

JCU ePrints

This file is part of the following reference:

Keall, Rebecca M. (2005) *Molecular and genetic analysis of Drosophila Rad21: a gene and protein involved in sister chromatid cohesion.*

PhD thesis, James Cook University.

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/2088>

Molecular and Genetic analysis
of *Drosophila Rad21*:
A gene and protein involved in
sister chromatid cohesion

Thesis submitted by
Rebecca M KEALL BSc(Hons)
in October 2005

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the School of Pharmacy and Molecular Sciences
James Cook University

ELECTRONIC COPY

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, declare that the electronic copy of this thesis provided to the James Cook University Library, is an accurate copy of the print thesis submitted, within the limits of the technology available.

Signature

Date

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, author of this work, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the University Library and, via the Australian Digital Theses network, for use elsewhere.

I understand that, as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the Copyright Act and I do not wish to place any further restriction on access to this.

Signature

22/2/06

Date

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

[Redacted Signature]

Signature

22/02/06

Date

STATEMENT OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF OTHERS

Stipend support: I was a recipient of an Australian Postgraduate Award stipend, and also of a three month School of Pharmacy and Molecular Sciences stipend.

Supervision: This research was performed under the supervision of Dr W. Warren in the School of Pharmacy and Molecular Sciences, at James Cook University, Townsville.

Other collaborations: Part of this work involved a four week period in the laboratory of collaborator, Dr. Margarete Heck in Edinburgh during which general techniques in biochemistry were learned.

Editorial assistance: Drs. W. Warren and K. Gorringer kindly proof-read this thesis

Research assistance: General technical and research assistance was provided by Leigh Cuttell. Additional technical assistance was provided by numerous individuals over the three year period of this study.

DNA microinjections were performed by Dr. W Warren.

Samples to be analysed by scanning electron microscopy were sputter coated by Dr. Kevin Blake.

Any other assistance: Analytical assistance in the form of DNA sequence analysis and microscopy was provided by the Advanced Analytical Centre at James Cook University.

Project costs: This project was supported in part by research grants from the Australian Research Council and The March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are so many people that have helped me over the last few years both scientifically and away from work.

I would firstly like to thank my supervisor, Dr Bill Warren, for his support throughout this project. I am grateful for the many opportunities that you have offered me, including moving interstate, and setting up a new lab. I am especially grateful that you had enough trust in me and my scientific ability to hand over your pet project and let me run with it. Just having that freedom has helped me grow immensely as a scientist, thank you.

To my collaborators and co-workers, thanks for all of the inspiration and distractions. Margarete, thank you for welcoming me into your lab in Edinburgh, and Sharron thanks for giving me a crash course in *Drosophila* biochemistry. Without your selflessness in helping me I am sure that it would have taken me eons to be able to generate pretty blots! Big thanks goes to the succession of technical assistants that have kept me supplied with fly and bacteria media over the years, without your help the lab would not have run so smoothly. To Leigh, Rachael, Sally and Kylie, thank you for everything. Without you guys, counting flies would never have been so much fun. Thanks especially Kylie and Rach for all of the scientific discussions and brain storming in the office, and for listening to me complain when things weren't working.

Dr. Kevin Blake, thank you for teaching me how to generate beautiful scanning electron micrographs, and for sputter coating the 300 plus samples that I continued to bombard you with. Thanks for the laughs and the genuine interest in my work. To Dr. Helena Richardson and Michelle Coombe, thank you for sending me part of the deficiency kit so that I could commence the genome-wide screen. Leonie, Hannah and Nicole, thank you for answering my calls for help when I was frustrated over technical problems, collectively you saved me hours of frustration and hair pulling. Bill, thanks for performing the embryo microinjections.

To all of my friends that have continued to support me despite the huge distance between Townsville and Melbourne, thank you. I wish to thank my family who have supported me in everything that I do. Mum, Dad, Paul, Amie, Sarah, Rach and Tom thanks for knowing that I am always there for you and care even if I am physically miles away.

Last but never least, I could not have done any of this without Wayne. Thank you for being my rock and my point of sanity throughout all of this.

It certainly has been an experience, thank you to everyone that has shared it with me.

ABSTRACT

The accurate and efficient dissemination of replicated chromosomes into daughter cells is fundamental to all aspects of biology. Chromosomal missegregation can lead to aneuploid chromosome configurations which are a hallmark of cancer cells and also a leading cause of birth defects and infertility in humans. Given that chromosome missegregation can result in such disastrous consequences, cells have evolved mechanisms to ensure the faithful segregation of chromosomes, one of which is sister-chromatid cohesion which is mediated by the cohesin complex.

Cohesin is a multi-protein complex thought to be the primary effector of sister chromatid cohesion in all eukaryotes. In yeast, cohesin is loaded onto chromosome arms in S-phase where it maintains sister chromatid cohesion until the metaphase-anaphase transition. Sister chromatid separation is then triggered by the site-specific cleavage of the RAD21 cohesin subunit. In metazoan species, including *Drosophila*, the bulk of cohesin dissociates from chromosomes in prophase, leaving a minor pool of centromere-associated cohesin to maintain sister-chromatid cohesion until anaphase. Exactly how the various cohesin subunits and their regulators orchestrate these events has yet to be fully elucidated. Meiotic cohesin complexes are subjected to additional levels of regulation to accommodate the different types of cell division that occur to produce haploid gametes. In humans, premature loss of meiotic sister chromatid cohesion has been proposed as the most likely molecular cause for sporadic aneuploidy linked to advanced maternal age.

The results presented in this thesis begin with a description of the rationale and approach used to identify the DRAD21 separase cleavage sites, and subsequently mutate them using site-directed mutagenesis. Characterisation of the dominant alleles generated is described, as is the first evidence of DRAD21 proteolysis. The overexpression of non-cleavable DRAD21 isoforms was investigated in a range of different tissues and developmental stages, and was shown to dominantly reduce the size of adult tissue. These data suggested that overexpression of non-cleavable isoforms of DRAD21 in dividing cells increased levels of cell death. Analysis of the cellular effects of non-cleavable DRAD21 overexpression in the developing eye imaginal disc confirmed that the level of apoptosis was increased in cells expressing non-cleavable DRAD21, and that this DRAD21 isoform induced mitotic delay or

arrest, consistent with a defect in mitotic progression. This is the first description of a *Drad21* mutant phenotype. The reduced and roughened eye phenotype generated as a result of non-cleavable DRAD21 expression in the eye imaginal discs provided a tool to use in genetic studies of DRAD21 function.

Genetic analysis showed that known and predicted cohesin regulators are capable of modulating the DRAD21 eye phenotype, therefore establishing the suitability of this phenotype for use in a genetic screen. The entire *Drosophila* genome was screened for genetic modifiers of the DRAD21 eye phenotype. In total 62 interacting genomic regions were identified, spanning chromosomes two, three and four. Analysis of these interactions revealed both enhancers and suppressors of the DRAD21 eye phenotype, and genetic dissection of some of the interacting regions allowed 13 modifier loci to be unequivocally identified at the molecular level. Specifically, ten distinct interacting regions were examined at the molecular level and ten suppressor loci and three enhancer loci were identified and a mechanism by which these interactions may be occurring was proposed for each.

These studies are likely to significantly influence our current understanding of metazoan chromosome dynamics and identify novel regulators of chromosome segregation. To date, some interacting loci identified at the molecular level have established roles in chromosome cohesion, while for others this study provides the first evidence for their role in this process. These studies will identify both novel regulators of chromosome segregation and hopefully provide a shortlist of genes that when functionally impaired may incrementally increase the risk of chromosome missegregation and aneuploidy in humans.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 THE CELL DIVISION CYCLE AND CHROMOSOME SEGREGATION .	2
1.1.1 IDENTIFICATION OF CHROMOSOMES AS BEARERS OF HEREDITARY INFORMATION	2
1.1.2 CELL DIVISION	3
1.1.2.1 Overview.....	3
1.1.2.2 The basic mechanisms of mitosis.....	4
1.1.2.3 The basic mechanism of meiosis.....	5
1.1.2.4 Sister Chromatid Cohesion.....	8
1.1.3 ERRORS IN CHROMOSOME SEGREGATION	11
1.2 UNDERSTANDING THE CELL CYCLE: GENETIC APPROACHES	12
1.2.1 KEY CELL CYCLE REGULATORS REVEALED BY GENETIC SCREENS IN YEAST	12
1.2.2 <i>DROSOPHILA</i> SCREENS FOR CELL CYCLE MUTANTS	14
1.2.2.1 <i>The Drosophila eye as a model system</i>	15
1.2.2.2 <i>Drosophila screens for cell cycle mutants</i>	16
1.3 UNDERSTANDING SISTER CHROMATID COHESION	20
1.3.1 GENETIC SCREENS IN YEAST REVEAL GENES REQUIRED FOR SISTER-CHROMATID COHESION	20
1.3.2 APPROACHES TO SCREEN FOR CHROMOSOME SEGREGATION GENES IN <i>DROSOPHILA</i>	21
1.4 THE COHESIN COMPLEX	22
1.4.1 THE YEAST COHESIN COMPLEX.....	22
1.4.1.1 <i>Establishment of cohesion in S-phase</i>	24
1.4.1.2 <i>Dissolution of cohesion – The Metaphase to Anaphase transition</i>	27
1.4.1.3 <i>The meiotic cohesin complex</i>	28
1.4.2 SISTER CHROMATID COHESION IN METAZOA	28
1.4.2.1 <i>Cohesin complexes in metazoans</i>	28
1.4.2.2 <i>Regulation of cohesin in higher eukaryotes</i>	29
1.4.2.2.1 Cohesin is removed from chromosomes in two distinct steps.....	29
1.4.2.2.2 Studies of meiotic cohesion in mammalian systems	33
1.5 THIS STUDY	35
1.5.1 SISTER CHROMATID COHESION IN <i>DROSOPHILA</i>	35
1.5.2 THE ROLE OF <i>DRAD21</i>	35
1.5.2.1 <i>A role for DRAD21 in meiosis?</i>	36
1.5.3 <i>DROSOPHILA</i> AS A MODEL SYSTEM TO STUDY SISTER-CHROMATID COHESION .	38
1.5.4 SCOPE OF THESIS	38

CHAPTER 2: MATERIALS AND METHODS	39
2.1 GENERATION OF PLASMIDS.....	40
2.1.1 RESTRICTION ENDONUCLEASE DIGESTION OF DNA	40
2.1.2 AGAROSE GEL ELECTROPHORESIS	40
2.1.3 PHENOL/CHLOROFORM EXTRACTION OF DNA	40
2.1.4 ETHANOL PRECIPITATION OF DNA	40
2.1.5 DEPHOSPHORYLATION OF VECTOR DNA	41
2.1.6 LIGATION	42
2.1.7 TRANSFORMATION OF BACTERIA	42
2.1.8 PURIFICATION OF PLASMID DNA	43
2.1.8.1 <i>Small scale preparation- Mini-preps</i>	43
2.1.8.2 <i>Large scale preparation- Midi and Maxi preps</i>	43
2.1.9 IN VITRO SITE DIRECTED MUTAGENESIS AND PLASMID GENERATION	43
2.1.10 DNA SEQUENCING	46
2.2 SDS-PAGE AND WESTERN BLOTTING.....	47
2.2.1 PROTEIN EXTRACTION.....	47
2.2.2 PROTEIN SEPARATION BY ELECTROPHORESIS	47
2.2.3 DETECTION OF PROTEINS AND WESTERN BLOTTING	48
2.3 STAINING OF EYE IMAGINAL DISCS.....	48
2.3.1 ANTIBODY STAINING OF EYE IMAGINAL DISCS	48
2.3.2 ACRIDINE ORANGE STAINING OF EYE IMAGINAL DISCS	49
2.4 SCANNING ELECTRON MICROSCOPY	49
2.4.1 PREPARATION OF SAMPLES	49
2.5 TRANSGENIC METHODS: GERM-LINE TRANSFORMATION OF DROSOPHILA MELANOGASTER	50
2.5.1 MICROINJECTION OF <i>DROSOPHILA</i> EMBRYOS.....	50
2.5.2 IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSGENIC FLIES	51
2.6 DROSOPHILA MELANOGASTER CULTURING.....	51
2.6.1 STOCKS	51
2.6.2 MEDIUM AND MAINTENANCE	53
2.6.3 <i>DROSOPHILA MELANOGASTER</i> SCORING/PHENOTYPIC ANALYSIS.....	53
2.6.4 GENERATING RECOMBINANT STOCKS.....	53
2.6.4.1 <i>PCR diagnostic test for confirmation of altered DRAD21cDNAs</i>	54
2.6.5 SCREENING FOR GENETIC INTERACTORS	54
2.6.6 EMBRYO HATCHING ASSAY	55

CHAPTER 3: GENERATION AND ANALYSIS OF A DOMINANT DRAD21 ALLELE	56
3.1 INTRODUCTION	57
3.2 RESULTS	58
3.2.1 IDENTIFICATION OF PUTATIVE SEPARASE CLEAVAGE SITES IN DRAD21	58
3.2.2 GENERATION OF PUTATIVE CLEAVAGE-RESISTANT DRAD21 ISOFORMS	61
3.2.2.1 <i>Germline transformation of Drosophila embryos</i>	64
3.2.3 ECTOPIC EXPRESSION OF PUTATIVE CLEAVAGE-RESISTANT DRAD21 ISOFORMS	66
3.2.3.1 <i>Tissue specific expression of altered forms of DRAD21: The gal4 UAS system</i>	66
3.2.3.2 <i>Ectopic expression of putative cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms</i> ...	66
3.2.3.3 <i>Loss of Drad21cDNA sequences from some transgenic lines</i>	68
3.2.3.4 <i>Ectopic expression of putative cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms in the differentiating cells of the eye imaginal disc</i>	70
3.2.3.5 <i>Generation of stable lines expressing the putative cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms</i>	72
3.2.4 ANALYSIS OF THE DOMINANT REDUCED AND ROUGHENED EYE PHENOTYPE ...	73
3.2.4.1 <i>Preferential cleavage of DRAD21 following arginine 474</i>	73
3.2.4.2 <i>GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye disc cells are disorganised</i>	76
3.2.4.3 <i>Overexpression of cleavage-resistant DRAD21 leads to increased levels of apoptosis</i>	77
3.2.4.4 <i>Mitotic progression is disrupted in GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye discs</i>	79
3.2.5 ECTOPIC EXPRESSION OF CLEAVAGE-RESISTANT DRAD21 ISOFORMS IN THE DEVELOPING EYE AND WING	81
3.2.5.1 <i>Ectopic expression of cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms in the asynchronously cycling cells of the eye imaginal disc</i>	81
3.2.5.2 <i>Ectopic expression of cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms in the wing imaginal disc</i>	82
3.3 DISCUSSION	84
3.3.1 METAZOAN MODEL OF ANEUPLOIDY	84
3.3.2 A ROLE FOR DRAD21 IN APOPTOSIS?	85
3.3.3 GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} AND GENETIC MODIFIERS	86

CHAPTER 4: A GENOME-WIDE MODIFIER SCREEN TO IDENTIFY NOVEL REGULATORS OF METAZOAN CHROMOSOME SEGREGATION	87
4.1 INTRODUCTION	88
4.1.1 COHESIN AND GENETIC SCREENS	88
4.1.4 STRATEGIES FOR GENETIC SCREENS IN <i>DROSOPHILA</i>	88
4.2 RESULTS	90
4.2.1 THE GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} PHENOTYPE CAN BE MODIFIED BY BOTH KNOWN AND PREDICTED COHESIN REGULATORS	90
4.2.2 GENOME-WIDE SCREEN FOR SECOND SITE MODIFIERS OF GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} REDUCED AND DISORGANISED EYE PHENOTYPE	93
4.2.2.1 Overview	93
4.2.2.2 X-chromosome Deficiency Kit stocks that modify the GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} phenotype	93
4.2.2.3 Second chromosome deficiency kit stocks that modify the GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} phenotype	96
4.2.2.3.1 Redundancy in the number of interacting regions on the second chromosome	99
4.2.2.4 Third chromosome deletions that modify the GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} phenotype	100
4.2.2.4.1 Redundancy in the number of interacting regions on the third chromosome	103
4.2.2.5 Fourth chromosome deletions that modify the GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} phenotype	104
4.2.3 PHENOTYPIC SUB-CATEGORIES OF GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} MODULATION	104
4.2.3.1 Overview	104
4.2.3.2 Suppressors clearly fall into six phenotypic classes	104
4.2.3.3 Enhancers fall into three phenotypic classes	108
4.2.4 SECOND-PASS SCREENING TO ELIMINATE MODIFIERS OF APOPTOSIS	111
4.3 DISCUSSION	114
4.3.1 SUITABILITY OF THE GMR> DRAD21 ^{DM} EYE PHENOTYPE FOR USE IN A GENETIC SCREEN	114
4.3.2 SUMMARY OF GENOME WIDE SCREEN USING THE DEFICIENCY KIT	116
4.3.3 POTENTIAL IDENTIFICATION OF NOVEL PRO AND ANTI-APOPTOTIC GENES	118

CHAPTER 5: IDENTIFICATION OF GENETIC MODIFIER LOCI AT THE MOLECULAR LEVEL	120
5.1 INTRODUCTION	121
5.1.1 IDENTIFICATION OF INTERACTING REGIONS.....	121
5.2 RESULTS	122
5.2.1 OVERVIEW	122
5.2.2 IDENTIFICATION OF <i>CYCLINA</i> AS THE SUPPRESSOR LOCUS IN REGION S122 ...	123
5.2.2.1 <i>S122 region overview</i>	123
5.2.2.2 <i>Genetic dissection of region S122</i>	124
5.2.2.3 <i>Proposed mechanism of suppression</i>	126
5.2.3 IDENTIFICATION OF <i>EIF-4A</i> AS THE SUPPRESSOR LOCUS IN REGION S107	128
5.2.3.1 <i>S107 region overview</i>	128
5.2.3.2 <i>Genetic dissection of S107</i>	129
5.2.2.3 <i>Proposed mechanism of suppression</i>	132
5.2.4 IDENTIFICATION OF <i>HDAC4</i> AS THE SUPPRESSOR LOCUS IN REGION S79	133
5.2.4.1 <i>S79 region overview</i>	133
5.2.4.2 <i>Genetic dissection of region S79</i>	133
5.2.4.3 <i>Proposed mechanism of suppression</i>	137
5.2.5 IDENTIFICATION OF <i>DUP</i> AS THE SUPPRESSOR LOCUS IN REGION S67	138
5.2.5.1 <i>S67 region overview</i>	138
5.2.5.2 <i>Genetic dissection of region S67</i>	138
5.2.5.3 <i>Proposed mechanism of suppression</i>	141
5.2.6 IDENTIFICATION OF <i>SCM13</i> AS THE SUPPRESSOR LOCUS IN REGION S81	142
5.2.6.1 <i>S81 region overview</i>	142
5.2.6.2 <i>Genetic dissection of region S81</i>	143
5.2.6.3 <i>Proposed mechanism of suppression</i>	146
5.2.7 IDENTIFICATION OF <i>PROD</i> AS THE SUPPRESSOR LOCUS IN REGION S164.....	147
5.2.7.1 <i>S164 region overview</i>	147
5.2.7.2 <i>Genetic dissection of region S164</i>	147
5.2.7.3 <i>Proposed mechanism of suppression</i>	151
5.2.8 IDENTIFICATION OF <i>CDK7</i> AS THE SUPPRESSOR LOCUS IN REGIONS S82 AND S158	151
5.2.8.1 <i>S82 and S152 regions and genetic dissection</i>	151
5.2.8.1 <i>Proposed mechanism of suppression</i>	155
5.2.9 IDENTIFICATION OF <i>KNI</i> AS THE ENHANCER LOCUS IN REGION E97	156
5.2.9.1 <i>E97 region overview</i>	156
5.2.9.2 <i>Genetic dissection of region E97</i>	156
5.2.9.3 <i>Proposed mechanism of enhancement</i>	160
5.2.10 COMPLEX GENETIC INTERACTIONS IN ENHANCER REGION E60.....	161
5.2.10.1 <i>E60 region overview</i>	161
5.2.10.2 <i>Genetic dissection of region E60</i>	161
5.2.10.3 <i>Proposed mechanisms of interaction</i>	165
5.2.10.3.1 <i>Proposed mechanism of enhancement by mle</i>	166
5.2.10.3.2 <i>Proposed mechanism of enhancement by EcR</i>	166
5.2.10.3.3 <i>Proposed mechanism of suppression by Src42A</i>	167

5.2.11 COMPLEX GENETIC INTERACTIONS IN CYTOLOGICAL REGIONS 26, 27 AND 28 OF CHROMOSOME 2L.....	169
5.2.11.1 Region overview.....	169
5.2.11.2 Genetic dissection of region	170
5.2.11.3 Suppressor regions 27C2-3; 27C4-5 and 27C4-5;27D1-2.....	172
5.2.11.4 Enhancer regions 26F4;27C1 and 28A4;28D1.....	175
5.2.11.5 Proposed mechanism of suppression by <i>Hrb27C</i>	176
5.2.11.6 Proposed mechanism of suppression by <i>smt3</i>	177
5.3 DISCUSSION	178
5.3.1 IDENTIFICATION OF INTERACTING LOCI.....	178
5.3.2 PROS AND CONS OF USING THE DEFICIENCY KIT TO SCREEN THE GENOME ...	179
5.3.3 PROS AND CONS OF USING THE CANDIDATE GENE APPROACH TO IDENTIFY INTERACTING LOCI	180
5.3.4 THREE MAIN SUPPRESSION MECHANISMS	181
5.3.4.1 Suppression by histone modification	181
5.3.4.2 Suppression by M-phase regulation	182
5.3.4.3 Suppression by regulation of sister chromatid separation, or cohesin	183
5.3.5 FUTURE DIRECTIONS	184
5.3.5.1 Identification of remaining <i>GMR>DRAD21^{DM}</i> modifiers.....	184
5.3.5.2 Analysis of identified modifiers.....	185
5.3.5.3 Quantitation of interaction phenotypes	185
CHAPTER 6: FINAL DISCUSSION.....	187
6.1 INTRODUCTION	188
6.2 THIS STUDY	189
6.3 FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	192
6.3.1 IDENTIFICATION OF OTHER INTERACTING LOCI AT THE MOLECULAR LEVEL ..	192
6.4 IMPLICATIONS	193
6.4.1 HUMAN DISEASE.....	193
6.4.2 <i>GMR>DRAD21^{DM}</i> AS A MODEL OF MEIOSIS I NON-DISJUNCTION	195
6.5 FINAL COMMENTS.....	197
BIBLIOGRAPHY	198
APPENDIX 1.....	216
APPENDIX 2.....	221

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. 1: Comparison of the main features of mitosis and meiosis	5
Table 2. 1: <i>E.coli</i> strains and genotypes.....	42
Table 2. 2: Oligonucleotides used in this study and their sequences.....	45
Table 3. 1: Transgenic lines generated in this study	65
Table 3. 2: Overexpression of altered DRAD21 forms.....	67
Table 4. 1: Modulation of the GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} eye phenotype by known and predicted cohesin interactors	92
Table 4. 2: X Chromosome modifiers of GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} eye phenotype.....	94
Table 4. 3: Second chromosome modifiers of the GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} phenotype....	98
Table 4. 4: Third Chromosome modifiers of the GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} eye phenotype	102
Table 4. 5: Suppressor interactions fall into six phenotypic classes.....	105
Table 4. 6: Enhancer interactions fall within three broad categories.....	108
Table 4. 7: Modifiers eliminated from further analysis due to alteration of the GMRhid phenotype.....	113
Table 5. 1: GMR>DRAD21 ^{DM} interacting loci identified	178

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. 1: <i>The typical eukaryotic cell cycle</i>	4
Figure 1. 2: <i>The cytological features of mitosis</i>	6
Figure 1. 3: <i>The cytological features of meiosis</i>	7
Figure 1. 4: <i>Correct chromosome segregation in mitosis and meiosis required sister chromatid cohesion</i>	10
Figure 1. 5: <i>Schematic of the eye imaginal disc</i>	16
Figure 1. 6: <i>The Gal4-UAS system</i>	17
Figure 1. 7: <i>The cohesin complex</i>	23
Figure 1. 8: <i>Cohesin is pushed to sites of convergent transcription by the transcription apparatus</i>	26
Figure 1. 9: <i>Cohesin is removed from metazoan chromosomes in two distinct steps</i>	30
Figure 1. 10: <i>The RAD21/REC8 family of proteins</i>	37
Figure 2. 1: <i>pUAST transformation vector</i>	41
Figure 2. 2: <i>The Drosophila polytene chromosomes</i>	52
Figure 3. 1: <i>Separase cleavage sites</i>	59
Figure 3. 2: <i>Identification of putative DRAD21 separase cleavage sites</i>	61
Figure 3. 3: <i>Site-directed mutagenesis to create cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms</i>	62
Figure 3. 4: <i>Transformation constructs</i>	63
Figure 3. 5: <i>PCR diagnostic test for the presence of Drad21 transgenes</i>	69
Figure 3. 6: <i>GMR-Gal4 overexpression of putative cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms</i>	71
Figure 3. 7: <i>Biochemical analysis of DRAD21 cleavage</i>	75
Figure 3. 8: <i>Western blot of eye imaginal disc extracts</i>	75
Figure 3. 9: <i>Neuronal cells in the imaginal disc are disorganised</i>	76
Figure 3. 10: <i>Over-expression of Drad21 cleavage mutants causes increased apoptosis</i>	78
Figure 3. 11: <i>Progression through mitosis is perturbed in eye discs expressing GMR>DRAD21^{DM}</i>	80
Figure 3. 12: <i>ey-Gal4 overexpression of cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms</i>	82
Figure 3. 13: <i>Overexpression of cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms in the developing wing</i>	83

Figure 4. 1: <i>The GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype can be modified by known cohesin regulators.....</i>	91
Figure 4. 2: <i>Identification of X chromosome modifiers of GMR>DRAD21^{DM}</i>	95
Figure 4. 3: <i>S82 and S158 suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype to similar extents</i>	96
Figure 4. 4: <i>Identification of second chromosome modifiers of GMR>DRAD21^{DM}</i>	97
Figure 4. 5: <i>Overlapping deficiencies modify GMR>DRAD21^{DM} to similar extents</i>	100
Figure 4. 6: <i>Identification of third chromosome modifiers of GMR>DRAD21^{DM} ...</i>	101
Figure 4. 7: <i>Overlapping deficiencies modify GMR>DRAD21^{DM} to similar extents</i>	103
Figure 4. 8: <i>Strong, Moderate-Strong and Mixed suppressor classes.....</i>	106
Figure 4. 9: <i>Weak1, Weak 2 and Weak 3 suppressor classes</i>	107
Figure 4. 10: <i>Strong and moderate enhancer classes</i>	109
Figure 4. 11: <i>Weak enhancer class</i>	110
Figure 4. 12: <i>Second-pass screening to identify modifiers of apoptosis.....</i>	112
Figure 4. 13: <i>Model for enhancement/suppression by separase and scc2.....</i>	115
Figure 4. 14: <i>Suppressor and enhancer regions occur throughout the genome</i>	117
Figure 5. 1: <i>Flow chart of the approaches used to identify GMR>DRAD21^{DM} interacting loci.....</i>	122
Figure 5. 2: <i>Mutations in Cyclin A suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype</i>	124
Figure 5. 3: <i>Schematic of the region responsible for the S122 interaction.....</i>	126
Figure 5. 4: <i>Mutations in Cyclin B suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype</i>	127
Figure 5. 5: <i>Schematic of the region responsible for the S107 interaction.....</i>	131
Figure 5. 6: <i>Mutations in eIF-4a suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype.....</i>	131
Figure 5. 7: <i>Schematic of the region responsible for the S79 interaction.....</i>	135
Figure 5. 8: <i>Mutations in HDAC4 suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype</i>	136
Figure 5. 9: <i>Schematic of the region responsible for the S67 interaction.....</i>	140
Figure 5. 10: <i>Mutations in Dup suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype</i>	141
Figure 5. 11: <i>Schematic of the region responsible for the S81 interaction.....</i>	145

Figure 5. 12: <i>Mutations in Scim13 suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype</i>	146
Figure 5. 13: <i>S164 and S91 suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype to different extents.</i>	148
Figure 5. 14: <i>Schematic of the region responsible for the S164 interaction.</i>	150
Figure 5. 15: <i>A prod insertion allele suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype</i>	150
Figure 5. 16: <i>S82 and S158 suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype to similar extents</i>	152
Figure 5. 17: <i>Schematic of the region responsible for the S82 and S158 interactions</i>	154
Figure 5. 18: <i>A Cdk7 null allele suppresses the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype</i>	155
Figure 5. 19: <i>E97 and E99 enhance the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype to different extents.</i>	157
Figure 5. 20: <i>Schematic of region deleted to produce the E97interaction</i>	158
Figure 5. 21: <i>Two different kni alleles enhance the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype</i>	159
Figure 5. 22: <i>Schematic of region deleted to produce the E60 interaction</i>	163
Figure 5. 23: <i>Different genetic interactions act together in region E60 to produce the observed enhancement phenotype</i>	165
Figure 5. 24: <i>Src42A is likely to function as a positive regulator of cell division in the Drosophila eye</i>	168
Figure 5. 25: <i>The GMR>DRAD21^{DM} phenotype is enhanced and suppressed by deletions in region 26-28 of chromosome 2L</i>	169
Figure 5. 26: <i>Schematic of the complex genetic interactions in polytene divisions 26, 27 and 28</i>	172
Figure 5. 27: <i>Two different Hrb27C alleles suppress the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype</i>	173
Figure 5. 28: <i>The smt3⁰⁴⁴⁹³ insertion allele suppresses the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} size defect</i>	174

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

aa	Amino Acid
BL	US <i>Drosophila</i> stock centre at Bloomington, Indiana
bp	Base pair
BSA	Bovine serum albumin
cDNA	DNA that is synthesised from a messenger RNA template
CO₂	Carbon dioxide
Df	Deficiency
dH₂O	Distilled water
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
DTT	Dithiothreitol
ECL	Enhanced chemi-luminescence
EDTA	Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid
G0	Parental generation
G1	First generation
G2	Second generation
GMR>	GMR-Gal4 induced transgene expression
HPLC	High Performance liquid chromatography
IPTG	Isopropyl-beta-D-thiogalactopyranoside
kb	Kilobase
kDa	Kilodalton
LB	Luria Bertani media
MF	Morphogenetic furrow
PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
PBT	Phosphate buffered saline plus 0.1% Tween-20
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
rpm	Revolutions per minute
SAP	Shrimp Alkaline Phosphatase
SB	Squishing buffer
SDS	Sodium dodecylsulfate
SMC	Structural maintenance of chromosomes
UAS	Upstream activation sequence
X-Gal	5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl-bD-galactoside

Addendum and Erratum

The following information should be added to, and/or considered with, the indicated thesis sections.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Figures 1.2 (on page 6) and 1.3 (on page 7) insert the following after the first sentence of each figure legend:

The centrosome, indicated as a black dot, is the microtubule organising centre of animal cells and also replicates during cell division to form the spindle poles.

Figure 1.5 on page 16; insert the following after the third sentence of the figure legend:

Posterior is to the left and anterior to the right.

Chapter 2: Materials and Methods

Section 2.6.5: Screening for genetic interactors. On page 55, insert the following after the first complete sentence on this page:

When comparing the effect of halving the dose of one or a number of genes by comparing affected and control siblings it was necessary to compare flies of the same sex. This is necessary as the male flies are smaller than the females, and therefore have smaller eyes.

Chapter 3: Generation and analysis of a dominant *Drad21* allele

Sections 3.2.4.3 and 3.2.5.2: On pages 77 (section 3.2.4.3) and 82 (section 3.2.5.2) the following needs to be added after the final sentence of each section:

The observed and/or predicted apoptosis may not be directly due to the expression of *Drad21^{DM}*, but a secondary effect due the inability to efficiently segregate chromosomes at anaphase. Irrespective of the direct apoptotic trigger, it is indisputable that the dominant phenotypes observed are at least in part due to an increase in the level of apoptosis.

Table 3.2 on page 67, the following should replace the descriptor “none” in the table:

WT

Figures 3.9 (page 76) and 3.10 (page 78), insert the following after the final sentence of each figure legend:

Anterior is to the left and posterior to the right.

Figure 3.11 on page 80, insert the following before the final sentence of the figure legend:

Overexpression of cyclinE using the GMR driver induces additional S-phases and subsequent mitoses which ultimately results in the differentiation of extra-numerary ommatidia and an enlarged, roughened and disorganised eye phenotype (see also sections 1.2.2.1 and 1.2.2.2).

Section 3.2.5.1: Ectopic expression of cleavage-resistant DRAD21 isoforms in the asynchronously cycling cells of the eye imaginal disc. On page 81, replace paragraph two, sentence four with:

In contrast, overexpression of one copy of the *Drad21^{RA474AG}* or of *Drad21^{DM}* transgenes in this pattern resulted in a reduction in the amount of adult eye tissue but did not appear to affect the organisation of the ommatidia to anywhere near the same extent as GMR driven expression.

Section 3.2.2: A role for DRAD21 in apoptosis? On page 85, replace paragraph one, sentence three with:

Cleavage of human RAD21 by caspases 3 and 7 has been shown to occur before the condensation of apoptotic chromatin and the resultant ~65kDa protein is required to amplify the cell death signal within the cell (Chen et al., 2002, Pati et al., 2002). Whether caspases are capable of cleaving *Drosophila* RAD21 could be assayed using commercially available enzymes and immuno-purified DRAD21 as a substrate. Additional investigations into the role of DRAD21 in apoptosis could also involve *in silico* analyses of the protein sequence to identify likely caspase cleavage sites and overexpression of the predicted cleavage products in flies and cell culture to see if they were capable of inducing apoptosis.

Chapter 4: Genome-wide modifier screen to identify novel regulators of metazoan chromosome segregation

Table 4.1 on page 92; insert the following columns after column titled “Gene Name”:

Function	Page reference
Cohesin	22-24, 27-28, 30, 35-36, 137, 173 and 183
DNA replication (PCNA)	160
Proteolysis	116
DNA helicase	
Chromosome segregation	27-33, 35-36, 43, 57-59, 61, 63, 70, 72-75, 84, 90-92, 114-115, 176-177, 181-183, 189-90
Mitotic kinase	29
DNA damage checkpoint	
Proteolysis	116
Mitotic kinase	181 and 183
separate	27-33, 35-36, 43, 57-59, 61, 63, 70, 72-75, 84, 90-92, 114-115, 176-177, 181-183, 189-90
DNA helicase	
Mitotic checkpoint	
DNA damage response	
Proteasome subunit	
Proteolysis	116
Proteolysis	
Mitotic exit	
Condensation and cell proliferation	147-148, 150-151, 180-181
Cell cycle progression	
Sister chromatid cohesion	
Mitotic kinase	27, 29, 163, 181, 183
Mitotic kinase	27, 29, 163, 181, 183
Proteasome	
securin	27,32-33,35,126-127, 176
Mitotic progression, anaphase entry	126-127, 154-155, 190
development	
Transcription, cohesion loading	21, 24-25, 35, 90-91,114-115, 140-141, 183 and 194
cohesin	22, 24,27-28, 30, 35-36, 137, 173 and 183
Centromeric cohesion	31, 35 and 114

Chapter 5: Identification of genetic modifier loci at the molecular level

Section 5.2.2.1: S122 Region overview. On page 123 replace paragraph one sentence two with:

This phenotype is characterised by a weak suppression of both the size and organisation defects of the GMR>DRAD21^{DM} eye phenotype (Figure 4.9, Table 4.5).

Section 5.2.2.2: Genetic dissection of region S122. On page 124 replace paragraph two sentence two with:

Both *CycA* alleles tested were capable of suppressing the reduced and roughened GMR>DRAD21DM eye phenotype to similar extents (Figure 5.2).

Section 5.2.3.1: S107 Region overview. On page 128 insert the following after the final sentence of paragraph two:

PTEN is an important cell growth regulator and plays an essential role in the regulation of both cell growth and cell division (Gao et al., 2000) through suppression of PI3K-dependent signaling (Maehama et al., 2004).

Section 5.2.5.2: Genetic dissection of region S67. On pages 140-141, replace the sentence that spans these pages with the following:

All four were shown to modulate the GMR>DRAD21DM phenotype, primarily by increasing the organisation of the eye (Figure 5.10).

Section 5.2.6.2: Genetic dissection of region S81. On page 145 replace paragraph two with the following:

LILLIPUTIAN is a protein involved in the regulation of cell size and cytokinesis (Maehama et al 2004, Tepass et al 2001) and is encoded by *lilli* located at 23B7-23C2. *lilli* genetically interacts with the *Pten* tumour suppressor gene (Maehama et al 2004), further supporting its role in the correct execution of the cell cycle, however, the *lillik*⁰⁵⁴³¹ insertion allele failed to significantly modify the GMR>DRAD21DM phenotype.

Section 5.2.10.2: Genetic dissection of region E60. On page 164 replace the final sentence of the last paragraph with the following:

Src42A^{KG02515} suppresses both the size and organisation defects to a moderate extent, whilst *Scr42A*^{myr1} and *Src42A*^{E1} mildly suppress the size and organization defects. This difference in the level of suppression is most likely to be due to the different strengths of the alleles tested, with the *Src42A*^{KG02515} insertion allele retaining the least amount of wild-type function.

5.2.10.3.3 Proposed mechanism of suppression by Src42A. On page 123 replace the fourth sentence of this section with the following:

Drosophila C-terminal SRC kinase, CSK, negatively regulates SRC42A mediated signaling, and SRC42a has been demonstrated to signal through JNK and JAK/STAT pathways to promote proliferation, and through the JAK/STAT pathway to trigger apoptosis (Read et al 2004, Laberge et al., 2005).

References cited in Addendum that do not appear in bibliography

MAEHAMA, T., KOSAKA, N., OKAHARA, F., TAKEUCHI, K.-I., UMEDA, M., DIXON, J. E. & KANAHO, Y. (2004) Suppression of a phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase signal by a specific spliced variant of *Drosophila* PTEN. *FEBS Letters*, 565, 43-47.