

1 **Brief Report**

2

3 **HC-Pro hypo- and hypersuppressor mutants: differences in**
4 **viral siRNA accumulation *in vivo* and siRNA binding activity**
5 ***in vitro***

6

7 **Clara Torres-Barceló^a, José-Antonio Daròs^a and Santiago F. Elena^{a,b,*}**

8

9 ^aInstituto de Biología Molecular y Celular de Plantas, Consejo Superior de
10 Investigaciones Científicas-UPV, Ingeniero Fausto Elio s/n, 46022 València, Spain,

11 ^bThe Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, NM 87501, USA

12 *Corresponding author: Instituto de Biología Molecular y Celular de Plantas (CSIC-
13 UPV), Ingeniero Fausto Elio s/n, 46022 València, Spain. Tel.: +34 963 877 895; fax:

14 +34 963 877 859. E-mail: sfelena@ibmcp.upv.es

15

1 **Abstract**

2 Viruses have evolved mechanisms to suppress the RNA silencing defense of their hosts,
3 allowing replication and systemic colonization. In a recent study, we found that the
4 effect of mutations in the RNA silencing suppressor of *Tobacco etch virus* (TEV) was
5 variable, ranging from complete abolition of suppressor activity to significantly stronger
6 suppression. Whereas hyposuppressor mutants were less virulent and accumulated less
7 viral particles than wildtype, hypersuppressors induced symptoms similar to wildtype
8 and accumulated to similar levels. Here we further characterize a set of these mutants in
9 terms of their ability to bind *in vitro* and induce accumulation *in vivo* of virus-derived
10 siRNAs. Hyposuppressor alleles are less efficient binding siRNAs than
11 hypersuppressors, whereas the latter are not different from the wildtype. As a
12 consequence of lower viral accumulation, plants infected with virus bearing a
13 hyposuppressor allele also accumulate less virus-derived siRNAs.

14

1 **Main text**

2 HC-Pro was the first viral protein identified as a suppressor of RNA silencing
3 [1,3,8,14]. Different experiments have led to propose models for the mechanism of HC-
4 Pro silencing suppression, one of them being the inhibition of RISC assembly through
5 sequestering 21-nt siRNA. Duplex-siRNA binding represents a common mechanism
6 for RNA silencing suppression that has independently evolved in, at least, the families
7 *Tombusviridae*, *Potyviridae* and *Closteroviridae* of positive-strand RNA viruses [9].

8 In a previous study, we described the effect of amino acid substitutions on the RNA
9 silencing suppressor activity of *Tobacco etch virus* (TEV, genus *Potyvirus*, family
10 *Potyviridae*) HC-Pro [16]. We estimated the relative suppression activity of a collection
11 of HC-Pro alleles by quantifying the amount of GFP mRNA, by real-time quantitative
12 RT-PCR, after co-infiltrating *Nicotiana benthamiana* leaves with cDNAs carrying each
13 allele together with a plasmid expressing a GFP reporter [7]. Among these mutants,
14 three caused a significant decrease in the activity (hyposuppressors) and five
15 significantly increased it (hypersuppressors). Interestingly, the match between
16 suppression activity and virus accumulation and virulence was imperfect. Despite
17 heterogeneity among HC-Pro alleles, virus carrying hyposuppressor alleles
18 accumulated, on average, less and produced milder infections than the wildtype virus.
19 By contrast, virus carrying hypersuppressor alleles did not differ, on average, from the
20 wildtype virus in either trait [16]. To gain further insights into the relative impact that
21 mutations in HC-Pro exert over the silencing pathway, here we examine the effect of
22 some mutants in the metabolism of viral siRNAs, both *in vivo* and *in vitro*.

23 First, we examined whether the different HC-Pro mutants selected differentially
24 affect the accumulation of TEV-derived siRNAs. A radioactively labeled *in vitro*
25 transcript corresponding to the plus strand of TEV was used as probe in a northern blot

1 analysis. Total RNA was extracted from 0.25 g of tissue from inoculated plants with
2 Trizol (Invitrogen) and the small RNA fraction (< 200 nt) purified with the miRACLE
3 miRNA Isolation Kit (Stratagene). Equal amounts of small RNAs were separated by
4 denaturing PAGE in a 15% gel. Fig. 1 shows the signal intensities of the siRNA
5 hybridization bands in the northern blot analysis of *N. benthamiana* plants infected with
6 different TEV clones bearing several HC-Pro hypo- and hypersuppressors alleles, as
7 well as the wildtype. The sensitivity of the method to detect differences between
8 genotypes was evaluated as the percentage of added variance component over the total
9 observed variance [15]. The maximum likelihood estimator of this variance component
10 was 90.24%, indicating that the method is quite sensitive. A nested ANOVA, in which
11 each allele was nested within its corresponding suppression category, revealed that
12 significant differences exist among suppressor categories on the amount of TEV-
13 derived siRNAs accumulated in infected plants ($F_{3,6} = 72.720$, $P < 0.001$) despite
14 different alleles within each category were also heterogeneous in their response ($F_{6,18} =$
15 6.763 , $P = 0.001$). A *post-hoc* Tukey's test [15] shows that plants infected with
16 hyposuppressor HC-Pro alleles produced significantly less TEV-specific siRNAs than
17 wildtype. However, this amount did not differ among hypersuppressor and wildtype
18 alleles ($P = 0.848$). On average, plants infected with hyposuppressor alleles
19 accumulated five-fold less (12.480 ± 3.946 (\pm SEM)) TEV-specific siRNAs than plants
20 infected with the wildtype virus (74.407 ± 26.692) and hypersuppressor mutants (67.979
21 ± 9.272).

22 This pattern closely matches that observed for the relationship between suppressor
23 activity and viral load reported in our previous work: both wildtype and
24 hypersuppressor mutants produced, on average, equal amounts of infectious viral
25 particles, whereas hyposuppressor mutants produced, on average, less infectious viral

1 particles [16]. Indeed, a significant correlation exists between siRNA accumulation and
2 viral load (Spearman's $\rho_s = 0.833$, 6 d.f., $P = 0.010$), which suggests that the former
3 may be a direct consequence of the latter. This is not surprising at all, since it was
4 shown that viral genomic RNA and virus-derived 21-nt siRNAs both increase during
5 the time course of an infection [9], suggesting that siRNA production is not inhibited *in*
6 *vivo* by the suppressor protein. In our study, we have quantified both free and protein-
7 bound (including HC-Pro-sequestered) siRNAs and, therefore, the total amount of
8 siRNAs cannot be taken as a direct proof of the suppression strength of each mutant.
9 Moreover, it has been postulated that HC-Pro acts in other steps along the RNA
10 silencing pathway and mutations may be affecting them and not necessarily siRNAs
11 sequestration. However, this interpretation is not fully satisfactory when the
12 maintenance/amplification step of plant RNA silencing is incorporated into the picture;
13 since an efficient suppression would clearly lower siRNAs levels [5].

14 As a consequence of these results, we further analyzed the most interesting HC-Pro
15 alleles with regard to their activity of binding *in vitro* 21-nt siRNA duplexes containing
16 3' 2-nt overhangs in an *in vivo/in vitro* assay. We transiently expressed different HC-
17 Pro hyper- and hiposuppressor alleles in *N. benthamiana* leaves using normalized
18 amounts of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* cultures. The *A. tumefaciens* clones were
19 transformed with the expression vector pBIN61 containing the different mutant HC-Pro
20 cDNA as well as the wildtype [12,16]. Total plant proteins were purified from the
21 agroinfiltrated areas and the concentration normalized to correct differences during
22 extraction and an electrophoretic mobility shift assay (EMSA) performed using a ³²P-
23 labelled 21-nt dsRNA with 2-nt 3' overhangs [11]. Each HC-Pro allele was assayed by
24 triplicate.. As before, we also evaluated the sensitivity of this method for detecting

1 differences between genotypes. In this case the added variance component among HC-
2 Pro alleles is 92.82% of the total (phenotypic) variance, indicating a good sensitivity.

3 A nested ANOVA of the EMSA data (Fig. 2) highlights significant differences
4 among suppressor categories in their capacity to bind siRNAs ($F_{3,6} = 34.034$, $P < 0.001$)
5 despite the heterogeneity observed between alleles within categories ($F_{6,18} = 3.312$, $P =$
6 0.022). Once again, a Tukey's test supports the notion that hyposuppressors bind 21-nt
7 siRNAs six-fold less efficiently than the other alleles, whereas differences between
8 wildtype and hypersuppressors are not significant. On the one hand, the binding
9 phenotype is not correlated with the accumulation of specific siRNAs in TEV-infected
10 plants ($\rho_S = 0.517$, 7 d.f., $P = 0.154$) or the number of viral particles ($\rho_S = 0.071$, 6 d.f.,
11 $P = 0.867$). On the other hand, the binding phenotype was positively correlated ($\rho_S =$
12 0.717 , 7 d.f., $P = 0.030$) with the silencing suppression activity quantified for the HC-
13 Pro alleles [16].

14 It has been postulated that two RNA-binding motifs (A and B) are present within the
15 central region of HC-Pro [13]. Interestingly, mutations in the two hyposuppressor
16 alleles showing the weakest binding activity and the lowest TEV-derived siRNA
17 accumulation (Fig. 2; CLA2 and AS13) are located within these domains [16]. The
18 third hyposuppressor mutation (AS20), however, is located at the C-terminus of the
19 molecule, which may interact with the central domain to mediate the suppressor activity
20 [17]. The hypersuppressor mutation PC22 is also located in the RNA-binding motif A.
21 Although its binding phenotype does not differ from wildtype (Fig. 2), the amount of
22 TEV-derived siRNA that accumulate in its presence is the lowest among
23 hypersuppressors (Fig. 1), suggesting that it may interfere with siRNA accumulation by
24 a mechanism different from sequestration.

1 Summarizing the above results, the amount of TEV-derived siRNAs accumulated
2 during the infection of *N. benthamiana* plants has no direct relationship with the activity
3 of HC-Pro sequestering siRNAs. These results suggest that HC-Pro hypersuppression
4 was not achieved by an increase in the ability to bind 21-nt siRNAs. What may be then
5 the mechanism for hypersuppression? It has been suggested [2] that HC-Pro interferes
6 with the RNA silencing machinery at other levels, e.g., through activation of an
7 endogenous silencing suppressor of the host. Two recent studies [6,18] have shown that
8 HC-Pro significantly reduces siRNAs 3'-methylation of siRNAs, making them sensible
9 to oligouridilation and subsequent degradation [10] and avoiding their incorporation
10 into RISC. Therefore, since we have not found a correlation between HC-Pro
11 hypersuppression and siRNA binding activity, we can postulate that hypersuppression
12 may be associated with alterations in siRNA methylation or with changes in the ability
13 to interact with endogenous suppressors of RNA silencing. Finally, as pointed out in
14 our previous work, it is worth taking into account the hierarchical action of the different
15 Dicer proteins [4] when thinking about HC-Pro interaction with the RNA silencing
16 pathway. An attractive hypothesis would be that wildtype HC-Pro preferentially
17 sequesters 21-nt siRNAs, but some hypersuppressors may bind more efficiently 22-nt
18 siRNAs.

19 **Acknowledgements** We thank J. Marqués, S. Martín and M.Á. Nohales for comments
20 and suggestions, Z. Mérai and A. Valli for protocols, and A. Cuadrado and F. de la
21 Iglesia for excellent technical assistance. This work was supported by grants from the
22 Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (MICINN)-Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo
23 Regional (BFU2006-14819-C02-01/BMC), the Generalitat Valenciana (ACOMP07-
24 263) and the European Molecular Biology Organization Young Investigator Program to

1 S.F.E and by grant BIO2008-01986 (MICINN) to J.A.D. C.T.B. was supported by a
2 predoctoral fellowship from the Generalitat Valenciana.

3


4 **References**

- 5 1. Anandalakshmi R, Pruss GJ, Ge X, Marathe R, Mallory AC, Smith TH, Vance VB
6 (1998) A viral suppressor of gene silencing in plants. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA
7 95:13079-13084
- 8 2. Anandalakshmi R, Marathe R, Ge X, Herr JM, Mau C, Mallory A, Pruss G,
9 Bowman L, Vance VB (2000) A calmodulin-related protein that suppresses
10 posttranscriptional gene silencing in plants. Science 290:142-144
- 11 3. Brigneti G, Voinnet O, Li WX, Ji LH, Ding SW, Baulcombe DC (1998) Viral
12 pathogenicity determinants are suppressors of transgene silencing in *Nicotiana*
13 *benthamiana*. EMBO J 17:6739-6746
- 14 4. Deleris A, Gallego-Bartolome J, Bao JS, Kasschau KD, Carrington JC, Voinnet O
15 (2006) Hierarchical action and inhibition of plant Dicer-like proteins in antiviral
16 defense. Science 313:68-71
- 17 5. Dunoyer P, Voinnet O (2008) Mixing and matching: the essence of plant systemic
18 silencing? Trends Genet 24:151-154
- 19 6. Ebhardt HA, Thi EP, Wang MB, Unrau PJ (2005) Extensive 3' modification of
20 plant small RNAs is modulated by helper component-proteinase expression. Proc
21 Natl Acad Sci USA 102:13398-13403
- 22 7. Johansen LK, Carrington JC (2001) Silencing on the spot: induction and
23 suppression of RNA silencing in the *Agrobacterium*-mediated transient expression
24 system. Plant Physiol 126:930-938

- 1 8. Kasschau KD, Carrington JC (1998) A counterdefensive strategy of plant viruses:
2 Suppression of posttranscriptional gene silencing. *Cell* 95:461-470
- 3 9. Lakatos L, Csorba T, Pantaleo V, Chapman EJ, Carrington JC, Liu YP, Dolja, VV,
4 Fernández Calvino L, López-Moya JJ, Burgyán J (2006) Small RNA binding is a
5 common strategy to suppress RNA silencing by several viral suppressors. *EMBO J*
6 25:2768-2780
- 7 10. Lozsa R, Csorba T, Lakatos L, Burgyán J (2008) Inhibition of 3' modification of
8 small RNAs in virus-infected plants require spatial and temporal co-expression of
9 small RNAs and viral silencing-suppressor proteins. *Nucl Acids Res* 36:4099-4107
- 10 11. Mérai Z, Kerényi Z, Kertész S, Magna M, Lakatos L, Silhavy D (2006) Double-
11 stranded RNA binding may be a general plant RNA viral strategy to suppress RNA
12 silencing. *J Virol* 80:5747-5756
- 13 12. Mérai Z, Kerényi Z, Molnár A, Barta E, Válóczy A, Bisztray G, Havelda Z,
14 Burgyán J, Silhavy D (2005) Aureusvirus P14 is an efficient RNA silencing
15 suppressor that binds double-stranded RNAs without size specificity. *J Virol*
16 79:7217-7226
- 17 13. Plisson C, Druker M, Blanc S, German-Retana S, Le Gall O, Thomas D, Bron P
18 (2003) Structural characterization of HC-Pro, a plant virus multifunctional protein.
19 *J Biol Chem* 278:23753-23761
- 20 14. Pruss G, Ge X, Shi XM, Carrington JC, Vance VB (1997) Plant viral synergism:
21 The potyviral genome encodes a broad-range pathogenicity enhancer that
22 transactivates replication of heterologous viruses. *Plant Cell* 9:859-868
- 23 15. Sokal RR, Rohlf FJ (1995) *Biometry*. Freeman & Co, New York


- 1 16. Torres-Barceló C, Martín S, Daròs JA, Elena SF (2008) From Hypo- to
2 Hypersuppression: effect of amino acid substitutions on the RNA-silencing
3 suppressor activity of the *Tobacco etch potyvirus* HC-Pro. *Genetics* 180:1039-1049
- 4 17. Varrelman M, Maiss E, Pilot R, Palkovics L (2007) Use of pentapeptide-insertion
5 scanning mutagenesis for functional mapping of the *Plum pox virus* helper-
6 component proteinase suppressor of gene silencing. *J Gen Virol* 88:1005-1015
- 7 18. Yu B, Chapman EJ, Yang ZY, Carrington JC, Chen XM (2006) Transgenically
8 expressed viral RNA silencing suppressors interfere with microRNA methylation in
9 *Arabidopsis*. *FEBS Lett* 580:3117-3120
- 10

1 **Fig. 1.** Accumulation of TEV-derived siRNAs in infected and mock inoculated plants
2 (3 replicates each). Hybridization signals were quantified with a phosphorimager (Fuji).
3 The amount of photostimulated luminescence units (PSL) was calculated by
4 subtracting the values of background and the mock inoculated controls (error bars
5 correspond to ± 1 SEM).



6

1 **Fig. 2.** Electrophoretic mobility shift assay (EMSA) of radioactively-labeled siRNAs
2 by different HC-Pro purified from agroinfiltrated *N. benthamiana* as described in [11]
3 (3 replicates each). Mean values of siRNAs binding by HC-Pro mutant alleles
4 quantified by phosphorimaging (error bars correspond to ± 1 SEM).



5