iScience, Volume 26

Supplemental information

Regulation of DNA damage response by trimeric G-proteins

Amer Ali Abd El-Hafeez, Nina Sun, Anirban Chakraborty, Jason Ear, Suchismita Roy, Pranavi Chamarthi, Navin Rajapakse, Soumita Das, Kathryn E. Luker, Tapas K. Hazra, Gary D. Luker, and Pradipta Ghosh

Regulation of DNA damage response by trimeric G-proteins

Amer Ali Abd El-Hafeez^{1, ¶}, Nina Sun¹, Anirban Chakraborty², Jason Ear^{1,3}, Suchismita Roy¹, Pranavi Chamarthi¹, Navin Rajapakse¹, Soumita Das⁴, Kathryn E Luker⁵, Tapas K. Hazra², Gary D. Luker⁵⁻⁷, Pradipta Ghosh^{1, 8-11§}

1Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

2Department of Internal Medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, Texas 77555, USA

3Biological Sciences Department, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, California 91768, USA

4Department of Pathology, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

5Center for Molecular Imaging, Department of Radiology, University of Michigan 109 Zina Pitcher Place, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-2200, USA

6Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Michigan, 2200 Bonisteel, Blvd., Ann Arbor, MI, 48109- 2099, USA.

7Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Michigan, 109 Zina Pitcher Place, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-2200, USA

8Department of Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

9Moores Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of California San

Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

10Veterans Affairs Medical Center, La Jolla, CA, USA.

11Lead Contact

§Corresponding author. prghosh@ucsd.edu

¶ **Secondary Affiliation**: Pharmacology and Experimental Oncology Unit, Cancer Biology Department, National Cancer Institute, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt

INVENTORY OF SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

- **SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES AND LEGENDS (7)**
- **SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES (4)**

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES AND LEGENDS

Figure S1 [related to Figure 2]. DNA damage repair response is impaired in cells without GIV.

A-B. Steps leading to creation of GIV KO HeLa lines. Cas9 target guides against GIV (CCDC88A) exons are listed in A. Gel showing screening of colonies by PCR of region flanking target site using genomic DNA from various cell clones from Cas9 selection (*bottom*). Immunoblots in B show examples of colonies that were either homozygous (-/-) or heterozygous (-/+) KO for GIV allele. KO clones were pooled to avoid clonal bias.

C-E. Line graphs display the metabolically active parental (blue) and GIV KO (red) cells that survived various doses of Doxorubicin (C), Cisplatin (D) or Etoposide (E), as determined by *MTT* tetrazolium assay (see *Methods*). Data displayed as mean ± S.E.M. and t-test was used to determine significance. (*; $p \le 0.05$; **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001. ns = not significant). See also Fig 2C for the table of IC50 values. **F**. Histograms show the percentage of cells at various stages of cell cycle (G1, S and G2/M) after challenged with Dox or vehicle control

(DMSO). See bar graphs in Fig 2D for quantification. **G**. Necrosis (NC), apoptotic (early, EAC; late, LAC; or combined) or living cells (LC) were quantified after challenged with either Dox or vehicle control (DMSO), as assessed by annexin V staining and flow cytometry. Scatter plots are displayed. Color coded quadrants are labeled.

H. Long amplicon qPCR (LA-QPCR) was used to evaluate genomic DNA SB levels in control vs. GIV KO cells. Representative full-length gels showing PCR-amplified fragments of the *HPRT* (E, top panel) and *POLB* (E, bottom panel) genes.

I. Images (top) and bar graphs (bottom) display anchorage-dependent growth into colonies after ~2 weeks of prolonged exposure of HeLa parental and GIV KO cells to 10 nM Doxorubicin or vehicle (DMSO) control (see *Methods*).

Figure S2 [related to Figure 2]. Survival after DNA damage is impaired in DLD1 and MDA-MB-231 cells without GIV.

A. Schematic outlining the three cell lines used in this work to study the role of GIV in cell survival after DNA damage. Parental and GIV KO HeLa cells are developed and validated in this work (see **Figure S1A-B**). Parental and GIV KO DLD1 cells were developed and validated in a prior work (see Key Resource Table). Generation and validation of parental and GIV KO MDA-MB-231 cells is described in **B-C. B-C.** Steps leading to the creation of GIV KO MDA-MB-231 lines. Cas9 target guides against GIV (CCDC88A) exons listed in **Fig S1A** (see *Methods*) were used to create GIV KO lines. Gel (B) showing screening of colonies by PCR of region flanking target site using genomic DNA from various cell clones from Cas9 selection. Immunoblots in C show examples of colonies that were KO for GIV allele. KO clones were pooled to reduce clonal bias. **D-F**. Bar graphs showing % survival of metabolically active HeLa (D), DLD-1 (E) and MDA-MB-231 (F) cell lines, challenged with either Dox or vehicle control (DMSO) for 24 h, as determined by *MTT* tetrazolium *assay.* Data displayed as mean ± S.E.M. and one-way ANOVA using Tukey's multiple comparisons test was used to determine significance. (*; p ≤ 0.05; *** $p < 0.001$. ns = not significant).

Figure S3 [related to Figure 3]. **The C-terminal BRCT module of BRCA1 binds to full length GIV from lysates of Cos7 and HeLa cells.** Pulldown assays were carried out using lysates of Cos7 (A) and Hs578T (B; a triple negative breast cancer line) cells as source of endogenous full length GIV with GST-BRCA1 and BARD1. Bound GIV was visualized by immunoblotting. See also **Fig 3D** for similar studes with lysates of HeLa cells.

Figure S4 [related to Figure 3]. Discovery of an evolutionarily conserved putative BRCT-binding motif on the C terminus of GIV. A. Short linear interaction motifs (SLIMs) within GIV's C-terminus. **Top:** Bar diagram showing the various domains of GIV. GBD, G protein binding domain; GEM, Guanine nucleotide exchange modulator; SH2, Src-like homology; PI4P, phosphoinositol-4-phosphate. **Bottom**: Sequence of GIV's C-terminus showing all currently identified SLIMs. The putative BRCT-binding SLIM is highlighted in pink. **B**. A curated list of studies that reported phosphorylation at Ser1716 on GIV (Girdin). Source: Phosphosite.org, a database that was developed with grants from the NIH.

Figure S5 [related to Figure 4]. Canonical (phosphodependent) binding of CtIP and BACH1 proteins to BRCA1 and proposed mechanism of phospho-dependent binding of GIV. A. Top: Solved structure of BACH1-derived SxxF consensus-bearing phosphopeptide bound to BRCA1 BRCT modules. Bottom: Model of M1775R mutation in BRCA (from solved structure of the mutant BRCA1; PDB: 1N50) showing steric clash of Arg at 1775 precluding binding of Phe (F) within the SxxF motif. **B**. Pulldown assays were carried out using lysates of HEK cells as source of myc-BACH1 (B) or GFP-CtIP (C) and recombinant GST/GST-BRCA1 WT and M1775R mutant proteins. Bound proteins were visualized by immunoblotting with anti-myc (BACH1; B), or anti-GFP (CtIP; C) IgGs. **D**. A lollipop graph showing the number of independent mass spectrometry studies that reported phosphorylation at Ser1716 on GIV (Girdin). Source: Phosphosite.org, a database that was Developed with grants from the NIH. **E**. Predicted kinases that mediate such phosphorylation, as determined using the bioinformatic web-based resource, NetPhos 3.1 (https://services.healthtech.dtu.dk/).

Figure S6 [related to Figure 5]. DNA damage repair response is impaired in cells expressing mutant GIV that cannot bind BRCA1 (F1719A) or bind/activate G proteins (F1685A). A-D. Line (A, C, D) and bar (B) graphs display metabolically active GIV-WT (blue), GIV-F1685A (red) and GIV-F1719A (black) cells that survived various doses of Doxorubicin (A-B), Cisplatin (C) or Etoposide (D), as determined by *MTT* tetrazolium assay (see *Methods*). Data displayed as mean ± S.E.M. and t-test was used to determine significance. (*; p ≤ 0.05; **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001. ns = not significant). See also **Fig 5C** for the table of IC50 values. **E**. Histograms show the percentage of cells at various stages of cell cycle (G1, S and G2/M) after challenged with Dox or vehicle control (DMSO). See bar graphs in **Fig 5D** for quantification. F. Necrosis (NC), apoptotic (early, EAC; late, LAC; or combined) or living cells (LC) were quantified after challenged with either Dox or vehicle control (DMSO), as assessed by annexin V staining and flow cytometry. Color coded quadrants are labeled. **G**. Long amplicon qPCR (LA-QPCR) was used to evaluate genomic DNA SB levels in control vs. GIV KO cells. Representative full-length gels showing PCR-amplified fragments of the *HPRT* (E, top panel) and *POLB* (E, bottom panel) genes.

Figure S7 [related to Figure 6]. GIV inhibits the localization of BRCA1 to sites of DNA damage. A-B. Bar graphs display the fold change in the number of bright foci of 53BP1 in parental and GIV KO MDA-MB-231 cells stably expressing mApple-53BP1 reoprter (which detects NHEJ) upon challenge with the indicated concentrations of Doxorubicin (A) or Cisplatin (B). Data displayed as mean ± S.E.M. and t-test to determine significance. (*; p ≤ 0.05; ***; p ≤ 0.001). See also **Fig 6F-H** for 53BP1 reporter studies on parental and GIV KO HeLa cells. **C-D**. Control (parental) and GIV-depleted (GIV KO) HeLa cells (**C**) or GIVdepleted HeLa cells stably expressing WT or mutant GIV constructs (D) were challenged with Dox or vehicle control (DMSO) prior to being fixed and co-stained for Y2H2AX (green) and BRCA1 (red) and analyzed by confocal microscopy. Representative images are shown (scale bar = 15 µm). **E**. Equal aliquots of nuclear (Nuc) and cytosolic (cyto) fractions prepared from Dox-challenged HeLa parental or GIV KO cells were probed for the indicated proteins by immunoblot. Loading controls are indicated.

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Supplementary Table 1 [related to Figure 1]: Gene ontology (GO) cellular component analysis for GIV interacting proteins, as determined by DAVID GO. Data are available via ProteomeXchange with identifier PXD022601.

Supplemental Information 2 [related to Figure 1]: Gene ontology (GO) molecular function analysis for GIV interacting proteins, as determined by

DAVID GO. Data are available via ProteomeXchange with identifier PXD02260.

Supplementary Table 3 [related to Figures 2 and **5]:** Summary of phenotypes observed in various cell lines used in this study.

Supplementary Table 4 [related to Figure 6]: Summary of Predicted Nuclear Import and Export Sequences in GIV/Girdin

