1 RNA strand invasion activity of the Polycomb complex PRC2

2

3 Authors: Célia Alecki^{1,2}, Victoria Chiwara¹, Lionel A. Sanz³, Daniel Grau⁴, Osvaldo Arias

4 Pérez^{1,5}, Karim-Jean Armache⁴, Fréderic Chédin³, and Nicole J. Francis^{1,2,6*}

5 Affiliations:

- 6 ¹Institut de recherches cliniques de Montréal, 110 Avenue des Pins Ouest, Montréal, QC, H2W
- 7 1R7, Canada
- ²Département de biochimie et médecine moléculaire Université de Montréal, 2900 Boulevard
 Edouard-Montpetit, Montréal, QC H3T 1J4, Canada.
- ³Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology and Genome Center, 1 Shields Avenue,
- 11 University of California, Davis, Davis, CA 95616, USA.
- ⁴Skirball Institute of Biomolecular Medicine, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular
- 13 Pharmacology, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY 10016, USA.
- ⁵Natural Sciences and Engineering Postgraduate; Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana,
- 15 Cuajimalpa, Mexico City, Mexico
- ⁶Division of Experimental Medicine, McGill University, 1001 Decarie Boulevard, Montreal, QC
- 17 H4A 3J1, Canada
- 18 *correspondence to: <u>nicole.francis@ircm.qc.ca</u>
- 19
- 20 Abstract: Epigenetic regulation is conveyed through information encoded by specific chromatin
- 21 features. Non-canonical nucleic acid structures could in principle also convey biological
- 22 information but their role(s) in epigenetic regulation is not known. Polycomb Group (PcG)
- 23 proteins form memory of transient transcriptional repression events that is necessary for
- 24 development. In Drosophila, PcG proteins are recruited to specific DNA sequences, Polycomb
- 25 Response Elements (PREs). PREs are switchable memory elements that can exist in repressed,
- active, or unengaged states ^{1,2}. How PcG activities are targeted to PREs to maintain repressed
- 27 states only in appropriate developmental contexts has been difficult to elucidate. Biochemically,
- PcG protein complexes modify chromatin to maintain gene repression 1,3,4 . However, PcG
- 29 proteins also interact with both RNA and DNA, and RNA is implicated in the targeting of PcG
- 30 function. We find that R-loops, three-stranded nucleic acid structures formed when an RNA
- 31 hybridizes to its complementary DNA and displaces the other DNA strand 5 , form at many PREs
- in *Drosophila* embryos, and correlate with the repressive state. R-loops are recognized by the
 PcG complex PRC1 in vitro. Unexpectedly, we find that the PcG complex PRC2 has RNA strand
- PcG complex PRC1 in vitro. Unexpectedly, we find that the PcG complex PRC2 has RNA strat
 invasion activity, which can drive formation of RNA-DNA hybrids, the key component of R-
- loops. Our results suggest a new mechanism for targeting PcG function through R-loop
- formation by PRC2 and recognition by PRC1. More generally, our findings suggest formation
- and recognition 6 of non-canonical nucleic acid structures as an epigenetic mechanism.
- 38

39

40

42 Main Text:

43 During *Drosophila* embryogenesis, transiently expressed transcription factors activate 44 homeotic (Hox) genes in certain regions of the embryo and repress them in others to dictate the future body plan⁷. Polycomb Group (PcG) proteins form a memory of these early cues by 45 maintaining patterns of *Hox* gene repression for the rest of development ^{1,7,8}. This paradigm for 46 47 transcriptional memory is believed to be used by the PcG at many genes in Drosophila, and to underlie the conserved and essential functions of PcG proteins in cell differentiation and 48 development from plants to mammals 9,10. Polycomb Response Elements (PREs) are DNA 49 50 elements that can recruit PcG proteins, but they also recapitulate the memory function of the PcG-51 when combined with early acting, region-specific enhancers in transgenes, they maintain transgene repression in a PcG-dependent manner only in regions where the early enhancer was not active 52 ^{1,11,12}. PREs contain a high density of binding sites for transcription factors that can recruit PcG 53 54 proteins through physical interactions ¹². However, the widespread expression, binding pattern, and properties of factors that bind PREs cannot explain how PREs can exist in alternate, 55 56 transcription-history dependent states to maintain restricted patterns of gene expression, or how they can switch between states ¹. Furthermore, DNA sequences with PRE-like properties have 57 been difficult to identify in other species ¹²⁻¹⁴ despite the conservation of PcG complexes, their 58 59 biochemical activities, and their critical roles in development.

60 RNAs may provide context specificity to PcG protein recruitment and function. Some 61 PREs, and some PcG binding sites in mammalian and plant cells, are transcribed into ncRNA, 62 while others reside in gene bodies, and thus are transcribed when the gene is expressed ^{15,16}. Both 63 the direction and level of transcription have been correlated with the functional state of PREs ¹⁵⁻ 64 ¹⁷. The PcG complex <u>Polycomb Repressive Complex 2</u> (PRC2) has a well-described high affinity

for RNA¹⁸⁻²². RNA is suggested to recruit PRC2 to specific chromatin sites¹⁸, but RNA binding 65 can also compete for chromatin binding and inhibit PRC2 activity ^{16,22-24}. One way for RNA to 66 interact with the genome is by the formation of R-loops, three-stranded nucleic acid structures 67 formed when an RNA hybridizes to a complementary DNA strand, thereby displacing the second 68 DNA strand ⁵. The formation of R-loops over genes with low to moderate expression is associated 69 with increased PcG binding and H3K27 trimethylation (H3K27me3) in human cells ²⁵ and R-loops 70 have been implicated in promoting PcG recruitment in mammalian cells ⁶, although other evidence 71 suggests they antagonize recruitment ²⁶. We hypothesized that R-loop formation could 72 biochemically link RNA to silencing through PREs and tested this idea in the Drosophila system. 73 To determine whether R-loops form at PREs, we carried out two biological replicates of 74 strand-specific DNA-RNA Immunoprecipitation followed by next generation sequencing (DRIP-75 76 seq) in Drosophila embryos (2-6 and 10-14 hour (H)) and in S2 cells (Fig. 1, Extended Data Fig. 1). DRIP-seq peaks called relative to both input and RNaseH-treated control samples and present 77 in both replicates were analyzed. 10 positive sites were validated by DRIP-qPCR (Extended Data 78 Fig. 1b). About two thirds of R-loops form over gene bodies (Extended Data Fig. 1). R-loops are 79 observed over genes encompassing all levels of transcription, although a majority are associated 80 with genes with no or low levels of expression (Extended Data Fig. 2a, b). Most R-loops form 81 with the strandedness expected from annotated transcripts (Fig. 1 a, c, Extended Data Fig. 2c), as 82 observed in other species ^{25,27,28}. 83 84 We detect R-loops at 22-33% of PREs (Fig. 1 a-c, Extended Data Fig. 1d, 2 a-d). R-loops at PREs are more likely to have an antisense orientation to annotated transcripts, or have no 85 overlapping annotated transcript, than total R-loops (Extended Data Fig. 2c). To test whether R-86

87 loops are related to the functional state of PREs, we compared PcG protein binding at R-loops

88 that do or do not form R-loops in each of our three samples. For each PcG protein tested, the median read density over PREs with R-loops is higher than that for PREs without R-loops (Fig. 89 1d-f, Extended Data Fig. 2e-g). Although binding of PcG proteins to PREs is necessary for their 90 91 repressive function, it may not be sufficient, since analyses of PcG protein binding at a small number of PREs in the ON and OFF states did not detect differences in PRC1 or PRC2 binding 92 ^{29,30}. Instead, histone modifications at and around PREs are correlated with the functional state so 93 that PREs in the OFF state are marked with H3K27me3²⁹. In both developing embryos and S2 94 cells, H3K27me3 density is higher at PREs with R-loops than those without R-loops (Fig. 1e). 95 H3K27Ac, a mark of the active state, is found at a small number of PREs, but correlates weakly 96 with the presence of R-loops (Extended data Fig. 2 d, h-j, 3d-f). To test whether transient 97 presence of an R-loop at PREs predicts the repressed state, we analyzed PREs that form R-loops 98 2-6H embryos that are no longer detected in 10-14H embryos for the presence of H3k27me3 in 99 later embryonic states (12-16H). PREs that formed R-loops in early embryos have a higher 100 density of H3K27me3 at subsequent developmental stages than PREs that do not form R-loops at 101 102 either stage (Fig. 1f), and are not enriched for H3K27Ac (p=0.0885). To understand biochemically how R-loops could promote the repressive state of PREs, 103

we turned to in vitro assays. We prepared R-loops *in vitro* by transcribing templates containing a PRE sequence (Fig. 2a). R-loops are visualized as bands containing radiolabelled RNA that comigrates with the DNA template, and their identity confirmed by their sensitivity to RNase H and DNase I, and resistance to RNaseA (Fig. 2b, Extended Data Fig. 4a, b). We incubated either of the two main PcG complexes, PRC1 or PRC2, (Extended Data Fig. 4c,d) with transcribed templates, and fractionated the reactions by sucrose gradient sedimentation. Nucleic acids bound by PcG complexes sediment near the bottom of the gradient and unbound nucleic near the top

(Fig. 2a). PRC1 binds preferentially to R-loop containing templates while PRC2 shows no
preference (Fig. 2c-f, Extended Data Fig. 4e-g). Both complexes bind tightly to RNA (Extended
Data Fig. 5a-e).

A small increase in R-loops is observed in some experiments in which PRC2 is incubated 114 with transcribed templates, suggesting PRC2 might influence R-loop formation (Extended Data 115 116 Fig. 5f,g). To test this, we mixed purified radio- or fluorescently-labelled RNA with dsDNA templates and titrated in PRC2 (Fig. 3a-c). We observe PRC2 dose-dependent appearance of a 117 labelled RNA that migrates at the position of dsDNA (Fig. 3d, e, g, Extended Data Fig. 6a, b). 118 119 These putative strand invasion products form with either the sense or anti-sense RNA, but not 120 with a non-complementary RNA, indicating that base pairing between RNA and DNA is required (Fig. 3d-f). The products are sensitive to RNaseH and resistant to RNaseA, confirming 121 122 that they contain RNA-DNA hybrids (Fig. 3h, i, Extended Data Fig. 6b). Two control proteins, the transcription factor NFY and the PcG protein Sxc, do not form strand invasion products, 123 although they bind both DNA and RNA (Extended Data Fig. 6d-h). By the end of a 60-minute 124 reaction containing 3 fmol of linear DNA and 1.9 fmol of RNA, as much as 60% of the RNA is 125 incorporated into RNA-DNA hybrids, corresponding to 38% of the DNA molecules (Fig. 4a, b). 126 Strand invasion activity of PRC2 does not require addition of nucleotides, but does require 127 MgCl₂ (Extended Data Fig. S6c). Finally, PRC2 strand invasion activity co-fractionates with 128 PRC2 through size exclusion chromatography (Extended Data Fig. 7a-c). We conclude that 129 130 PRC2 induces RNA strand invasion of dsDNA to produce RNA-DNA hybrid containing structures, the key component of R-loops. 131

133	PRC2-mediated strand invasion could require binding to DNA, to RNA, or to both.
134	Detailed analyses of PRC2 binding to nucleic acids and chromatin are consistent with PRC2
135	making multiple contacts with both substrates ^{24,31} , while functional assays are consistent with a
136	single binding site that can bind chromatin, DNA or RNA but has highest affinity for RNA
137	^{16,22,23} . To understand the role of RNA and DNA interactions in PRC2-mediated strand invasion,
138	we manipulated the reaction conditions. Addition of RNA prior to DNA, or increasing the
139	amount of RNA, inhibits the reaction, while adding DNA prior to RNA or increasing DNA has
140	little effect (Fig. 4c-h, Extended Data Fig. 8a-d). These data are consistent with PRC2-DNA
141	interactions being critical for strand invasion, and higher affinity PRC2-RNA interactions
142	competing for them. This proposed mechanism, in which the protein binds the dsDNA template,
143	resembles "inverse RNA strand invasion" described for the repair proteins Rad52 and RecA ³²⁻³⁴
144	(See Extended Data Fig. 9a-c for models).
145	PRC2 and its methyltransferase activity are conserved from plants to human, as are
146	connections between PRC2 and RNA 9,16-18,35. We therefore anticipated that strand invasion
147	activity would be conserved. We find that PRC2-EZH1 has strand invasion activity at
148	concentrations that coincide with its DNA binding activity, while PRC2-EZH2 has little activity
149	under these conditions (Fig. 4i, j, Extended Data Fig. 8e).
150	The demonstration that PRC2 has RNA strand invasion activity, that PRC1 can recognize
151	R-loops, and that R-loops are present at PREs in vivo suggest a mechanistic model for how
152	RNAs can promote the off state of PREs through PRC2-driven R-loop formation. R-loops could
153	synergize with PRE-binding proteins to recruit PRC1 and would also sequester the RNA and
154	tether it to the genome, preventing it from competing with the chromatin substrate for PRC2
155	binding. Stabilization of PcG proteins at PREs through R-loop formation would promote

156	chromatin modification through the well-known activities of PRC1 and PRC2 ^{1,4} . R-loops may
157	also interfere with binding or function of proteins that promote the active state of PREs. Our data
158	indicate that both coding and ncRNAs form R-loops. The regulation of these RNAs and therefore
159	of R-loops could provide transcription history and developmental context specificity to PcG
160	recruitment by transcription factors that constitutively recognize PREs. A conceptually similar
161	model for how high levels of RNA production at PREs could promote the ON state and low
162	levels the OFF state was proposed previously ¹⁷ , but R-loop formation provides a mechanism by
163	which it can occur.
164	The connection between RNA and PRC2 has been recognized for some time, in species
165	from plants to humans ^{16-18,35} , but mechanisms beyond RNA binding by PRC2 have not
166	previously been described. Our discovery of PRC2-mediated RNA strand invasion, and R-loop
167	formation at PREs, suggests a mechanism to connect RNA to PcG targeting and function, and
168	the formation and recognition ⁶ of non-canonical nucleic acid structures to epigenetics (Extended
169	Data 10).

171 **References:**

172	1	Steffen, P. A. & Ringrose, L. What are memories made of? How Polycomb and Trithorax
173		proteins mediate epigenetic memory. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 15, 340-356,
174		doi:10.1038/nrm3789 (2014).
175	2	Schwartz, Y. B. et al. Alternative epigenetic chromatin states of polycomb target genes.
176		PLoS Genet 6, e1000805, doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000805 (2010).
177	3	Aranda, S., Mas, G. & Di Croce, L. Regulation of gene transcription by Polycomb
178		proteins. Sci Adv 1, e1500737, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1500737 (2015).
179	4	Simon, J. A. & Kingston, R. E. Occupying chromatin: Polycomb mechanisms for getting
180		to genomic targets, stopping transcriptional traffic, and staying put. Mol Cell 49, 808-
181		824, doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2013.02.013 (2013).
182	5	Santos-Pereira, J. M. & Aguilera, A. R loops: new modulators of genome dynamics and
183		function. Nat Rev Genet 16, 583-597, doi:10.1038/nrg3961 (2015).
184	6	Skourti-Stathaki, K. et al. R-Loops Enhance Polycomb Repression at a Subset of
185		Developmental Regulator Genes. Mol Cell 73, 930-945 e934,
186		doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2018.12.016 (2019).
187	7	Maeda, R. K. & Karch, F. The bithorax complex of Drosophila an exceptional Hox
188		cluster. Curr Top Dev Biol 88, 1-33, doi:10.1016/S0070-2153(09)88001-0 (2009).
189	8	Simon, J. Locking in stable states of gene expression: transcriptional control during
190		Drosophila development. Curr Opin Cell Biol 7, 376-385 (1995).
191	9	Grossniklaus, U. & Paro, R. Transcriptional silencing by polycomb-group proteins. Cold
192		Spring Harb Perspect Biol 6, a019331, doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a019331 (2014).

193	10	Prezioso, C. & Orlando, V. Polycomb proteins in mammalian cell differentiation and
194		plasticity. FEBS Lett 585, 2067-2077, doi:10.1016/j.febslet.2011.04.062 (2011).
195	11	Poux, S., Kostic, C. & Pirrotta, V. Hunchback-independent silencing of late Ubx
196		enhancers by a Polycomb Group Response Element. EMBO J 15, 4713-4722 (1996).
197	12	Kassis, J. A. & Brown, J. L. Polycomb group response elements in Drosophila and
198		vertebrates. Adv Genet 81, 83-118, doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-407677-8.00003-8 (2013).
199	13	Bauer, M., Trupke, J. & Ringrose, L. The quest for mammalian Polycomb response
200		elements: are we there yet? Chromosoma 125, 471-496, doi:10.1007/s00412-015-0539-4
201		(2016).
202	14	Xiao, J. et al. Cis and trans determinants of epigenetic silencing by Polycomb repressive
203		complex 2 in Arabidopsis. Nat Genet 49, 1546-1552, doi:10.1038/ng.3937 (2017).
204	15	Hekimoglu, B. & Ringrose, L. Non-coding RNAs in polycomb/trithorax regulation. RNA
205		<i>Biol</i> 6 , 129-137 (2009).
206	16	Herzog, V. A. et al. A strand-specific switch in noncoding transcription switches the
207		function of a Polycomb/Trithorax response element. Nat Genet 46, 973-981,
208		doi:10.1038/ng.3058 (2014).
209	17	Ringrose, L. Noncoding RNAs in Polycomb and Trithorax Regulation: A Quantitative
210		Perspective. Annu Rev Genet 51, 385-411, doi:10.1146/annurev-genet-120116-023402
211		(2017).
212	18	Davidovich, C. & Cech, T. R. The recruitment of chromatin modifiers by long noncoding
213		RNAs: lessons from PRC2. RNA 21, 2007-2022, doi:10.1261/rna.053918.115 (2015).
214	19	Davidovich, C. et al. Toward a consensus on the binding specificity and promiscuity of
215		PRC2 for RNA. Mol Cell 57, 552-558, doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2014.12.017 (2015).

216	20	Davidovich, C., Zheng, L., Goodrich, K. J. & Cech, T. R. Promiscuous RNA binding by
217		Polycomb ronrossive complex 2. Nat Struct Mol Riel 20, 1250, 1257
217		Polycomo repressive complex 2. Nat Struct Mot Biot 20, 1250-1257,
218		doi:10.1038/nsmb.2679 (2013).
219	21	Wang, X. et al. Targeting of Polycomb Repressive Complex 2 to RNA by Short Repeats
220		of Consecutive Guanines. Mol Cell 65, 1056-1067 e1055,
221		doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2017.02.003 (2017).
222	22	Wang, X. et al. Molecular analysis of PRC2 recruitment to DNA in chromatin and its
223		inhibition by RNA. Nat Struct Mol Biol 24, 1028-1038, doi:10.1038/nsmb.3487 (2017).
224	23	Beltran, M. et al. The interaction of PRC2 with RNA or chromatin is mutually
225		antagonistic. Genome Res 26, 896-907, doi:10.1101/gr.197632.115 (2016).
226	24	Zhang, Q. et al. RNA exploits an exposed regulatory site to inhibit the enzymatic activity
227		of PRC2. Nat Struct Mol Biol 26, 237-247, doi:10.1038/s41594-019-0197-y (2019).
228	25	Sanz, L. A. et al. Prevalent, Dynamic, and Conserved R-Loop Structures Associate with
229		Specific Epigenomic Signatures in Mammals. Mol Cell 63, 167-178,
230		doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2016.05.032 (2016).
231	26	Chen, P. B., Chen, H. V., Acharya, D., Rando, O. J. & Fazzio, T. G. R loops regulate
232		promoter-proximal chromatin architecture and cellular differentiation. Nat Struct Mol
233		<i>Biol</i> 22 , 999-1007, doi:10.1038/nsmb.3122 (2015).
234	27	Hartono, S. R. et al. The Affinity of the S9.6 Antibody for Double-Stranded RNAs
235		Impacts the Accurate Mapping of R-Loops in Fission Yeast. J Mol Biol 430, 272-284,
236		doi:10.1016/j.jmb.2017.12.016 (2018).
237	28	Xu, W. et al. The R-loop is a common chromatin feature of the Arabidopsis genome. Nat

238 Plants 3, 704-714, doi:10.1038/s41477-017-0004-x (2017).

239	29	Papp, B. & Muller, J. Histone trimethylation and the maintenance of transcriptional ON
240		and OFF states by trxG and PcG proteins. Genes Dev 20, 2041-2054,

- doi:10.1101/gad.388706 (2006).
- 242 30 Langlais, K. K., Brown, J. L. & Kassis, J. A. Polycomb group proteins bind an engrailed
- PRE in both the "ON" and "OFF" transcriptional states of engrailed. *PLoS One* 7,
- e48765, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0048765 (2012).
- 245 31 Long, Y. *et al.* Conserved RNA-binding specificity of polycomb repressive complex 2 is
- achieved by dispersed amino acid patches in EZH2. *Elife* **6**, doi:10.7554/eLife.31558
- 247 (2017).
- 32 Kasahara, M., Clikeman, J. A., Bates, D. B. & Kogoma, T. RecA protein-dependent Rloop formation in vitro. *Genes Dev* 14, 360-365 (2000).
- 250 33 Mazina, O. M., Keskin, H., Hanamshet, K., Storici, F. & Mazin, A. V. Rad52 Inverse
- 251 Strand Exchange Drives RNA-Templated DNA Double-Strand Break Repair. *Mol Cell*
- **67**, 19-29 e13, doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2017.05.019 (2017).
- 253 34 Zaitsev, E. N. & Kowalczykowski, S. C. A novel pairing process promoted by
- Escherichia coli RecA protein: inverse DNA and RNA strand exchange. *Genes Dev* 14,
 740-749 (2000).
- 256 35 Berry, S. & Dean, C. Environmental perception and epigenetic memory: mechanistic
- 257 insight through FLC. *Plant J* **83**, 133-148, doi:10.1111/tpj.12869 (2015)

259 Acknowledgements:

260	We thank E. Lécuyer's lab for assistance collecting <i>Drosophila</i> embryos, O. Neyret for advice
261	on preparation of NGS samples, J. Mallette for technical assistance, C. Gentile for advice on
262	bioinformatics, M. Wilson for S9.6 antibody, M. Reijns for plasmid to express hRNaseH2, M.
263	Drolet for intellectual support, and F. Robert, M. Drolet, and members of the Francis lab for
264	comments on the manuscript. This research was enabled in part by support provided by Calcul
265	Québec (www.calculquebec.ca) and Compute Canada (<u>www.computecanada.ca</u>). Funding:
266	Work in the N.J.F. lab was funded by CIHR 311557, in the K.J.A. lab by a grant from the David
267	and Lucile Packard Foundation, NIH 5R01GM115882-03, and 5T32HL007151-40 (to D.G.), and
268	in the F.C. lab by NIH R01-GM120607. Author contributions: Conceptualization: N.J.F. &
269	C.A.; Investigation: C.A., O.A. & N.J.F.; Formal analysis: C.A. & N.J.F.; Resources: V.C. &
270	D.G., K.J.A., L.A.S., F.C.; Writing: N.J.F., C.A., K.J.A., F. C., Supervision: N.J.F., Funding
271	acquisition: N.J.F., F.C., K.J.A. Competing interests: The authors declare no competing
272	interests. Materials & Correspondence: All correspondence and material requests should be
273	directed to N.J.F.

275 Fig. 1 R-loops form at Drosophila PREs and correlate with a repressed state. a-c. DRIP-seq traces showing R-loop formation at PREs bound by PRC1 components (arrows) in 2-6H and 10-276 14H Drosophila embryos (Ph), and in S2 cells (dRING). RNaseH-treated samples are negative 277 278 controls. "Unstr" indicates all R-loops, while + and – indicate strand specific tracks; direction refers to the DNA in the RNA-DNA hybrid. Called peaks are indicated under the traces. Red 279 arrowheads above genes indicate direction of annotated transcripts. d, e. Median normalized 280 intensity of PRC1 components (d), or H3K27me3 (e) over PREs with or without R-loops. 2-6H 281 and 10-14H R-loop data are compared with Ph at 4-12H and H3K27me3 at 4-8H and 12-16H 282 respectively. S2 cell R-loop data are compared with dRING. Whiskers show min. to max. f. 283 Median normalized intensity of H3K27me3 at 12-16H over PREs where R-loop formation is 284 detected in 2-6H but not in 10-14H compared to PREs with no R-loops detected at either stage. 285 286 See also Extended Data Fig. 2.





- Fig. 2 PcG complexes recognize R-loop containing templates. a. Scheme for testing binding of
- 289 PcG complexes to R-loop containing plasmids. b. Radiolabelled RNAs that co-migrate with the
- 290 DNA plasmid (lane 2) are confirmed as R-loops by their sensitivity to DNaseI (lane3) and
- 291 RNaseH (lane 4), and resistance to RNaseA (lanes 5-7). c, d. Representative gradients of PRC1
- 292 (c) and PRC2 (d) binding. ³²P-RNA panel shows RNaseA digested RNA-DNA hybrids. See
- Extended Data Fig. 4 for full gels. E, F. Quantification for PRC1 (e, n=8) and PRC2 (f, n=6).
- 294 Points show the mean +/- S.D. RNA-DNA and DNA curve fits are different for PRC1
- 295 (p<0.0001, exact sum-of-squares F-test).

d



а







Fig. 3 PRC2 has RNA strand invasion activity. a, b. Nucleic acids used for RNA strand

- invasion. Plasmids with the vestigial (vg) PRE in either orientation are transcribed to produce
- sense (a) or anti-sense RNAs (b). Linearized plasmid is used as the DNA template. c. Strand
- invasion assay scheme. d-f. Titration of PRC2 with either the sense (d) or anti-sense (e) vg PRE
- 301 RNA, or a non-complementary RNA (f). g. Quantification of 3 titrations; graphs show mean +/-
- 302 S.D of the the fraction of signal with 200 nM PRC2. h, i. RNA strand invasion products are
- sensitive to RNaseH (lane 4) but resistant to RNaseA (lane 6). See also Extended Data Fig. 6.



305 Fig. 4 Characteristics and conservation of PRC2 strand invasion activity. In a-h, left panel

- shows a representative gel of Cy5-labelled RNA, and graph (right panel) summarizes multiple
- 307 experiments. a, b. Time course of RNA strand invasion. c, d. Effect of order of addition of
- nucleic acids. Asterisks in all panels indicate p<0.05 (unpaired student's t-test). red=RNA vs.
- 309 DNA; black=RNA vs. together. c-g. Effect of increasing RNA (e, f) or DNA (g, h). Asterisks:
- 310 red=0.91 nM vs. 0.04 nM; black=0.91 nM vs. 0.18 nM. I- All PRC2 titrations are 25-400 nM. i,
- j. PRC2-EZH1 has strand invasion activity. See also Extended Data Fig. 8.

