



**A MECHANISM FOR TRANSCRIPTIONAL  
INTERFERENCE BETWEEN CONVERGENT  
PROMOTERS IN THE DEVELOPMENTAL SWITCH OF  
BACTERIOPHAGE 186**

This thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Molecular and Biomedical Sciences  
(Biochemistry), University of Adelaide

Benjamin Peter Callen, B. Sc. (Hons)

March 2003

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>THESIS SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>VII</b>
<b>DECLARATION .....</b>	<b>IX</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 CONVERGENT TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSCRIPTIONAL INTERFERENCE. ....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 GENE REGULATION BY CONVERGENT TRANSCRIPTION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.2.1. CONSTITUTIVE GENE EXPRESSION.....	2
1.2.2. SERENDIPITOUS REDUCTION OF GENE EXPRESSION .....	3
1.2.3. CONTROLLED REGULATION OF GENE EXPRESSION.....	4
1.2.4. CONVERGENT TRANSCRIPTION AS PART OF THE GENETIC SWITCH FOR TEMPERATE BACTERIOPHAGE DEVELOPMENT. ....	7
<i>i. The role of transcriptional interference in the development of phage 186.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>ii. Convergent transcription in phage P2. ....</i>	<i>8</i>
<b>1.3 THE FREQUENCY OF CONVERGENT TRANSCRIPTION IN NATURE.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.4 THE MECHANISM OF INTERFERENCE. ....</b>	<b>14</b>
1.4.1. TRANSCRIPTION FROM A SINGLE PROMOTER .....	14
1.4.2. PROPERTIES OF INTERFERENCE BASED ON PREVIOUS STUDIES. ....	19
1.4.3. THE POSSIBLE MECHANISMS OF INTERFERENCE.....	20
1.4.4. SPECIFIC MECHANISMS EXAMINED BY PREVIOUS STUDIES. ....	21
<i>Steric hindrance by promoter bound polymerase .....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Interference by antisense transcription .....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Interference due to the head-on collisions between converging polymerases. ....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Topology .....</i>	<i>27</i>
<b>1.5 AIMS OF THIS STUDY.....</b>	<b>28</b>

## CHAPTER 2

### MEASURING TRANSCRIPTIONAL INTERFERENCE BETWEEN 186 *PR* AND *PL* *IN VIVO* ....30

#### 2.1 INTRODUCTION .....30

#### 2.2 RATIONALE FOR ESTABLISHING A SYSTEM TO MEASURE 186 INTERFERENCE. ....30

2.2.1 PROMOTER FRAGMENT. ....30

2.2.2. TYPE OF PROMOTER ASSAY. ....31

2.2.3. TYPE OF PROMOTER VECTOR SYSTEM. ....32

2.2.4. HOST STRAIN.....33

#### 2.3. RESULTS .....34

2.3.1. SHORT FRAGMENTS ASSAYED USING *PMRR9* GAVE 7 FOLD INTERFERENCE. ....34

2.3.2. REPEATING THE ASSAYS IN AN IMPROVED VECTOR SYSTEM GAVE 5.3 FOLD INTERFERENCE. ....34

2.3.3. INTERFERENCE DOES NOT CHANGE BETWEEN DIFFERENT HOST STRAINS. ....36

2.3.4. *PL* DOES NOT INTERFERE WITH *PR* ACTIVITY.....36

2.3.5. ACTIVITIES OF *PR*<sup>+</sup> AND *PL*<sup>-</sup> .....37

#### 2.4 DISCUSSION.....37

2.4.1 MEASURING INTERFERENCE *IN VIVO*.....37

2.4.2 CONCLUSIONS ABOUT INTERFERENCE BETWEEN *PR* AND *PL* ACTIVITY. ....40

#### 2.5 SUMMARY.....41

## CHAPTER 3

### WHAT ACTION OF *PR* TRANSCRIPTION CAUSES INTERFERENCE? .....43

#### 3.1 INTRODUCTION .....43

#### 3.2 INTERFERENCE BY *PR* BOUND RNAP .....43

3.2.1. STERIC INTERFERENCE BY *PR* BOUND RNAP.....45

3.2.2. *PR* ACTING AS A LOCAL SINK FOR UNBOUND RNAP .....46

3.2.3. RNAP BOUND TO *PR* AS A ROADBLOCK FOR *PL* TRANSCRIPTION.....47

#### 3.3. INTERFERENCE BY *PR* ELONGATION.....47

3.3.1. HEAD-ON COLLISIONS.....47

3.3.2. ANTISENSE RNA.....48

3.3.3. ELONGATION OVER *PL*.....49

#### 3.4. DISCUSSION.....52

<b>3.5. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>55</b>
---------------------------	-----------

## **CHAPTER 4**

<b>NATURE OF THE INTERFERENCE CAUSED BY THE PASSAGE OF RNAP ACROSS <i>PL</i>.....</b>	<b>56</b>
---	-----------

<b>4.1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>56</b>
-------------------------------	-----------

4.1.1. POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS FOR THE REDUCTION OF <i>PL</i> ACTIVITY CAUSED BY THE PASSAGE OF POLYMERASE OVER THIS REGION.....	56
--	----

4.1.2. THE SITTING DUCK MECHANISM OF INTERFERENCE.....	56
--	----

<b>4.2 RESULTS .....</b>	<b>57</b>
--------------------------	-----------

4.2.1. ESTABLISHING AN <i>IN VITRO</i> TRANSCRIPTION ASSAY SYSTEM. ....	57
---	----

4.2.2. THE CLEARANCE RATES AT <i>PL</i> AND <i>PR</i> . ....	62
--	----

4.2.3. THE RATE OF OPEN COMPLEX FORMATION AT <i>PL</i> AND <i>PR</i> . ....	63
---	----

4.2.4. OPEN COMPLEXES FORMED AT <i>PL</i> <i>IN VITRO</i> ARE SENSITIVE TO ELONGATION FROM <i>PR</i> . ....	64
---	----

4.2.5. ATTEMPTS TO ESTABLISH AN <i>IN VITRO</i> MODEL OF INTERFERENCE.....	66
--	----

<b>4.3 DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>68</b>
----------------------------	-----------

4.3.1. KINETICS OF PROMOTER INITIATION AT <i>PL</i> .....	68
---	----

4.3.2. HEAD-ON COLLISIONS BETWEEN AN OPEN COMPLEX AND ELONGATING RNAP. ....	71
---	----

<b>4.4 SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>73</b>
--------------------------	-----------

## **CHAPTER 5**

<b>CONVERGENT PROMOTER INTERFERENCE IN BACTERIOPHAGE P2 SUPPORTS THE SITTING DUCK MODEL .....</b>	<b>74</b>
---	-----------

<b>5.1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>74</b>
-------------------------------	-----------

<b>5.2 INTERFERENCE BETWEEN THE SWITCH PROMOTERS OF P2.....</b>	<b>75</b>
---	-----------

5.2.1. THE <i>IN VIVO</i> LEVEL OF INTERFERENCE BETWEEN P2 PROMOTERS IS 2 FOLD WHEN MEASURED USING A SINGLE COPY <i>LACZ</i> PROMOTER ASSAY.....	75
--	----

5.2.2. COMPARISON BETWEEN P2 AND 186 PROMOTER SWITCH PROMOTER ACTIVITIES. ....	76
--	----

5.2.3. INTERFERENCE BETWEEN THE P2 PROMOTERS IS NOT RECIPROCAL.....	76
---	----

5.2.4. INTERFERENCE IS NOT AFFECTED BY DIFFERENT <i>PE</i> MUTATIONS. ....	77
--	----

<b>5.3 CAN THE SITTING DUCK MODEL OF INTERFERENCE EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCE IN INTERFERENCE BETWEEN 186 AND P2 PROMOTERS? .....</b>	<b>77</b>
--	-----------

5.3.1. INCREASING THE SPACING BETWEEN CONVERGENT P2 PROMOTERS HAS NO EFFECT ON INTERFERENCE.....	78
--	----

5.3.2. THE LYTIC PROMOTER OF P2 IS WEAKER LESS AGGRESSIVE THAN THAT OF 186.....	79
5.3.3. THE LYSOGENIC PROMOTER OF P2 IS LESS SENSITIVE THAN THAT OF 186. ....	79
<b>5.4 IS THE SENSITIVITY OF THE LYSOGENIC PROMOTER A REFLECTION OF ITS SITTING DUCK POTENTIAL?.....</b>	<b>80</b>
5.4.1 ESTABLISHING AN <i>IN VITRO</i> TRANSCRIPTION SYSTEM FOR <i>PC</i> .....	80
5.4.2. RATE OF CLEARANCE OF <i>PC</i> .....	81
5.4.3. RATE OF OPEN COMPLEX FORMATION OF <i>PC</i> .....	82
<b>5.5 DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>83</b>
5.5.1. WHY IS P2 INTERFERENCE MUCH LESS THAN THAT EXPECTED FROM THE LITERATURE?.....	83
5.5.2. THE ORIGIN AND INFLUENCE OF TRANSCRIPTS X, Y AND Z. ....	85
5.5.2. WHY DOES <i>PC</i> PRODUCE A LOW LEVEL OF <i>IN VITRO</i> TRANSCRIPTS?.....	87
5.3.4. CONCLUSIONS.....	89
 <b>CHAPTER 6</b>	
<b>FINAL DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>91</b>
 <b>6.1. THE MECHANISM OF TRANSCRIPTIONAL INTERFERENCE BETWEEN THE CONVERGENT SWITCH PROMOTERS OF 186. ....</b>	<b>91</b>
6.1.1. <i>PR</i> BOUND RNAP DOES NOT INHIBIT <i>PL</i> ACTIVITY.....	91
6.1.2. MECHANISMS OF INTERFERENCE INVOLVING ELONGATION FROM <i>PR</i> .....	93
Head-on collisions.....	93
Antisense transcription.....	94
Elongation over <i>pL</i> .....	95
6.1.3. INTERFERENCE BY ELONGATION OVER <i>PL</i> . ....	96
The transient, multiple round nature of this mechanism. ....	96
Promoter occlusion. ....	96
A sitting duck mechanism. ....	98
Interference in P2: Support for the sitting duck mechanism. ....	101
Future experiments.....	102
6.1.4. ALTERNATIVE MECHANISMS OF INTERFERENCE INVOLVING ELONGATION FROM <i>PR</i> . ....	103
Transcriptionally induced changes in host proteins.....	103
DNA topology.....	103
 <b>6.2 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS ABOUT CONVERGENT PROMOTERS AND INTERFERENCE. ....</b>	<b>105</b>
Properties of the convergent promoters. ....	106
The speed of elongation.....	106
Promoter spacing.....	106
 <b>6.3 TRANSCRIPTIONAL INTERFERENCE IN EUKARYOTIC SYSTEMS.....</b>	<b>109</b>

<b>6.4 REINTERPRETATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL SWITCH IN LIGHT OF NEW INTERFERENCE DATA.....</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>6.5 TRANSCRIPTIONAL INTERFERENCE BY TANDEM PROMOTERS.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>6.6 FINAL CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>111</b>
 <b>CHAPTER 7</b>	
<b>MATERIALS AND METHODS .....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>7.A. MATERIALS.....</b>	<b>113</b>
7.A.1. BACTERIAL STRAINS.....	113
7.A.2. BACTERIOPHAGE.....	113
7.A.3. PRIMERS .....	113
7.A.4. PLASMIDS.....	114
7.A.5. REAGENTS.....	114
7.A.5.1. <i>Enzymes</i> .....	114
7.A.5.2. <i>Chemicals</i> .....	115
a. Radiochemicals.....	115
b. General chemicals.....	115
7.A.6. MEDIA AND BUFFERS.....	117
7.A.6.1. <i>Growth Media</i> .....	117
a. Liquid media.....	117
b. Solid media.....	117
7.A.6.2. <i>Buffers and solutions</i> .....	118
<b>7.B METHODS.....</b>	<b>120</b>
7.B.1 BACTERIAL AND PHAGE PROCEDURES.....	120
7.B.1.1. <i>Storage of bacterial and phage stocks</i> .....	120
7.B.1.2. <i>Growth of bacterial strains</i> .....	120
7.B.1.3. <i>Preparation and Transformation of calcium chloride competent cells</i> .....	120
7.B.1.4. <i>Preparation and transformation of electrocompetent cells</i> .....	121
7.B.1.5. <i>Low titre <math>\lambda</math> phage stocks</i> .....	122
7.B.1.6. <i>Plating and assaying phage</i> .....	122
7.B.1.7. <i>Construction of chromosomal lacZ fusions</i> .....	123
7.B.2. DNA MANIPULATION.....	123
7.B.2.1. <i>Plasmid miniprep</i> .....	123
7.B.2.2. <i>Large scale plasmid purification</i> .....	123
7.B.2.3. <i>Ethanol precipitation</i> .....	125
7.B.2.4. <i>Agarose gel electrophoresis</i> .....	125

7.B.2.5. Determination of DNA concentration.....	125
7.B.2.6. Isolation of DNA fragments from agarose gels.....	126
7.B.2.7. Restriction digestion.....	126
7.B.2.8. Reactions with alkaline phosphatase.....	126
7.B.2.9. Blunt ending 5' and 3' overhangs.....	126
7.B.2.10. Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR).....	126
7.B.2.11. Preparation of annealed oligos for cloning.....	127
7.B.2.12. Insert preparation by primer extension.....	127
7.B.2.13. DNA Ligations.....	128
7.B.2.14. Sub-cloning of PCR products.....	128
7.B.2.15. Site-directed mutagenesis.....	128
7.B.2.16. Big Dye Sequencing reactions.....	129
7.B.2.17. Labelling DNA markers.....	129
7.B.2.18. Preparation of loading control used during in vitro transcription.....	130
7.B.3. LACZ ASSAYS.....	130
7.B.4. IN VITRO TRANSCRIPTION ASSAYS.....	131
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>133</b>

## THESIS SUMMARY

Convergent transcription defines a situation where two promoters are arranged face-to-face, leading to a partial 5' overlap between their transcripts. Multiple examples of convergent promoters have been reported in a wide range of organisms (including bacteriophage, *E. coli*, plants, yeast and humans). In both eukaryotes and prokaryotes the simultaneous *in vivo* activity of such promoters generally leads to repression of transcription from the opposing promoter, a phenomenon termed transcriptional interference. Interference is often asymmetric, with a strong (the aggressive) promoter reducing the expression of a weak (the sensitive) promoter. This interaction has been used in various ways to effect regulation of gene expression.

A number of studies have investigated this phenomenon in both *E. coli* and eukaryotic systems however the exact mechanism(s) remain speculative. Theoretically, a wide range of molecular mechanisms of interference are possible. This study uses largely *in vivo* methods to eliminate some of these possibilities and sets out to further understand the mechanism operating for one set of converging promoters.

The convergent promoters used in this study are those of the lysis-lysogeny switch from bacteriophage 186. The bacteriophage 186 lytic promoter, *pR*, is ten times stronger than the lysogenic promoter, *pL*, found 62 bp downstream in a convergent orientation. In chapter 2 a single copy, promoter, reporter system was established to measure convergent promoter activity. It was shown that the stronger promoter reduced the transcriptional activity of the weaker promoter 5.6 fold, and that this interference is not reciprocal. No variation in interference was seen when different host strains were used.

In Chapter 3, this promoter system was used to determine what action of *pR* causes interference of *pL*. A minor role for *pR* bound RNAP during interference was demonstrated by the following observations: (i) Increasing the spacing between the promoters an extra 100 bp brought no loss in interference but rather a slight increase. This is inconsistent with a steric hindrance model of interference where RNAP bound at *pR* inhibits RNAP binding at *pL*. (ii) Placing the promoters in a close divergent orientation completely abolished interference, which is contrary to a competitive



inhibition model of interference. And (iii) The placement of a unidirectional intrinsic terminator between  $pR$  and  $pL$  significantly reduced interference from 9.2 fold to 3.3 fold. This is contrary to a mechanism of interference where RNAP bound at  $pR$  acts as a roadblock.

A major role of elongation from  $pR$  over  $pL$  during interference was shown by the observations that (i) Divergent promoters that also actively transcribe the 62 nt of 5' antisense transcript did not restore interference, contrary to a model of interference that involves antisense transcription. And (ii) that terminating elongation from  $pR$  prior to transcription over  $pL$  dramatically reduced interference.

The nature of interference caused by elongation over  $pL$  was then investigated in Chapter 4. Based on the *in vitro* observation that open complexes formed at  $pL$  were slow to escape and clear the promoter and that the activity of these complexes was reduced by collisions with converging elongating polymerase from  $pR$ . A 'sitting duck' mechanism of interference is proposed in which  $pR$  convergent transcription over  $pL$  negatively affects promoter initiation intermediates that form at  $pL$ .

In Chapter 5 the validity of this mechanism was supported by an investigation of transcriptional interference between another example of convergent promoters found in the developmental switch of the related bacteriophage, P2. The strong lytic promoter was shown to reduce the activity of the weak lysogenic promoter only 2.2 fold (contrary to the 30 fold interference found in the literature). The difference in interference with that of 186 promoters was shown to be partly due to the differences in sensitivity of the two lysogenic promoters. The *in vitro* rate of escape of open complexes formed at the P2 lysogenic promoter was shown to be much faster than that of 186  $pL$ . The lack of interference for P2 promoters could therefore be explained by a reduced potential of its lysogenic promoter to form 'sitting ducks'. Thus, interference in the 186 system occurs because RNAP complexes at  $pL$  that are waiting to clear are sensitive to passing elongating polymerase from  $pR$ . This 'sitting duck' mechanism is likely to be important for promoters that are close together. Mechanisms involving collisions between elongating polymerases and promoter occlusion and a general mechanism for transcriptional interference by convergent promoters discussed in Chapter 6.