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ABSTRACT

*Drosophila* Dicer-2 generates small interfering RNAs (siRNAs) from long double-stranded RNA (dsRNA), whereas Dicer-1 produces microRNAs from pre-microRNA. My thesis focuses on the functional characteristics of two *Drosophila* Dicers that makes them specific for their biological substrates. We found that RNA binding protein partners of Dicers and two small molecules, ATP and phosphate are key in regulating *Drosophila* Dicers’ specificity. Without any additional factor, recombinant Dicer-2 cleaves pre-miRNA, but its product is shorter than the authentic miRNA. However, the protein R2D2 and inorganic phosphate block pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-2. In contrast, Dicer-1 is inherently capable of processing the substrates of Dicer, long dsRNAs. Yet, partner protein of Dicer-1, Loqs-PB and ATP increase the efficiency of miRNA production from pre-miRNAs by Dicer-1, therefore enhance substrate specificity of Dicer-1. Our data highlight the role of ATP and regulatory dsRNA-binding partner proteins to achieve substrate specificity in *Drosophila* RNA silencing.

Our study also sheds light onto the function of the helicase domain in *Drosophila* Dicers. Although Dicer-1 doesn’t hydrolyze ATP, ATP enhances miRNA production by increasing Dicer-1’s substrate specificity through lowering its $K_M$. On the other hand, Dicer-2 is a dsRNA-stimulated ATPase that hydrolyzes ATP to ADP, and ATP hydrolysis is required for Dicer-2 to process long dsRNA. Wild-type Dicer-2, but not a mutant defective in ATP hydrolysis, is processive; generating siRNAs faster than it can dissociate from a long dsRNA.
substrate. We propose that the Dicer-2 helicase domain uses ATP to generate many siRNAs from a single molecule of dsRNA before dissociating from its substrate.

Piwi-dependent small RNAs, namely piRNAs, are a third class of small RNAs that are distinct from miRNAs and siRNAs. Their primary function is to repress transposons in the animal germline. piRNAs are Dicer-independent, and require Piwi family proteins for their biogenesis and function. Recently in addition to their presence in animal germlines, the presence and function of piRNA-like RNAs in the somatic tissues have been suggested (Yan et al. 2011; Morazzani et al. 2012; Rajasethupathy et al. 2012). We have investigated whether the piRNA-like reads in our many Drosophila head libraries come from the germline as a contaminant or are soma-specific. Most of the piRNA reads in our published head libraries show high similarity to germline piRNAs. However, piRNA-like reads from manually dissected heads are distinct from germline piRNAs, proving the presence of somatic piRNA-like small RNAs. We are currently asking the question whether these distinct piRNA-like reads in the heads are dependent on the Piwi family proteins, like the germline piRNAs.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Discovery and Importance of Small RNAs

Small RNAs are small regulatory molecules comprised of ribonucleotides. They are generally smaller than 30 nucleotides and do not encode for a protein. They function as RNA molecules to regulate gene expression in a sequence specific way at both the transcriptional and posttranscriptional levels (Baulcombe et al. 1996). Small interfering RNAs (siRNAs), microRNAs (miRNAs) and Piwi-dependent small RNAs (piRNAs) are perhaps the three most well known classes of small RNAs.

Victor Ambros and his colleagues discovered small RNAs as gene expression regulators for the first time in 1993. The lin-4 gene surprisingly did not encode for a protein but rather 22 (mature miRNA) -60 nucleotide (pre-miRNA) transcripts that are complementary to the 3´UTR of lin-14 mRNA (Lee et al. 1993). This seminal work established this antisense relationship as a negative regulation mechanism controlling lin-14 protein levels. What was a curious observation in worms later turned out to be a genome wide gene regulation mechanism that is conserved from plants to humans (Hamilton et al. 1999; Grishok et al. 2001, Brennecke; Hipfner et al. 2003). In 1998, Andrew Fire, Craig Mello and their colleagues identified, double stranded RNA as a potent genetic interference molecule (Fire et al. 1998). Double stranded or siRNAs are used as an important tool to modulate gene expression in laboratory studies and are being tested as a cure for incurable diseases such as Huntington's disease.
(Montgomery et al. 1998; Kennerdell et al. 1998; Billy et al. 2001; Boutla et al. 2001; Chiu et al. 2002; Elbashir et al. 2001).

Since these two important discoveries, our knowledge about small RNA function and biogenesis has greatly expanded. Small RNAs have been implicated in diverse functions ranging from regulating development to repressing transposon activity (Hamilton et al. 1999; Reinhart et al. 2000; Lai et al. 2002, Aravin et al. 2001; Aukerman et al. 2003; Brennecke; Hipfner et al. 2003; Catalanotto et al. 2002; Chen et al. 2004; Grishok et al. 2001; Stark et al. 2003; Johnston et al. 2003; Kanellopoulou et al. 2005; Lau et al. 2001; Mallory et al. 2004; Noma et al. 2004; Vagin et al. 2006).
Figure 1.1. The siRNA and the miRNA Pathway in *Drosophila melanogaster* (adapted from Ghildiyal & Zamore, 2009). The siRNA pathway originates from long double stranded RNAs whereas the miRNA pathway starts with very long endogenous precursor transcripts called primary miRNAs (pri-miRNAs). The siRNA precursors are cleaved by Dicer-2 to form siRNA duplexes that are subsequently loaded into an Argonaute-2 (Ago2) RNA induced silencing complex (RISC). After cleavage of the passenger strand, single stranded and methylated mature siRNA bound Argonaute-2 cleaves target mRNAs. Drosha/Pasha complex processes pri-miRNAs to ~60 nt short hairpins called pre-miRNAs in the nucleus. After being exported to cytoplasm, Dicer1/Loqs PB complex cleaves the pre-miRNAs into miRNA-miRNA* duplexes. miRNA-miRNA* duplex is loaded into RISC comprised of Argonaute-1 (Ago1). miRNA bound RISC functions in mRNA destabilization or translational repression of the antisense target mRNA.
Small RNA Pathways in *Drosophila melanogaster*

siRNAs and miRNAs are functionally distinct and their biogeneses require different protein complexes in *Drosophila melanogaster* (Lee et al. 2004, Figure 1.1). miRNAs are mainly responsible for repressing gene expression through mRNA destabilization and translational repression (Lewis et al. 2003; Bartel et al. 2004; Selbach et al. 2008; Baek et al. 2008; Brodersen et al. 2008). miRNAs are essential in many core processes such as development and stem cell maintenance (Bohmert et al., 1998; Grishok et al. 2001; Knight and Bass 2001; Wienholds et al., 2003; Giraldez et al. 2005). On the other hand, the main function of siRNAs is to protect *Drosophila* genome from invasion by somatic transposons and defend against viruses (Galiana-Arnoux et al., 2006; Chung et al., 2008; Deddouche et al., 2008; Flynt et al., 2009; Saleh et al., 2009; van Rij et al., 2009).

The siRNA pathway starts with long double stranded RNAs that might be originated from viral replication intermediates (Flynt et al., 2009), bidirectionally transcribed overlapping transcripts (Okamura et al., 2008a; Watanabe et al., 2008); hybridized transcripts to antisense pseudogene derived transcripts (Tam et al., 2008), and long hairpins formed by inverted transcripts (Yang and Kazazian, 2006; Czech et al., 2008; Ghildiyal et al., 2008; Kawamura et al., 2008; Okamura et al., 2008b). These precursors are cleaved by Dicer-2 to form siRNA duplexes that are subsequently loaded into silencing complexes, namely Argonaute-2 (Flynt et al., 2009; Tomari et al. 2004; Matranga et al. 2005; Pham et al. 2005;

The miRNA pathway starts with very long endogenous precursor transcripts called primary miRNAs (pri-miRNAs) (Cai et al. 2004; Lee, Kim et al. 2004). Drosha/Pasha complex processes these pri-miRNAs to ~60 nt short hairpins called pre-miRNAs in the nucleus (Papp et al. 2003; Lee et al. 2002; Lee et al., 2003; Denli et al., 2004; Gregory et al., 2004; Han et al., 2006). Pre-miRNAs are then exported to cytoplasm in and Exportin-5 dependent manner (Yi et al. 2003; Bohnsack 2004; Lund et al. 2004). Dicer1/ Loqs PB complex cleaves the pre-miRNAs into miRNA-miRNA* duplexes in the cytoplasm (Forstemann et al. 2005). miRNA-miRNA* duplex is loaded into RNA induced silencing complex(RISC) comprised of Argonaute-1 (Ago1) (Forsteman et al. 2007; Tomari et al. 2007). The miRNA is unwound from miRNA* strand after binding Ago-1 (Kawamata et al. 2009; Okamura et al. 2009). Mature miRNA bound RISC is called mature RISC; it functions in mRNA destabilization or translational
repression of the antisense target mRNA (Lewis et al. 2003; Bartel et al. 2004; Selbach et al. 2008; Baek et al. 2008; Brodersen et al. 2008).
The Role of Dicer in Small RNA Biogenesis

Dicer was first identified and named for its cleavage of double stranded RNA in 2001 and discovered to be the key protein required for both miRNA and siRNA generation (Bass et al. 2000; Bernstein et al. 2001; Hutvanger et al. 2001; Jiang et al. 2005).

In *Drosophila*, two Dicer proteins lie at the center of both siRNA and microRNA biogenesis pathways (Figure 1.1). Both Dicer 1 and Dicer 2 cut structurally very similar double stranded RNAs and release 21/22 nucleotide products (Zamore et al. 2000). Nonetheless, they are remarkably specific to their respective substrates. Previous genetic studies have revealed this specificity in vivo (Lee et al. 2004). Dicer-1 is required for microRNA maturation (Jiang et al., 2005). When dicer-2 is absent, siRNA formation is abolished but miRNAs remain unaffected. Similarly dicer-1 mutation is lethal in flies, meaning that Dicer-2 cannot rescue miRNA processing.

The domain architectures of *Drosophila* Dicers are identical except for the N terminus. Both Dicers have two RNase III domains that are required for RNA cleavage (Bernstein et al. 2001; Bass et al. 2000). Crystal structure of Dicer from a unicellular eukaryote, *Giardia* Dicer, illuminated how the core domains of Dicer relate to its function. (Figure 1.2; (Macrae et al., 2006; Macrae et al., 2008; Jinek et al., 2009). The double stranded RNA binding domain and the PAZ domain are required for binding to RNA. PAZ domain binds to the 5´ and 3´ end of the double stranded RNA. The distance between the open helical end of the RNA to the
active sites is exactly 25 nucleotides in *Giardia* Dicer determining the product size. The catalytically active RNAse III domains are 2 nucleotides apart from each other, therefore upon cleavage the product has a 2 nucleotide 3' overhang (Bass, 2000; Cerutti et al., 2000; Lingel et al., 2003; Song et al., 2003; Yan et al., 2003; Lingel et al., 2004; Ma et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2004; Gan et al., 2006; Macrae et al., 2006; MacRae et al., 2007).
Figure 1.2. Molecular Mechanism of dsRNA Cleavage by *Giardia intestinalis* Dicer. The crystal structure of *Giardia intestinalis* Dicer (PDB ID: 2FFL, Macrae et al. 2006) with overlayed structure of an siRNA (PDB ID: 2F8S, Yuan et al. 2006).
**Drosophila Dicer-1**

**Drosophila Dicer-2**
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- **DEAD**: DEAD-like helicase superfamily
- **RNB**: Ribonuclease III family
- **HIS**: Helicase superfamily C-terminal domain
- **PAZ**: PAZ domain
- **DSRM**: Double-stranded RNA binding motif
Figure 1.3. Domain Structure of *Drosophila* Dicers and their RNA Binding Protein Partners. Domain structure of *Drosophila* Dicer-1, *Drosophila* Dicer-2, Human Dicer, Giardia Dicer, Loqs PB, LoqsPD, and R2D2 were adapted from the SMART protein domain analysis (Schultz et al., 1998; Ponting et al., 1999).
Function of Dicer is coupled to additional RNA binding partner proteins in metazoans (Figure 1.3). In *Drosophila melanogaster*, miRNA and siRNA pathways associate with specific Dicers, and specific RNA binding partners. These partner proteins are relatively small and have only double stranded RNA binding domains. The presence of the N-terminal DexDc domain and the differences in partner proteins are potential sources of specificity for these proteins (Jiang et al. 2005; Saito et al. 2005). Loquacious transcript is alternatively spliced to produce four variant transcripts (Figure 1.4). Loqs-PB, translated from one of these variants is in complex with Dicer-1, and functions in the miRNA pathway (Forstemann et al., 2005; Jiang et al., 2005). Loqs-PB enhances miRNA maturation, but not loading of mature miRNAs into RISC (Forstemann et al. 2005, Liu et al. 2007). On the other hand, R2D2, which is in complex with Dicer-2, is required to load siRNAs into Argonaute 2 containing RNA silencing complex (Liu et al., 2003; Tomari et al., 2004; Liu et al., 2006). Loqs-PD, an alternatively spliced isoform of Loquacious gene, also forms a complex with Dicer-2 and is involved in the endogenous siRNA pathway (Figure 1.1, 1.3, 1.4) (Zhou et al., 2009; Okamura et al., 2008b; Hartig et al., 2009; Zhou et al., 2009; Miyoshi et al., 2010; Hartig and Forstemann, 2011).

Dicer1/Loqs PB complex cleaves the pre-miRNAs into miRNA-miRNA* duplexes in the cytoplasm. Pre-miRNAs are ~60 nt short hairpins that are exported after pri-miRNA processing (Cai et al. 2004; Lee, Kim et al. 2004) by Drosha/Pasha complex (Papp et al. 2003; Lee et al. 2002; Lee et al., 2003; Denli
et al., 2004; Gregory et al., 2004; Han et al., 2006). Pre-miRNAs are composed of a partially double stranded region called stem, a loop structure at the one end of the stem, and an open helical two nucleotide 3’ overhang at the other end of the stem (Figure 1.5). Dicer-1/Loqs-PB complex cleaves the double stranded stem from the loop side, releasing a mature ~22 nucleotide miRNA/miRNA* duplex. Depending on where the mature miRNA strand comes from, pre-miRNAs can be divided into two classes. In the first class of pre-miRNAs, mature miRNA is derived from the 5’ arm. Therefore, Dicer-1 cleavage occurs at the 3’ end of the mature miRNA. In the second class of pre-miRNAs, mature miRNA strand is derived from the 3’ arm of the hairpin. In this case, Dicer-1 cleaves to form 5’ end of the mature miRNA.

Dicer-2 processes long dsRNA and long hairpins into ~21 nucleotide siRNAs. Dicer cleaves dsRNAs starting from the open double-stranded ends (Vermeulen et al., 2005; Macrae et al., 2006; Weinberg et al., 2011). Dicer-2 seems to be efficient in processing long double stranded RNA molecules, since never an intermediary product is observed. Its efficiency is furthermore increased in the presence of ATP (Zamore et al., 2000; Nykanen et al., 2001).

RNAse III and PAZ domains are sufficient for dicing activity, yet all metazoan dicers contain helicase domains (Figure 1.3). The studies about the function of the helicase domain of Dicer have been puzzling. Human Dicer was reported to be ATP-independent, and the removal of the helicase domain increased its efficiency if the helicase domain was removed (Zhang et al., 2002;
Ma et al., 2008). A different study implicated the helicase domain in processing thermodynamically unstable hairpin RNAs (Soifer et al., 2008). Helicase domain of Dicer was also implicated in siRNA pathway independent functions such as interaction with HIV-I Tat protein (Bennasser & Jeang, 2006) and mediating interferon induction (Deddouche et al., 2008).

The helicase domain of Dicer-2 belongs to the RIG-I (retinoic acid-inducible gene) family of RNA helicases. RIG-I recognizes viral nucleotides and activates interferon response in vertebrates (Yoneyama & Fujita, 2007; Zou et al., 2009). RIG-I was reported to sense triphosphates at the 5´ end and to translocate along viral dsRNA. Triphosphate and dsRNA structure are required to induce ATPase activity, and subsequent translocation of RIG-I (Myong et al., 2009).

siRNA formation from long dsRNAs requires ATP in flies and fission yeast (Zamore et al., 2000; Colmenares et al., 2007). Dicer-2 is responsible for production of siRNAs and its helicase domain has a predicted ATP binding site. Moreover, a mutation in the predicted ATP binding site (walker A motif) of Dicer-2 was found to block inverted repeat derived siRNA silencing in Drosophila (Lee et al., 2004).

The following two chapters of my thesis work examined the effects of ATP and RNA binding protein partners on the miRNA and siRNA formation by Dicer-1 and Dicer-2. I used recombinantly expressed purified proteins for in vitro dicing assays and to measure the effect of partner proteins on the activity of Drosophila
Dicers. In our work, we tried to identify the ATP requiring step in dicing and explore the function of the helicase domain of *Drosophila* Dicer-2. In addition, we also explored the mechanistic basis of substrate specificities of Dicer-1 and Dicer-2. We found that RNA binding protein partners of Dicers and two small molecules, ATP and phosphate are key in regulating *Drosophila* Dicers’ specificity.
Figure 1.4. The Transcript Variants and Domain Structures of Loquacious (Loqs) Isoforms. Transcript variants of four different Loqs isoforms, which are transcribed from the same location and alternatively spliced, are shown on the left. On the right, domain architectures of four different Loqs isoforms are shown. The transcript and the domain structures Loqs isoforms were adapted from UCSC genome browser and smart domain protein analysis (Kent et al., 2002; Fujita et al., 2010; Schultz et al., 1998; Ponting et al., 1999).
Figure 1.5. Structures of two pre-miRNAs; pre-let-7 and pre-miR-1. Mature miRNA strand is in red and miRNA* strand is in blue. Seven nucleotides in yellow denotes the seed sequence, which is important for target mRNA recognition. Green arrows point at Dicer-1 cleavage site.
Piwi Dependent Small RNAs in *Drosophila melanogaster*

The second part of my thesis is about the somatic Piwi-dependent small RNA family. While siRNAs and miRNAs are found throughout the whole organism, piRNAs were discovered as a distinct class of germ line specific small RNAs (Vagin et al. 2006; Grivna et al. 2006). piRNAs are conserved throughout the animal kingdom, and protect the germline from transposon invasion (Grivna et al. 2006; Brennecke et al. 2007; Houwing et al. 2007; Das et al. 2008; Grimson et al. 2008). Animals without functional piRNAs are sterile (Schupbach et al 1991; Klattenhoff et al. 2007; Batista et al. 2008). piRNAs guide PIWI proteins to silence transposons in the germ line of animals (Cox et al. 2000; Aravin et al. 2001; Aravin et al. 2003; Grivna et al. 2006; Brennecke et al. 2007; Batista et al. 2008; Das et al. 2008; Chamberyron et al. 2008; Desset et al. 2008).

piRNA biogenesis and function diverge significantly from miRNAs and siRNAs (Brennecke et al. 2007; Li et al. 2008). piRNAs are longer, generally 24 to 30 nucleotides long, their 3’ termini 2’O methylated, and they don’t have double stranded RNA precursors (Aravin et al. 2001; Aravin et al. 2004; Vagin et al. 2006; Saito et al. 2007; Kirino et al. 2007; Ohara et al. 2007). Unlike siRNAs and miRNAs, piRNA production does not require Dicer and likely involves only single-stranded precursor RNAs (Vagin et al. 2006; Girard et al. 2006; Saito et al. 2007; Kirino et al. 2007; Ohara et al. 2007; Brennecke et al. 2007; Batista et al. 2008). The biogenesis of piRNAs and their role in transposon silencing have been elucidated mainly from studies of *Drosophila* ovaries and testes (Aravin et

*Drosophila* gonads express three PIWI proteins: Piwi, Aubergine, and Ago3 (Ghildiyal et al. 2009; Cox et al. 1998; Cox et al. 2000; Harris et al. 2001; Vagin et al. 2006; Saito et al. 2006; Nishida et al. 2007; Yin et al. 2007; Klattenhoff et al. 2007; Desset et al. 2008; Malone et al. 2009). Piwi localizes to the nucleus in both the germline and the surrounding somatic follicle cells, and helps regulate differentiation and patterning of the germline nurse cells as well as the oocyte (Cox et al. 1998; Cox et al. 2000).

Our lab and others have extensively used small RNA sequencing approaches to study this pathway in the germline (Vagin et al. 2006; Brennecke et al. 2007; Malone et al. 2009; Li et al. 2009). High throughput sequencing of piRNAs bound to Piwi, Aubergine, and Ago3 suggested a model called the “Ping-Pong” mechanism for the production and subsequent amplification of piRNAs in response to transcription of the transposons they target. The Ping-Pong model proposes that Aubergine and Ago3 collaborate both to increase the abundance of piRNAs and to bias piRNAs toward the antisense strand (Brennecke et al. 2007; Gunawarde et al. 2007). The detailed mechanism by which Aubergine and Piwi acquire primary piRNAs is unknown, but recent results suggest that they derive from long RNAs transcribed from “piRNA clusters”. These regions of the
genome are specifically transcribed in the gonads and are characterized by transposon-richness, and a dearth of genes (Olivieri et al. 2010). The Ping-Pong model postulates that Aubergine, bound to an anti-sense primary piRNA pairs with the mRNA transcript of an active transposon, resulting in cleavage of the target and generation of a 3’ cleavage product bearing a 5’ monophosphate. The 5’ end of the 3’ cleavage fragment then becomes the 5’ end of a sense piRNA bound to Ago3. This “secondary piRNA” can then direct cleavage of a primary piRNA transcript derived from a piRNA cluster. The next step reverses this process. The Ago3:sense piRNA complex cleaves the long transcript from a piRNA cluster, generating antisense RNA fragments that bind to Aub. These fragments are envisioned to be trimmed to mature piRNAs (Brennecke et al. 2007; Gunawarde et al. 2007; Li et al. 2009).

Transposon derived piRNAs bound to Piwi silence transposon expression in the nucleus by a poorly understood mechanism. Although the mechanism is not clearly known and controversial, they are thought to transcriptionally silence genes and repeat sequences by DNA methylation or heterochromatin formation (Lees-Murdock et al. 2003; Saito et al. 2006; Kato et al. 2007). Heterochromatin dependent transcriptional silencing was detected at piRNA clusters yet the heterochromatin formation was suggested to be independent from the piRNA pathway (Moshkovich et al., 2010). Piwi was reported to interact with the histone protein HP1a and the HP1a interacting motif is required for the silencing function of Piwi (Brower-Toland et al., 2007). Moreover, Piwi and a piRNA species was
suggested to promote euchromatic histone modification in subtelomeric heterochromatin (Yin & Lin, 2007). Another observation related to the function of piRNA pathway came from positional effect variation studies in *Drosophila* (Todeschini et al., 2010). In this study, authors took advantage of a transsilencing effect where a P transgene such as P-lacZ in subtelomeric heterochromatin is able to repress another P-lacZ copy in trans. This transsilencing effect, which is maternal and epigenetically transmitted through meiosis, was found to be fully or partially abolished by piRNA pathway genes aubergine and piwi (Todeschini et al., 2010).

In addition to their presence in animal germlines, the presence and function of piRNA-like small RNAs in the somatic tissues have been suggested (Yan et al. 2011; Lee et al. 2011; Morazzani et al. 2012) yet it was not clear whether they were methylated. Recently, methylated Piwi bound RNAs were found the Aplysia central nervous system. piRNAs that are antisense to the promoter region of CREB2 are shown to be upregulated by serotonin. Upon upregulation, these piRNA species facilitates methylation of a conserved CpG island in the promoter region of CREB2, regulating transcription of CREB2. This event promotes long-term changes in neurons upon stimulation (Rajasethupathy et al. 2012).

The fourth chapter of my thesis addresses the question whether somatic piwi dependent small RNAs are present in *Drosophila* head tissues. We have investigated whether the piRNA-like reads in our many *Drosophila* head libraries
come from the germline as a contaminant or are soma-specific. We found that most of the piRNA reads in our published head libraries show high similarity to germline piRNAs. However, piRNA-like reads from manually dissected heads are distinct from germline piRNAs, proving the presence of somatic piRNA-like small RNAs.
CHAPTER II: PHOSPHATE AND R2D2 RESTRICT THE
SUBSTRATE SPECIFICITY OF DICER-2, AN ATP-DRIVEN
RIBONUCLEASE.
Preface

The work in this chapter was the result of a collaborative work. Dr. Gang Lu, Dr. Robert Dutcher, and Dr. Yeming Wang from Dr. Traci M Tanaka Hall's laboratory recombinantly expressed Dicer-2 and Dicer-2$^{G31R}$; designed, recombinantly expressed and purified Dicer-2$^{D1217,1614N}$. Dr. Ryuya Fukunaga performed dicing experiments in Figure 2.2 and 2.S1B, 2.S3A. Dr. Ryuya Fukunaga purified recombinantly expressed Dicer-2 and Dicer-2$^{G31R}$. I carried out the dicing and ATP consumption assays and northern hybridization in Figures 2.1, 2.S1, 2.3, 2.S3B, 2.S3C, 2.4, 2.S4, 2.5, Table 2.1, and 2.2. I purified recombinantly expressed Dicer-2 and Dicer-2/R2D2.
Abstract

Drosophila Dicer-2 generates small interfering RNAs (siRNAs) from long double-stranded RNA (dsRNA), whereas Dicer-1 produces microRNAs from pre-microRNA. What makes the two Dicers specific for their biological substrates? We find that purified Dicer-2 can efficiently cleave pre-miRNA, but that inorganic phosphate and the Dicer-2 partner protein R2D2 inhibit pre-miRNA cleavage. Dicer-2 contains C-terminal RNase III domains that mediate RNA cleavage, and an N-terminal helicase motif whose function is unclear. We show that Dicer-2 is a dsRNA-stimulated ATPase that hydrolyzes ATP to ADP; ATP hydrolysis is required for Dicer-2 to process long dsRNA, but not pre-miRNA. Wild-type Dicer-2, but not a mutant defective in ATP hydrolysis, can generate siRNAs faster than it can dissociate from a long dsRNA substrate. We propose that the Dicer-2 helicase domain uses ATP to generate many siRNAs from a single molecule of dsRNA before dissociating from its substrate.
Introduction

In *Drosophila melanogaster*, distinct pathways produce 21 nt small interfering RNAs (siRNAs) and ~22 nt microRNAs (miRNAs). The RNase III enzyme Drosha, aided by its partner protein, Pasha, cleaves primary miRNAs to release pre-miRNAs, ~70 nt long stem-loop structures that contain a mature miRNA within their stems (Lee et al., 2003; Denli et al., 2004; Gregory et al., 2004; Han et al., 2004; Han et al., 2006). The pre-miRNA is then cleaved by Dicer-1, acting with its dsRNA-binding domain (dsRBD) protein partner, Loquacious-PB (Loqs-PB), to liberate a duplex comprising the mature miRNA bound to its miRNA*, a partially complementary small RNA derived from the opposite arm of the pre-miRNA stem (Förstemann et al., 2005; Jiang et al., 2005; Saito et al., 2005; Ye et al., 2007). Mature miRNAs can derive from either the 5’ or 3’ arm of the pre-miRNA stem.

In contrast to miRNAs, *Drosophila* siRNAs are generated by Dicer-2 (Lee et al., 2004), which forms a stable complex with the dsRNA-binding protein R2D2 (Liu et al., 2003). In vitro, Dicer-2 can produce siRNAs in the absence of R2D2, but both Dicer-2 and R2D2 are required to load siRNAs into Ago2 (Liu et al., 2003; Tomari et al., 2004; Pham and Sontheimer, 2005; Liu et al., 2006; Tomari et al., 2007). Exogenous siRNAs derive from long dsRNA molecules that are generated experimentally, from viral RNA genomes or intermediates of replication, whereas endo-siRNAs derive from convergent transcription of mRNAs or from RNA from mobile genetic elements (Yang and Kazazian, 2006;
Czech et al., 2008; Ghildiyal et al., 2008; Kawamura et al., 2008; Okamura et al., 2008a; Okamura et al., 2008b; Tam et al., 2008; Watanabe et al., 2008). A special class of endogenous siRNAs, hp-esiRNAs derive from partially self-complementary hairpin transcripts. Production of esiRNAs by Dicer-2 requires an alternative partner protein, Loqs-PD. This Loqs isoform contains only two of the three dsRBDs found in the Dicer-1 partner protein, Loqs-PB (Okamura et al., 2008b; Hartig et al., 2009; Zhou et al., 2009; Miyoshi et al., 2010; Hartig and Forstemann, 2011).

Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 each contain two RNase III domains, which form an intramolecular heterodimer whose dimer interface creates two active sites (Zhang et al., 2004; Macrae et al., 2006; Ye et al., 2007). Like other members of the Dicer family, Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 each contain a C-terminal dsRBD and a central PAZ domain, an RNA-binding motif specialized to recognize the two-nucleotide, 3′ single-stranded tails of Drosha and Dicer products (Bass, 2000; Cerutti et al., 2000; Lingel et al., 2003; Song et al., 2003; Yan et al., 2003; Lingel et al., 2004; Ma et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2004; Gan et al., 2006; Macrae et al., 2006; MacRae et al., 2007). The structure of Giardia intestinalis Dicer and functional studies using human Dicer suggest that the distance between the PAZ domain and the active sites of the RNase III domains establishes the length of the small RNA product (Zhang et al., 2004; Gan et al., 2006; Macrae et al., 2006; MacRae et al., 2007; Takeshita et al., 2007).

Differences in the domain architecture of Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 are unlikely to
explain their distinct substrate specificities. *Drosophila* Dicer-2 shares its domain architecture—including N-terminal DExDc, Helicase C, PAZ, RNase IIIa, RNase IIIb, dsRBD domains—with human Dicer, which produces both siRNAs and miRNAs. In contrast, Dicer-1 lacks a DExDc domain, yet has a Helicase C domain. DExDc/H and DEAD box domains are found in a wide range of RNA “helicases,” proteins that couple ATP hydrolysis to RNA binding or unwinding (Pyle, 2008). In addition to unwinding nucleic acids, helicase domains can couple ATP hydrolysis to translocation along nucleic acid molecules, rearrange RNA:protein or protein: protein interactions, or act as RNA chaperones (Bianco and Kowalczykowski, 2000; Beran et al., 2006; Bowers et al., 2006; Dumont et al., 2006; Halls et al., 2007; Pyle, 2008; Franks et al., 2010).

In *Drosophila* and Caenorhabditis elegans, siRNA production from long dsRNAs requires ATP (Zamore et al., 2000; Bernstein et al., 2001; Ketting et al., 2001; Nykanen et al., 2001). Moreover, a point mutation (G31R) in the *Drosophila* Dicer-2 helicase domain blocks siRNA production in vivo, although the protein retains the ability to collaborate with R2D2 to load synthetic siRNAs (Lee et al., 2004; Pham et al., 2004) and highly paired miRNA/miRNA* duplexes (Forstemann et al., 2007) into Ago2. In contrast, a mutation predicted to inhibit nucleotide binding by the human Dicer helicase domain does not affect dicing (Zhang et al., 2002).

What restricts a given Dicer to a specific dsRNA substrate? We find that purified, recombinant Dicer-2 can cleave pre-miRNA, but that R2D2 inhibits
processing of pre-miRNA by Dicer-2, while promoting use of its biologically relevant substrate by reducing the $K_M$ of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA. Moreover, physiological concentrations of inorganic phosphate block pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-2, but do not inhibit processing of long dsRNA by Dicer-2 or pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-1. Thus, the characteristic specificity of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA is not intrinsic to the enzyme, but rather emerges in the presence of inorganic phosphate and R2D2. We also find that Dicer-2 is a dsRNA-stimulated ATPase that hydrolyzes ATP to ADP; ATP hydrolysis is required for Dicer-2 to process long dsRNA but not pre-miRNA. Wild-type Dicer-2, but not a mutant defective in ATP hydrolysis, can generate siRNAs faster than it dissociates from its long dsRNA substrate. We envision that the Dicer-2 helicase domain uses ATP to drive the movement of Dicer-2 along dsRNA, enabling it to generate many siRNAs from a single molecule of substrate before dissociating from the dsRNA.
Results

Dicer-2 Processes Pre-miRNA Inaccurately

In vivo, Dicer-1 but not Dicer-2 is required to produce miRNAs from the stems of pre-miRNA. Surprisingly, purified, recombinant Dicer-2 cleaved pre-miRNA (Figure 2.1). However, the size of the miRNA and miRNA* products generated by Dicer-2 differed from those produced by Dicer-1: the predominant Dicer-2 product was one nucleotide shorter than that produced by Dicer-1. For miRNAs residing on the 5’ arm of their pre-miRNA, such a difference in size would not alter the miRNA seed sequence, but could promote their inappropriate loading into Argonaute2, which favors 21 nt RNAs, rather than Argonaute1, which prefers 22mers (Ameres et al., 2011). For the ~60% of D. melanogaster miRNAs derived from the 3’ arm of their pre-miRNA, the seed sequence of the Dicer-2 product would differ from the authentic miRNA and would therefore regulate a repertoire of mRNAs different from that controlled by the authentic miRNA. The biological consequences of such misregulation are predicted to be dramatic, suggesting that processing of pre-miRNA by Dicer-2 is suppressed in vivo.
Figure 2.1. Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 Produce Different Products from Pre-let-7.

Synthetic, 5 monophosphorylated pre-let-7 (1.0 μM) was incubated with Dicer-1 (6.0 nM) or Dicer-2 (16.2 nM) for 1 h. Products were resolved by electrophoresis. let-7 and let-7* were detected by Northern hybridization.
**R2D2 Inhibits Dicing of Pre-miRNA by Dicer-2**

We compared the rate of pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2 alone to the rate of purified Dicer-2/R2D2 heterodimer, Dicer-2 supplemented with equimolar Loqs-PD, and Dicer-2/R2D2 heterodimer supplemented with Loqs-PD. R2D2 significantly inhibited pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2 when either enzyme (data not shown) or substrate was in excess (Figure 2.2A; p-value for excess substrate = 0.0009). Similar inhibition of Dcr-2 processing by R2D2 was observed for a 25 bp RNA duplex (Figure 2.S1A), suggesting that R2D2 suppresses processing of short, double-stranded substrates irrespective of the extent of complementarity or the presence of a loop. In contrast, we did not detect any inhibition of pre-let-7 processing when Loqs-PD was added to Dicer-2, even though the same preparation of Loqs-PD lowered the $K_m$ of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA 10-fold (Table 2.1). These data suggest that, R2D2, but not Loqs-PD, helps suppress pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-2 in vivo.
Figure 2.2. R2D2 and Phosphate Inhibit Dicer-2 Processing of Short Substrates. (A) let-7 production was monitored using 5 $^{32}$P-radiolabeled pre-let-7 (100 nM) with or without ATP for Dicer-2 alone (8 nM), Dicer-2/R2D2 (8 nM), Dicer-2 + Loqs-PD (8 nM + 8 nM) or Dicer-2/R2D2 + Loqs-PD (8 nM + 8 nM). (B) Processing of internally $^{32}$P-radiolabeled long dsRNA or 5 $^{32}$P-radiolabeled pre-let-7 (100 nM) by Dicer-2 (8 nM). CK, creatine kinase; CP, creatine phosphate. (C) Initial velocities for the processing of 100 nM pre-let-7 or long dsRNA (106 bp blunt ended or 104 bp with 2 nt, 3 overhanging ends) by 8 nM Dicer-2 or Dicer-2/R2D2 in the presence of increasing concentrations of potassium phosphate. Total potassium in the reaction was kept constant. (D) Initial velocities for Dicer-2 processing pre-let-7, 106 bp blunt ended dsRNA or 104 bp dsRNA with 2 nt, 3 overhanging ends in the presence of 25 mM potassium phosphate, acetate, chloride, or glutamate. (E) Processing of internally $^{32}$P-radiolabeled long dsRNA or 5 $^{32}$P-radiolabeled pre-let-7 substrate (100 nM) by wild-type or G31R mutant Dicer-2 (8 nM) with or without ATP or with ATPS (1 mM). Values are mean ± standard deviation for three independent experiments.
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Figure 2.S1. R2D2 Inhibits Dicer-2 Processing of a 25 bp dsRNA Substrate and Creatine Phosphate Inhibits Dicer-2 Processing of a Long dsRNA Bearing 5 Triphosphate termini. (A) siRNA production by Dcr-2 (5.4 nM) or Dcr-2/R2D2 heterodimer (12 nM) was measured for a 25 bp dsRNA (100 nM). Red indicates deoxynucleotides. (B) A 5 triphosphorylated 316 bp dsRNA (100 nM) bearing 2 nt 5 overhanging ends was incubated with Dicer-2 (8 nM) in the presence or absence of ATP, creating kinase (CK), or creatine phosphate (CP).
Dicer-2 forms a stable heterodimer with R2D2 (Liu et al., 2003; Tomari et al., 2004; Liu et al., 2006), but it is unknown whether R2D2 modulates dicing rate. We measured the initial rate of dicing by Dicer-2 alone or by the Dicer-2/R2D2 heterodimer using increasing concentrations of long dsRNA substrate and saturating ATP (1 mM). For both Dicer-2 and Dicer-2/R2D2 the data fit well to the Michaelis-Menten kinetic scheme (Figure 2.S2)

\[
\begin{align*}
E + S & \rightleftharpoons ES \\
& \rightarrow E + 24P \\
\end{align*}
\]

where \( k_{\text{cat}} \) is the rate of complete conversion of substrate into siRNAs at saturating dsRNA concentration. The \( k_{\text{cat}} \) of Dicer-2/R2D2 processing a 515 bp dsRNA (0.03 ± 0.02 min\(^{-1}\)) was indistinguishable from that of Dicer-2 alone (0.03 ± 0.01 min\(^{-1}\); Table 2.1). In contrast, the \( K_M \) for Dicer-2/R2D2 (2 ± 1 nM) was less than that of Dicer-2 alone (6 ± 2 nM, p-value = 0.04), suggesting that R2D2 increases the affinity of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA (Table 2.1). Similarly, supplementing Dicer-2 (2 nM) with purified recombinant Loqs-PD (2 nM) did not alter the \( k_{\text{cat}} \), but did decrease \( K_M \) (0.4 ± 0.1 nM, p-value = 0.02), suggesting that Loqs-PD also increases the affinity of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA (Table 2.1).
Figure 2.S2. Michaelis-Menten Analysis of Dicer-2, Dicer-2 + Loqs-PD, and Dicer-2/R2D2 Using a 515 bp dsRNA Substrate. The initial rate (velocity) of substrate processing by 2 nM Dicer-2, 3 nM Dicer-2/R2D2, and 2 nM Dicer-2 + 2 nM Loqs-PD was measured for increasing concentrations of a 515 bp long dsRNA in the presence of 1 mM ATP. The data were fit to the Michaelis-Menten equation. $V_{\text{max}}$ corresponds to the rate of complete conversion of a molecule of substrate into 24 siRNAs at saturating dsRNA concentration.
Table 2.1. Michaelis-Menten Analysis of Dicer-2 and Partner Proteins. Dicer-2, Dicer-2/R2D2, or Dicer-2 supplemented with equimolar Loqs-PD was incubated with a 515 bp dsRNA and saturating ATP (1 mM) ATP. The initial rates of converting dsRNA into siRNA for increasing amounts of substrate were measured and fit to the Michaelis-Menten equation (Figure S5). The table reports mean ± standard deviation for three trials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(K_M) (nM)</th>
<th>Change in (K_M)</th>
<th>(V_{\text{max}}) (nM min(^{-1}))</th>
<th>([E_T]) (nM)</th>
<th>(k_{\text{cat}}) (min(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Change in (k_{\text{cat}})</th>
<th>(k_{\text{cat}} / K_M) (nM(^{-1}) min(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Change in (k_{\text{cat}} / K_M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dicer-2</td>
<td>6 ± 2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005 ± 0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicer-2/R2D2</td>
<td>2 ± 1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.02</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicer-2 + Loqs-PD</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.03</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phosphate Inhibits Dicing of Pre-miRNA by Dicer-2

In flies, dicing of long dsRNA requires ATP (Nykanen et al., 2001). Typically, creatine kinase (CK) and creatine phosphate (CP) are included in dicing reactions to maintain high levels of ATP and constant levels of free Mg\(^{2+}\). Relative to ATP alone, the inclusion of CK and CP modestly enhanced Dicer-2 processing of both a 106 bp dsRNA bearing a 5’ monophosphorylated blunt end (Figure 2.2B) and a 316 bp dsRNA bearing a 5’ triphosphorylated, 2 nt, 5’ overhang (Figure 2.S1B), but did not enhance processing of a 104 bp dsRNA with a 5’ monophosphorylated, 2 nt 3’ overhang (Figure 2.2B). In contrast, standard “ATP” conditions (+ATP, +CP, +CK) inhibited pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2. More detailed analyses revealed that CP sufficed to inhibit pre-let-7 dicing.

CP can be hydrolyzed in water to creatine and phosphate. We therefore tested whether inorganic phosphate inhibited pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2. We measured the initial rate of processing (\(v_0\)) with increasing concentrations of potassium phosphate (KH\(_2\)PO\(_4\)/K\(_2\)H PO\(_4\), pH 7.4) for pre-let-7, a 106 bp blunt end dsRNA and a 104 bp dsRNA with 2 nt 3’ overhanging ends. Physiological concentrations of phosphate (Burt et al., 1976; Erecinska et al., 1977; Auesukaree et al., 2004) inhibited processing of pre-let-7, but neither of the two dsRNAs (Figure 2.2C). We observed little or no inhibition of pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-2 with 25 mM acetate, chloride, or glutamate (Figure 2.2D). Moreover, none of the anions—including phosphate—had a significant effect on
the dicing of long dsRNA. Phosphate further inhibited the low level of pre-let-7 processing of Dicer-2/R2D2 (Figure 2.2C) and Dicer-2/R2D2 + Loqs-PD, and suppressed pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2 + Loqs-PD (data not shown). In contrast, processing of pre-let-7 by Dicer-1 was unaffected by phosphate (Figure 2.2C). We conclude that under physiological conditions—2–25 mM phosphate and a majority of Dicer-2 complexed with R2D2—Dicer-2 is unlikely to use pre-miRNA as a substrate.

**ATP Hydrolysis and siRNA Production by Dicer-2**

The Dicer-2 G31R point mutation, which lies in the protein’s DEKc motif, uncouples Argonaute2 loading from dsRNA dicing (Lee et al., 2004). The mutation is predicted to disrupt ATP binding. Consistent with the requirement for ATP in siRNA production by Dicer-2, dsRNA processing by purified recombinant Dicer-2 G31R was significantly less than wild-type Dicer-2 for both substrates with blunt and 3’ overhanging ends (Figure 2.2D, p-value = 2.2 × 10⁻⁶ for blunt end substrate). While dsRNA processing by wild-type Dicer-2 was strongly stimulated by ATP, mutant Dicer-2 G31R was not (Figure 2.2D). Nonetheless, Dicer-2 G31 cleaved pre-let-7 as efficiently as the wild-type enzyme, consistent with the finding that ATP was not required for wild-type Dicer-2 to cleave pre-let-7 (Figure 2.2A). Moreover, processing of long dsRNA by wild-type Dicer-2 was inhibited by adenosine 5’-O-(3-thio)triphosphate (ATPgS), but processing of pre-let-7 was not (Figure 2.2D).
In agreement with ATPγS inhibiting dsRNA processing, Dicer-2 hydrolyzed ATP to ADP (Figure 2.3A). Both ATP and ATPαS supported the production of siRNA from long dsRNA, but ATPγS did not (Figure 2.3B). In the presence of 1 mM ATP, the rate of dicing long dsRNA declined exponentially with increasing ATPγS, suggesting that ATPγS competes with ATP for binding to Dicer-2 and that once bound, ATPγS is not efficiently hydrolyzed, preventing the production of siRNAs from long dsRNA.
Figure 2.3. Dicer-2 Requires ATP Hydrolysis to Process Long dsRNA. (A) Dicer-2 (10.8 nM) was incubated with 2.5 μM $^{32}$P ATP and 150 nM 515 bp dsRNA, and ATP hydrolysis monitored by thin-layer chromatography. (B) siRNA production by Dicer-2 (5.4 nM) from a 515 bp dsRNA (25 nM) was monitored with or without ATP or ATPgS (1 mM). (C) ATP hydrolysis by Dicer-2 (5.4 nM) was monitored for 120 nt long nucleic acid substrates (20 nM): dsRNA, single-stranded RNA, single-stranded DNA, RNA/DNA heteroduplex or double-stranded DNA in the presence of ATP (1 mM). (D) ATP hydrolysis by Dicer-2 (5.4 nM) in the presence of ATP (1 mM) was measured for 20 nM dsRNA bearing a 5 monophosphate and a 2 nt 3 overhang or blunt ends; the blunt ended dsRNA bearing either 5 monophosphate or 5 hydroxy termini. (E) ATP hydrolysis by mutant Dicer-2$^{D1217,1614N}$ (3.3 nM), Dicer-2$^{G31R}$ (2 nM) and wild-type Dicer-2 (2 nM) was measured in the absence or presence of 20 nM dsRNA bearing 5 monophosphate, blunt ends. (F) Left panel, initial rates for the conversion of substrate into siRNA by Dicer-2 (2.7 nM) for an internally $^{32}$P-radiolabeled 515 bp dsRNA (150 nM) were measured at increasing concentrations of ATP. Right panel, initial rates for the hydrolysis of ATP to ADP by Dicer-2 in the presence of 150 nM, 515 bp dsRNA were measured for increasing ATP concentrations. The data were fit to the Michaelis-Menten equation. Table 2 reports the Michaelis-Menten parameters. (G) ATP consumption by Dicer-2 was measured in the presence of ATP (350 μM) and dsRNA substrates with blunt, 5 triphosphorylated termini for six different lengths: 40 bp (420 nM), 60 bp (280 nM), 106 bp (158
nM), 208 bp (80.5 nM), 345 bp (49 nM), 558 bp (30 nM). Substrate concentrations were selected to ensure an equal number of base pairs in each reaction. Values are mean ± standard deviation for three independent experiments.
Table 2.2. Michaelis-Menten Analysis of siRNA Production and ATP Consumption by Dicer-2. Purified recombinant Dicer-2 was incubated with a 515 bp dsRNA and ATP. The initial rates of converting dsRNA into siRNA for increasing amounts of substrate were measured at saturating ATP (1 mM), and the initial rates of hydrolysis of ATP to ADP were measured at saturating dsRNA (150 nM) for increasing amounts of ATP. Different preparations of Dicer-2 were used here and in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$K_M$ (nM)</th>
<th>$V_{max}$ (nM min$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$[E_T]$ (nM)</th>
<th>$k_{cat}$ (min$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$k_{cat} / K_M$ (nM$^{-1}$ min$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substrate consumed</td>
<td>6 ± 2</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siRNA produced</td>
<td>6 ± 2</td>
<td>5 ± 2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4 ± 1</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP hydrolyzed</td>
<td>14,000 ± 4,000</td>
<td>460 ± 70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93 ± 14</td>
<td>0.007 ± 0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dicer-2 is a dsRNA-Stimulated ATPase

ATP hydrolysis by Dicer-2 increased when dsRNA was added (Figure 2.3C, p-value= 0.024, Wilcoxon rank sum test). The inclusion of 120 nt single-stranded RNA or DNA or 120 bp DNA/RNA heteroduplex or double-stranded DNA stimulated ATP hydrolysis less than the 120 bp dsRNA (all 20 nM; Figure 3C). A 25 nt single-stranded RNA or DNA, a 21 bp dsRNA or a 21 bp DNA/RNA heteroduplex, all failed to stimulate the Dicer-2 ATPase activity above the rate observed when no substrate was present (Figure 2.S3B). Neither the end structure of the dsRNA—blunt versus 3’ overhang—or the presence of a 5’ monophosphate ($v_0^{5’ PO_4} = 0.4 \pm 0.1 \, \mu M \, min^{-1}$ versus $v_0^{5’ OH} = 0.3 \pm 0.1 \, \mu M \, min^{-1}$) significantly changed the ATP hydrolysis rate (Figure 2.3D).

ATP hydrolysis by Dicer-2 does not require dsRNA cleavage. A Dicer-2 mutant, D1217,1615N, in which a key aspartate in each of the two RNase III domain active sites was changed to asparagine, retained significant dsRNA-stimulated ATPase activity (p-value = 0.02; Figure 2.3E). Under multiple-turnover conditions, Dicer-2$^{D1217,1615N}$ was essentially inactive for dicing, and siRNA production was detected only when $[\text{Dicer-2}^{D1217,1615N}] >> [\text{substrate}]$ (data not shown). In contrast, Dicer-2$^{G31R}$, which also does not support multiple-turnover dicing of long dsRNA, did not hydrolyze ATP in the presence of dsRNA (Figure 2.3E). We conclude that the Dicer-2 helicase domain is responsible for the enzyme’s dsRNA-stimulated ATPase activity.
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Figure 2.S3. ATP Hydrolysis is Required for Efficient Long dsRNA Processing by Dicer-2. (A) siRNA formation from 5 monophosphorylated, internally $^{32}\text{P}$-radiolabeled, blunt ended, 106 bp dsRNA was monitored in the presence of 1 mM ATP in the presence of increasing concentrations of ATP$\gamma$S. Initial rates of conversion of dsRNA to siRNA were plotted as a function of ATP$\gamma$S concentration. (B) ATP consumption was measured over time for a 40 bp (420 nM), 60 bp (280 nM), 106 bp (158 nM), 208 bp (81 nM), 345 bp (49 nM), and a 558 bp (30 nM) dsRNA substrate. Initial rates ($v_0$) were calculated from the fitted exponential curves and used in Figure 3F. (C) The hydrolysis of ATP to ADP was measured for Dicer-2 alone (5.4 nM) or with 25 nt single-stranded (ss) synthetic RNA, 25 nt synthetic ssDNA, 25 bp synthetic RNA or RNA-DNA duplex. ATP hydrolysis by Dicer-2 (5.4 nM) in the presence of a 515 bp dsRNA is shown in gray for reference. Substrate concentrations were chosen to achieve equivalent nt.mole.l$^{-1}$: ssRNA and ssDNA, 4.4 µM; RNA and DNA-RNA duplex, 2.2 µM; and 515 bp dsRNA, 100 nM. (D) The hydrolysis of ATP to ADP was measured for Dicer-2 (5 nM) with pre-let-7 (5 µM) or with 558 bp dsRNA (100 nM) in the presence of 1 mM ATP.
**ATP Consumption and Dicing are Coupled**

We measured the initial rates of siRNA production and ATP hydrolysis using a 515 bp dsRNA in the presence of increasing concentrations of ATP. The dependence on ATP concentration of both siRNA production and ATP hydrolysis fit well to the Michaelis-Menten kinetic scheme (Figure 2.3F). When both substrate and ATP were saturating (i.e., ≥ 10 × K_M), the k_cat for ATP hydrolysis was 93 ± 14 min⁻¹, whereas the k_cat for siRNA production was 4 ± 1 min⁻¹, as inferred from the k_cat for the complete conversion of a molecule of substrate into siRNA. These values predict that 23 ± 8 molecules of ATP are hydrolyzed for each 21 nt siRNA formed (Figure 2.3F, Table 2.2). Such a high rate of ATP hydrolysis for each siRNA produced might suggest that ATP energy and siRNA production are poorly coupled. Alternatively, ATP might be hydrolyzed to power translocation of Dicer-2 along the dsRNA, with approximately one ATP molecule consumed for each base pair traversed, a rate similar to DNA and RNA translocases containing ATPase/helicase domains (Bianco and Kowalczykowski, 2000; Patel and Donmez, 2006; Seidel et al., 2008). Consistent with this idea, the rate of ATP consumption was essentially unchanged for different substrate lengths when the molar concentration of base pairs was kept constant (Pearson correlation, r = 0.98; Figure 2.3G, 2.33B).
Evidence that Dicer-2 is Processive

If ATP fuels the translocation of Dicer-2 along dsRNA, dicing should produce successive siRNAs along the substrate. In the presence of ATP, Dicer-2 would be predicted to produce the first siRNA—i.e., the terminal siRNA—at roughly the same rate as subsequent, internal siRNAs. In contrast, in the absence of ATP, the rate of production of siRNA should decline as its distance from 5’ end increases. To test these predictions, we synthesized three, identical 120 nt dsRNA substrates, each bearing a single $^{32}$P radiolabel at position 16, 35, or 104 from the 5’ end of one strand (Figure 2.4A). All substrates contained two deoxynucleotides at one end, forcing Dicer-2 to initiate processing from the opposite end (Figure 2.S4A) (Rose et al., 2005). We used this “one-ended” substrate to examine the production of the first, second, or fourth siRNA (see Experimental Procedures) in the presence or absence of ATP (Figure 2.4A). With 1 mM ATP, the initial rates for the production of the first, second, and fourth siRNAs were essentially indistinguishable (~28 nM min$^{-1}$); with no ATP, the rate for the first siRNA (1.4 ± 0.3 nM min$^{-1}$) was greater than that of the second (0.9 ± 0.1 nM min$^{-1}$), which was greater than the rate for the fourth siRNA (0.2 ± 0.1 nM min$^{-1}$; Figure 2.4A).

We can envision two explanations consistent with these results and previous studies on Dicer enzymes: either ATP fuels processive dicing of long dsRNA or dicing of long dsRNA in the presence of ATP comprises a slow initial binding step to the end of the substrate, followed by rapid but ATP-dependent
production of subsequent siRNAs. Such a two-step process might occur if the rate of production of the first siRNA was slowed by the blunt structure of the substrate; the first dicing event would convert the substrate end to a 2 nt, 3’ overhang bearing a 5’ monophosphate, with all subsequent siRNAs produced rapidly. To test this idea, we prepared a substrate bearing one blocked end and a 2 nt, 3’ overhang bearing a 5’ monophosphate at the other end (Figure 2.S4B). The rates of first siRNA production from both blunt and 3’ overhanging end substrates were indistinguishable when the reactions contained ATP—conditions where dicing was efficient. They were also similar when ATP was omitted—when dicing was slow (Figure 2.4B). The subsequent siRNAs were also produced at similar rates from the two different substrates (Figure 2.S4B). Thus, we favor the hypothesis that ATP converts Dicer-2 from an inefficient, distributive enzyme into a processive enzyme.

Surprisingly, ATP also enhanced the production of the terminal siRNA from long dsRNA under single-turnover conditions ([Dicer-2] >> [dsRNA]); the enhancement by ATPγS was considerably weaker (Figure 2.4C). This suggests that ATP hydrolysis is required for the production of even the first siRNA. ATP was required irrespective of the terminal structure of the dsRNA (blunt versus 3’ overhang), excluding a role for ATP in the binding of Dicer-2 to a particular type of dsRNA end.

Moreover, when the [enzyme] > [dsRNA], helicase mutant Dicer-2^{G31R} produced the first siRNA at similar rates in the presence or absence of either
ATP or ATPγS (Figure 2.4D and 2.S4C). For Dicer-2^{G31R}, the rate of production of the terminal siRNA was faster than that of the fourth siRNA, consistent with the idea that ATP hydrolysis converts Dicer-2 from a distributive to a processive enzyme (Figure 2.4E).
Figure 2.4. Evidence that Dicer-2 is Processive.

(A) Site-specifically $^{32}$P-radiolabeled 120 bp dsRNAs were used to measure the rate of production of the first, second and fourth siRNAs from the all-RNA end of the substrate; the 3’ end of the sense strand contained two deoxynucleotides (red) to block entry of Dicer-2 from the other end (Figure 2.S4A). Production of siRNA was monitored in the presence or absence of ATP using 100 nM dsRNA and 5.4 nM Dicer-2. Values correspond to the mean ± standard deviation from three independent experiments. The data were fit to a single exponential function. In (A) and (B), pink denotes the position of the $^{32}$P-radiolabel. (B) The rate of production of the initial siRNA was measured as in (A), but using a site-specifically $^{32}$P-radiolabeled dsRNA with either a blunt (black) or a 2 nt 3 overhanging (red) end in the presence or absence of ATP. (C) The rate of production of the initial siRNA was monitored using 100 nM Dicer-2 and 10 nM dsRNA bearing either a blunt (left) or a 2 nt 3 overhanging (right) end in the presence or absence of ATP or ATPS. (D) The rate of production of the initial siRNA from a 120 bp blunt ended dsRNA (10 nM) was measured using 100 nM mutant Dicer-2$^{G31R}$. (E) The rate of production of the first and fourth siRNAs from a 120 bp blunt ended dsRNA (100 nM) was measured using 100 nM Dicer-2$^{G31R}$. Values are mean ± standard deviation for three independent experiments.
Figure 2.S4. The Rate of siRNA Production for Different dsRNA Termini:

Two 5 Deoxynucleotides Block Entry of Dicer-2, but Blunt and 3´ Overhanging Ends are Processed Similarly. (A) Twenty-five and 29 bp dsRNA substrates (73 nM) containing two 2’ deoxycytidine nucleotides at the 3´ end were incubated with 5.4 nM Dicer-2, and total siRNA production measured at 45 min. For each substrate, the 5´ ribonucleotide of the 5´ end or the end that contained 3 deoxynucleotides on the complementary strand was $^{32}$P-radiolabeled to allow measurement of siRNA production from that end alone. (B) Site-specifically $^{32}$P-radiolabeled 120 bp dsRNAs (100 nM) were incubated with Dicer-2 (5.4 nM) in the presence of 1 mM ATP to detect production of the first, second and fourth siRNAs as diagrammed here and in Figure 4A. Right, the substrate end where Dicer-2 enters was either blunt (top) or had a 2 nt 3´ overhang (bottom). (C) Production of the initial siRNA (i.e., the first siRNA) by Dicer-2$^{G31R}$ (100 nM) from a 118 bp dsRNA (10 nM) bearing a 2 nt 3´ overhanging end was measured in the presence or absence of ATP or in the presence of ATPγS (see also Figures 4A and S4A).
Dicer-2 produces siRNAs without dissociating from the dsRNA

A processive enzyme can act multiple times on its substrate before dissociating. Thus, catalysis by processive enzymes resists dilution (Rivera and Blackburn, 2004). To test whether Dicer-2 remains physically associated with the long dsRNA after three subsequent dicing events, we used the 120 nt, site-specifically $^{32}$P-radiolabeled dsRNA to monitor the rate of production of the fourth siRNA following dilution (Figure 2.4A). The dsRNA substrate (200 fmol) was first pre-incubated with Dicer-2 (54 fmol) for 2 min at 4°C to allow the enzyme to bind substrate. During this pre-incubation step, no siRNA was detected (data not shown). Next, the reaction was diluted 1,000-fold into buffer pre-warmed to 25°C. The diluted reaction was incubated at 25°C, and production of the fourth siRNA measured over time (Figure 2.5A). During the pre-incubation, the substrate concentration (20 nM) was > 3-fold greater than the $K_M$ of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA; after dilution, the substrate concentration was ~300 times less than the $K_M$. For both the pre-incubation and the dilution steps, the dsRNA substrate was present at ~4-fold higher concentration than Dicer-2. When the pre-incubation was omitted, little fourth siRNA was produced (Figure 2.5B), demonstrating that the conditions largely prevented reassociation of Dicer-2 with dsRNA once it dissociated from the substrate.

When ATP was included in both the pre-incubation and the dilution buffer, 54 fmol of Dicer-2 produced 10 fmol of fourth siRNA in 1 h. About half as much fourth siRNA was produced when ATP was present in the dilution buffer but
omitted from the pre-incubation. When ATP was omitted from the dilution buffer, essentially no fourth siRNA was produced, regardless of whether ATP was present during the pre-incubation, suggesting that ATP dissociates rapidly from Dicer-2. More fourth siRNA was made when ATP was present in both the pre-incubation and dilution buffers than when pre-incubation was carried out in the absence of ATP (p-value = 0.015). We conclude that the initial binding of Dicer-2 to the end of long dsRNA is enhanced by ATP and that in the presence of ATP Dicer-2 remains associated with the dsRNA. We propose that the stably bound Dicer-2 then cleaves successive siRNAs along the dsRNA.
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Figure 2.5. Dicer-2 Remains Associated with its Substrate in the Presence of ATP. (A) Design of the experiment. The reaction contained 54 fmol Dicer-2 and 200 fmol dsRNA, corresponding to 5.4 nM enzyme and 20 nM dsRNA before dilution. (B) The rate of production of the fourth siRNA was measured for six different combinations of pre-incubation (no pre-incubation, without ATP, and with ATP) and dilution (without and with ATP). Values are mean ± standard deviation for three independent experiments.
Figure 2.6. A Model for *Drosophila* Dicer-2.
Table 2.S1. List of Synthetic DNA Oligonucleotides. m, 2’-O-methyl ribose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primers</th>
<th>Sequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 515 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-GCG TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GAC TCA GAT CTC GAG CTC AAG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 515 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-GCT GTT GTA GTT GTA CTC CAG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 515 bp product for antisense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-GCG TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GCT GTT GTA GTT GTA CTC CAG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 515 bp product for antisense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-GAC TCA GAT CTC GAG CTC AAG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 316 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-GCGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGCCACAAGTTCAGCGTGTCC-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 316 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-TCGATGCCCCTCAGCTCG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 316 bp product for antisense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-GCGTAATACGACTCACTATAGTCGATGCCCTTCAGCTCG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 316 bp product for antisense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-GCCACAAGTTCCAGCGTGTC-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let-7 probe for Northern hybridization</td>
<td>5’-CTA TAC AAC CTA CTA CCT CAA-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>let-7</strong> probe for Northern hybridization</td>
<td>5’-AAA GCT AGC ACA TTG TAT AGT-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 558, 345, 208, 106 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 3G)</td>
<td>5’-TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GCA AGC TGA CCC TGA AGT TC-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 558 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-mGmGT CAC GAA CTC CAG CAG GAC-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 558 bp product for anti-sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GTC ACA GAC TCC AGC AGG AC-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 558, 345, 208, 106 bp product for anti-sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-mGmGC AAG CTG ACC CTG AAG TTC-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 345 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-mGmGC CAT GAT ATA GAC GT TGT-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 345 bp product for anti-sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GCC ATG ATA TAG ACG TTG TG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 208 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-mGmGG TCT TGT AGT TGC CGT CGT-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 208 bp product for anti-sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5’-TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GGT CTT GTA GTT GCC GTC GT-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 106 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-mGmGT AGC GGC TGA AGC ACT GCA-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 106 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5′-GCG TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GGC CAC AAG TTC AGC GTG TCC-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 106 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-mGmGG CCA GGG CAC GGG CAG CTT GCC G-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 106 bp product for anti-sense RNA (blunt end) from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5′-mGmGG CCA CAA GTT CAG CGT GTC C-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 106 bp product for anti-sense RNA (blunt end) from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5′-GTA CTT AAT ACG ACT CAC TAT AGG GCC AGG GCA CGG GCA GCT TGC CG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 104 bp product for anti-sense RNA (3′overhang) from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5′-GTA CTT AAT ACG ACT CAC TAT AGC CAG GGC ACG GGC AGC TTG CCG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 104 bp product for sense RNA (3′overhang) from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5′-mTmTG GGC CAC AAG TTC AGC GTG TCC-3′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.S2. List of Synthetic RNA Oligonucleotides. d, deoxy ribose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sequence Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 nt sense RNA</td>
<td>5’-ACC CUG AAG UUC AUC UGC ACC ACdC dG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 25 bp dsRNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 nt anti-sense RNA</td>
<td>5’-CGG UGG UGC AGA UGA ACU UCA GGG UCA -3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 25 bp dsRNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 nt sense RNA</td>
<td>5’-ACC CUG AAG UUC AUC UGC ACC GUC CAC dCdG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 29 bp dsRNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 nt anti-sense RNA</td>
<td>5’-CGG UGG ACG GUG CAG AUG AAC UUC AGG GUC A-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 29 bp dsRNA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-let 7</td>
<td>5’-UGA GGU AGU AGG UUG UAU AGU AGU AAU UAC ACA UCA UAC UAU ACA AUG UGC UAG CUU UCU-3’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.S3. DNA Templates for Transcription and DNA Splints for RNA Ligation, Used in Figures 2.3 and 2.4. m, 2’-O-methyl ribose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNA template to transcribe antisense RNA strand in Figure 4</td>
<td>5’-ACT CCT CAA CAA ATC ATA AAC TAC AAT ATA CAT CAA TAC GAC ATT ACC CTC ACA ATC AAT CAT ACA ACC ATC CCT AAA GAC CAA CAG CAC CCC ACG ATC AAG AAT AAG AAC TAT AAT CCC TAT AGT GAG TCG TAT TAC CCA 3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7 RNAP promoter sequence annealed to the DNA template for transcription</td>
<td>5’-GCG TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA splint for RNA ligation to generate sense strand in Figure 4</td>
<td>5’-GGG ATT ATA GTT CTT ATT GAT CGT GGG GTG CTG TTT AGG GAT GGT TGT AGT ATT GAT TGT GAG GGT AAT GTC GTA TTG ATG TAT ATT GTA GTT TAT GAT TTG TTG AGG AGT-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA template to transcribe 40 nt sense RNA in Figure 3G</td>
<td>5’-mGGC TTC ATG TGG TCG GGG TAG CGG CTG AAG CAC TGC ACG CCT ATA GTG AGT CGT ATT ACG C-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA template to transcribe 40 nt anti-sense RNA in Figure 3G</td>
<td>5’-mGGC GTG CAG TGC TTC AGC CGC TAC CCC GAC CAC ATG AAG CCT ATA GTG AGT CGT ATT ACG C-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA template to transcribe 60 nt sense RNA in Figure 3G</td>
<td>5’-mGGT GAA CTT CAG GGT CAG CTT GCT TCA TGT GGT CGG GGT AGC GGC TGA AGC ACT GCA CGC CTA TAG TGA GTC GTA TTA CGC-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA template to transcribe 60 nt anti-sense RNA in Figure 3G</td>
<td>5’-mGGC GTG CAG TGC TTC AGC CGC TAC CCC GAC CAC ATG AAG CAA GCT GAC CCT GAA GTT CAC CTA TAG TGA GTC GTA TTA CGC-3’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.S4. List of Synthetic RNA Oligonucleotides Assembled by Splinted Ligation into Site-Specifically Labeled Sense-Strand RNA and Used in Figure 2.4, 2.5 and S4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RNA #</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RNA #1</td>
<td>5’-ACU CCU CAA CAA AUC A-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #2</td>
<td>5’-UAA ACU ACA AUA UAC AUC AAU ACG ACA UUA CCC UCA CAA UCA AUC AUA CAA CCA UCC CUA AAG ACC AAC AG CAC CCC A-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #3</td>
<td>5’-CGA UCA AGA AUA AGA ACU AUA AUC dCdC-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #4</td>
<td>5’-ACU CCU CAA CAA AUC AUA AAC UAC AAU AUA CAU CA-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #5</td>
<td>5’-AUA CGA CAU UAC CCU CAC AAU CAA UCA UAC AAC CAU CCC UAA AGA CCA ACA GCA CCC CA-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #6</td>
<td>5’-UCC UCA ACA AAU CA-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #7</td>
<td>5’-UCC UCA ACA AAU CAU AAA CUU CAA UAU ACA UCA UCA-3’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Purified Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 both process pre-miRNAs, but generate different length products (22 versus 21 nt). Genetic analyses suggest that Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 are restricted to specific substrate classes in vivo (Lee et al. 2004). For example, Dicer-2 cannot replace Dicer-1 in the miRNA pathway. Similarly, dicer-2 mutants are defective for RNAi, even though they express normal levels of Dicer-1 (Lee et al., 2004). Despite structural similarities, Dicer-2 specifically processes esiRNA hairpins, while Dicer-1 cleaves pre-miRNAs (Lee et al., 2004; Förstemann et al., 2005; Jiang et al., 2005; Saito et al., 2005; Miyoshi et al., 2010). This observation suggests that the length of a dsRNA is the primary determinant of substrate choice.

Our data argue that the combination of R2D2 and cellular phosphate restricts Dicer-2 to its biologically relevant substrates by inhibiting the processing of short substrates such as pre-miRNA. Thus, a protein, R2D2, and a small molecule, phosphate, convert a promiscuous dsRNA endonuclease into one specific for the long dsRNA substrates that trigger RNAi. It is tempting to speculate that inorganic phosphate interferes with recognition of the 5’ monophosphate present on all pre-miRNAs, and that 5’ phosphate recognition is unnecessary for longer substrates, because their greater length allows additional protein-RNA contacts—perhaps by the dsRNA-binding and the helicase domains—between Dicer-2 and long dsRNA. We note that human Dicer has
been reported to recognize a 5’ monophosphate on single-stranded RNA (Kini and Walton, 2007).

In flies, the Dicer-2 partner proteins Loqs-PD and R2D2 likely enhance substrate specificity by increasing the affinity of the enzyme for long dsRNA. The $k_{\text{cat}}$ for and Dicer-2 and Dicer-2/R2D2 were similar, but R2D2 decreased the $K_M$ of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA (Table 2.1 and Figure 2.S2). We note that the specificity constant, $k_{\text{cat}}/K_M$, was ~4 fold higher for the Dicer-2/R2D2 heterodimer than for Dicer-2 alone. Similarly, Loqs-PD lowered the $K_M$ of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA without reducing the catalytic rate, resulting in a ~10-fold higher $k_{\text{cat}}/K_M$.

Processing of pre-miRNA by Dicer-1 was unaffected by phosphate. We find that the intrinsic properties of Dicer-1, which cannot efficiently catalyze multiple-turnover processing of long dsRNA, restrict that enzyme to process pre-miRNA. We do not yet know whether the transition of substrates from Dicer-1 to Dicer-2 is gradual, such that some substrates are processed equally well by both enzymes. In theory, such intermediate substrates might be selected against in evolution, enforcing the distinction between Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 substrates.

The Dicer-2 helicase domain is similar to that of RIG-I, a sensor in the mammalian innate immune system. The RIG-like ATPase/helicase domain is conserved among plant and animal Dicers. Yet, its function has remained unknown. Our data suggest that this domain of Dicer-2 is involved in ATP-dependent production of successive siRNAs from long dsRNA. Notably, two other members of this helicase family, DRH-3 and RIG-I are also bona fide
ATPases: DRH-3, a C. elegans protein required for RNA silencing and germ-line development (Nakamura et al., 2007), is a dsRNA-stimulated ATPase (Matranga and Pyle, 2010); and the mammalian protein RIG-I, which recognizes viral 5′ triphosphorylated dsRNA and initiates an innate immune response, uses ATP to translocate along dsRNA (Myong et al., 2009). Our data are consistent with the idea that ATP hydrolysis fuels translocation of Dicer-2 along long dsRNA substrates. An alternative view—that the ATP-dependent binding of a molecule of Dicer at the end of the substrate promotes the complete and rapid oligomerization of Dicer-2 along the entire extent of the dsRNA—would require that the Dicer and RIG-I helicase domains share a conserved sequence but have highly divergent functions.

ATP was not required for Dicer-2 to process pre-miRNA, and a mutant Dicer-2 unable to hydrolyze ATP remained able to process pre-miRNA but not long dsRNA. These results help explain why in C. elegans, in which a single Dicer processes both long dsRNA and pre-miRNA, a mutation in the DCR-1 helicase domain disrupted endo-siRNA, but not miRNA, accumulation (Welker et al., 2010).

Four lines of evidence support a role for ATP hydrolysis in the production of successive siRNAs along the dsRNA by Dicer-2. First, Dicer-2 consumes a constant amount of ATP per base-pair. Second, ~23 molecules of ATP were consumed for each 21 nt siRNA produced. Third, the rate of production of the first, second, and fourth siRNAs from a long dsRNA substrate were
indistinguishable in the presence of ATP, but in the absence of ATP, the rate of siRNA production declined with increasing distance from the end of the dsRNA. Finally, the association of Dicer-2 with a long dsRNA was resistant to dilution provided ATP was present, suggesting that after binding the end of its substrate, Dicer-2 remains bound to the dsRNA and uses ATP energy to reposition itself to produce the next 21 bp siRNA. Translocation along the dsRNA seems a likely mechanism.

Although helicase mutant Dicer-2$^{G31R}$ processed pre-miRNAs as efficiently as wild-type Dicer-2, the mutant was unable to produce even the terminal siRNA from a long RNA duplex under multiple turnover conditions. This suggests an inherent ability of the helicase domain of Dicer-2 to distinguish between long and short substrates. We note that the helicase domain of human Dicer auto-inhibits processing of an RNA duplex, and its dsRNA-binding protein partner TRBP, a homolog of R2D2 and Loqs, relieves this inhibition (Ma et al., 2008; Chakravarthy et al., 2010). We hypothesize that Drosophila Dicer-2 can occupy two distinct conformations. When inorganic phosphate is low, Dicer-2 assumes a conformation—perhaps similar to the auto-inhibited conformation of human Dicer—that can bind and load siRNA. This conformation is unaffected by ATP and, we presume, is involved in promiscuously processing pre-miRNA in vitro. When inorganic phosphate is higher and the enzyme’s helicase and dsRNA-binding domains engage its substrate, Dicer-2 assumes a conformation that requires ATP for binding and hydrolysis to process dsRNA.
Materials and Methods

Protein Expression and Purification

Expression and purification of His$_6$-Dicer-2 or His$_6$-Dicer-2 and His$_6$-R2D2 in Sf21 cells was as described (Liu et al., 2003; Tomari et al., 2004). His$_6$-Dicer-$2^{G31R}$, His$_6$-Dicer-$2^{D1217,1614N}$ and His$_6$-Dicer-1 were expressed in Sf9 insect cells using the BAC-to-BAC Baculovirus Expression System (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) and purified from cell lysates by using Ni-NTA agarose (QIAGEN, Valencia, CA), HiTrap Q, HiTrap Heparin (GE Healthcare, Pittsburgh, PA), and Superdex 200 gel filtration. Loqs-PD was expressed in Escherichia coli Rosetta2(DE3), isolated using Ni-Sepharose (GE Healthcare), treated with HRV3C protease cleavage to remove the His-tag, and purified using HiTrap SP and HiTrap Heparin. Proteins were exchanged into 20 mM HEPES-KOH (pH 8.0), 100 mM NaCl, 1 mM Tris(2-carboxyethyl)phosphine hydrochloride. Protein concentrations were determined by quantitative amino acid analysis (Keck Biotechnology Resource Laboratory, New Haven, CT). Two different preparations of recombinant Dicer-2 were used in this study. Preparation 1 was used for Table 2.1 and Figures 2.2, 2.3E, 2.4C, 2.S2B, 2.S3A, 2.S3D, and 2.S2. Preparation 2 was used for Table 2.2 and Figures 2.1, 2.3A–D, 2.3F, 2.3G, 2.4A, 2.4B, 2.5, 2.S1, 2.S2A, 2.S3B, 2.S3C, and 2.S4.
RNA Substrates

dsRNAs were prepared as described (Haley et al., 2003). PCR templates for transcription of sense and antisense RNAs were generated from the EGFP sequence of pN3-eGFP using primers listed in Table 2.S1. Twenty-five and 29 bp dsRNAs (Figure 2.S2A, 2.S3B, 2.S4A, Table 2.S2) were as previously described (Rose et al., 2005). Synthetic RNAs and synthetic Drosophila pre-let-7 (Dharmacon, Lafayette, CO) were 5’ 32P-radiolabeled using γ-32P ATP (6000 Ci/mmol; PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA) and T4 polynucleotide kinase (NEB, Ipswich, MA). After gel purification, RNA strands or pre-let-7 were incubated at 65°C for 5 min and then at 25°C for 30 min. Site-specifically radiolabeled 120 nt dsRNAs were prepared by DNA-splinted ligation (Table 2.S3 and 2.S4) (Moore and Sharp, 1993; Moore and Query, 2000). To monitor formation of the fourth siRNA in Figure 2.4B, we used a 120 nt substrate in which the 5th siRNA (the last siRNA generated by Dicer-2 from this substrate) was site-specifically 32P-radiolabeled. The fourth siRNA produced corresponds to the sum of the two 32P-radiolabeled cleavage products produced when the dsRNA was cleaved to generate the fourth and fifth siRNAs.

In Vitro RNA Processing

For Dcr-2 +Loqs-PD, Loqs-PD was first mixed with Dicer-2 or Dicer-2/R2D2 and incubated 10 min on ice followed by 5 min at room temperature. Dicing reactions contained 7.5 mM DTT, 3.3 mM magnesium acetate, 0.25% v/v glycerol, 100 mM potassium acetate, 18 mM HEPES-KOH (pH 7.4), 15 mM CP,
2.25 µg CK, and 1 mM ATP; –ATP reactions contained 1 mM EDTA but no CK or CP; ATPγS reactions contained 1 mM ATPγS only. In Figure 2.2A-D, 2.3, 2.4B-E, 2.5, 2.3, and 2.4, +ATP reactions contained no CP or CK; +CP and +CK reactions in Figure 2B and S2B contained 20 mM CP or 2.25 µg CK. Reactions were assembled on ice and pre-incubated at 25°C for 5 min before adding RNA. In Figure S4, dilution buffer contained 0.1% NP-40.

Aliquots (1 µl) of reactions with radiolabeled RNA substrate were quenched by the addition of 25 volumes of formamide loading buffer (98% v/v formamide, 0.1% w/v bromophenol blue and xylene cyanol, 10 mM EDTA), incubated 5 min at 95°C, and analyzed by electrophoresis through a denaturing polyacrylamide 7 M urea gel using 0.5× Tris-borate-EDTA buffer (National Diagnostics, Atlanta, GA). In Figure 5, 200 µL aliquots from dilution reactions were stopped with 300 mM sodium acetate and 25 mM EDTA, isopropanol precipitated, and dissolved in formamide loading buffer before gel analysis. Gels were exposed to image plates and analyzed with an FLA-5000 and ImageGauge 3.0 software (Fujifilm, Tokyo, Japan). In Figure 1, let-7 and let-7* strands were detected by Northern hybridization with 5’-32P-radiolabeled DNA probes (Table S1).

**ATP Hydrolysis**

α-32P-ATP (250 nM, 3000 mmol/Ci; PerkinElmer) was used to monitor hydrolysis. Reactions were stopped with a 25 vol formamide loading dye and spotted onto 20 cm × 20 cm cellulose plates (EMD, Darmstadt, Germany) and
chromatographed in 0.75 M KH$_2$PO$_4$ (adjusted to pH 3.3 with H$_3$PO$_4$) until the solvent reached the top of the plate. The plate was dried and analyzed by phosphorimagery. For Figure 2.S3B, ATP hydrolysis was monitored using the ATP Bioluminescent Assay Kit (Sigma, St. Louis, MO). The reaction was stopped by diluting the sample 10 times in H$_2$O and immediately flash-freezing in liquid nitrogen. Samples were stored at –80°C until they were measured. A standard curve spanning at least 100-fold less than and greater than the experimental values was used to determine ATP concentrations.

**Rate Analyses**

Substrate converted to siRNA versus time was fit to $y = y_0 + A(1 - e^{-kt})$, where $\frac{dy}{dt} = Ake^{-kt}$. When $t = 0$, $\frac{dy}{dt} = Ak$ (Lu and Fei, 2003). Data were fit to the Michaelis-Menten scheme using Visual Enzymics 2008 (Softzymics, Princeton, NJ) for Igor Pro 6.11 (WaveMetrics, Lake Oswego, OR). The rate of substrate consumption was fit for each replicate separately, and two-tailed, two sample equal variance t-test used to compare rates (Excel, Microsoft, Seattle, WA). R 2.6.0 software was used for other statistical analyses.
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CHAPTER III: PROCESSING OF PRE-MIRNAS BY DROSOPHILA

DICER-1
Preface
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Abstract

*Drosophila* Dicer-1 is responsible for generating miRNAs from pre-miRNAs. Despite structural similarities to endo-siRNAs and other double stranded RNA, pre-miRNAs are processed in a very specific manner by Dicer-1 and not Dicer-2. What confers this specificity is unknown. Here we report that a partner protein of Dicer-1, Loqs-PB, and ATP enhance substrate specificity of Dicer-1. More specifically, ATP and Loqs-B likely facilitate efficient processing of the miRNA/miRNA* duplex by Dicer-1 by lowering the $K_M$. Our data highlight the role of ATP and regulatory dsRNA-binding partner proteins to achieve substrate specificity in *Drosophila* RNA silencing.
Introduction

Both siRNAs and miRNAs rely on members of the Dicer family of double-stranded (ds) RNA-specific RNase III endonucleases for their processing from longer RNA precursors (Bernstein et al., 2001; Hutvágner et al., 2001; Ketting et al., 2001; Knight and Bass, 2001). In *Drosophila melanogaster*, two separate pathways produce siRNAs and miRNAs. Primary miRNA precursors are transcribed by Pol II and contain one or a few miRNA precursors (pre-miRNAs) (Lee et al., 2002; Cai et al., 2004; Lee et al., 2004a). The RNase III enzyme Drosha, in collaboration with its dsRNA-binding domain partner protein, Pasha, cleaves primary miRNAs to release pre-miRNAs, ~70 nt long stem-loop structures that contain the mature miRNA within this structure (Lee et al., 2003; Denli et al., 2004; Gregory et al., 2004; Han et al., 2004; Han et al., 2006). Subsequently, pre-miRNAs are exported from the nucleus to the cytoplasm by Exportin 5 (Yi et al., 2003; Bohnsack et al., 2004; Lund et al., 2004). In the cytoplasm, the pre-miRNAs are cleaved by Dicer-1, which acts in concert with its dsRNA-binding protein partner, Loquacious-PB (Loqs-PB). This processing step liberates a duplex comprising the mature miRNA bound to its miRNA*, a partially complementary small RNA derived from the opposite arm of the pre-miRNA stem ( Förstemann et al., 2005; Jiang et al., 2005; Saito et al., 2005; Ye et al., 2007). Different mature miRNAs derive from either the 5’ or 3’ arm of the pre-miRNA stem.

* Drosophila* Dicer-1 contains two RNase III domains that form an
intramolecular heterodimer whose dimer interface creates two active sites (Zhang et al., 2004; Macrae et al., 2006; Ye et al., 2007). Each active site positions two Mg$^{2+}$ ions that catalyze phosphodiester bond hydrolysis on one or the other strand of the dsRNA. Dicer-1 generates a dsRNA terminus bearing a two-nucleotide 3′ overhang characteristic of all RNase III enzymes (Bass, 2000; Zhang et al., 2004; Gan et al., 2006; Macrae et al., 2006). Like other members of the Dicer family, Dicer-1 contains a C-terminal dsRBD and a central PAZ domain, which has an RNA-binding motif that can recognize the two-nucleotide,3′ single-stranded ends of Drosha and Dicer products (Cerutti et al., 2000; Lingel et al., 2003; Song et al., 2003; Yan et al., 2003; Lingel et al., 2004; Ma et al., 2004; Macrae et al., 2006; MacRae et al., 2007). The crystal structure of a simple Dicer protein from Giardia intestinalis, together with functional studies using human Dicer, suggest that the distance between the PAZ domain and the active sites of the RNase III domains establishes the length of the small RNA product (Zamore, 2001; Zhang et al., 2004; Gan et al., 2006; Macrae et al., 2006; MacRae et al., 2007; Takeshita et al., 2007).

Here, we present evidence that Dicer-1 requires ATP to efficiently process its substrates. ATP facilitates efficient processing of pre-miRNAs when in excess compared to Dicer-1, as would be expected in vivo. ATP modifies the properties of Dicer-1 by decreasing its $K_M$ for pre-miRNA. Its partner protein Loqs-PB, like ATP, decreases the $K_M$ of Dicer-1 for pre-miRNA. Thus, the characteristic substrate specificity of Dicer-1 arise both from its intrinsic properties, and its
interactions with a small molecule—ATP—and its cognate dsRNA-binding partner protein.
Results

ATP enhances processing of pre-let-7 by Dicer-1

Previous studies concluded that Dicer-1 requires no ATP for pre-miRNA processing (Jiang et al., 2005), yet it wasn’t clear whether the substrate and enzyme concentrations were close to intracellular levels (pre-miRNA = $4 \times 10^4$ cpm, enzyme = not specified). Since the Helicase C domain of Dicer-1 contains an ATP-binding domain, we asked whether ATP binding or hydrolysis had any effect in pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-1 (Figure 3.S1B).

We analyzed pre-let-7 processing using purified recombinant Dicer-1 and Dicer-1/Loqs-PB in ATP presence or absence. Consistent with previous single-turnover analyses, ATP was dispensable for processing of pre-let-7 when the concentration of Dicer-1 or Dicer-1/Loqs-PB was greater than pre-let-7. However, when pre-let-7 substrate concentration was much greater than that of Dicer-1, ATP enhanced pre-let-7 processing for both Dicer-1 and Dicer-1/Loqs-PB (Figure 3.1A, right). This multiple-turnover reaction condition likely reflects the intracellular environment in which Dicer-1 functions. Surprisingly, ATP had no statistically significant effect on the rate of pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-1 at saturating substrate concentrations (Table 3.1), rather, it decreased the $K_M$ (p-value = 0.02).
T. thermophilus Hb8 UvrB Chain A
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Figure 3.1. Alignment of the Predicted ATP-Binding Site of Dicer-1 with Known or Putative ATPase Proteins. The alignment is from the NCBI conserved domain database. An asterisk denotes residues predicted to be at the ATP-binding site of Dicer-1, based on the crystal structure of the UvrB protein bound to ATP (Theis et al., 1999; Marchler-Bauer et al., 2009)
Figure 3.1. ATP and Loqs-PB Increase Multiple-Turnover Pre-miRNA Processing by Dicer-1. (A) Production of let-7 from a 5′32P-radiolabeled pre-let-7 substrate by Dicer-1 (black) or Dicer-1/Loqs (green) was measured with or without 1 mM ATP under single- (left; 8 nM enzyme, 1 nM substrate) or multiple-turnover conditions (right; 2 nM enzyme, 150 nM substrate). (B) Pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-1/Loqs-PB was monitored under single- (left) or multiple-turnover (right) conditions in the presence (black) or absence (gray) of ATP or in the presence of the ATP analogs (blue) ATP αS or ATP γS. Values correspond to the mean ± standard deviation from three independent experiments. The data were fit to a single exponential function. (C) siRNA production from a 517 bp dsRNA (25 nM) by Dicer-1 or Dicer-1/Loqs-PB (235 nM) was monitored in the presence or absence of ATP. Left, the amount of siRNA generated by Dicer-1 alone was measured in the presence (black) or absence (gray) of ATP. Right, the amount of siRNA generated by Dicer-1/Loqs-PB was measured in the presence (solid line) or absence (dashed line) of ATP.
Although ATP is required for efficient pre-miRNA processing in multi-turnover conditions, using the same thin-layer chromatography assay we were unable to detect ATP hydrolysis above background by Dicer-1 or Dicer-1/Loqs PB in pre-let-7 substrate presence or absence (Figure 3.S2A). ATP analogs modified at the β–γ bond did not affect multiple rounds of pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-1/Loqs PB (Figure 3.1B). Single-turnover cleavage of pre-let-7 by Dicer-1 required no ATP. Our results are suggestive of ATP promoting an alternative, higher affinity conformation for Dicer-1.

**Dicer-1 Does Not Process Long dsRNA Efficiently**

Loqs-PB has been proposed to prevent Dicer-1 from processing long dsRNA, thereby restricting siRNA production to Dicer-2 (Saito et al., 2005). However, we found that Dicer-1 alone did not efficiently process a 517 bp dsRNA, nor did Loqs-PB inhibit the low level of siRNA production by Dicer-1 (Figure 3.1C). In fact, we could only detect siRNA production from a 517 bp dsRNA when Dicer-1 was in ~10-fold excess compared to the dsRNA substrate (225 nM Dicer-1, 25 nM long dsRNA), (Figure 3.1C). Moreover, we were unable to detect siRNA production by Dicer-1 (data not shown) using the same multiple-turnover conditions (25 nM dsRNA and 2 nM Dicer) under which Dicer-2 efficiently generated siRNAs. Unlike Dicer-2, processing of long dsRNA by Dicer-1 or Dicer-1/ Loqs-PB was distributive, with intermediate products readily detected (Figure 3.2).
Figure 3.S2. Non-hydrolyzable β-γ ATP Analogs do not Replace ATP for Pre-miRNA Processing by Dicer-1. (A) ATP (1 mM) hydrolysis to ADP was measured for 450 nM Dicer-1 or Dicer-1/Loqs-PB in the presence and absence of 2 µM pre-let-7 substrate. (B) pre-let-7 (150 nM) processing by Dicer-1/Loqs-PB (2 nM) was measured in the presence of the non-hydrolyzable ATP analogs, AMPPcP or AMPcPP (1mM) under conditions of substrate excess. For comparison, pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-1/Loqs-PB in the absence (gray) or presence of ATP (black) is shown.
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Figure 3.2. Dicer-1, but not Dicer-2, Generates Intermediates when Processing Long dsRNA. 25 nM internally $^{32}$P-radiolabeled 515 bp dsRNA was incubated with either 225 nM Dicer-1 or 5.4 nM Dicer-2. The top gel was run to visualize both the uncleaved substrate and the 21–22 bp siRNA products; the lower gel was run to resolve the intermediates (arrowheads) generated by Dicer-1.
**Loqs-PB Decreases the $K_M$ of Dicer-1 for Pre-let-7**

Although Loqs-PB does not alter the affinity of Dicer-1 for long dsRNA, it might be expected to increase the affinity of Dicer-1 for its authentic substrate, pre-miRNA. Michaelis-Menten analyses of pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-1 and Dicer-1/Loqs-PB revealed a small increase in catalytic rate when Loqs-PB was present ($k_{cat} = 2.4 \pm 1.1 \text{ min}^{-1}$ for Dicer-1 versus $1.1 \pm 0.9 \text{ min}^{-1}$ for Dicer-1/Loqs-PB; p-value = 0.01) and a large decrease in $K_M$ ($44.3 \pm 32.3 \text{ nM}$ for Dicer-1 versus $4.4 \pm 3.5 \text{ nM}$ for Dicer/Loqs-PB) in the presence of ATP (Table 3.1). The effect of ATP on the kinetics of pre-miRNA processing was similar for Dicer-1/Loqs-PB and Dicer-1 alone. For Dicer-1/Loqs-PB, ATP had no statistically significant effect on $k_{cat}$, but significantly decreased the $K_M$ (Table 3.1, p-value = 0.008). Overall, the combination of ATP and Loqs-PB decreased the $K_M$ for Dicer-1 by 25-fold and increased its specificity constant, $k_{cat}/K_M$ by 75-fold.
Table 3.1. Michaelis-Menten Analysis of Dicer-1.
Purified recombinant Dicer-1 was incubated with pre-let-7 and the production of let-7 miRNA measured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dicer-1 plus:</th>
<th>ATP</th>
<th>$K_M$ (nM)</th>
<th>Change in $K_M$</th>
<th>$k_{cat}$ (min$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Change in $k_{cat}$</th>
<th>$k_{cat} / K_M$ (nM$^{-1}$ min$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Change in $k_{cat} / K_M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>116.5 ± 13.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.008 ± 0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>44.3 ± 32.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.03</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loqs-PB</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>73.3 ± 12.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.009</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.4 ± 3.5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.4 ± 1.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Our data suggest a model in which ATP and dsRNA binding partners channel Dicer-1 to its biologically appropriate substrate class. To the best of our knowledge, the use of a nucleotide cofactor to ensure biologically appropriate substrate specificity in an RNA silencing pathway is without precedent. Loqs-PB increases the efficiency of pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-1 most likely by increasing its affinity for pre-miRNA.

Genetic data suggested that Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 are restricted to specific substrate classes in vivo. Dicer-2 cannot replace Dicer-1 in the miRNA pathway, and dicer-2 mutants are defective for RNAi, even when Dicer-1 is expressed at normal levels. Despite structural similarity between endo siRNA hairpins, and pre-miRNAs, Drosophila Dicers can effectively discriminate these substrates suggesting that the length of a dsRNA is the primary determinant for substrate choice. In the presence of ATP and dsRNA-binding domain partner proteins, longer precursors are processed by Dicer-2, while shorter ones are processed more efficiently by Dicer-1. We do not yet know if the transition from Dicer-1 substrate to Dicer-2 substrate is gradual; with some substrates processed equally well by each enzyme. Nor do we know if biologically relevant precursor RNAs exist that are cleaved by both Dicer-1 and Dicer-2. Evolution might have selected against such dual substrates, ensuring the production of precise small RNA products.
While attractive, partner proteins specifying substrate choice for *Drosophila* Dicers is not entirely consistent with our data. Specifically, we did not observe a role for Loqs-PB in restricting Dicer-1 to the miRNA pathway. Instead, Loqs-PB appears to increase the affinity of Dicer-1 for pre-miRNA (i.e., it decreased the $K_M$).

The ATPase/helicase domain scaffold of Dicer is widely conserved among plants and animals, including in human Dicer. Yet, detailed functional analysis of the domain has yet be carried out. The helicase domains of Dicers might potentially provide an interface for protein-protein interactions. Supporting this possibility, Drosphila Dicer-2’ ATPase/helicase domain interacts with innate immunity pathway proteins, promoting an immune response upon entry of an RNA virus (Wang et al., 2006; Deddouche et al., 2008). Our data suggest that ATP binding or hydrolysis catalyzed by ATPase/helicase domains may also enhance the catalytic function of Dicers, by one or more of several possible mechanisms including improved substrate binding, enhanced catalytic efficiency, and promotion of processivity. In this regard, it is striking that the dsRNA-binding partner protein for human Dicer, TRBP, binds Dicer through its ATPase/helicase domain (Ma et al., 2008; Daniels et al., 2009).
Materials and Methods

Protein Expression and Purification

Dicer-1 protein was expressed from a recombinant baculovirus containing a Dicer-1 cDNA isolated from *Drosophila* S2 cells and inserted into the pFastBac1 vector (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, USA). The sequence of this cDNA corresponds to the genomic sequence of S2 cells and some Oregon R fly stocks, but bears 9 polymorphic differences from the FlyBase reference genome. A His$_6$ tag was added to the amino-terminus of Dicer-1 to facilitate purification. Similarly, a cDNA encoding full-length *Drosophila* Loqs-PB (Förstemann et al., 2005) was inserted into pFastBac1 with an N-terminal His$_6$ tag. His-Dicer-1 alone or together with His-Loqs-PB was expressed in Sf9 insect cells using the BAC-to-BAC Baculovirus Expression System (Invitrogen) and purified from cell lysates by successive chromatography using Ni-NTA agarose (QIAGEN), HiTrap Q (GE Healthcare, Pittsburgh, PA, USA), HiTrap Heparin (GE Healthcare), and Superdex 200 gel filtration. The final purified proteins were exchanged into 20 mM HEPES-KOH (pH 8.0), 100 mM NaCl, and 1 mM tris(2-carboxyethyl)phosphine hydrochloride.

cDNAs encoding each Loqs isoform were generated by RT-PCR of fly total RNA and inserted in between the Sall and NotI restriction sites of a modified pCold I vector (Takara, Otsu, Shiga, Japan) containing the HRV3C protease recognition site. Amino-terminally His-tagged Loqs proteins were expressed in Rosetta2(DE3) Escherichia coli cells. The proteins were purified using Ni-
Sepharose (GE Healthcare), followed by HRV3C protease cleavage to remove the His-tag, and then further purified using HiTrap SP and HiTrap Heparin (GE Healthcare).

**RNA Substrates**

Synthetic pre-let-7 (Dharmacon, Lafayette, CO, USA) (Sequence: 5’-UGA GGU AGU AGG UUG UAU AGU AGU AAU UAC ACA UCA UAC UAU ACA AUG UGC UAG CUU UCU-3’) were 5’ radiolabeled using $\gamma^{32}$P ATP (6000 Ci/mmol; Perkin Elmer) and T4 polynucleotide kinase (NEB, Ipswich, MA, USA). Synthetic *Drosophila* pre-let-7 was 5’ $^{32}$P-radiolabeled, gel purified, incubated at 65°C for 5 min and then at 25°C for 30 min.

**In Vitro RNA Processing**

For multiple-turnover dicing reactions, 150 nM substrate was incubated with 2 nM recombinant Dicer-1 and Dicer-1/Loqs-PB. For single-turnover reactions, 1 nM RNA substrate was incubated with 8 nM Dicer. Dicing reactions contained 7.5 mM DTT, 3.3 mM magnesium acetate, 0.25% v/v glycerol, 100 mM potassium acetate, 18 mM HEPES-KOH (pH 7.4) and 15 mM creatine phosphate, 2.25 µg creatine kinase, and 1 mM ATP for +ATP reactions; 1 mM EDTA but no creatine kinase or creatine phosphate for –ATP and non-hydrolyzable ATP analog reactions. One mM ATP$\alpha$S, ATP$\gamma$S, AMPCPP, or AMPPcP were used for ATP analog reactions. Reactions were assembled on ice and then pre-incubated at 25°C for 5 min before adding the RNA substrate (Haley et al., 2003).
Aliquots (1 μl) of reactions with radiolabeled RNA substrate were quenched by the addition of 25 volumes of formamide loading buffer (98% v/v formamide, 0.1% w/v bromophenol blue, 0.1% w/v xylene cyanol, 10 mM EDTA), incubated 5 min at 95°C, and analyzed by electrophoresis through a denaturing polyacrylamide 7 M urea gel using 0.5× tris-borate-EDTA buffer (National Diagnostics, Atlanta, GA, USA). To resolve substrate from product a 15% polyacrylamide/urea gel was used for pre-let-7. Gels were exposed to image plates and analyzed with an FLA-5000 instrument and ImageGauge 3.0 software (Fujifilm, Tokyo, Japan).

**Measuring ATP Hydrolysis**

To monitor ATP consumption by Dicer-1, α-32P-ATP (250 nM, 3000 mmol/Ci; PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA, USA) was added. Reactions were quenched by adding a 25-fold excess of formamide loading dye, and samples were spotted onto 20 cm × 20 cm cellulose thin-layer glass plates (EMD, Darmstadt, Germany) 1.5 cm above the bottom and chromatographed in 0.75 M KH₂PO₄ (adjusted to pH 3.3 with H₃PO₄) until the solvent reached the top of the plate, and then the plate was dried and analyzed by phosphorimagery.

**Rate Analyses**

As described in the Material & Methods section of Chapter II.
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CHAPTER IV: PRESENCE OF PIRNAS IN *DROSOPHILA* HEADS
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Abstract

Piwi-dependent small RNAs (piRNAs) are a distinct class of small RNAs differing from miRNAs and siRNAs in their biogenesis and function. piRNAs are discovered in animal germlines as a ~23-30nt small RNA family that function in repressing transposon expression. piRNA biogenesis and function are Dicer-independent, and instead require Piwi family proteins. Despite their critical role in the germline, the function and presence piRNA-like RNAs in the somatic tissues has not been clearly established. Here, we investigated whether reads that have piRNA-like properties generated from *Drosophila* head small RNA sequencing libraries come from the germline as a contaminant or are soma-specific. The distribution of piRNAs from our previously published head libraries revealed a very strong correlation to that of germline piRNAs. However, piRNAs from manually dissected heads are distinct from germline piRNAs, strongly suggesting the presence of a distinct set of somatic piRNAs. We are currently investigating whether these distinct head piRNAs are dependent on the Piwi family proteins in a manner similar to germline piRNAs.
**Introduction**

piRNAs guide PIWI proteins to silence transposons in the germ line of animals (Cox et al. 2000; Aravin et al. 2001; Aravin et al. 2003; Grivna et al. 2006; Brennecke et al. 2007; Batista et al. 2008; Das et al. 2008; Chamberyron et al. 2008; Desset et al. 2008). Unlike siRNAs and miRNAs, piRNA production does not require Dicer and likely involves only single-stranded precursor RNAs (Vagin et al. 2006; Girard et al. 2006; Saito et al. 2007; Kirino et al. 2007; Ohara et al. 2007; Brennecke et al. 2007; Batista et al. 2008). The biogenesis of piRNAs and their role in transposon silencing have been elucidated mainly from studies of *Drosophila* ovaries and testes (Aravin et al. 2001; Brennecke et al. 2007; Li et al. 2009). *Drosophila* gonads express three PIWI proteins: Piwi, Aubergine, and Ago3 (Ghildiyal et al. 2009; Cox et al. 1998; Cox et al. 2000; Harris et al. 2001; Vagin et al. 2006; Saito et al. 2006; Nishida et al. 2007; Yin et al. 2007; Klattenhoff et al. 2007; Desset et al. 2008; Malone et al. 2009). Piwi localizes to the nucleus in both the germline and the surrounding somatic follicle cells, and helps regulate differentiation and patterning of the germline nurse cells as well as the oocyte (Cox et al. 1998; Cox et al. 2000). Transposon derived piRNAs bound to Piwi silence transposon expression in the nucleus by a poorly understood mechanism.

In contrast, Ago3 and Aub reside in the germ cell cytoplasm (Kotelnikov et al. 2009; Li et al. 2009). High throughput sequencing of piRNAs bound to Piwi, Aubergine, and Ago3 suggested a model called the “Ping-Pong” mechanism for
the production and subsequent amplification of piRNAs in response to transcription of the transposons they target. The Ping-Pong model proposes that Aubergine and Ago3 collaborate both to increase the abundance of piRNAs and to bias piRNAs toward the antisense strand (Brennecke et al. 2007; Gunawarde et al. 2007). The detailed mechanism by which Aubergine and Piwi acquire primary piRNAs is unknown, but recent results suggest that they derive from long RNAs transcribed from “piRNA clusters”. These regions of the genome are specifically transcribed in the gonads and are characterized by transposon-richness, and a dearth of genes (Olivieri et al. 2010). The Ping-Pong model postulates that Aubergine, bound to an anti-sense primary piRNA pairs with the mRNA transcript of an active transposon, resulting in cleavage of the target and generation of a 3′ cleavage product bearing a 5′ monophosphate. The 5′ end of the 3′ cleavage fragment then becomes the 5′ end of a sense piRNA bound to Ago3. This “secondary piRNA” can then direct cleavage of a primary piRNA transcript derived from a piRNA cluster. The next step reverses this process. The Ago3:sense piRNA complex cleaves the long transcript from a piRNA cluster, generating antisense RNA fragments that bind to Aub. These fragments are envisioned to be trimmed to mature piRNAs (Brennecke et al. 2007; Gunawarde et al. 2007; Li et al. 2009).

piRNAs are best known for their transposon repression function in the germline. Yet, they seem to be mapping to regions other than transposons and there is some preliminary evidence suggesting their presence in tissues other
than the germline. Of particular interest are piRNAs that were reported to map to coding genes (Robine et al. 2009; Saito, Inagaki et al. 2009). Furthermore, methylated small RNAs longer than 23nt were detected in *Drosophila* heads in mutants defective of siRNA production, suggesting the presence piRNAs (Ghildiyal et al. 2008). Longer species of small RNAs have also been reported in somatic tissues (Yan et al. 2011; Morazzani et al. 2012). Furthermore, the RNAs from the Aplysia central nervous system have been shown to be methylated and are found in complex with Piwi. One such piRNA species is antisense to the promoter region of CREB2 and its expression is regulated by serotonin. This piRNA species derives from a serotonin dependent methylation of a conserved CpG island in the promoter region of CREB2, and promotes long term changes in neurons upon stimulation (Rajaseethupathy et al. 2012).

In *Drosophila* embryos, piRNA species have recently been proposed to bind 3′ untranslated region (UTR) and promote deadenylation of the mRNA encoding Nanos, a protein required for anterior-posterior patterning of the developing embryo (Rouget et al. 2010).

In this work, we analyzed piRNA-like small RNAs reads derived from *Drosophila* heads. We analyzed the extent of contamination from the germline to understand whether they are soma specific or germline derived. Next, we optimized cloning of small RNAs from manually dissected *Drosophila* heads to minimize germline contamination. We observe a distinct population of methylated
piRNA-like species in manually dissected heads, and their distribution differs significantly from germline tissues.
Results

piRNAs are observed in the absence of endo-siRNAs.

Endogenous methylated siRNA reads (endo-siRNAs) were discovered in *Drosophila* heads by oxidation enriched small RNA cloning (Ghildiyal et al. 2008). Endogenous siRNAs were dependent on siRNA pathway genes Dicer-2, R2D2 and Argonaute-2. Interestingly, in the absence of these genes, production of endo-siRNAs was abolished but longer transposon mapping reads were observed (Ghildiyal et al. 2008). In that study, *Drosophila* heads were extracted by rigorously shaking flies frozen in liquid nitrogen in a two layer sieve allowing the entrapment of bodies on the upper sieve while the heads were trapped in the lower sieve. Although this method is a very time efficient way to extract a large number of *Drosophila* heads, the chance of contamination of the head samples with other parts of the body is high. Therefore, one cannot confidently claim that the observed longer piRNA-like reads were from the head tissue as opposed to germline contamination from the body.

To explore this very important problem, we first undertook a bioinformatics approach. We used many small RNA sequencing datasets previously generated from *Drosophila* germline or heads. We specifically searched for the extent of similarity between the piRNA-like reads from the head and germline datasets (Figure 4.1, 4.1A, 4.1B).
Figure 4.1. Summary of Sequencing Reads. (A) dcr2 or r2d2 homozygous mutations is sufficient to abolish the majority of 21nt small RNAs. Length distribution of genome mapped reads were shown as histograms. Three previously published small RNA head libraries from different genotype flies were used (left column: wildtype, center column: dcr-2, right column: r2d2; see Materials and Methods for details). First row depicts all unique genome mapping reads. The second row shows the length distribution for only transposon mapping reads. Blue and red bars annotate sense and anti-sense directions, respectively.
Transposon mapping piRNAs suggest a high probability of contamination.

piRNA reads from both head and germline datasets were mapped to the *Drosophila melanogaster* genome or transposons (see Methods for the full list of datasets and methods). The number of piRNA reads mapping to each transposon family was compared (Figure 4.2A). The spearman and pearson correlations are shown in Table 4.1. Given the extremely high correlation between to two datasets, the most parsimonious explanation is a contamination from germline in the head datasets. The other but less likely possibility is that all transposons mapping piRNAs are expressed at the same level between *Drosophila* heads and germline.
Figure 4.2. Transposon Mapping piRNAs Suggest a High Probability of Contamination. (A) piRNA reads that mapped to each *Drosophila* transposon family were compared in the dcr2 mutant head and germline. For the germline piRNAs, the sum of reads from ovaries and testes for each transposon family was used. piRNA reads were normalized such that the total number of piRNA reads in the head and germline datasets are equal. (B) piRNA reads that mapped to *Drosophila* coding exons were grouped by transcripts. piRNAs from dcr2 mutant heads were compared to germline (maximum number of piRNA reads from either ovaries or testes). Similar results were obtained from comparisons with ago2 and r2d2 mutant heads instead of dcr-2 (data not shown).
Table 4.1. Pearson and Spearman Correlations between Transposon Mapping piRNA Reads from Several Published Datasets. Correlation values were calculated by using normalized number of piRNAs mapping to each transposon family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison pair</th>
<th>Pearson's product-moment correlation</th>
<th>Spearman's rank correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dcr2Het heads/wt testis</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dcr2Het heads/wt ovary</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dcr2 heads/wt testis</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dcr2 heads/wt ovary</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ago2 heads/wt testis</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ago2 heads/wt ovary</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2d2 Het heads/wt testis</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2d2 Het heads t/wt ovary</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2d2 heads/wt testis</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2d2 heads/wt ovary</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wt testis/ wt ovary</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next, we mapped the piRNA-like reads from oxidized head libraries to the entire genome and plotted regions with mapped piRNAs as a histogram for each chromosome arm at a 1000 base resolution. Visual inspection of histograms for head versus ovary or testis datasets indicated a lower correlation for non-transposon mapping regions. A careful examination showed that a significant proportion of piRNAs mapped to coding genes (data not shown).

**piRNAs map to coding genes**

To more systematically analyze protein-coding gene mapping piRNAs, genomic coordinates of coding transcripts were extracted from Flybase. Each transcript was further divided into exonic, and intronic regions as well as into 5’UTR, CDS, and 3’UTR. We then matched the coordinates of genome mapping piRNA-like reads from each dataset to count the number of piRNA species mapping to 5´, 3´UTR or open reading frame. We analyzed raw read counts as well as read density for each given region. The density was measured as reads per kilobase per million reads (RPKM). However, we should note that as we don’t a priori expect the reads to tile the entire length of a transcript region, this length normalization might yield a biased estimator of piRNA abundance (Figure 4.3A).

We found that more 3´UTR regions contained piRNAs on average in dcr2 mutant fly dataset compared to 5´UTR or open reading frame. piRNAs that map to the coding transcripts had a length distribution that is typical of piRNAs (23-30 nt) (Figure 4.3B). Furthermore, 70% of gene-mapping piRNAs had U as the 5´
most nucleotide and were more likely to be oriented in the same direction as the transcript.

**Gene mapping piRNAs abundance and gene expression correlate weakly.**

Next, we wanted to address was whether the observed piRNA-like reads are degradation products of mRNAs. Even though the characteristic U-bias and the enrichment of these reads in oxidation libraries argue against this bias, the predominantly sense orientation of these reads is suggestive of a degradation process. We predicted that if these piRNA-like reads are simply degradation products then the number of piRNA species for a given mRNA should be highly correlated to the corresponding mRNAs expression. To test this idea, we downloaded pre-normalized expression profiling data using Affymetrix microarrays from Flyatlas (Chintapalli VR et al. 2007, GEO accession number GSE7763). We extracted gene expression values from relevant tissues, namely ovary, testes and head.

The number of piRNA species mapping to a particular transcript and the corresponding mRNA expression in the relevant tissue (head, ovary or testis) were compared. The correlation values were as follows (Table 4.2.). Transcripts enriched in piRNA species are not necessarily from the most highly expressed genes. This result is suggestive that observed gene-mapping piRNAs are not artifactual products resulting from degradation (Figure 4.4).
Figure 4.3 piRNAs are More Concentrated in the 3’UTR Region of Coding Transcripts. (A) A boxplot was used to compare piRNA reads mapping to 5’UTR, coding region or 3’UTR in the sense or anti-sense direction. The width of the box is proportional to the number of datapoints shown with each box. Open circles denote data points that lie outside 1.5 times the interquartile range. The thick line in the box corresponds to the median of the distribution. The same boxplot was drawn using absolute read count (top) or read counts divided by the length of the corresponding region of the transcript (bottom) (B) Length distribution of gene mapping dcr-2 head piRNAs in the sense (blue) or anti-sense (red) orientation was shown as before.
**Table 4.2. Correlations between Transposon Mapping piRNA Reads from Several Published Datasets.** Number of piRNA reads that map to coding transcripts and corresponding expression values in relevant tissues were compared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>piRNA reads</th>
<th>Flyatlas Expression value</th>
<th>Pearson's Product-Moment's Correlation</th>
<th>Spearman's Rank correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dcr2 ovary</td>
<td>wt ovary</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wt testes</td>
<td>wt testes</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dcr2 heads</td>
<td>wt heads</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ago2 heads</td>
<td>wt heads</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.4. Gene Mapping piRNA Abundance and Gene Expression

Correlate Weakly. piRNAs (y axis) that mapped to coding transcripts from ago2 mutant (top panel) and dcr2 mutant (bottom panel) head small RNA libraries were compared with Drosophila head expression values of corresponding transcripts from Flyatlas (see Methods).
Gene mapping piRNAs predominantly map to a small set of coding genes. The vast majority of genes do not have any transcripts with mapped piRNAs (Table 4.3). GO enrichment was done for the genes whose 3´UTR enriched for piRNA species. Among the enriched cellular processes for piRNA mapping genes are kinase activity, neural processes and phosphate metabolism (Table 4.4). Top 20 of transcripts with most 3´UTR exon mapped piRNA species, there are several with functions specific to nervous system (Table 4.5). These transcripts are likely to be important for neural functions. Images of examples of such transcripts with mapped piRNAs are shown in Table 4.3, 4.5 and Figure 4.5 (visualization was rendered using the UCSC Genome Browser).
Figure 4.5. Representative coding genes with mapping piRNAs.

Representative transcripts were visualized using UCSC genome browser (Kent et al. 2002, Fujita et al. 2010). (A) The coding gene region of hsc70 gene is shown in blue and piRNA reads from dcr2 mutant heads (user track) are shown in black. 3’UTR region of hsc70 is shown in more detail at the bottom revealing that several different species of reads were mapping to the 3’UTR. (B) Gene regions of retinin, rfabg, CG4933, CG6770 genes are shown with mapping piRNA reads. (C) Gene regions of adh, adhr, CG17108, nplp2 are shown with mapping piRNA reads.
Table 4.3. Gene mapping piRNA are Concentrated in a Small Subset of Coding Transcripts. Number of piRNAs mapping to transcripts in either the same (sense) or reverse (anti-sense) orientation was shown. Each transcript is further divided into 5’, 3’ UTR and coding sequence. Only the top 35 transcripts with the highest number of total species were shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dcr2 Heads</th>
<th>5’UTR</th>
<th>CDS</th>
<th>3’ UTR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense species</td>
<td>Sense reads</td>
<td>Anti sense species</td>
<td>Anti sense reads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG41580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33239</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33241</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33237</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33245</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33244</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33242</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33247</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG32616</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33238</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33243</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG33246</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG17461</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG42398</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG32320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>X4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG11064</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG40715</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG34421</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG32377</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG40609</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG41529</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG5119</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG12717</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG4027</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG17870</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG41423</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG3481</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG40715</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4. Gene Ontology (GO) Enrichment of Transcripts with the Most Mapped piRNAs in dcr-2 Heads. GO enrichment was performed using FuncAssociate. Transcripts with at least 20 piRNA species in their 3’UTR exons was provided as a query set (Berriz et al. 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GO annotation</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>adjusted P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metarhodopsin inactivation</td>
<td>316.5</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protein kinase CK2 complex</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex differentiation</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinase regulator activity</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protein kinase regulator activity</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bristle morphogenesis</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cell morphogenesis involved in differentiation</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuron differentiation</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation of kinase activity</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation of protein kinase activity</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation of transferase activity</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP metabolic process</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation of protein phosphorylation</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATPase activity, coupled to transmembrane movement of ions, phosphorylative mechanism</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATPase activity, coupled to transmembrane movement of ions</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation of phosphorylation</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation of phosphate metabolic process</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation of phosphorus metabolic process</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lipid particle</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation of protein modification process</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning or memory</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognition</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5. Many transcripts with 3´UTR Mapping piRNAs have Neurological Function. Top 20 transcripts with the most 3’UTR mapped piRNA species are shown along with their functions. 7 out of 20 genes are likely to be involved in neurobiological processes (shown in red).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene name</th>
<th>GO annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>senseless</td>
<td>axon guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG9674</td>
<td>glutamate biosynthetic process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pathetic</td>
<td>amino acid transmembrane transport, gro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG18854</td>
<td>inositol-1,4,5-trisphosphate 3-kinase activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dcaps</td>
<td>neurotransmitter secretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG9941</td>
<td>zinc ion binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dHCF</td>
<td>histone H3 acetylation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-3-3ζ</td>
<td>learning or memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG8765</td>
<td>lateral inhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG14216</td>
<td>mRNA processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RfaBp</td>
<td>smoothened signaling pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raspberry</td>
<td>axon guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG32850</td>
<td>zinc ion binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG40228</td>
<td>cellular component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unkempt</td>
<td>compound eye development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atf6</td>
<td>regulation of transcription, DNA-dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tequila</td>
<td>long-term memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr4</td>
<td>intracellular steroid hormone receptor signaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pdh</td>
<td>oxidation-reduction process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desat1</td>
<td>male mating behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of piRNA species from manually dissected male heads does not correlate with that of testis piRNA species.

Given the high contamination risk from germline in previous head piRNA datasets, we decided to generate small RNA sequencing libraries from Drosophila heads using a different method. Instead of using the double sieve shaking technique described above, we first froze the flies in liquid nitrogen and manually dissected their heads on dry ice.

Using 1000-2000 fly heads, we were able to isolate very minute amounts of methylated small RNAs. In fact, we were unable to see any visible RNA footprint after 15 cycles of PCR forcing us to increase the number of cycles to an undesirably high number of 25. The lack of sufficient starting material also manifested itself in the low complexity of the sequenced reads. Using stringent criteria for 5’ and 3’ adapter matching, we obtained a total of ~2.3M reads. However, the library complexity was very poor. We observed only 123K different species and ~33K out of these mapped to the genome. This poor complexity and minute amount of starting material suggests that sample preparation needs to be scaled up at least an order of magnitude (see Table 4.S1 for number of reads and species).

Despite the limited size of this sequencing library and the issues with sample complexity, we next tried to address the issue of contamination. As an additional way to test for contamination, we utilized only male heads in this study. Nearly 50% of testis piRNAs map to a single locus called suppressor of stellate
(su(ste)), and these piRNAs are required for suppressing stellate elements in the germline. By contrast, in the manually dissected head dataset we observed that su(ste) mapping piRNAs are not abundant (Figure 4.6). The choice of male heads, thus, allowed us to estimate an upper bound on the level of contamination using the assumption of no su(ste) expression in heads. Using this assumption, the overall germline piRNA contamination in the manually dissected head dataset was shown to be <1%. Using this upper bound for contamination, we cannot explain the presence of other piRNAs that map to somatic transposons such as gypsy that are more enriched in the heads compared to the germline.

Although gene mapping piRNAs were still detected in this manually dissected small datasets, due to small number of species the conclusions should be drawn with a larger scale manually dissected head library (Figure 4.7).

These results strongly suggest that manually dissected heads is a good alternative way to avoid germline contamination. However, only a minute amount of material can be extracted from even 1000 heads. Therefore, an order of magnitude scale-up is needed for analysis.
Figure 4.6. piRNAs Isolated from Manually Dissected Male Heads do not Originate from Germline Contamination. (A) Length distribution of all small RNA reads (left), and that of transposon mapping small RNAs divided into sense (blue) and antisense (red) orientation from manually dissected male heads (right) were plotted as before. (B) piRNA reads from from manually dissected male heads were mapped to the *Drosophila melanogaster* transposons. The number of normalized piRNA reads mapping to each transposon family was shown as a scatter plot. Linear (left) and logarithmic (right) scale graphs were plotted.
Figure 4.7. Coding Region Mapping piRNAs are Found in Manually Dissected Head Small RNA Library. (A) Distribution of head piRNAs from manually dissected flies that map to each 5´UTR, coding region or 3´UTR in the sense or anti-sense direction were plotted as a boxplot. The width of the box is proportional to the number of datapoints shown with each box. Open circles denote data points that lie outside 1.5 times the interquartile range. The thick line in the box corresponds to the median of the distribution. (B) Length distribution of gene mapping head piRNAs in the sense (blue) or anti-sense (red) direction of the coding gene. (C) Nucleotide frequency plot of the gene mapping piRNA species. Nucleotides G and U are represented more frequently compared with C and A on the 5´most nucleotide.
Table 4.S1. Summary of Manually Dissected piwi Mutant, ago2
Heterozygous Male Head Small RNA Library Reads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of reads</th>
<th>Number of species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inserts</td>
<td>2285582</td>
<td>123344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genome mapping</td>
<td>624897</td>
<td>32661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miRNAs</td>
<td>47100</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piRNAs</td>
<td>262009</td>
<td>16756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposon mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piRNAs</td>
<td>98935</td>
<td>5825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siRNAs</td>
<td>61637</td>
<td>3875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposon mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siRNAs</td>
<td>13479</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

piRNA-like small RNAs have previously been reported in somatic tissues of several organisms. Yet, the specific biochemical and genetic properties of these RNAs have not been fully explored. For example, it is unclear whether these longer species are methylated or depend on piwi family proteins for their biogenesis. To overcome these limitations we utilize two strategies. First, we use Drosophila lines that have homozygous null mutations in piwi family proteins to test whether the longer species observed in the head are dependent on the piwi family proteins. Second, we use an oxidation procedure that specifically enriches for methylated small RNA species during small RNA sequencing library preparation. This approach is well suited for resolving the question of piRNA presence in Drosophila heads.

With this work, we attempted to characterize the sequence landscape of somatic piRNAs in detail. In addition to previously well characterized, transposon mapping piRNAs, we observed a clear signature of piRNAs that map to intergenic and coding regions of the genome. An important question is whether gene mapping piRNAs result merely from unspecific degradation of coding mRNAs? Given that these reads are enriched in oxidized libraries, their 3’ end are very likely methylated. This modification argues against these products to be unspecific degradation product. Yet, it would be important to detecting these piRNAs on northern blot after oxidation followed by β elimination as a more direct way to test their methylation.
Another key question to address is how gene mapping piRNAs are made. These piRNAs are likely to be produced by RNA polymerase II, which also is responsible for synthesizing protein-coding mRNAs. Then, what differentiates whether a transcript will be a mature mRNA or get processed into piRNAs? To answer this question the first step would be to test whether piRNAs are processed from the protein-coding mRNAs or they are independently transcribed. One speculative idea is the presence of chromatin associated factors that mark certain transcripts for processing by the piRNA machinery.

Finally, the function of somatic piRNAs especially those that map to protein-coding mRNAs need to be explored. Are these piRNAs function in a similar silencing role as the germline specific transposons mapping piRNAs? To address this question, genome-wide expression profiling of piwi mutant Drosophila heads could be used. However, it should be noted that isolation of pure samples from Drosophila without any contamination is very time consuming. Therefore, other model organisms that are amenable to genetic alternations might be preferred for studying this problem.
Materials and methods

Small RNA cloning and sequencing

Small RNA cloning was performed as described before with the same set of 5’ and 3’ adapters (Li et al. 2009). Briefly, 2-4 day flies were frozen with liquid nitrogen and their heads were manually dissected. Between 1000-2000 fly heads were used for generating one sequencing library. In addition to the previously described methods, we depleted 2S rRNA using biotinylated antisense oligos that were subsequently removed using 2.5mg of Dynabeads MyOne streptavidin C1 beads (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, USA). Beads were washed 3 times in B&W buffer (5 mM Tris-HCl(pH 7.5), 0.5 mM EDTA, 1M NaCl) and 2 times in Solution A (0.1 M NaOH, 50 mM NaCl), and resuspended in 600 µl 0.5X SSC buffer before incubation with the RNA sample. A DNA oligo complementary to Drosophila 2S rRNA was added to a final concentration of 125 nM. After incubation of the reaction for 30 min, heat denatured RNA sample (80 °C for 5 min) was added to the reaction. The reaction was incubated at 50 °C for 1 hr. Supernatant and magnetic beads were separated with a magnet and the RNA from the supernatant was ethanol precipitated. For oxidation of 2S rRNA depleted small RNAs, RNA was incubated with 25 mM NaIO4 in 60 mM borax, 60 mM boric acid, pH 8.6, for 30 min at 25°C. RNA was similarly extracted by ethanol precipitation.
Genome mapping of small RNA reads

Perfect matching 5´ and 3´ linkers were selected and removed to identify insert sequences. Extracted raw inserts were mapped to the Drosophila genome using pre-compiled Bowtie index for D. melanogaster, Flybase, r5.22 (Langmead et al. 2009; McQuilton et al. 2012). For the mapping, one mismatch was allowed and only the best match was reported using Bowtie parameters <a --best --strata -v 1>. Only unique mapping reads were reported using bowtie parameter <k 1>. To identify 5´UTR, coding region and 3´UTR mapping reads, exon sequences were extracted from Flybase using Galaxy website (Goecks et al. 2010; Blankenberg et al. 2010; Giardine et al. 2005). Separate Bowtie indexes were prepared from 5´UTR, coding region and 3´UTR exonic regions using bowtie-build function. In case of multiple isoforms for a given Flybase gene id, only the longest isoform was selected to simplify quantification of mapped piRNA reads. To identify and annotate transposon mapping reads, Drosophila melanogaster transposon sequences were downloaded from Berkeley Drosophila genome project and a bowtie index was built as described above. The alignment parameters were the same with the following exception. In addition to unique mapping reads, piRNAs mapping to multiple location were used after dividing the number of reads to the number of mapped locations.

Published datasets used for the analyses

dcr-2, ago-2 and r2d2 mutant fly head small RNA datasets (Ghildiyal et al. 2008), wild type testis and ovary small RNA datasets (Li et al. 2009), dcr-2
mutant ovary small RNA datasets (Czech et al. 2008) were used for the analyses presented throughout the paper.

**Graphs and statistical analysis**

R software were used for all statistical tests, graphs and correlation analyses.

**Frequency analysis**

Frequency plots were generated using randomly selected 10,000 sequences by using a sequence logo generator, weblogo (Crooks et al. 2004; Schneider et al. 1990).

**Gene expression analysis**

For gene expression analysis tab de-limited pre-normalized data from Affymetrix arrays was used (Chintapalli VR et al. 2007, GEO accession number GSE7763).

**GO enrichment analysis**

Genes with more than 20 mapped piRNA species were used for GO enrichment analysis. Genes were ranked by the number of species and analyzed using the “ordered mode” in FuncAssociate software (Berriz et al. 2009).
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CHAPTER V: FINAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
The first part of my thesis focused on the function of Drosophila Dicers; mechanism of substrate specificity and the function of the helicase domain.

Genetic studies suggested that Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 are restricted to specific substrate classes in vivo. Dicer-2 mutants are defective for RNAi, even though they express normal levels of Dicer-1. However, Dicer-2 cannot replace Dicer-1 in the miRNA pathway (Lee et al. 2004). It was unclear how Dicers specifically recognize their structurally similar substrates. Given that Dicer-2 processes esiRNA hairpins RNAs while Dicer-1 cleaves pre-miRNAs, suggests that the length of a dsRNA is the primary determinant of substrate choice by the two Drosophila Dicer enzymes.

We found that R2D2 and phosphate are two key factors that confer Dicer-2 specificity to longer dsRNA substrates. An intracellular ion, phosphate, inhibits Dicer-2 from processing only short substrates but not longer substrates. In the presence of R2D2 and inorganic phosphate Dicer-2 became specific to longer siRNA precursors. Furthermore, in the presence of ATP, R2D2 and Loqs-PD, Dicer-2 becomes more specific to its long dsRNA substrate with a $K_m$ of ~2 nM compared to ~8 nM when Dicer-2 is alone.

Similarly, ATP and dsRNA binding partners channel Dicer-1 to its biologically appropriate substrate class. To our knowledge, the use of a nucleotide cofactor to ensure biologically appropriate substrate specificity in an RNA silencing pathway is without precedent. Loqs-PB increases pre-miRNA processing efficiency by Dicer-1, potentially by increasing its affinity for substrate.
To understand the role of ATP in Dicer-1 function, the first experiment was to test whether Dicer-1 binds ATP and measure the affinity of ATP binding. We could not detect any ATP hydrolysis by Dicer-1, but we did not test whether Dicer-1 binds ATP. Future work could test whether ATP binding affects substrate binding. A Dicer-1 mutant that can bind to its substrate but cannot process them can be utilized. Another question is whether other molecules such as ADP, AMP or other ATP analogs have effects similar to ATP. The efficiency of dicing and effects on Dicer-1’s $K_M$ for pre-miRNAs should be identified.

We do not yet know if the transition of substrates from Dicer-1 to Dicer-2 is gradual such that some substrates are processed equally well by each enzyme. It is also unclear whether there are any biologically relevant precursor RNAs that are cleaved by both Dicer-1 and Dicer-2. One speculative possibility is that evolution has selected against such dual substrates, ensuring the production of precise small RNA products.

Future work could explore processing of substrates as a function of length. Is there a certain length of RNA where Dicer-1 processing is inhibited or is there a gradual effect of length on Dicer-1’s affinity? Similarly, our results suggested that ATP dependency of Dicer-2 is length dependent, and there is likely a cutoff length at which ATP becomes necessary for Dicer-2 activity. Future work needs to clearly identify this length by testing varying lengths of double stranded RNA substrates. Another related question is the role of R2D2 and phosphate as a function of substrate length. We know that short hairpins such as pre-miRNAs
are not processed by Dicer-2 in the presence of phosphate and R2D2. Yet, it is unclear whether Dicer-1 or Dicer-2 or both process intermediate length hairpin substrates such as long pre-miRNA hairpins or short endogenous siRNA precursor hairpins.

My thesis also explored the ATPase/helicase domain scaffold of Dicers. This domain is widely conserved among plants and animals, including in humans. Yet, the detailed analysis of its function remains unexplored. One possibility is that the helicase domains provide Dicers with the ability to interact with proteins in other pathways. In Drosophila, the Dicer-2 ATPase/helicase domain interacts with components of the innate immunity pathway, promoting an immune response upon entry of an RNA virus into a cell (Wang et al., 2006; Deddouche et al., 2008). Our data suggest that ATP binding or hydrolysis catalyzed by ATPase/helicase domains may also enhance the catalytic function of Dicers.

Two different conformations of Dicer-2 might be formed. One for dicing of long dsRNA and one for loading siRNAs into RNA induced silencing complex. We observed that in the absence of phosphate ion and R2D2, Dicer-2 cleaved short dsRNAs without the requiring ATP. In the presence of phosphate R2D2 and ATP, Dicer-2 might be in a specific conformation where it specifically binds to long dsRNA. It would be interesting to test whether Dicer-2 changes conformation upon ATP binding/hydrolysis and binding of R2D2 and phosphate. Different conformations of Dicer-2 might affect the RNA substrate binding and
this could be tested by footprinting Dicer-2–dsRNA complexes in the presence of ATP, phosphate and R2D2.

We don’t know the exact mechanism of phosphate inhibition of pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-2. Does the phosphate ion directly bind Dicer-2? Is it the same domain –PAZ– that binds to the 5´ and 3´ end of the RNA substrate? From preliminary studies, phosphate seems to mainly increase $K_M$. Therefore, the inhibition may be competitive. Phosphate might be binding to the same site as the substrate and inhibit its binding. This could tested by using an RNAse III mutant Dicer, which can bind to dsRNA substrate but cannot process it. Specifically, gel shift dsRNA binding assays could be performed and dissociation constant ($K_D$) of dsRNA binding by RNAseIII mutant Dicer-2 could be calculated at different phosphate concentrations.

Understanding the function of Dicer’s helicase domain is not only important for the miRNA/siRNA field, but also for the helicase field. Our work is one of the few mechanistic studies on RIG-I like helicases and translocation along double-stranded RNAs. A previous study utilized single-molecule translocation assays and detected directional movement of human RIG-I along dsRNA (REF). Our study was focused on the coupling of ATPase function to the translocation of Dicer-2 along dsRNA.

We discovered that Drosophila Dicer-2 is a double-stranded RNA induced ATPase. ATP hydrolysis was required for Dicer-2’s processivity. We found that Dicer-2 hydrolyzed ~1 molecule of ATP was per base-pair of processed long
dsRNA. ATP seems to be required for Dicer-2’s processivity suggesting that Dicer-2 does not release its substrate or any intermediate before fully processing the substrate into siRNAs in ATP’s presence. For Drosophila, this might be advantageous during viral infections, as the viral nucleic acids will be efficiently processed into siRNAs. Given that neither viral dsRNA precursors nor endogenous dsRNA precursors are abundant, energetic cost of ATP hydrolysis could be offset by the advantage of increased efficiency and specificity. The helicase domain doesn’t make Dicer-2 specific to longer substrates, yet ATP dependent mode of dicing is only active in the presence of long substrates. Interestingly, Dicer-2 did not hydrolyze as much ATP when processing dsRNAs shorter than 40 base-pairs compared to longer substrates.

We propose an inchworm model of translocation along dsRNA by Dicer-2 (Pyle 2008). To test whether Dicer-2 moves along dsRNA, traps along the double stranded RNA could be introduced such as stretches of deoxyribonucleic acid, mismatches or hairpins on one of the strands. Effects of these traps to siRNA production by Dicer-2 could be measured. Alternatively, single molecule assays could be performed to measure Dicer-2 translocation along double stranded RNA.

Our dilution experiment suggested that ATP is not only required for translocation along long dsRNA but also enhances binding to the substrate. Directly measuring the effect of ATP on dsRNA substrate binding of Dicer-2 should be measured by binding assays with RNase III mutant Dicer-2.
ATP dependent processing of siRNAs might not be conserved in mammals since published work established that human Dicer function is ATP independent (Ma et al., 2008). Alternatively, ATP dependent function or hydrolysis might be dependent on the presence of additional factors such as TRBP or PACT, two RNA binding partner proteins of human Dicer. It is crucial to test the effect of ATP, phosphate or partner proteins on human Dicer.

While the first part of my thesis elucidated how Drosophila Dicers process siRNA and miRNA precursors, is the second part focused on piRNAs. It is unknown what marks primary piRNA precursors for processing into mature piRNAs. We know that primary piRNAs are loaded to Piwi, and the primary piRNA precursors are processed into smaller fragments by a nuclease.

Similarly, piRNAs function is still poorly understood. Role of piRNAs in DNA methylation and interaction of Piwi with histone proteins such as HP1a were reported (Brower-Toland et al., 2007; Watanabe et al., 2011) yet we still lack a mechanistic understanding of piRNA function. Repression of transposon activity by piRNAs is well known, but their mechanism of action is not clear. They might destabilize transposon transcripts or they might alter DNA methylation or chromatin structure.

In addition to the well-established role of piRNAs in transposon repression of transposons in the germline (Cox et al. 2000; Aravin et al. 2001; Aravin et al. 2003; Grivna et al. 2006; Brennecke et al. 2007; Batista et al. 2008; Das et al. 2008; Chamberyron et al. 2008; Desset et al. 2008), recent studies
elucidated germline independent functions of piRNAs in Drosophila embryos and Aplysia central nervous system (Rouget et al. 2010, Rajasethupathy et al. 2012). Although the presence of piRNAs in somatic tissues in Drosophila and mammals has been reported, the functions of these somatic piRNAs remain unknown (Yan et al. 2011; Morazzani et al. 2012).

Our study elucidated the presence of piRNAs mapping to the coding genes, especially to their 3’ untranslated regions (3’UTRs). A few of these 3’UTR mapping piRNAs overlap with polyadenylation cleavage signal sequences. It is tempting to speculate that these to be involved in polyadenylation site selection. Future studies should test whether mutations in piRNA genes alter mRNA profiles of somatic tissues.
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SUMMARY

Drosophila Dicer-2 generates small interfering RNAs (siRNAs) from long double-stranded RNA (dsRNA), whereas Dicer-1 produces microRNAs (miRNAs) from pre-miRNA. What makes the two Dicers specific for their biological substrates? We find that purified Dicer-2 can efficiently cleave pre-miRNA, but that inorganic phosphate and the Dicer-2 partner protein R2D2 inhibit pre-miRNA cleavage. Dicer-2 contains C-terminal RNase III domains that mediate RNA cleavage and an N-terminal helicase motif, whose function is unclear. We show that Dicer-2 is a dsRNA-stimulated ATPase that hydrolyzes ATP to ADP; ATP hydrolysis is required for Dicer-2 to process long dsRNA, but not pre-miRNA. Wild-type Dicer-2, but not a mutant defective in ATP hydrolysis, can generate siRNAs faster than it can dissociate from a long dsRNA substrate. We propose that the Dicer-2 helicase domain uses ATP to generate many siRNAs from a single molecule of dsRNA before dissociating from its substrate.

INTRODUCTION

In Drosophila melanogaster, distinct pathways produce 21 nt small interfering RNAs (siRNAs) and ~22 nt microRNAs (miRNAs). The RNase III enzyme Drosha, aided by its partner protein, Pasha, cleaves primary miRNAs to release pre-miRNAs, ~70 nt long stem-loop structures that contain a mature miRNA within their stems (Lee et al., 2003; Denli et al., 2004; Gregory et al., 2004; Han et al., 2004, 2006). The pre-miRNA is then cleaved by Dicer-1, acting with its double-stranded RNA (dsRNA)-binding domain (dsRBD) protein partner, Loquacious-PB (Loqs-PB), to liberate a duplex comprising the mature miRNA bound to its miRNA*, a partially complementary small RNA derived from the opposite arm of the pre-miRNA stem (Fürstemann et al., 2005; Jiang et al., 2005; Saito et al., 2005; Ye et al., 2007). Mature miRNAs can derive from either the 5’ or 3’ arm of the pre-miRNA stem.

In contrast to miRNAs, Drosophila siRNAs are generated by Dicer-2 (Lee et al., 2004), which forms a stable complex with the dsRNA-binding protein R2D2 (Liu et al., 2003). In vitro, Dicer-2 can produce siRNAs in the absence of R2D2, but both Dicer-2 and R2D2 are required to load siRNAs into Ago2 (Liu et al., 2003, 2006; Tomari et al., 2004, 2007; Pham and Sontheimer, 2005). Exogenous siRNAs derive from long dsRNA molecules that are generated experimentally, from viral RNA genomes or intermediates of replication, whereas endogenous siRNAs derive from convergent transcription of mRNAs or from RNA from mobile genetic elements (Yang and Kazazian, 2006; Czech et al., 2008; Ghildiyal et al., 2008; Kawamura et al., 2008; Okamura et al., 2008a, 2008b; Tam et al., 2008; Watanabe et al., 2008). A special class of endogenous siRNAs, hp-siRNAs, derive from partially self-complementary hairpin transcripts. Production of esiRNAs by Dicer-2 requires an alternative partner protein, Loqs-PD. This Loqs isoform contains only two of the three dsRBDs found in the Dicer-1 partner protein, Loqs-PB (Okamura et al., 2008b; Hartig et al., 2009; Zhou et al., 2009; Miyoshi et al., 2010; Hartig and Förstemann, 2011).

Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 each contain two RNase III domains, which form an intramolecular heterodimer whose dimer interface creates two active sites (Zhang et al., 2004; Macrae et al., 2006; Ye et al., 2007). Like other members of the Dicer family, Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 each contain a C-terminal dsRBD and a central PAZ domain, an RNA-binding motif specialized to recognize the two-nucleotide, 3’ single-stranded tails of Drosha and Dicer products (Bass, 2000; Cerutti et al., 2000; Lingel et al., 2003, 2004; Song et al., 2003; Yan et al., 2003, 2004; Zhang et al., 2004; Gan et al., 2006; Macrae et al., 2006; MacRae et al., 2007). The structure of Giardia intestinalis Dicer and functional studies using human Dicer suggest that the distance between the PAZ domain and the active sites of the RNase III domains establishes the length of the small RNA product (Zhang et al., 2004; Gan et al., 2006; Macrae et al., 2006; MacRae et al., 2007; Takeshita et al., 2007).

Differences in the domain architecture of Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 (Figure S1A) are unlikely to explain their distinct substrate specificities. Drosophila Dicer-2 shares its domain architecture—including N-terminal DExDc, Helicase C, PAZ, RNase IIIa, RNase IIIb, and dsRBDb domains—with human Dicer, which produces both siRNAs and miRNAs. In contrast, Dicer-1 lacks a DExDc
domain, yet has a Helicase C domain. DEExDc/H and DEAD box domains are found in a wide range of RNA “helicases,” proteins that couple ATP hydrolysis to RNA binding or unwinding (Pyle, 2008). In addition to unwinding nucleic acids, helicase domains can couple ATP hydrolysis to translocation along nucleic acid molecules, rearrange RNA:protein or protein:protein interactions, or act as RNA chaperones (Bianco and Kowalczykowski, 2000; Beran et al., 2006; Bowers et al., 2006; Dumont et al., 2006; Halls et al., 2007; Pyle, 2008; Franks et al., 2010).

In Drosophila, Caenorhabditis elegans, and Schizosaccharomyces pombe, siRNA production from long dsRNAs requires ATP (Zamore et al., 2000; Bernstein et al., 2001; Ketting et al., 2001; Nykänen et al., 2001; Colmenares et al., 2007). Moreover, a point mutation (G31R) in the Drosophila Dicer-2 helicase domain blocks siRNA production in vivo, although the protein retains the ability to collaborate with R2D2 to load synthetic siRNAs (Lee et al., 2004; Pham et al., 2004) and highly paired miRNA/miRNA* duplexes (Forstemann et al., 2007) into Ago2. In contrast, a mutation predicted to inhibit nucleotide binding by the human Dicer helicase domain does not affect dicing (Zhang et al., 2002).

What restricts a given Dicer to a specific dsRNA substrate? We find that purified, recombinant Dicer-2 can cleave pre-miRNA, but that R2D2 inhibits processing of pre-miRNA by Dicer-2, while promoting use of its biologically relevant substrate miRNA, such a difference in size would not alter the miRNA authentic miRNA. The biological consequences of such misregulation are predicted to be dramatic, suggesting that processing of pre-miRNA by Dicer-2 is suppressed in vivo.

**RESULTS**

**Dicer-2 Processes Pre-miRNA Inaccurately**

In vivo, Dicer-1 but not Dicer-2 is required to produce miRNAs from the stems of pre-miRNA. Surprisingly, purified, recombinant Dicer-2 cleaved pre-miRNA (Figure 1). However, the size of the miRNA and miRNA* products generated by Dicer-2 differed from those produced by Dicer-1: the predominant Dicer-2 product was one nucleotide shorter than that produced by Dicer-1. For miRNAs residing on the 5’ arm of their pre-miRNA, the seed sequence of the Dicer-2 product would differ from the authentic miRNA and would therefore regulate a repertoire of mRNAs different from that controlled by the authentic miRNA. The biological consequences of such misregulation are predicted to be dramatic, suggesting that processing of pre-miRNA by Dicer-2 is suppressed in vivo.

In the absence of Dicer-2, flies do not accumulate siRNAs (Lee et al., 2004; Ghildiyal et al., 2008; Okamura et al., 2008a, 2008b; Czech et al., 2008). Why does Dicer-1 not make siRNAs in the absence of Dicer-2, especially since immunopurified Dicer-1 has been reported to dice long dsRNA (Saito et al., 2005)? Loqs-PB has been proposed to prevent Dicer-1 from processing long dsRNA, restricting it to the miRNA pathway (Saito et al., 2005). However, we find that Dicer-1 is unable to catalyze multiple-turnover cleavage of long dsRNA (data not shown). In fact, 225 nM Dicer-1 was approximately as active at siRNA production from 25 nM long dsRNA as 5.4 nM Dicer-2. Unlike Dicer-2, Dicer-1 generated intermediates when processing long dsRNA (Figure S1B). Our data argue against Loqs-PB restricting Dicer-1 to the miRNA pathway. Instead, they suggest that the fundamental block to Dicer-1 processing long dsRNA is its inherent inefficiency in using this substrate.

**Dicer-2 Inhibits Dicing of Pre-miRNA by Dicer-2**

We compared the rate of pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2 alone to the rate of purified Dicer-2/R2D2 heterodimer, Dicer-2 supplemented with equimolar Loqs-PD, and Dicer-2/R2D2 heterodimer supplemented with Loqs-PD. R2D2 significantly inhibited pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2 when either enzyme (data not shown) or substrate was in excess (Figure 2A) (p value for excess substrate = 0.0009). Similar inhibition of Dcr-2 processing by R2D2 was observed for a 25 bp RNA duplex (Figure S2A), suggesting that R2D2 suppresses processing of short,
Figure 2. R2D2 and Phosphate Inhibit Dicer 2 Processing of Short Substrates

(A) let 7 production was monitored using 5' 32P radiolabeled pre let 7 (100 nM) with or without ATP for Dicer 2 alone (8 nM), Dicer 2/R2D2 (8 nM), Dicer 2 + Loqs PD (8 nM + 8 nM), or Dicer 2/R2D2 + Loqs PD (8 nM + 8 nM).

(B) Processing of internally 32P radiolabeled long dsRNA or 5' 32P radiolabeled pre let 7 (100 nM) by Dicer 2 (8 nM). CK, creatine kinase; CP, creatine phosphate.

(C) Initial velocities for the processing of 100 nM pre let 7 or long dsRNA (106 bp blunt ended or 104 bp with 2 nt, 3' overhanging ends) by 8 nM Dicer 2 or Dicer 2/R2D2 in the presence of increasing concentrations of potassium phosphate. Total potassium in the reaction was kept constant.

(D) Initial velocities for Dicer 2 processing pre let 7, 106 bp blunt ended dsRNA or 104 bp dsRNA with 2 nt, 3' overhanging ends in the presence of 25 mM potassium phosphate, acetate, chloride, or glutamate.
Double-stranded substrates irrespective of the extent of complementarity or the presence of a loop. In contrast, we did not detect any inhibition of pre-let-7 processing when Loqs-PD was added to Dicer-2, even though the same preparation of Loqs-PD lowered the Km of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA 10-fold (Table 1). In contrast, the Km for Dicer-2/R2D2 (2 ± 1 nM) was less than that of Dicer-2 alone (6 ± 2 nM, p value = 0.04), suggesting that R2D2 increases the affinity of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA.

Phosphate and R2D2 Restrict Dicer-2 to Long dsRNA
Dicer-2 forms a stable heterodimer with R2D2 (Liu et al., 2003, 2006; Tomari et al., 2004), but it is unknown whether R2D2 modulates dicing rate. We measured the initial rate of dicing by Dicer-2 alone or by the Dicer-2/R2D2 heterodimer using increasing concentrations of long dsRNA substrate and saturating ATP (1 mM). For both Dicer-2 and Dicer-2/R2D2, the data fit well to the Michaelis-Menten kinetic scheme (Figure S5).

\[
\text{ES} \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-1}]{k_1} \text{E} + \text{S} \xrightarrow{k_{\text{cat}}} \text{E} + 2\text{P}
\]

where \(k_{\text{cat}}\) is the rate of complete conversion of substrate into siRNAs at saturating dsRNA concentration. The Km of Dicer-2/R2D2 processing a 515 bp dsRNA (0.03 ± 0.02 min⁻¹) was indistinguishable from that of Dicer-2 alone (0.03 ± 0.01 min⁻¹) (Table 1). In contrast, the Km for Dicer-2/R2D2 (2 ± 1 nM) was less than that of Dicer-2 alone (6 ± 2 nM, p value = 0.04), suggesting that R2D2 increases the affinity of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA (Table 1). Similarly, supplementing Dicer-2 (2 nM) with purified recombinant Loqs-PD (2 nM) did not alter the \(k_{\text{cat}}\) but did decrease Km (0.4 ± 0.1 nM, p value = 0.02), suggesting that Loqs-PD also increases the affinity of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA (Table 1).

Phosphate Inhibits Dicing of Pre-miRNA by Dicer-2
In flies, dicing of long dsRNA requires ATP (Nykänen et al., 2001). Typically, creatine kinase (CK) and creatine phosphate (CP) are included in dicing reactions to maintain high levels of ATP and constant levels of free Mg²⁺. Relative to ATP alone, the inclusion of CK and CP modestly enhanced Dicer-2 processing of both a 106 bp dsRNA bearing a 5’ monophosphorylated blunt end (Figure 2B) and a 316 bp dsRNA bearing a 5’ triphosphorylated, 2 nt, 5’ overhang (Figure S2B), but did not enhance processing of a 104 bp dsRNA with a 5’ monophosphorylated, 2 nt, 3’ overhang (Figure 2B). In contrast, standard “ATP” conditions (+ATP, +CP, +CK) inhibited pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2.

More detailed analyses revealed that CP sufficed to inhibit pre-let-7 dicing. CP can be hydrolyzed in water to creatine and phosphate. We therefore tested whether inorganic phosphate inhibited pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2. We measured the initial rate of processing (\(v_0\)) with increasing concentrations of potassium phosphate (\(K_2\text{HPO}_4/\text{KH}_2\text{PO}_4\), pH 7.4) for pre-let-7, a 106 bp blunt end dsRNA, and a 104 bp dsRNA with 2 nt, 3’ overhanging ends. Physiological concentrations of phosphate (Burt et al., 1976; Erecinska et al., 1977; Auesukaree et al., 2004) inhibited processing of pre-let-7 but neither of the two dsRNAs (Figure 2C). We observed little or no inhibition of pre-miRNA processing by Dicer-2 with 25 mM acetate, chloride, or glutamate (Figure 2D). Moreover, none of the anions—including phosphate—had a significant effect on the dicing of long dsRNA. Phosphate further inhibited the low level of pre-let-7 processing of Dicer-2/R2D2 (Figure 2C) and Dicer-2/R2D2 + Loqs-PD and suppressed pre-let-7 processing by Dicer-2 + Loqs-PD (data not shown). In contrast, processing of pre-let-7 by Dicer-1 was unaffected by phosphate (Figure 2C). We conclude that under physiological conditions — 2–25 mM phosphate and a majority of Dicer-2 complexed with R2D2 — Dicer-2 is unlikely to use pre-miRNA as a substrate.

ATP Hydrolysis and siRNA Production by Dicer-2
The Dicer-2 G31R point mutation, which lies in the protein’s DEExDC motif, uncouples Argonautae2 loading from dsRNA dicing (Lee et al., 2004). The mutation is predicted to disrupt ATP binding. Consistent with the requirement for ATP in siRNA production by Dicer-2, dsRNA processing by purified recombinant Dicer-2G31R was significantly less than wild-type Dicer-2 for substrates with either blunt or 3’ overhanging ends (Figure 2D) (p value = 2.2 x 10⁻⁶ for blunt end substrate). While dsRNA processing by wild-type Dicer-2 was strongly stimulated by ATP, mutant Dicer-2G31R was not (Figure 2D). Nonetheless, Dicer-2G31R cleaved pre-let-7 as efficiently as the wild-type enzyme, consistent with the finding that ATP was not required for wild-type Dicer-2 to cleave pre-let-7 (Figure 2A). Moreover, processing of long dsRNA by wild-type Dicer-2 was inhibited by

Table 1. Michaelis-Menten Analysis of Dicer-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Km (nM)</th>
<th>Change in Km</th>
<th>(V_{\text{max}}) (nM min⁻¹)</th>
<th>([\text{E}]) (nM)</th>
<th>(k_{\text{cat}}) (min⁻¹)</th>
<th>Change in (k_{\text{cat}})</th>
<th>(k_{\text{cat}}/K_{\text{M}}) (nM⁻¹ min⁻¹)</th>
<th>Change in (k_{\text{cat}}/K_{\text{M}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dicer 2</td>
<td>6 ± 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005 ± 0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicer 2/R2D2</td>
<td>2 ± 1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.02</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicer 2 + Loqs PD</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.03</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dicer 2, Dicer 2/R2D2, or Dicer 2 supplemented with equimolar Loqs-PD was incubated with a 515 bp dsRNA and saturating ATP (1 mM) ATP. The initial rates of converting dsRNA into siRNA for increasing amounts of substrate were measured and fit to the Michaelis-Menten equation (Figure S5). The table reports mean ± standard deviation for three trials.
Figure 3. Dicer 2 Requires ATP Hydrolysis to Process Long dsRNA

(A) Dicer 2 (10.8 nM) was incubated with 2.5 μM [α-32P]ATP and 150 nM 515 bp dsRNA, and ATP hydrolysis was monitored by thin layer chromatography.

(B) siRNA production by Dicer 2 (5.4 nM) from a 515 bp dsRNA (25 nM) was monitored with or without ATP or ATPγS (1 mM).

(C) ATP hydrolysis by Dicer 2 (5.4 nM) was monitored for 120 nt long nucleic acid substrates (20 nM): dsRNA, single stranded RNA, single stranded DNA, RNA/DNA heteroduplex, or double stranded DNA in the presence of ATP (1 mM).
adenosine 5′-O-(3-thio)triphosphate (ATPγS), but processing of pre-let-7 was not (Figure 2D).

In agreement with ATPγS inhibiting dsRNA processing, Dicer-2 hydrolyzed ATP to ADP (Figure 3A). Both ATP and ATPγS supported the production of siRNA from long dsRNA, but ATPγS did not (Figure 3B). In the presence of 1 mM ATP, the rate of dicing long dsRNA declined exponentially with increasing ATPγS, suggesting that ATPγS competes with ATP for binding to Dicer-2 and that, once bound, ATPγS is not efficiently hydrolyzed, preventing the production of siRNAs from long dsRNA.

Dicer-2 Is a dsRNA-Stimulated ATPase

ATP hydrolysis by Dicer-2 increased when dsRNA was added (Figure 3C) (p value = 0.024, Wilcoxon rank-sum test). The inclusion of 120 nt single-stranded RNA or DNA or 120 bp DNA/RNA heteroduplex or double-stranded DNA stimulated ATP hydrolysis less than the 120 bp dsRNA (all 20 nM) (Figure 3C). A 25 nt single-stranded RNA or DNA, a 21 bp dsRNA, and a 21 bp DNA/RNA heteroduplex all failed to stimulate the Dicer-2 ATPase activity above the rate observed when no substrate was present (Figure S3B). Neither the end structure of the dsRNA—blunt versus 3′ overhang—nor the presence of a 5′ monophosphate (v0000003 PO4 = 0.4 ± 0.1 μM min−1 versus v0000003 OH 0.3 ± 0.1 μM min−1) significantly changed the ATP hydrolysis rate (Figure 3D).

ATP hydrolysis by Dicer-2 does not require dsRNA cleavage. A Dicer-2 mutant, D1217,1615N, in which a key aspartate in each of the two RNase III domain active sites was changed to asparagine, retained significant dsRNA-stimulated ATPase activity (p value = 0.02) (Figure 3E). Under multiple-turnover conditions, Dicer-2D1217,1615N was essentially inactive for dicing, and siRNA production was detected only when [Dicer-2D1217,1615N] >> [substrate] (data not shown). In contrast, Dicer-G3251R, which also does not support multiple-turnover dicing of long dsRNA, did not hydrolyze ATP in the presence of dsRNA (Figure 3E). We conclude that the Dicer-2 helicase domain is responsible for the enzyme’s dsRNA-stimulated ATPase activity.

ATP Consumption and Dicing Are Coupled

We measured the initial rates of siRNA production and ATP hydrolysis using a 515 bp dsRNA in the presence of increasing concentrations of ATP. The dependence on ATP concentration of both siRNA production and ATP hydrolysis fit well to the Michaelis-Menten kinetic scheme (Figure 3F).

Evidence that Dicer-2 Is Processive

If ATP fuels the translocation of Dicer-2 along dsRNA, dicing should produce successive siRNAs along the substrate. In the presence of ATP, Dicer-2 would be predicted to produce the first siRNA—i.e., the terminal siRNA—at roughly the same rate as subsequent, internal siRNAs. In contrast, in the absence of ATP, the rate of production of siRNA should decline as its distance from the 5′ end increases. To test these predictions, we synthesized three identical 120 nt dsRNA substrates, each bearing a single 32P radiolabel at position 16, 35, or 104 from the 5′ end of one strand (Figure 4A). All substrates contained two deoxynucleotides at one end, forcing Dicer-2 to initiate processing from the opposite end (Figure S4A). We used this “one-ended” substrate to examine the
Figure 4. Evidence that Dicer 2 Is Processive

(A) Site specifically $^{32}$P radiolabeled 120 bp dsRNAs were used to measure the rate of production of the first, second, and fourth siRNAs from the all RNA end of the substrate; the 3' end of the sense strand contained two deoxynucleotides (red) to block entry of Dicer 2 from the other end (Figure S4A). Production of siRNA was monitored in the presence or absence of ATP using 100 nM dsRNA and 5.4 nM Dicer 2. Values correspond to the mean ± standard deviation from three independent experiments. The data were fit to a single exponential function. In (A) and (B), pink denotes the position of the $^{32}$P radiolabel.

(B) The rate of production of the initial siRNA was measured as in (A) but using a site specifically $^{32}$P radiolabeled dsRNA with either a blunt (black) or a 2 nt, 3' overhanging (red) end in the presence or absence of ATP.

(C) The rate of production of the initial siRNA was monitored using 100 nM Dicer 2 and 10 nM dsRNA bearing either a blunt (left) or a 2 nt 3' overhanging (right) end in the presence or absence of ATP or ATPγS.

(D) The rate of production of the initial siRNA from a 120 bp blunt ended dsRNA (10 nM) was measured using 100 nM mutant Dicer 2 $^{G31R}$.

(E) The rate of production of the first and fourth siRNAs from a 120 bp blunt ended dsRNA (100 nM) was measured using 100 nM Dicer 2 $^{G31R}$. Values are mean ± standard deviation for three independent experiments.
production of the first, second, or fourth siRNA (see Experimental Procedures) in the presence or absence of ATP (Figure 4A). With 1 mM ATP, the initial rates for the production of the first, second, and fourth siRNAs were essentially indistinguishable (\(-28 \text{ nM min}^{-1}\)); with no ATP, the rate for the first siRNA (\(1.4 \pm 0.3 \text{ nM min}^{-1}\)) was greater than that of the second (\(0.9 \pm 0.1 \text{ nM min}^{-1}\)), which was greater than the rate for the fourth siRNA (\(0.2 \pm 0.1 \text{ nM min}^{-1}\)) (Figure 4A).

We can envision two explanations consistent with these results and previous studies on Dicer enzymes; either ATP fuels processive dicing of long dsRNA, or dicing of long dsRNA in the presence of ATP comprises a slow initial binding step to the end of the substrate, followed by rapid but ATP-dependent production of subsequent siRNAs. Such a two-step process might occur if the rate of production of the first siRNA was slowed by the blunt structure of the substrate; the first dicing event would convert the substrate end to a 2 nt, 3' overhang bearing a 5' monophosphate, with all subsequent siRNAs produced rapidly. To test this idea, we prepared a substrate bearing one blocked end and a 2 nt, 3' overhang bearing a 5' monophosphate at the other end (Figure S4B). The rates of first siRNA production from both blunt and 3'-overhanging end substrates were indistinguishable when the reactions contained ATP—conditions where dicing was efficient. They were also similar when ATP was omitted—when dicing was slow (Figure 4B). The subsequent siRNAs were also produced at similar rates from the two different substrates (Figure S4B). Thus, we favor the hypothesis that ATP converts Dicer-2 from an inefficient, distributive enzyme into a processive enzyme.

Surprisingly, ATP also enhanced the production of the terminal siRNA from long dsRNA under single-turnover conditions (\([\text{Dicer-2}] >> [\text{dsRNA}]\)); the enhancement by ATP/\(S\) was considerably weaker (Figure 4C). This suggests that ATP hydrolysis is required for the production of even the first siRNA. ATP was required irrespective of the terminal structure of the dsRNA (blunt versus 3' overhang), excluding a role for ATP in the binding of Dicer-2 to a particular type of dsRNA end.

Moreover, when the [enzyme] > [dsRNA], helicase mutant Dicer-2G31R produced the first siRNA at similar rates in the presence or absence of either ATP or ATP/\(S\) (Figures 4D and S4C). For Dicer-2G31R, the rate of production of the terminal siRNA was faster than that of the fourth siRNA, consistent with the idea that ATP hydrolysis converts Dicer-2 from a distributive to a processive enzyme (Figure 4E).

**Dicer-2 Produces siRNAs without Dissociating from the dsRNA**

A processive enzyme can act multiple times on its substrate before dissociating. Thus, catalysis by processive enzymes resists dilution (Rivera and Blackburn, 2004). To test whether Dicer-2 remains physically associated with the long dsRNA after three subsequent dicing events, we used the 120 nt, site-specifically \(32\text{P}\)-radiolabeled dsRNA to monitor the rate of production of the fourth siRNA following dilution (Figure 4A). The dsRNA substrate (200 fmol) was first preincubated with Dicer-2 (54 fmol) for 2 min at 4°C to allow the enzyme to bind substrate. During this preincubation step, no siRNA was detected (data not shown). Next, the reaction was diluted 1000-fold into buffer prewarmed to 25°C. The diluted reaction was incubated at 25°C, and production of the fourth siRNA was measured over time (Figure 5A). During the preincubation, the substrate concentration (20 nM) was >3-fold greater than the \(K_m\) of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA; after dilution, the substrate concentration was ~300 times less than the \(K_m\). For both the preincubation and the dilution steps, the dsRNA substrate was present at ~4-fold higher concentration than Dicer-2. When the preincubation was omitted, little fourth siRNA was produced (Figure 5B), demonstrating that conditions largely prevented reassociation of Dicer-2 with dsRNA once it dissociated from the substrate.

When ATP was included in both the preincubation and the dilution buffer, 54 fmol of Dicer-2 produced 10 fmol of fourth siRNA in 1 hr. About half as much fourth siRNA was produced when ATP was present in the dilution buffer but omitted from the preincubation. When ATP was omitted from the dilution buffer, essentially no fourth siRNA was produced, regardless of whether ATP was present during the preincubation, suggesting that ATP dissociates rapidly from Dicer-2. More fourth siRNA was made when ATP was present in both the preincubation...
and dilution buffers than when preincubation was carried out in the absence of ATP (p value = 0.015). We conclude that the initial binding of Dicer-2 to the end of long dsRNA is enhanced by ATP and that in the presence of ATP, Dicer-2 remains associated with the dsRNA. We propose that the stably bound Dicer-2 then cleaves successive siRNAs along the dsRNA (Figure 6).

**DISCUSSION**

Purified Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 both process pre-miRNAs, but generate products of different length (22 versus 21 nt). Genetic analyses suggest that Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 are restricted to specific substrate classes in vivo (Lee et al., 2004). For example, Dicer-2 cannot replace Dicer-1 in the miRNA pathway. Similarly, \( K_{\text{M}} \) of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA (Table 1 and Figure S5). We note that the specificity constant, \( k_{\text{cat}}/K_{\text{M}} \), was ~4 fold higher for the Dicer-2/R2D2 heterodimer than for Dicer-2 alone. Similarly, Loqs-PD lowered the \( K_{\text{M}} \) of Dicer-2 for long dsRNA without reducing the catalytic rate, resulting in an ~10-fold higher \( k_{\text{cat}}/K_{\text{M}} \).

Processing of pre-miRNA by Dicer-1 was unaffected by phosphate. We find that the intrinsic properties of Dicer-1, which cannot efficiently catalyze multiple-turnover processing of long dsRNA, restrict that enzyme to process pre-miRNA. We do not yet know whether the transition of substrates from Dicer-1 to Dicer-2 is gradual, such that some substrates are processed equally well by both enzymes. In theory, such intermediate substrates might be selected against in evolution, enforcing the distinction between Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 substrates.
The Dicer-2 helicase domain is similar to that of RIG-I, a sensor in the mammalian innate immune system. The RIG-like ATPase/helicase domain is conserved among plant and animal Dicers. Yet its function has remained unknown. Our data suggest that this domain of Dicer-2 is involved in ATP-dependent production of successive siRNAs from long dsRNA. Notably, two other members of this helicase family, DRH-3 and R-IG, are also bona fide ATPases: DRH-3, a C. elegans protein required for RNA silencing and germline development (Nakamura et al., 2007), is a dsRNA-stimulated ATPase (Matranga and Pyle, 2010), and the mammalian protein RIG-I, which recognizes viral 5’ triphosphorylated dsRNA and initiates an innate immune response, uses ATP to translocate along dsRNA (Myong et al., 2009). Our data are consistent with the idea that ATP hydrolysis fuels translocation of Dicer-2 along long dsRNA substrates. An alternative view—that the ATP-dependent binding of a molecule of Dicer at the end of the substrate promotes the complete and rapid oligomerization of Dicer-2 along the entire extent of the dsRNA—would require that the Dicer and RIG-I helicase domains share a conserved sequence but have highly divergent functions.

ATP was not required for Dicer-2 to process pre-miRNA, and a mutant Dicer-2 unable to hydrolyze ATP remained able to process pre-miRNA but not long dsRNA. These results help explain why in C. elegans, in which a single Dicer processes both long dsRNA and pre-miRNA, a mutation in the DCR-1 helicase domain disrupted endo-siRNA, but not miRNA, accumulation (Welker et al., 2010).

Four lines of evidence support a role for ATP hydrolysis in the production of successive siRNAs along the dsRNA by Dicer-2. First, Dicer-2 consumes a constant amount of ATP per base pair. Second, ~23 molecules of ATP were consumed for each 21 nt siRNA produced. Third, the rate of production of the first, second, and fourth siRNAs from a long dsRNA substrate were indistinguishable in the presence of ATP, but in the absence of ATP, the rate of siRNA production declined with increasing distance from the end of the dsRNA. Finally, the association of Dicer-2 with a long dsRNA was resistant to dilution provided ATP was present, suggesting that after binding the end of its substrate, Dicer-2 remains bound to the dsRNA and uses ATP energy to reposition itself to produce the next 21 bp siRNA. Translocation along the dsRNA seems a likely mechanism.

Although helicase mutant Dicer-2 G31R processed pre-miRNAs as efficiently as wild-type Dicer-2, the mutant was unable to produce even the terminal siRNA from a long RNA duplex under multiple turnover conditions. This suggests an inherent ability of the helicase domain of human Dicer to distinguish between long and short substrates. We note that the helicase domain of human Dicer autoinhibits processing of an RNA duplex, and its dsRNA-binding partner TRBP, a homolog of R2D2 and Loqs, relieves this inhibition (Ma et al., 2008; Chakravarthy et al., 2010). We hypothesize that Drosophila Dicer-2 can occupy two distinct conformations. When inorganic phosphate is high, Dicer-2 assumes a conformation—perhaps similar to the autoinhibited conformation of human Dicer—that can bind and load siRNA. This conformation is unaffected by ATP and, we presume, is involved in promiscuously processing pre-miRNA in vitro. When inorganic phosphate is higher and the enzyme’s helicase and dsRBDs engage its substrate, Dicer-2 assumes a conformation that requires ATP for binding and hydrolysis to process dsRNA.

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

**Protein Expression and Purification**

Expression and purification of His6 Dicer 2 or His6 Dicer 2 and His6 R2D2 in S21 cells was as described (Liu et al., 2003; Tomari et al., 2004). His6 Dicer 2 G31R, His6 Dicer 2 D217T,D164N, and His6 Dicer 1 were expressed in Sf9 insect cells using the BAC to BAC Baculovirus Expression System (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) and purified from cell lysates by using Ni NTA agarose (Qiagen, Valencia, CA), HiTrap Q, HiTrap Heparin (GE Healthcare, Pitts burgh), and Superdex 200 gel filtration. Loqs PD was expressed in Escherichia coli Rosetta2(DE3), isolated using Ni Sepharose (GE Healthcare), treated with HRV3C protease to cleave away the His tag, and purified using HiTrap Q, HiTrap Heparin and HiTrap SP and HiTrap Heparin. Proteins were exchanged into 20 mM HEPES KOH (pH 8.0), 100 mM NaCl, 1 mM tris(2 carboxyethyl)phosphine hydrochloride. Protein concentrations were determined by quantitative amino acid analysis (Keck Biotechnology Resource Laboratory, New Haven, CT). Two different preparations of recombinant Dicer 2 were used in this study. Preparation 1 was used for Table 1 and Figures 2, 3, 4C, S2B, S3A, S3D, and S5. Preparation 2 was used for Table 2 and Figures 1, 3A, 3D, 3F, 3G, 4A, 4B, 5, S1, S2A, S3B, S3C, and S4.

**RNA Substrates**

DsrRNAs were prepared as described (Haley et al., 2003). PCR templates for transcription of sense and antisense RNAs were generated from the EGFP coding region of pN3 eGFP using primers listed in Table S1. Twenty and 29 bp dsRNAs (Figures S2A, S3B, and S4A and Table S2) were as previously described (Rose et al., 2005). Synthetic RNAs and synthetic Drosophila pre let 7 (Dharmacon, Lafayette, CO) were 5’ 32P radiolabeled using [γ 32P]ATP (6000Ci/mmol) (PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA) and T4 polynu cleotide kinase (NEB, Ipswich, MA). After gel purification, RNA strands or pre let 7 were incubated at 65°C for 5 min and then at 25°C for 30 min. Site specifically radiolabeled 120 nt dsRNAs were prepared by DNA splinted ligation (Tables S3 and S4) (Moore and Sharp, 1993; Moore and Query, 2000). To monitor formation of the fourth siRNA in Figure 4B, we used a 120 nt substrate in which the fifth siRNA (the last siRNA generated by Dicer 2 from this substrate) was site specifically 32P radiolabeled. The fourth siRNA produced corresponds to the sum of the two 32P radiolabeled cleavage products produced when the dsRNA was cleaved to generate the fourth and fifth siRNAs.

**In Vitro RNA Processing**

For Dcr 2 +Loqs PD, Loqs PD was first mixed with Dicer 2 or Dicer 2/R2D2 and incubated for 10 min on ice, followed by 5 min at room temperature. Dicing reactions contained 7.5 mM DTT, 3.3 mM magnesium acetate, 0.25% w/v glyc erol, 100 mM potassium acetate, 18 mM HEPES KOH (pH 7.4), 15 mM CP, 2.25 µg CK, and 1 mM ATP. ATP reactions contained 1 mM EDTA but no CK or CP; ATP+S reactions contained 1 mM ATP+S only. In Figures 2A 2D, 3, 3B 4E, 5, S3, and S4, +ATP reactions contained no CP or CK; +CP and +CK reactions in Figures 2B and S2B contained 20 mM CP or 2.25 µg CK. Reac tions were assembled on ice and preincubated at 25°C for 5 min before adding RNA. In Figure S4, dilution buffer contained 0.1% NP 40.

Aliquots (1 µl) of reactions with radiolabeled RNA substrate were quenched by the addition of 25 volumes of formamide loading buffer (88% v/v formamide, 0.1% w/v bromophenol blue and xylene cyanol, 10 mM EDTA), incubated for 5 min at 95°C and analyzed by electrophoresis through a denaturing polyacrylamide 7 M urea gel using 0.5× Tris borate EDTA buffer (National Diagnostics, Atlanta). In Figure 5, 200 µl aliquots from dilution reactions were stopped with 300 mM sodium acetate and 25 mM EDTA, isopropanol precip itated, and dissolved in formamide loading buffer before gel analysis. Gels were exposed to image plates and analyzed with an FLA 5000 and Image Gauge 3.0 software (Fujifilm, Tokyo). In Figure 1, let 7 and let 7’ strands were detected by northern hybridization with 5’ 32P radiolabeled DNA probes (Table S1).
ATP Hydrolysis

$[^32]P$ATP (250 nM, 3000 mmol/Ci) (PerkinElmer) was used to monitor hydrolysis. Reactions were stopped with a 25 vol formamide loading dye, spotted onto 20 x 20 cm cellulose plates (EMD, Darmstadt, Germany), and chromatographed in 0.75 M K$_2$H$_2$PO$_4$ (adjusted to pH 3.3 with H$_3$PO$_4$) until the solvent reached the top of the plate. The plate was dried and analyzed by phosphor imagery. For Figure S3B, ATP hydrolysis was monitored using the ATP Bioluminescent Assay Kit (Sigma, St. Louis). The reaction was stopped by diluting the sample ten times in H$_2$O and immediately flash freezing in liquid nitrogen. Samples were stored at -80°C until they were measured. A standard curve spanning at least 100 fold less than and greater than the experimental values was used to determine ATP concentrations.

Rate Analyses

Substrate converted to siRNA versus time was fit to $y = y_0 + A (1 - e^{-kt})$, where $dy/dt = Ake^{-kt}$. When $t = 0$, $dy/dt = Ak$ (Lu and Fei, 2003). Data were fit to the Michaelis Menten scheme using Visual Enzymics 2008 (Softzymics, Princeton, NJ) for Igor Pro 6.11 (WaveMetrics, Lake Oswego, OR). The rate of substrate consumption was fit for each replicate separately, and two tailed, two sample equal variance t test was used to compare rates (Excel, Microsoft, Seattle). R 2.6.0 software was used for other statistical analyses.
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Phosphate and R2D2 Restrict the Substrate Specificity of Dicer-2, an ATP-Driven Ribonuclease
Elif Sarinay Cenik, Ryuya Fukunaga, Gang Lu, Robert Dutcher, Yeming Wang, Traci M. Tanaka Hall, and Phillip D. Zamore

Figure S1, related to Figure 1. Dicer-1, but not Dicer-2, Generates Intermediates when Processing Long dsRNA

(A) Domain Structures of Drosophila Dicer-1 and Dicer-2 and human Dicer. Domain structures were adapted from SMART protein domain database (Schultz et al., 1998; Ponting et al., 1999). The DExDc motif in these proteins has the sequence DECH.

(B) 25 nM internally $^{32}$P-radiolabeled 515 bp dsRNA was incubated with either 225 nM Dicer-1 or 5.4 nM Dicer-2. The top gel was run to visualize both the uncleaved substrate and the 21–22 bp siRNA products; the lower gel was run to resolve the intermediates (arrowheads) generated by Dicer-1.
Figure S2, related to Figure 2. R2D2 Inhibits Dicer-2 Processing of a 25 bp dsRNA Substrate and Creatine Phosphate Inhibits Dicer-2 Processing of a Long dsRNA Bearing 5’ Triphosphate termini

(A) siRNA production by Dcr-2 (5.4 nM) or Dcr-2/R2D2 heterodimer (12 nM) was measured for a 25 bp dsRNA (100 nM). Red indicates deoxynucleotides.

(B) A 5’ triphosphorylated 316 bp dsRNA (100 nM) bearing 2 nt 5’ overhanging ends was incubated with Dicer-2 (8 nM) in the presence or absence of ATP, creating kinase (CK), or creatine phosphate (CP). Values are mean ± standard deviation for three independent experiments.
**A**

[25 bp dsRNA] >> [Dcr-2 or Dcr-2/R2D2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>siRNA product (nM)</th>
<th>time (min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0  10  20  30  40  50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20  40  60  80  100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B**

5’ overhang dsRNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>siRNA product (nM)</th>
<th>time (min)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0  30  60  90  120  180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ATP, + CP, + CK</td>
<td>[Graph showing product accumulation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ATP</td>
<td>[Graph showing product accumulation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP, -CP, -CK</td>
<td>[Graph showing product accumulation]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S3, related to Figure 3. ATP Hydrolysis is Required for Efficient Long dsRNA Processing by Dicer-2

(A) siRNA formation from 5’ monophosphorylated, internally $^{32}$P-radiolabeled, blunt ended, 106 bp dsRNA was monitored in the presence of 1 mM ATP in the presence of increasing concentrations of ATPγS. Initial rates of conversion of dsRNA to siRNA were plotted as a function of ATPγS concentration.

(B) ATP consumption was measured over time for a 40 bp (420 nM), 60 bp (280 nM), 106 bp (158 nM), 208 bp (81 nM), 345 bp (49 nM), and a 558 bp (30 nM) dsRNA substrate. Initial rates ($v_0$) were calculated from the fitted exponential curves and used in Figure 3F.

(C) The hydrolysis of ATP to ADP was measured for Dicer-2 alone (5.4 nM) or with 25 nt single-stranded (ss) synthetic RNA, 25 nt synthetic ssDNA, 25 bp synthetic RNA or RNA-DNA duplex. ATP hydrolysis by Dicer-2 (5.4 nM) in the presence of a 515 bp dsRNA is shown in gray for reference. Substrate concentrations were chosen to achieve equivalent nt.mole.l$^{-1}$: ssRNA and ssDNA, 4.4 µM; RNA and DNA-RNA duplex, 2.2 µM; and 515 bp dsRNA, 100 nM.

(D) The hydrolysis of ATP to ADP was measured for Dicer-2 (5 nM) with pre-let-7 (5 µM) or with 558 bp dsRNA (100 nM) in the presence of 1 mM ATP. Values are mean ± standard deviation for three independent experiments.
Figure S4, related to Figure 4. The Rate of siRNA Production for Different dsRNA Termini: Two 5’ Deoxynucleotides Block Entry of Dicer-2, but Blunt and 3’ Overhanging Ends are Processed Similarly

(A) Twenty-five and 29 bp dsRNA substrates (73 nM) containing two 2’ deoxycytidine nucleotides at the 3’ end were incubated with 5.4 nM Dicer-2, and total siRNA production measured at 45 min. For each substrate, the 5’ ribonucleotide of the 5’ end or the end that contained 3’ deoxynucleotides on the complementary strand was $^{32}$P-radiolabeled to allow measurement of siRNA production from that end alone.

(B) Site-specifically $^{32}$P-radiolabeled 120 bp dsRNAs (100 nM) were incubated with Dicer-2 (5.4 nM) in the presence of 1 mM ATP to detect production of the first, second and fourth siRNAs as diagrammed here and in Figure 4A. Right, the substrate end where Dicer-2 enters was either blunt (top) or had a 2 nt 3’ overhang (bottom).

(C) Production of the initial siRNA (i.e., the first siRNA) by Dicer-2$^{G31R}$ (100 nM) from a 118 bp dsRNA (10 nM) bearing a 2 nt 3’ overhanging end was measured in the presence or absence of ATP or in the presence of ATPγS (see also Figures 4A and S4A).

Panels (B) and (C) report mean ± standard deviation for three independent experiments.
Figure S5, related to Table 1. Michaelis-Menten analysis of Dicer-2, Dicer-2 + Loqs-PD, and Dicer-2/R2D2 using a 515 bp dsRNA substrate

The initial rate (velocity) of substrate processing by 2 nM Dicer-2, 3 nM Dicer-2/R2D2, and 2 nM Dicer-2 + 2 nM Loqs-PD was measured for increasing concentrations of a 515 bp long dsRNA in the presence of 1 mM ATP. The data were fit to the Michaelis-Menten equation. $V_{max}$ corresponds to the rate of complete conversion of a molecule of substrate into 24 siRNAs at saturating dsRNA concentration. Values are mean ± standard deviation for three independent experiments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 515 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-GCG TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GAC TCA GAT CTC GAG CTC AAG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 515 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-GCT GTT GTA GTT GTA CTC CAG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 515 bp product for antisense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-GCG TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GCT GTT GTA GTT GTA CTC CAG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 515 bp product for antisense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-GAC TCA GAT CTC GAG CTC AAG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 316 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-GCGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGCCACAAGTTCACTCGTGTCC-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 316 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-TCGATGCCCTTCAGCTCG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 316 bp product for antisense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-GCGTAATACGACTCACTATAGCGATGCCCTTCAGCTCG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 316 bp product for antisense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5′-GCCACAAGTTCACTCGTGTCC-3′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S1. Synthetic DNA Oligonucleotides. m, 2′-O-methyl ribose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer Type</th>
<th>Forward Primer</th>
<th>Reverse Primer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>let-7 probe for Northern hybridization</td>
<td>5'-CTA TAC AAC CTA CTA CCT CAA-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let-7* probe for Northern hybridization</td>
<td>5'-AAA GCT AGC ACA TTG TAT AGT-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 558, 345, 208, 106 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 3G)</td>
<td>5'-TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GCA AGC TGA CCC TGA AGT TC-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 558 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-mGmGT CAC GAA CTC CAG CAG GAC-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 558 bp product for anti-sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GTC ACG AAC TCC AGC AGG AC-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 558, 345, 208, 106 bp product for anti-sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-mGmGC AAG CTG ACC CTG AAG TTC-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 345 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-mGmGC CAT GAT ATA GAC GT T GTG-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 345 bp product for anti-sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-mGmGC CAT GAT ATA GAC GT T GTG-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 208 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GCC ATG ATA TAG ACG TTG TG-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 208 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-mGmGG TCT TGT AGT TGC CGT CGT-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 208 bp product for anti-sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GGT CTT GTA GTT GCC GTC GT-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 106 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-mGmGT AGC GGC TGA AGC ACT GCA-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 106 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5'-GCG TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG GGC CAC AAG TTC AGC GTG TCC-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 106 bp product for sense RNA from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-mGmGG CCA GGG CAC GGG CAG CTT GCC G-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 106 bp product for anti-sense RNA (blunt end) from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5'-mGmGG CCA CAA GTT CAG CGT GTC C-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 106 bp product for anti-sense RNA (blunt end) from pEGFP-N3</td>
<td>5'-GTA CTT AAT ACG ACT CAC TAT AGG GCC AGG GCA CGG GCA GCT TGC CG-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward primer for 104 bp product for anti-sense RNA (3'overhang) from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5'-GTA CTT AAT ACG ACT CAC TAT AGC CAG GCC AGC AGC AGC TTG CCG-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse primer for 104 bp product for sense RNA (3'overhang) from pEGFP-N3 (Figure 2)</td>
<td>5'-mTmTG GGC CAC AAG TTC AGC GTG TCC-3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2. Synthetic RNA Oligonucleotides. d, deoxy ribose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 nt</td>
<td>Sense RNA</td>
<td>5’-ACC CUG AAG UUC AUC UGC ACC ACdC dG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 nt</td>
<td>Anti-sense RNA</td>
<td>5’-CGG UGG UGC AGA UGA ACU UCA GGG UCA -3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 nt</td>
<td>Sense RNA</td>
<td>5’-ACC CUG AAG UUC AUC UGC ACC GUC CAC dCdG-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 nt</td>
<td>Anti-sense RNA</td>
<td>5’-CGG UGG ACG GUG CAG AUG AAC UUC AGG GUC A-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-let 7</td>
<td>5’-UGA GGU AGU AGG UUG UAU AGU AGU AAU UAC ACA UCA UAC UAU ACA AUG UGC UAG CUU UCU-3’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S3. DNA Templates for Transcription and DNA Splints for RNA Ligation, used in Figures 3 and 4. m, 2’-O-methyl ribose.

| DNA template to transcribe antisense RNA strand in Figure 4 | 5’-ACT CCT CAA CAA ATC ATA AAC TAC AAT ATA CAT CAA TAC GAC ATT ACC CTC ACA ATC AAT CAT ACA ACC ATC CCT AAA GAC CAA CAG CAC CCC ACG ATC AAG AAT AAG AAC TAT AAT CCC TAT AGT GAG TCG TAT TAC GC-3’ |
| T7 RNAP promoter sequence annealed to the DNA template for transcription | 5’-GCG TAA TAC GAC TCA CTA TAG-3’ |
| DNA splint for RNA ligation to generate sense strand in Figure 4 | 5’-GGG ATT ATA GTT CTT ATT CTT GAT CGT GGG GTG CTG TTG GTC TTT AGG GAT GGT TGT ATG ATT GAT TGT GAG GGT AAT GTC GTA TTG ATG TAT ATT GTA GGT TAT GAT TTG TTG AGG AGT-3’ |
| DNA template to transcribe 40 nt sense RNA in Figure 3G | 5’-mGGC TTC ATG TGG TCG GGG TAG CGG CTG AAG CAC TG C ACG CCT ATA GTG AGT CGT ATT ACG C-3’ |
| DNA template to transcribe 40 nt anti-sense RNA in Figure 3G | 5’-mGGC GTG CAG TGC TTC AGC CGC TAC CCC GAC CAC ATG AAG CCT ATA GTG AGT CGT ATT ACG C-3’ |
| DNA template to transcribe 60 nt sense RNA in Figure 3G | 5’-mGGT GAA CTT CAG GGT CAG CTT GCT TCA TGT GGT CGG GGT AGC GGC TGA AGC ACT GCA CGC CTA TAG TGA GTC GTA TTA CGC-3’ |
| DNA template to transcribe 60 nt anti-sense RNA in Figure 3G | 5’-mGGC GTG CAG TGC TTC AGC CGC TAC CCC GAC CAC ATG AAG CAA GCT GAC CCT GAA GTT CAC CTA TAG TGA GTC GTA TTA CGC-3’ |
Table S4. Synthetic RNA Oligonucleotides Assembled by Splinted Ligation into Site-Specifically Labeled Sense-Strand RNA and Used in Figure 4 and S5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RNA #</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RNA #1</td>
<td>5’-ACU CCU CAA CAA AUC A-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #2</td>
<td>5’-UAA ACU ACA AUA UAC AUC AAU ACA UUA CCC UCA CAA UCA UAC AUA CAA CCA UCC CUA AAG ACC AAC AG CAC CCC A-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #3</td>
<td>5’-CGA UCA AGA AUA AGA ACU AUA AUC dCdC-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #4</td>
<td>5’-ACU CCU CAA CAA AUC AUA AAC UAC AAU AUA CAU CA-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #5</td>
<td>5’-AUA CGA CAU UAC CCU CAC AAU CAA UCA UAC AAC CAU CCC UAA AGA CCA ACA GCA CCC CA-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #6</td>
<td>5’-UCC UCA ACA AAU CA-3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNA #7</td>
<td>5’-UCC UCA ACA AAU CAU AAA CUAA CAA UAU ACA UCA-3’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Why did you move back to China?**
First of all, I feel extremely privileged to be educated and trained at the University of Minnesota. There are many superb scientists studying vision and brain imaging there. My collaboration with them led to some intriguing findings on visual adaptation, unconscious visual processing, and contextual modulation in early visual cortical areas. From them I learned not just experimental skills, but also various distinct perspectives on these same scientific questions.

Career-wise, working in China is very attractive to me. Government research funds in China have been growing at an annual rate of more than 20%. Ample funding allows me to explore and carry out much larger and more risky projects. At Peking University, I have been enjoying working with the country’s most intelligent and hardworking students. In addition, I am a big ping-pong and soccer fan, and living in China gives me a lot more opportunity to enjoy these sports.

**Tell us something about neuroscience in China?**
Neuroscience in China has a tradition of excellence. I would like to mention the founders of modern Chinese neuroscience — Robert Kho-Seng Lim, Te-Pei Feng and Hsiang-Tung Chang. Lim and Feng were members of the US National Academy of Sciences. Lim carried out pioneering work on the physiology of neuromuscular junction and synaptic plasticity. Interested readers might want to read a chapter published in the *Annual Review of Neuroscience* in 1988 (11, 1–12) about Lim’s career development and the early history of neuroscience in China. Chang was one of the pioneers of studying dendritic potentials and among the first to recognize the functional significance of dendrites in the central nervous system.

Neuroscience in China has grown steadily since the 1920s, and started to flourish in the 1990s. In 1995, the Chinese Neuroscience Society was founded and it now has more than 2500 members. Major neuroscience research programs are located in the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Peking University, Fudan University, Beijing Normal University, University of Science and Technology of China, many medical universities and institutes, and many more places. Research areas include molecular, cellular and developmental neurobiology, systems and computational neuroscience, as well as cognitive and behavioral neuroscience. Chinese neuroscientists are making their contribution to the development of this field on a par with their peers in the international arena, as demonstrated by their frequent publications in almost all prestigious journals (including *Current Biology*).

**And what about psychology in China?** Psychology, on the other hand, took a slightly different turn. In 1917, the first psychology laboratory in China was set up at Peking University, under the guidance of the university president Yuen-Pei Tsai. Tsai studied psychology with Wilhelm Wundt when he was in Germany. Unfortunately, the development of psychology was suppressed for a long time, even halted during the Cultural Revolution from 1966 to 1976. This is because psychology was criticized as a pseudo-science. In 1981, only four universities had a psychology department. Interestingly, the turning point for the development of psychology was also in the 1990s, almost in parallel with the time when neuroscience started to thrive. Up to now, there are more than two hundred psychology departments/institutes in China. Founded in 1921, the Chinese Psychological Society now has about 8000 members. Psychological research in China covers almost all basic and applied fields. Brain and cognitive science has been identified as one of the eight research frontiers by the central government in 2006 and two national key laboratories have been set up targeting fundamental issues in this area. The rapid development of psychology (and neuroscience) in China is partly due to the nation’s economic boom and thus a rapid growth in research funds. I feel honored to live in this era and to experience the dramatic (positive) changes of science and research in China.

Department of Psychology, Peking University, Beijing 100871, P.R. China. E-mail: ffang@pku.edu.cn
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**Argonaute proteins**

Elif Sarinay Cenik1 and Phillip D. Zamore1,2

**What are Argonautes proteins?**
Argonaute proteins form an evolutionarily conserved family whose members silence gene expression in pathways such as RNA interference (RNAi). Argonaute family proteins can be divided into AGO and PIWI proteins (*Figure 1*). Both types of Argonaute proteins bind 21–35 nt long small RNA guides whose sequence identifies the genes to be silenced. Argonaute–small-RNA complexes can repress the transcription of genes, target mRNAs for site-specific cleavage or general degradation, or block mRNA translation into protein. AGO proteins bind ~21 nt small interfering RNAs (siRNAs) and 21–23 nt microRNAs (miRNAs). Both siRNAs and miRNAs are cut from double-stranded RNA precursors by RNase III enzymes such as Dicer. AGO proteins are essential for development and differentiation, and in most plants and animals, defend cells against viral infection. In contrast, PIWI proteins bind 23–30 nt PIWI-interacting RNAs (piRNAs), whose production does not appear to involve double-stranded RNA or Dicer. piRNAs are unique to animals, where they repress transposon expression and ensure the successful production of sperm and eggs.

**How do Argonautes function?** An Argonaute protein plus its small RNA guide compose the RNA-induced silencing complex (RISC). RISC complexes can also contain additional proteins thought to extend the functions of Argonautes or to direct RISC to specific sub-cellular locations. The simplest, and likely ancestral, Argonaute function is endonucleolytic cleavage of its RNA target at a single phosphodiester bond. The structure of Argonaute ensures that the bond cleaved always lies between the target nucleotides paired to the tenth and eleventh nucleotides of the guide RNA. Increasingly, Argonaute aficionados refer to these nucleotides as g10 and g11 for the small RNA and t10 and t11 for the target, viewing both the guide (g) and the target (t) from...
the 5’-to-3’ perspective of the small silencing RNA.

What does Argonaute look like?
No three-dimensional structure is available for an entire eukaryotic Argonaute protein, but a series of structures of eubacterial and archaeal Argonautes, as well as structures of individual domains of eukaryotic Argonaute proteins, together reveal broad principles that hold true in fungi, plants, and animals. All Argonaute/Piwi proteins comprise three key domains: PIWI, MID, and PAZ (Figure 2). The Argonaute endonuclease, which requires Mg²⁺ to slice a target RNA into products bearing 3’ hydroxyl and 5’ phosphate groups, resides in the carboxy-terminal PIWI domain (Figure 2A). The PIWI domain resembles another nuclease, RNase H, a DNA-guided ribonuclease. Like RNase H, the PIWI domain contains three negatively charged, evolutionarily conserved amino acids — typically aspartate-aspartate-glutamate (DDE) — that form a Mg²⁺-binding catalytic triad. Unlike RNase H, the small RNA guide remains stably bound to the Argonaute protein through many rounds of target cleavage.

The amino-terminal PAZ domain uses its oligonucleotide-binding (OB) fold to secure the 3’ end of the small RNA guide strand to Argonaute (Figure 2B). A conserved hydrophobic cavity within the PAZ domain recognizes the characteristic two-nucleotide, 3’ overhanging end of the guide-passenger siRNA or miRNA/miRNA* duplex generated by Dicer. The PAZ domain can also detect chemical modification of the 3’ end of the small RNA. In plants, all small RNAs bear a 2’S-methyl modification at their final ribose sugar. In animals, piRNAs, but not typically miRNAs or siRNAs, are 2’S-methyl modified, although in insects siRNAs bound to Argonaute2 are also 2’S-methyl modified. The PAZ domains of human PIWI proteins (Hiwi1, Hiwi2, Hili) bind more tightly to the two-nucleotide, 3’ overhanging end of a dsRNA when it bears a 2’S-methyl than when the end is 2’ hydroxyl. Conversely, the PAZ domain of the human AGO protein Ago1 prefers a 2’ hydroxyl. Comparison of the structures of single-stranded RNA bound to the PAZ domain from mouse Miwi with that of the PAZ domain from human Ago1 suggests that the wider RNA-binding cleft of the Miwi PAZ domain better accommodates a terminal 2’-O-methyl group than does that of Ago1. However, *Drosophila* Ago1 — whose guide RNAs in vivo are thought always to end with a 2’ OH — can accept 2’-O-methyl guides, at least in vitro.

Finally, the MID domain anchors the 5’ monophosphate of a small silencing RNA to the Argonaute protein, securing the guide through multiple cycles of target cleavage (Figure 2A). In vitro studies suggest that 5’ phosphate binding helps align the small RNA on the surface of Argonaute, ensuring that the correct bond of the target is positioned in the endonuclease active site. The MID domain also participates in sorting small RNAs among various Argonaute paralogs according to the identity of the first nucleotide of the RNA guide. For example, in *Arabidopsis* Ago1 prefers small RNAs that begin with uridine, Ago2 and Ago4 prefer an initial adenosine, and Ago5 prefers cytosine. Swapping the MID domain of one *Arabidopsis* Argonaute for that of another exchanges the initial nucleotide that is favored. Such nucleotide preferences likely arise from subtle differences in the amino acid side chains near the 5’ phosphate-binding pocket: structures of the human Ago2 MID domain bound to nucleoside monophosphates suggest that Ago2 favors small RNAs that begin with uridine or adenosine because a rigid loop in the domain inhibits binding to cytidine or guanosine.

How do Argonautes obtain their small RNA guides? On their own, AGO proteins do not accept an siRNA or miRNA/miRNA* duplex, yet all available evidence suggests that AGO proteins
are initially loaded with double-stranded small RNAs, which then mature to single-stranded RNA-containing, functional RISC. Loading of a small RNA duplex into an AGO protein requires both ATP and the chaperones Hsc70 and Hsp90. Hsc70 and Hsp90 are thought to use ATP energy to open AGO proteins to permit them to bind double-stranded small RNAs, but the details of this process remain unknown.

In Drosophila, mammals, and likely other higher plants and animals, RISC complexes load a small RNA duplex in a defined orientation: the thermodynamically less stable 5’ end of the double-stranded small RNA ends up in the phosphate-binding pocket of the MID domain, establishing that strand as the future small RNA guide. The other RNA strand becomes the passenger. Such thermodynamic asymmetry, together with first nucleotide identity, determines which strand of a small RNA duplex becomes the guide for an AGO protein. Most small RNA duplexes preferentially produce a readily predictable siRNA guide or miRNA strand, although some are bi-functional, with both strands loaded into AGO proteins. Even for these ‘symmetric’ small RNAs, a single molecule of duplex can only load one of its two strands; the other strand is ultimately destroyed.

An AGO protein bound to an siRNA or miRNA/miRNA* duplex is called pre-RISC. Once the siRNA passenger or miRNA* strand of the duplex small RNA is evicted from pre-RISC, the complex becomes mature RISC. For catalytically active AGO proteins, the siRNA passenger strand is thought to be cleaved as if it were a target mRNA.

The heterodimeric protein C3PO has been proposed to facilitate release of the cleaved passenger strand. For catalytically inactive AGO proteins, mismatches within the duplex — in the seed or between guide positions g12 to g15 — promote maturation of pre-RISC to RISC.

Many eukaryotes produce multiple Argonaute proteins, which are often functionally distinct. Flies and plants, for example, devote different AGO proteins to the RNAi and miRNA pathways. Caenorhabditis elegans produces 27 Argonautes (including two PIWI proteins). Mice and humans make four AGO proteins, only one of which, Ago2, retains the ability to cleave its RNA targets. Whether the functions of Ago1, Ago3, and Ago4 differ is not known.

How does Argonaute recognize and repress its mRNA targets? The ‘seed sequence’ of a small silencing RNA guide — nucleotides 2 to 7 or 2 to 8 — provides nearly all of the specificity for target binding. Argonaute proteins pre-organize the seed sequence into a one-stranded helix whose conformation makes it ready to pair with a target without loss of entropy. Argonaute proteins accomplish this by binding the negatively charged phosphodiesther backbone of seed sequence nucleotides, displaying the edges of bases g2 to g8 so that they are ready to base-pair with t2 to t8 of a target mRNA.

Why the rest of the nucleotides of the small RNA guide contribute so little to target binding remains unexplained. The two-state model envisions that the guide strand nucleotides 3’ to the seed sequence alternate between two isoenergetic conformations: bound to Argonaute, with the 3’ terminus anchored in the PAZ domain, and paired to the target mRNA, with the 3’ end free in solution. The fixed-end model proposes that the 3’ end of the guide strand remains anchored in the PAZ domain at all times, irrespective of the presence of a target RNA. Both models assume that the 5’ end of the small RNA guide always resides in the MID domain phosphate-binding pocket.

The structures of Thermus thermophilus Argonaute bound to a DNA guide and to a DNA guide together with an RNA target support the two-state model: the 3’ end of the guide strand binds the PAZ domain when only the DNA guide is present, but not when a target RNA
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The next step reverses the process: the Ago3-sense-piRNA complex cleaves the long transcript of a piRNA cluster, generating antisense RNA fragments that bind to Aub and are envisioned to be trimmed to piRNA length by an unidentified 3´-to-5´ exonuclease.

In addition to the transposon-targeting piRNAs produced by the Ping-Pong cycle early in spermatogenesis (‘pre-pachytene piRNAs’), mammals generate piRNAs from non-repetitive but gene-poor loci as the developing spermatocytes enter the pachytene stage of meiosis. Mutations that block production of these pachytene piRNAs arrest spermatogenesis at the round spermatid stage. We do not know why pachytene piRNAs are required for mammalian sperm maturation or what genes or DNA structures pachytene piRNAs regulate.
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Moreover, piRNA biogenesis, especially primary piRNA production, remains obscure. Are the piRNA precursors transcribed from large clusters initially fragmented to generate the 5´ monophosphorylated ends of piRNAs, then trimmed by exonucleases to generate discrete 3´ ends? What is the function of piRNAs derived from non-repetitive sequences? In Drosophila embryos, piRNAs have recently been proposed to bind the 3´ untranslated region (UTR) and promote deadenylation of the mRNA encoding Nanos, a protein required for anterior–posterior patterning of the developing embryo. Are piRNAs that map to 3´ UTRs generally involved in the temporal or spatial control of gene expression?

The sorting of small RNAs among different Argonaute proteins according to the structure and sequence of an siRNA or miRNA duplex suggests that each Argonaute protein might have a unique or specific regulatory function or that individual Argonautes might be specifically retained or degraded during cell differentiation. Yet no functional difference has been discovered distinguishing human Ago1, Ago3, and Ago4. Perhaps these three human AGOs bind different regulatory proteins. Defining the repertoire of proteins bound by each human Argonaute protein may help reveal their specific functions.

What do we know about how piRNAs are made and how they function? piRNAs guide PIWI proteins to silence transposons in the germ line of animals. We know little about the early steps in the biogenesis of piRNAs except that unlike siRNAs and miRNAs, piRNA production does not require Dicer and likely involves only single-stranded precursor RNAs.

Hints about the biogenesis of piRNAs and their role in transposon silencing come mainly from studies of Drosophila ovaries and testes. Drosophila gonads express three PIWI proteins: Piwi, Aubergine, and Ago3. Piwi localizes to the nucleus in both the germine and the surrounding somatic follicle cells, which help regulate the differentiation and patterning of the germline nurse cells and oocytes. Transposon-derived piRNAs bound to Piwi silence transposon expression in the nucleus by poorly understood mechanisms. In contrast, Ago3 and Aub reside in the germ cell cytoplasm.

What is the ‘Ping-Pong’ mechanism of amplification of piRNAs? High throughput sequencing of piRNAs bound to Piwi, Aubergine, and Ago3 suggest a model, the ‘Ping-Pong’ mechanism, for how this class of small silencing RNAs is produced and subsequently amplified in response to transcription of the transposons they target. The Ping-Pong model proposes that Aubergine and Ago3 collaborate both to increase the abundance of piRNAs and to bias piRNAs toward the antisense strand. The detailed mechanism by which Aubergine and Piwi acquire primary piRNAs is unknown, but current evidence suggests they derive from long RNAs transcribed from ‘piRNA clusters’: transposon-rich, gene-poor regions of the genome which are specifically transcribed in the gonads. The Ping-Pong model postulates that Aubergine, bound to an anti-sense primary piRNA, pairs with the mRNA transcript of an active transposon, cleaving it in two and generating a 3´ cleavage product bearing a 5´ monophosphate. The 5´ end of the 3´ cleavage fragment then becomes the 5´ end of a sense piRNA bound to Ago3. This ‘secondary piRNA’ can then direct cleavage of a primary piRNA transcript derived from a piRNA cluster. The next step reverses the process: the Ago3-sense-piRNA complex cleaves the long transcript of a piRNA cluster, generating antisense RNA fragments that bind to Aub and are envisioned to be trimmed to piRNA length by an unidentified 3´-to-5´ exonuclease.

In addition to the transposon-targeting piRNAs produced by the Ping-Pong cycle early in spermatogenesis (‘pre-pachytene piRNAs’), mammals generate piRNAs from non-repetitive but gene-poor loci as the developing spermatocytes enter the pachytene stage of meiosis. Mutations that block production of these pachytene piRNAs arrest spermatogenesis at the round spermatid stage. We do not know why pachytene piRNAs are required for mammalian sperm maturation or what genes or DNA structures pachytene piRNAs regulate.

What is on the horizon? piRNAs protect the germline from invading transposons, but do they actually silence expression? We know that Piwi proteins cleave transposons to generate more piRNAs, which then cleave more transposons, but it remains to be established that this amplification cycle is the primary mechanism for transposon silencing by piRNAs. In many animals, piRNAs repress transcription, but we do not know how. Do Piwi proteins bind DNA or nascent transcripts? Do they recruit factors that alter chromatin structure or histone modifications?