRNA. However, it is not unlikely that further work will reveal the involvement of a particular subset of tRNAs in mediating the shifts. Studies of suppres-

3824

sor tRNAs are expected to highlight features important for such shifting as well as being of interest in their own right.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Media and bacterial strains. Minimal medium, sugars, amino acids, antibiotics, and other media, including green plates for the recovery of P22-sensitive strains, were as described previously (13). Histidinol was used at 1 mM. Rifampin dissolved in methanol (20 mg/ml) was used at a final concentration of 50 μ g/ml. *uvrB* and *recA* phenotypes were both sensitive to UV light. Bacterial strains, plasmids, and bacteriophages are listed in Table 1.

Isolation and identification of sufS suppressors of trpE91. Revertants resulting from external suppressors, both in S. typhimurium and in Escherichia coli, were isolated and identified as described elsewhere (28). In S. typhimurium, those mapping to the sufS region were identified by transduction with the sufS-linked marker argH::Tn10 as the donor. Loss of suppression in 10 to 20% of Tet^r transductants indicated that the suppressor was likely to be a sufS allele. In E. coli, revertants identified as external were transduced to kanamycin resistance with phage grown on MC57 (28), which carries a Tn10-derived Kan^r element (47) 47% linked to $sufS^+$. Those that lost the sufS phenotype in a proportion of transductants were likely to be sufS alleles. (Transformation or transduction of argH-linked suppressors with plasmids pTuB11.1 and pTuB12 invariably gave the following result: loss of suppression in the presence of pTuB12 [functional tRNAs] and retention of suppression with pTuB11.1 [nonfunctional tRNAs]. tufB alleles are selectable as kirromycin resistant. argH-linked suppressors directly selected without the aid of kirromycin give the sufS pattern of results with the pTuB plasmids. The multicopy nature of pTuB plasmids does not allow an unequivocal distinction between recessive and dominant alleles of sufS. This distinction is made in merodiploids with F'111.)

Procedure to seek dominant alleles of sufS. A two-step procedure was used to identify dominant sufS alleles. In the first step, independently derived revertants were sought in haploid cells, analyzed by transduction, and separated into three groups: a (linked to trpE91 [internal revertants]); b (linked to argH::Tn10 [presumptive sufS or tufB suppres-

^{*} Corresponding author.

[†] This paper is dedicated to Professor Bruce Ames.

[‡] Present address: Institute of Molecular Biology, The Biomedical Center, S-751 24 Uppsala, Sweden.

| Strain, plasmid, or phage | Genotype or relevant characteristic | Source or reference | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Bacterial strains | | | | | |
| S. typhimurium | | | | | |
| SGSC10 | galE | K. Sanderson | | | |
| SR305 | HfrA purC | K. Sanderson (43) | | | |
| SL4213 | hsdL6 hsdSA29 galE496 metA22 metE551 ilv xyl-404 rpsL120 H1-b H2-e, n, x Fels 2 Nml | J. R. Roth | | | |
| TT2385 | hisT159 hisO1242 hisG6608 zii-614::Tn10 | J. R. Roth | | | |
| TH42 | metA22 leu-151 proB401 trpE91 suf\$601 hisO1242 hisC3737 | This study | | | |
| TH44 | Derivative of SR305 with deletion of $uvrB$ and gal , UV ^s | 28 | | | |
| TH51 | trpE91 sufS601 rpoB argH::Tn10 galE btuB | This study | | | |
| TH66 | trpE91 sufS601 argH::Tn10 (Tn10-sufS ca. 15% linked) | This study | | | |
| ST108 | trpE91 metF96 F'111 Rif ^D | This study | | | |
| Strains carrying sufJ128 | | J. R. Roth | | | |
| 79 strains carrying his | | J. R. Roth | | | |
| frameshift mutations | | | | | |
| E. coli | | | | | |
| SU1675 | CSH26 rec | M. O'Connor | | | |
| CSH57 | ara leu lacY purE gal trp his argG rpsL mal xyl mtl ilv thi metA/B | J. Miller | | | |
| CGSC4258 | Strain carrying F'111, including region metA to metF | B. Bachmann | | | |
| CH19 | CSH57 derivative, gal ⁺ trpBE9 Salmonella trpE91 (chromosomal integration) | 28 | | | |
| MC57 | thr leu thi lacY ara-14 xyl-5 mtl-1 proA2 his-4 rpsL31 tsx-33 Tn10-ptac-mini-Kan (sufS ⁺ 47% linked) | 28 | | | |
| Plasmids | | | | | |
| pTuB11.1 with Tet ^r | pBR322 clone carrying functional <i>tufB</i> -deleted tRNAs | L. Bosch | | | |
| pTuB12 with Tet ^r | pBR322 clone carrying functional tRNAs and trans- lationally nonfunctional <i>tufB</i> | L. Bosch | | | |
| Phages | | | | | |
| P22HT | | Collection of S. Thompson and J. F. Atkins | | | |
| MG-178-1 | | Collection of S. Thompson and J. F. Atkins | | | |
| P1 virA | | Collection of S. Thompson and J. F. Atkins | | | |
| BF23 | | Collection of S. Thompson and J. F. Atkins | | | |
| C21 | | Collection of S. Thompson and J. F. Atkins | | | |
| 021 | | concentration of or ritompson and or 1. Autom | | | |

| TABLE 1 | | Bacterial | strains, | plasmids, | and | phages |
|---------|--|-----------|----------|-----------|-----|--------|
|---------|--|-----------|----------|-----------|-----|--------|

sors]); and c (linked to neither [presumptive tufA, supK, *hopR*, *hopE*, or unknown suppressors]). Their growth rates were then matched against that of sufS601 and the category to which they belonged. A total of 710 independent revertants were tested in this way. All revertants with a faster growth rate than, and four revertants indistinguishable from, sufS601 were internal (category a; total, 661). Two revertants indistinguishable from sufS601 and 44 slower-growing revertants were linked to *argH* (category b; total, 46). Three revertants among the 710, all slower growing than sufS601, were in category c. This result showed that revertants unequivocally faster growing than sufS601 are unlikely to contain sufS alleles. sufS601 and the phenotypically indistinguishable 607 and 609 alleles are the most efficient (i.e., fastest growing on minimal media) sufS alleles we have ever isolated. They are recessive, as are the sufS suppressors in any of the slower-growing revertants tested (see Results). On the basis of this finding, in the second step, dominant alleles were sought in merodiploids with F'111 (23) as follows. Revertants of trpE91 selected in ST108 under continuous selection for Rif^D (dominant) and Met⁺ phenotypes, to ensure the presence of two copies of the $sufS^+$ gene, were compared with sufS601 mutants, and all mutants except those clearly of faster growth than sufS601 were retained. To test for dominant alleles on the F', F'111 Rif^D was transferred from each revertant to a trpE91 argH::Tn10 strain, selecting for Tet^r and Rif^r to seek F'-ductants with Trp prototrophy. To test for chromosomal dominant alleles, a Tn/0 marker linked to *sufS* was introduced into each revertant by transduction, and loss of prototrophy was sought in a proportion of the transductants.

Construction of lac frameshift mutants. Oligonucleotides were synthesized by an ABI 380A or -B synthesizer, and the crude material was cloned directly. On annealing, the complementary oligonucleotides had overhanging 5' and 3' ends designed for insertion into HindIII and ApaI restriction targets, respectively. Construction of the pBR322-based plasmid vector with a functional *bla* gene, a *tac* promoter for the included *lacZ* gene, and multiple cloning sites, including HindIII and ApaI, is described elsewhere (48). After ligation, an E. coli rec derivative of CSH26 (Su1675; Table 1) was transformed by standard procedures (34). The sequences of the plasmid inserts were checked by the dideoxy method of sequencing on double-stranded DNA (11). Transfer to S. typhimurium was via transformation into the restriction-minus strain SL4213 (12). From this strain, plasmids were transformed into the suppressor-containing and isogenic parental strains. The dependence of lac suppression on the sufS allele was confirmed by replacing sufS with its wild-type $sufS^+$ via a linked Tn10 from strain TT2385. The same transductants that became Trp⁻ because of the loss of sufS were now Lac⁻. Whole-cell β -galactosidase assays were based on the procedure of Miller (35), with the minor modifications described elsewhere (48). Assay values were also determined on cultures grown in minimal medium and

found to be higher but proportionally very similar. The units presented are those from cells grown in LB broth.

Rif^r, Rif^D, and BF23^r selection. Rif^r mutants were selected for resistance to 50 µg of rifampin per ml in haploid strains (30). Many of these mutants are recessive and arise at a frequency of 10^{-8} . Rif^D mutants (38) were sought in the same way but in merodiploid strains with F'111. One mutant resulting from a change on the plasmid-borne copy of *rpoB* was distinguished from those with alterations of the chromosomal copy. F'111 fragmentation led to loss of the F'-borne Rif^D unless selection was maintained. Phage BF23 grows on all E. coli strains but only on galE mutants of S. typhimurium (20). Selection for BF23 resistance in galE Salmonella strains yields mutations in the *btuB* gene (20). Up to 100 colonies can appear in the area of lysis of a spot of 10⁹ BF23 particles on a lawn of Salmonella cells because of either loss of *galE* or mutations in *btuB*. Loss of *galE* is identifiable by resistance to phage C21.

Other methods. Integration of trpE91 into the *E. coli* chromosome, introduction of sufS and sufJ into desired strains, construction of trpE his double mutants, intraspecies transfer of F' and plasmids, and F' and plasmid elimination were carried out as described previously (28). Hfr and intraspecies F' transfers and P1 transduction in *E. coli* were done as described by Miller (35). Transduction in *S. typhimurium* was performed as described elsewhere (13, 44).

RESULTS

Mapping of Salmonella sufS suppressors. Initial mapping was performed with one of the stronger members, sufS601, of the original set of suppressors for the -1 frameshift mutation trpE91. (sufS601 in the earlier report [42] had been designated sup-601.) The approximate location of sufS was determined by Hfr mapping. The origin of HfrA in Salmo*nella* strain TH44, which also has deletions in *uvrB* and *gal*. is at min 81, and the chromosome is transferred clockwise. Interrupted mating between TH44 and the metA leu sufS601 strain TH42, using uvrB as a counterselective marker, resulted in 30% of donor metA⁺ (min 89.5) recombinants coinheriting the wild-type sufS, whereas only 8% of leu^+ (min 2.8) recombinants were $sufS^+$. This procedure located sufS closer to min 89. The rpoB locus maps at min 88.5. P1 transduction crosses between a rifampin resistance allele of rpoB in a derivative of TH44 and a galE derivative of TH42 demonstrated a closer linkage of sufS to rpoB (88%) than to metA (35%). Three-point test crosses (see Materials and Methods) indicated the order

An additional transduction, using the P22-like phage MG178-1, showed 17% linkage of sufS to argH::Tn10, and threepoint test crosses indicated the order

In E. coli, btuB is known to map between rpoB and argH, approximately 3 kilobase pairs (kbp) from argH (20). We mapped an equivalent gene in S. typhimurium, also between rpoB and argH and close to the latter. The results of four-point test crosses (Fig. 1 and Table 2), together with the above data, gave the order metA....rpoB....sufS....btuB.... argH.

In addition to *sufS601*, we isolated 22 other suppressors with similar map positions. The gene for $tRNA_3^{Thr}$ (*thrT*) is



FIG. 1. Transductional mapping of sufS. Selection was for Arg⁺, and transductants were scored for resistance to phage BF23 and rifampin and for the presence of sufS. The relative order of sufS and btuB depicted is that which best fits the data of Table 2, in which the frequency of the predicted quadruple-crossover classes 5 and 6 (class 7 is not shown), as expected, is low.

located between rpoB and btuB (1, 5, 25). Transduction crosses between strains containing a sufJ allele of thrT(sufJ128) and sufS601 yielded recombinants containing either sufS or sufJ but not both, which indicated tight linkage of the two markers. We isolated spontaneous sufS alleles in the presence of sufJ128 to demonstrate that they are not incompatible.

These data, taken together, indicated a position of sufS between min 88.1 and 88.5 tightly linked to the thrT locus. This region in E. coli contains the tufB operon (comprising four tRNA genes in the order thrU tyrU glyT thrT tufB) flanked by rrnB and rpl gene clusters (1, 25). In S. typhimurium, the thrT and tufB genes were known to be in the same positions as in the E. coli counterparts, with the tufB gene starting 115 bp downstream from the 3' end of the tRNA gene cluster (5, 26; L. Bossi and D. Dunn, personal communication). This is very similar to the 114-bp spacing in E. coli. Only six nucleotides separate glyT from thrT in E. coli (1, 10, 25). It is now known that the glyT gene is also very close to tufB, being separated from it by only 197 bp in S. typhimurium (5; D. O'Mahony, unpublished data). A complementation test was used to determine whether sufS was likely to be in the four-tRNA-gene cluster, in tufB, or in neither. An earlier study (27) had shown that some alleles of tufB are trpE91 suppressors; therefore, although the sufS alleles are largely phenotypically distinguishable from the *tufB* alleles by growth rate, the possibility that the sufS suppressors constituted a different class of *tufB* alleles had to be considered seriously. Since sufS is recessive (see below), we considered the possibility that introduction of plasmid-borne wild-type copies of either *tufB* or the tRNA gene cluster might mask the phenotype of this gene.

Plasmids pTuB11.1 and pTuB12, constructed by J. van Delft and L. Bosch, are pBR322 derivatives carrying a cloned tufB operon. pTuB11.1 has a functional tufB but an

TABLE 2. Result of a four-point test cross to establish the position of *sufS601* relative to *btuB* and *argH*^a

| Transductant class | Phenotype | No. | % | |
|-----------------------|---|-----|------|--|
| 1 | Arg ⁺ BF23 ^r Trp ⁺ (sufS) Rif ^r | 68 | 31 | |
| 2 | Arg ⁺ BF23 ^s Trp ⁺ (sufS) Rif ^r | 26 | 12 | |
| 3 | Arg ⁺ BF23 ^s Trp ⁻ (sufS ⁺) Rif ^r | 52 | 24 | |
| 4 | Arg ⁺ BF23 ^s Trp ⁻ (sufS ⁺) Rif ^s | 66 | 30.5 | |
| 5 | $Arg^+ BF23^r Trp^- (sufS^+) Rif^r$ | 4 | 2 | |
| 6 | Arg ⁺ BF23 ^r Trp ⁻ (sufS ⁺) Rif ^s | 1 | 0.5 | |
| 7 | Arg ⁺ BF23 ^s Trp ⁺ (sufS) Rif ^s | 0 | 0 | |
| | | | | |

" Results from the cross shown in Fig. 1. Both donor and recipient strains are galE, which confers phage BF23 sensitivity. BF23 resistance results from an additional mutation in the btuB gene. Rifampin resistance arises from mutations in the rpoB gene.

approximately 400-bp deletion spanning the tRNA genes (46). In the isogenic pTuB12, in contrast, the four tRNA genes are functional but there is a 240-bp deletion within *tufB* (45). Introduction of these plasmids into 22 sufS Salmonella strains, linked to argH at min 88, and into a sufS601 strain resulted in the retention of sufS expression in the presence of pTuB11.1 (nonfunctional tRNAs) but loss of expression in the presence of pTuB12 (functional tRNAs). In contrast to sufS, alleles of tufB showed loss of expression in the presence of the elongation factor EF Tu-encoding plasmid pTuB 11.1. Segregants of each strain with sufS (pTuB12) lacking pTuB12 regained sufS expression. These results, together with the transduction mapping data, indicated that sufS is allelic either to one of the four tRNA genes or to a tightly linked gene adjacent to the tRNA gene cluster whose expression is masked in the presence of multiple copies of the tRNA genes.

E. coli sufS. As part of a previous study (28), trpE91 was transferred into the chromosome of an E. coli strain with a deletion of the E. coli tryptophan operon to give strain CH19. In that study, the hopR category of trpE91 suppressors was analyzed and found to constitute a higher proportion of the suppressors than in Salmonella strains, in which they are rare. Two of the non-hopR suppressors, suf-3 and suf-519, noted among the Trp⁺ revertants were used for the study described here. Because of the mapping results for S. typhimurium (see above), suf-3 was tested for linkage to the rpoB-btuB region of the E. coli chromosome. In P1 transductions, the results showed 77% linkage to rpoB, 78% linkage to *btuB*, and 37% linkage to $arg\Delta BC$ (contiguous with argH). suf-519 mapped to the same region. Both were established as presumptive alleles of sufS by the plasmid complementation test and designated sufS3 and sufS519. Expression of each allele was masked by the presence of plasmid pTuB12 (expressed tRNAs) but not by the presence of pTuB11.1. The importance of finding a sufS class of suppressors in *E. coli* similar to the *Salmonella* counterpart becomes apparent (see Discussion), as more is known in E. coli of the singularity of the gene to which sufS is allelic.

sufS is recessive, and dominant alleles could not be isolated. The E. coli F' factor F'111 includes the region metA to argH. Salmonella strain TH66, which is argH::Tn10 and contains trpE91 sufS601, is Arg⁺ but tryptophan requiring in the presence of F'111, which indicates that sufS is recessive. Fortuitously, F'111 fragments readily. Loss of the sufS gene results in segregants of TH66/F'111 regaining the sufS601 phenotype. Such segregants arise at an extremely high frequency unless selection is maintained for F' material spanning sufS on both sides. A derivative, F'111 Rif^D, was isolated by selection for a dominant rifampin resistance allele of *rpoB* (80 to 88% linkage to *sufS*). When maintenance of F' material from argH to rpoB was forced in TH66/F'111 Rif^D, sufS expression was completely masked and segregants regaining the sufS phenotype did not arise. MetA⁺ selection was substituted for Rif^r selection in another strain, with comparable results. Similar experiments were done with the *sufS* alleles 605, 607, 609, 617, 625, and 627, with the same result. All of the sufS alleles tested in S. typhimurium were recessive. In contrast, F'111 Rif^D did not affect the phenotype of a hopE allele. For the equivalent experiment in E. coli, in which the same F' could recombine with the chromosome at a much higher frequency since it was of E. coli origin, a recA derivative of a strain with sufS3 was used. F'111 Rif^D was introduced. sufS3 was also found to be recessive, with haploid segregants regaining the sufS phenotype. At one time, it was considered likely that a recessive property of frameshift suppressors indicated that the suppressors were likely to be allelic with a tRNA modification enzyme gene rather than with a tRNA structural gene (41), but the results presented above show that this is not always necessarily so.

The recessive nature of all of the sufS alleles tested prompted a search for dominant sufS suppressors. F'111 Rif^D was introduced into the suppressor-free Salmonella strain trpE91 metF96 to generate ST108. Continuous selection for rpoB (Rif^D) and $metF^+$ genes, which span $sufS^+$ on F'111 Rif^D, ensures that ST108 contains two copies of the wild-type $sufS^+$ gene. Any sufS allele isolated should therefore be dominant. A total of nearly 1,000 Trp⁺ revertants from 100 independent cultures were selected and tested (see Materials and Methods). No sufS alleles were found. The results were taken to indicate that all retained revertants of ST108 were attributable to reversions either within *trpE* or in genes other than sufS and that dominant alleles are extremely rare or do not occur. The possibility that multiple mutations could give rise to a dominant sufS allele cannot, of course, be excluded.

Specificity of sufS601. Previous results (42) showed that sufS607 and sufS609 did not suppress the 8 hisC frameshift mutations 13, 122, 146, 377, 540, 855, 856, and 857 and that sufS607 did not suppress 18 amber, 6 ochre, or 2 UGA mutations. Since that time, several suppressible +1 frameshift mutations have been reported (cited in references 28 and 50). The suppressible +1 frameshift Salmonella mutations hisD3749, hisC3734, hisC3737, hisF3704, hisC3072, hisC3736, hisD6580, hisG6609, hisD3749S7, and trpE872 were studied mainly by J. Roth and colleagues (see reference 28). For the study presented here, these mutations were tested for suppression by sufS601 and 25 other sufS alleles. No suppression was detected. sufS601 was then tested with 69 other known Salmonella his frameshift mutations (18, 19, 24, 33, 49), the entire number in the collection of J. Roth, and again no suppression was detected.

To delimit the site of suppression and determine its specificity, we then turned to synthesizing lacZ mutants by using recently developed methods (48). Complementary DNA oligonucleotides that recreated the trpE91 suppression window (Table 3) were cloned just downstream of the start codon of a plasmid-borne lacZ gene such that ribosomal frameshifting within the window was required to give βgalactosidase. Initial experiments first showed that the suppression site was in the second half of the window and subsequently that the sequence CAG GGA sufficed (construct a in Table 3). Note that the serine AGU codon overlapping the GGA in trpE91 is not necessary. GGA is crucial to suppression. Changing the first or last nucleotide of the GGA to C or G, respectively (constructs b and c in Table 3), abolished suppression. The levels of β -galactosidase with these constructs were indistinguishable in the sufS601 mutant or in its isogenic suppressor-free parent. This result is noteworthy when the last nucleotide is changed to generate GGG; its significance is considered in Discussion. In additional constructs, with sequences similar to that of construct c, which has the in-frame GGG, different codons, including AGA (which, like AGG, is a rare codon and so may be slow to decode [7]), were placed immediately 3' of the GGG codon. These also showed no suppression by sufS601 (data not shown). The CAG codon immediately 5' of the GGA was found not to be necessary for suppression, but the identity of the nucleotide 5' of the GGA did influence the level of suppression (Table 3). G at this position (construct a) gave approximately twice the level of suppression of A, U,

| Construct a | Frameshift required -1 | <u>Services</u> | | | | | | β-Galactosidase activity (U) | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|---------|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| | | Sequence | | | | | sufS601 | <i>sufS</i> (wild type) | | | | |
| | | AGC UL | J U AA C | CAG | GGA | ACC | UAA | ACU | CGG | GCC | 616 | 38 |
| | -1 | AGC UL | JU AAC | CAG | NGN | ACC | UAA | AUC | CGG | GCC | | |
| b | | | | | СA | | | | | | 18 | 18 |
| c | | | | | GG | | | | | | 21 | 20 |
| | -1 | AGC UL | JU AAC | CAN | GGA | ACC | UAA | ACU | CGG | GCC | | |
| d | | | | A | | | | | | | 281 | 42 |
| e | | | | U | | | | | | | 328 | 36 |
| f | | | | C | | | | | | | 353 | 32 |
| g | +1 | AGC U | JA AC | CAG | GGA | ACC | UAA | AUC | GGG | CC | 30 | 35 |
| h | 0 (stop hop) | | AGC | UUC | GGA | UAA | GGG | AAC | GGC | С | 19 | 12 |
| trnE91 suppression window | UUU GAU GCG UUC | CGU CU | IG UUA | CAG | GGA | GUG | UGA | | | | | |

| TADLE 1 | C | 6 60701 | • | | | 1 7 |
|---------|-------------|-------------|------------------|--------|-----------|----------------------|
| IABLE 1 | Specificity | OT SHENDER | summession assa | ved on | synthetic | <i>lacz</i> millants |
| | opeenien | 01 01190001 | Suppression assu | | | nere in maraneo |

^{*a*} The sequences shown are those of one strand of the oligonucleotides inserted six nucleotides 3' of the start of the *lacZ* gene. In the -1 and +1 frame constructs, ribosomes are required to shift frame in the window delimited by the overlined stop codons to enter the zero frame of the main body of the downstream *lacZ* gene. With the zero-frame construct, the ribosomes are required to maintain frame but to bypass or read through the UAA stop codon to produce β -galactosidase. Units of β -galactosidase are as defined by Miller (35). The frameshift window of the *trp* mutant suppressible by *sufS* is shown for comparison.

or C (construct d, e, or f). The observed level of suppression was directly related to the presence of sufS601. Replacement with $sufS^+$ (by transduction) in the plasmid-bearing strains reduced the β -galactosidase level to that of background. (The different background levels of β-galactosidase between constructs b and c on one hand and those in constructs a, d, e, and f very likely resulted from the effect of the U three bases 3' of the stop codon in constructs a, d, e, and f on a very low level of internal translation initiation at the triplet UCG, which was not previously known to be capable of acting as an initiator.) We estimate the level of suppression with construct a to be of the order of 2% of the in-frame level of β -galactosidase. (This value is approximate because of the unhealthy state of cells with very high levels of β -galactosidase from the *tac* promoter on the multicopy plasmid and some variation in in-frame control values with different sequences.)

No +1 frame suppression by sufS601 was apparent, at least with the sequence in construct g (Table 3). These results on the high degree of specificity of sufS are not inconsistent with the lack of suppression of the his mutants tested (see above). A striking feature of the other class of tRNA suppressors of trpE91, hopR, is their ability to cause hopping. With hopR1, flanking of a UAA stop codon by its target codon (e.g., GUG UAA GUG) results in suppression, with one amino acid being inserted for the nine nucleotides (M. O'Connor et al., manuscript in preparation; 16). With a sequence analogous to that which worked for hopR, no suppression by sufS601 was detected (construct h in Table 3).

DISCUSSION

Previous protein-sequencing results had shown that *sufS601* causes the sequence CAG GG<u>A GU</u>G to be decoded as Gln Gly Ser, with the Ser being encoded by the underlined AGU (16). The genetic analysis presented here maps *sufS* to a cluster of four adjacent tRNA genes, one of which is *glyT*, the gene for tRNA₂^{Gly} which decodes GGA and GGG. Results of *sufS601* suppression of the *lac* constructs delimit the suppression site to GGA, with GGG being

nonsuppressible. At least for normal in vivo conditions, GGA is decoded only by $tRNA_2^{Gly}$, for which only one gene, glyT, exists in E. coli (22, 36, 37). The lack of suppression of a GGG site by *sufS601* is compatible with *sufS* being allelic with glyT since, unlike GGA, GGG is also decoded by tRNA₁^{Gly} (22, 36). A tRNA₂^{Gly} encoded by a mutant *sufS* may not be competitive with wild-type tRNA₁^{Gly} for GGG read-ing, or the interaction of the mutant tRNA₂^{Gly} with GGG may be better than with GGA and therefore not prone to cause frameshifting. We conclude that sufS alleles are mutations of glvT. Our collaborators B. H. Mims and E. J. Murgola and their colleagues have determined the altered tRNA sequence and base modification pattern of tRNA2Gly encoded by several sufS alleles, and DNA sequencing has pinpointed the changes at the glyT gene level in the same and other sufSalleles (D. J. O'Mahony, B. H. Mims, S. Thompson, E. J. Murgola, and J. F. Atkins, manuscript in preparation). Since earlier results have shown that in E. coli there is only one gene for the sole tRNA that decodes GGA (22, 36, 37), we conclude that sufS alleles retain triplet-decoding ability.

The recessive property of sufS indicates that the tRNA conformational states that promote frameshifting are poor competitors against their wild-type tRNA counterpart. The inability to isolate dominant alleles confirms that single-step mutations in tRNA₂^{Gly} that render the suppressor tRNA more competitive with the wild type at the frameshift site do not occur or occur exceedingly rarely. This finding is somewhat surprising. The 6% level of sufS alleles among all trpE91 revertants found in Salmonella haploid cells is reduced to zero in merodiploids. This is without the contraints of having to retain normal triplet decoding by one of the two (or three) available glyT alleles. Why are sufS alleles recessive to their wild-type glyT counterpart? The aminoacylation ability of several missense suppressor mutants of $tRNA_2^{Gly}$ is greatly reduced (21, 36), and Mims and Murgola (O'Mahony et al., in preparation) have found that this is also the case for the tRNA₂^{Gly} encoded by some, but not others, of the sufS alleles. Thus, decreased aminoacylation ability cannot be the only explanation for sufS recessivity. It is possible that the mutant charged $tRNA_2^{Gly}$ is defective in its interaction with elongation factor Tu or is discriminated against at the proofreading stage.

The experiment in which the base 5' flanking to the GGA suppression site was varied permits a distinction to be made between the two main models for suppression, originally suggested by the protein-sequencing results and the correspondence of sufS to glyT. sufS alleles were isolated as suppressors of trpE91, which has the sequence CAG GGA at the suppression site. In one model, the sufS mutant form of tRNA^{Giy} pairs with GGA less stably than would wild-type $tRNA_2^{Gly}$; it disengages from the GGA but remains within the ribosome. On occasions when the message slips back one base, it re-pairs with the underlined GGG in a triplet interaction. The A of the GGA would then be available to be the first nucleotide of the next AGU codon, with a resultant shift to the -1 frame. An analogous model appears to be the explanation for the other category, consisting of hopR and hopE, of tRNA suppressors for trpE91 except that the shift there is +2 rather than -1 (16). Since certain wild-type tRNAs also have this capability (48), the phenomenon may be of general interest. In the second model, the pairing of the first two bases of the GGA codon to the anticodon bases 36 and 35 does not get disrupted. In a specific version of this model, the third codon base is occluded by its anticodon counterpart, base 34, most but not all of the time; i.e., the wobble base 34 wafts close to and away from the third codon base, as dictated perhaps by a conformational flux of the tRNA (third-position "waffle"). When it is distant from the third codon base, the latter is available to become the first nucleotide of a -1 frame AGU codon. Thus, frameshifting is caused by doublet decoding. This model is somewhat distinct from the only previous examples, in which doublet codon-anticodon interaction was the cause of frameshifting (8, 14, 17). In the prior example, which was in vitro, there was no hint of occlusion of the third codon base (8, 14, 17) and a noncognate codon-anticodon interaction was involved, in contrast to the cognate interaction involved with sufS.

An influence of the base 5' flanking to the GGA codon on the suppression mediated by *sufS601* is apparent from the results presented here. The disengagement-re-pairing model requires a G in the 5' position. However, while suppression is best with G in the 5' position, it also occurs at a high level with A, C, or U. We interpret the latter result as indicating that the second model operates in any case. Whether the influence of the 5' G represents some context effect on a mechanism that does not involve disengagement or whether the disengagement-re-pairing is also operative at a certain level has not been resolved. Different sufS alleles have their alterations from wild type at several different positions in glyT (O'Mahony et al., in preparation). When the characterization of all alterations in glyT that give rise to suppressors is complete, it will be worthwhile to check an example of each type for its specificity of suppression. Not all alleles may use the same mechanism, and such information may provide a clue to the reason for the different mechanisms of suppression by sufS601 and hopR1.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Dymphna Hill for spirited assistance. Thérèse Tuohy and Michael O'Connor for performing some experiments and for comments on the manuscript. John Roth for generous access to his culture collection, Leen Bosch for the invaluable pTuB plasmids and hospitality to J.F.A., and Bob Weiss for major contributions to the construct approach. We thank Ray Gesteland for traditionally generous support and Ray Gesteland and Manny Murgola for comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by grants from the Irish National Board for Science and Technology/Eolas (to S.T. and J.F.A.), by National Science Foundation grant DMG-8408649 (to Ray Gesteland and J.F.A.), and by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. An, G., and J. D. Friesen. 1980. The nucleotide sequence of *tufB* and four nearby tRNA structural genes of *Escherichia coli*. Gene 12:33–39.
- Atkins, J. F., D. Elseviers, and L. Gorini. 1972. Low activity of β-galactosidase in frameshift mutants of *Escherichia coli*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 69:1192–1195.
- 3. Atkins, J. F., B. P. Nichols, and S. Thompson. 1983. The nucleotide sequence of the first externally suppressible -1 frameshift mutant, and of some nearby leaky frameshift mutants. EMBO J. 2:1345-1350.
- Atkins, J. F., and S. Ryce. 1974. UGA and non-triplet suppressor reading of the genetic code. Nature (London) 249:527–530.
- Bossi, L., and D. M. Smith. 1984. Suppressor sufJ: a novel type of tRNA mutant that induces translational frameshifting. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 81:6105–6109.
- Brierly, I., M. E. G. Boursnell, M. M. Binns, B. Bilimoria, V. C. Blok, T. D. K. Brown, and S. C. Inglis. 1987. An efficient ribosomal frame-shifting signal in the polymerase encoding region of the coronavirus IBV. EMBO J. 6:3779–3785.
- 7. Bonekamp, F., and K. F. Jensen. 1988. The AGG codon is translated slowly in *E. coli* even at very low expression levels. Nucleic Acids Res. 16:3013–3024.
- 8. Bruce, A. G., J. F. Atkins, and R. F. Gesteland. 1986. tRNA anticodon replacement experiments show that ribosomal frame-shifting can be caused by doublet decoding. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 83:5062–5066.
- 9. Buckley, K. J., and M. Hayashi. 1987. Role of premature translational termination in the regulation of expression of the $\phi X174$ lysis gene. J. Mol. Biol. 198:599–607.
- Chang, S., and J. Carbon. 1975. The nucleotide sequence of a precursor to the glycine- and threonine-specific transfer ribonucleic acids of *Escherichia coli*. J. Biol. Chem. 250:5542–5555.
- Chen, E. Y., and P. H. Seeburg. 1985. Supercoil sequencing: a fast and simple method for sequencing plasmid DNA. DNA 4:165-170.
- Colson, C., and A. van Pel. 1974. DNA restriction and modification systems in *Salmonella*. Mol. Gen. Genet. 129:325–337.
- Davis, R. W., D. Botstein, and J. R. Roth. 1980. Advanced bacterial genetics. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.
- Dayhuff, T. J., J. F. Atkins, and R. F. Gesteland. 1986. Characterization of ribosomal frameshift events by protein sequence analysis. J. Biol. Chem. 261:7491–7500.
- Dunn, J. J., and F. W. Studier. 1983. Complete nucleotide sequence of bacteriophage T7 DNA and the location of T7 genetic elements. J. Mol. Biol. 166:477–535.
- Falahee, M. B., R. B. Weiss, M. O'Connor, S. Doonan, R. F. Gesteland, and J. F. Atkins. 1988. Mutants of translational components that alter reading frame by two steps forward or one step back. J. Biol. Chem. 263:18099–18103.
- Gallant, J., R. Weiss, J. Murphy, and M. Brown. 1985. Some puzzles of translational accuracy, p. 92–107. *In M. Schaechter*, F. C. Neidhardt, J. L. Ingraham, and N. O. Kjeldgaard (ed.), The molecular biology of bacterial growth. Jones and Bartlett, Boston.
- Greeb, J., J. F. Atkins, and J. C. Loper. 1971. Histidinol dehydrogenase (*hisD*) mutants of *Salmonella typhimurium*. J. Bacteriol. 106:421–431.
- Hartman, P. E., Z. Hartman, R. C. Stahl, and B. N. Ames. 1971. Classification and mapping of spontaneous and induced mutations in the histidine operon of *Salmonella*. Adv. Genet. 16: 1–34.
- Heller, K., B. J. Mann, and R. J. Kadner. 1985. Cloning and expression of the gene for the vitamin B₁₂ receptor protein in the outer membrane of *Escherichia coli*. J. Bacteriol. 161:896–903.
- Hill, C. W. 1975. Informational suppression of missense mutations. Cell 6:419–427.

- 23. Holloway, B., and K. B. Low. 1987. F-prime and R-prime factors, p. 1145–1153. In F. C. Neidhardt, J. L. Ingraham, K. B. Low, B. Magasanik, M. Schaechter, and H. E. Umbarger (ed.), *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella typhimurium*: cellular and molecular biology. American Society for Microbiology, Washington, D.C.
- 24. Hoppe, I., H. M. Johnston, D. Biek, and J. R. Roth. 1979. A refined map of the *hisG* gene of *Salmonella typhimurium*. Genetics **92**:17-26.
- 25. Hudson, L., J. Rossi, and A. Landy. 1981. Dual function transcripts specifying tRNA and mRNA. Nature (London) 294:422-427.
- Hughes, D. 1986. The isolation and mapping of EF-Tu mutations in Salmonella typhimurium. Mol. Gen. Genet. 202:108–111.
- Hughes, D., J. F. Atkins, and S. Thompson. 1987. Mutants of elongation factor Tu promote ribosomal frameshifting and nonsense readthrough. EMBO J. 6:4235–4239.
- Hughes, D., S. Thompson, M. O'Connor, T. Tuohy, B. P. Nichols, and J. F. Atkins. 1989. Genetic characterization of frameshift suppressors with new decoding properties. J. Bacteriol. 171:1028–1034.
- 29. Jacks, T., H. D. Madhani, F. R. Masiarz, and H. E. Varmus. 1988. Signals for ribosomal frameshifting in the Rous sarcoma virus gag-pol region. Cell 55:447-458.
- Jin, D. J., and C. A. Gross. 1988. Mapping and sequencing of mutations in the *Escherichia coli rpoB* gene that lead to rifampicin resistance. J. Mol. Biol. 202:45–58.
- Kawakami, K., T. Inada, and Y. Nakamura. 1988. Conditionally lethal and recessive UGA suppressor mutations in the *prfB* gene encoding peptide chain release factor 2 in *Escherichia coli*. J. Bacteriol. 170:5378–5381.
- 32. Kawakami, K., Y. H. Jönsson, G. R. Björk, H. Ikeda, and Y. Nakamura. 1988. Chromosomal location and structure of the operon encoding peptide-chain-release factor 2 of *Escherichia coli*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 71:5620–5624.
- Kohno, T., and J. R. Roth. 1974. Proflavin mutagenesis of bacteria. J. Mol. Biol. 89:17-32.
- 34. Maniatis, T., E. F. Fritsch, and J. Sambrook. 1982. Molecular cloning: a laboratory manual. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.
- 35. Miller, J. H. 1972. Experiments in molecular genetics. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.
- 36. Murgola, E. J. 1985. tRNA, suppression and the code. Annu. Rev. Genet. 19:57–80.
- Murgola, E. J., and F. T. Pagel. 1980. Codon recognition by glycine transfer RNAs of *Escherichia coli in vivo*. J. Mol. Biol. 138:833-844.
- 38. Ovchinnikov, Y. A., G. S. Monastyrskaya, S. O. Guriev, N. F.

Kalinina, E. D. Sverdlov, A. I. Gragerov, I. A. Bass, I. F. Kiver, E. P. Moiseyeva, V. N. Igumnov, S. Z. Mindlin, V. G. Nikiforov, and R. B. Khesin. 1983. RNA polymerase rifampicin resistance mutations in *Escherichia coli*: sequence changes and dominance. Mol. Gen. Genet. 190:344–348.

- Pope, W. T., and R. H. Reeves. 1978. Purification and properties of the tRNA methylase from *Salmonella typhimurium*. J. Bacteriol. 136:191–200.
- Reeves, R. H., and J. R. Roth. 1975. Transfer ribonucleic acid methylase deficiency found in UGA suppressor strains. J. Bacteriol. 142:332-340.
- Riddle, D. L., and J. R. Roth. 1972. Frameshift suppressors. 11. Genetic mapping and dominance studies. J. Mol. Biol. 66: 483–493.
- 42. Riyasaty, S., and J. F. Atkins. 1968. External suppression of a frameshift mutant in *Salmonella*. J. Mol. Biol. 34:541-557.
- 43. Sanderson, K. E., and P. R. MacLachlan. 1987. F-mediated conjugation, F⁺ strains, and Hfr strains of Salmonella typhimurium and Salmonella abony, p. 1138–1144. In F. C. Neidhardt, J. L. Ingraham, K. B. Low, B. Magasanik, M. Schaechter, and H. E. Umbarger (ed.), Escherichia coli and Salmonella typhimurium: cellular and molecular biology. American Society for Microbiology, Washington, D.C.
- 44. Sanderson, K. E., and J. R. Roth. 1988. Linkage map of Salmonella typhimurium, edition VIII. Microbiol. Rev. 52: 485–532.
- 45. van Delft, J. H. M., and L. Bosch. 1988. Control of the tRNA-*tufB* operon in *Escherichia coli*. Eur. J. Biochem. 175: 375–378.
- 46. van Delft, J. H. M., D. S. Schmidt, and L. Bosch. 1987. The tRNA-*tufB* operon transcription termination and processing upstream from *tufB*. J. Mol. Biol. 197:647–657.
- Way, J. C., M. A. Davis, D. Morisato, D. E. Roberts, and N. Kleckner. 1984. New Tn10 derivatives for transposon mutagenesis and for construction of *lacZ* operon fusions by transposition. Gene 32:369–379.
- Weiss, R. B., D. M. Dunn, J. F. Atkins, and R. F. Gesteland. 1987. Slippery runs, shifty stops, backward steps and forward hops: -2, -1, +1, +2, +5, and +6 ribosomal frameshifting. Cold Spring Harbor Symp. Quant. Biol. 52:687-693.
- 49. Whitfield, H. J., Jr., R. G. Martin, and B. N. Ames. 1966. Classification of aminotransferase (C gene) mutants in the histidine operon. J. Mol. Biol. 21:335–355.
- Wilson, P. G., and M. R. Culbertson. 1988. Translational frameshifting and codon recognition, p. 415–430. *In M. F. Tuite*, M. Picard, and M. Bolotin-Fukuhara (ed.), Genetics of translation: new approaches. Springer-Verlag KG, Berlin.
- 51. Wilson, W., M. Braddock, S. E. Adams, P. D. Rathjen, S. M. Kingsman, and A. J. Kingsman. 1988. HIV expression strategies: ribosomal frameshifting is directed by a short sequence in both mammalian and yeast systems. Cell 55:1159–1169.