

Nucleosome-Depleted Regions in Cell-Cycle-Regulated Promoters Ensure Reliable Gene Expression in Every Cell Cycle

Lu Bai,^{1,2,*} Gilles Charvin,^{1,2,3} Eric D. Siggia,² and Frederick R. Cross¹

¹Center for Studies in Physics and Biology, The Rockefeller University, New York, NY 10065, USA

²The Rockefeller University, New York, NY 10065, USA

³Present address: Laboratoire Joliot-Curie, Ecole Normale Supérieure, 46 Allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon Cedex 07, France

*Correspondence: lbai01@rockefeller.edu

DOI 10.1016/j.devcel.2010.02.007

SUMMARY

Many promoters in eukaryotes have nucleosome-depleted regions (NDRs) containing transcription factor binding sites. However, the functional significance of NDRs is not well understood. Here, we examine NDR function in two cell cycle-regulated promoters, *CLN2pr* and *HOPr*, by varying nucleosomal coverage of the binding sites of their activator, Swi4/Swi6 cell-cycle box (SCB)-binding factor (SBF), and probing the corresponding transcriptional activity in individual cells with time-lapse microscopy. Nucleosome-embedded SCBs do not significantly alter peak expression levels. Instead, they induce bimodal, “on/off” activation in individual cell cycles, which displays short-term memory, or epigenetic inheritance, from the mother cycle. In striking contrast, the same SCBs localized in NDR lead to highly reliable activation, once in every cell cycle. We further demonstrate that the high variability in *Cln2p* expression induced by the nucleosomal SCBs reduces cell fitness. Therefore, we propose that the NDR function in limiting stochasticity in gene expression promotes the ubiquity and conservation of promoter NDR.

INTRODUCTION

Transcription activation pathways usually start with binding of activators to their cognate sites in promoters. Transcription factor binding site (TFBS) localization in nucleosome-depleted regions (NDRs) is generally believed to be important in enhancing transcription factor binding and facilitating subsequent transcription, based on several lines of evidence. Studies on many different factors suggested that nucleosomes limit their TFBS accessibility both in vitro (for review, see Owen-Hughes and Workman, 1994) and in vivo (Liu et al., 2006; Morohashi et al., 2007; Sekinger et al., 2005). Well-studied promoters, such as *GAL1-10pr* and *PHO5pr*, have their major TFBS positioned within constitutive NDRs, regardless of the transcriptional status of the gene (Lohr, 1997; Svaren and Horz, 1997). Genome-

wide studies on nucleosome positioning in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* revealed NDR upstream of transcription start sites (TSSs) in most promoters (Field et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2007; Mavrich et al., 2008a; Shivaswamy et al., 2008; Whitehouse et al., 2007; Yuan et al., 2005), and promoters in higher organisms are also frequently nucleosome deficient (Mavrich et al., 2008b; Ozsolak et al., 2007; Schones et al., 2008). Such configuration is hardly perturbed by global transcriptional profile change (Zawadzki et al., 2009). The ubiquity and evolutionary conservation of NDR indicates its important function.

However, NDR localization of TFBS is not essential for gene activation. Many factors can bind to nucleosomal TFBS and form ternary complexes (DNA, nucleosome, and factor) in vitro (Owen-Hughes and Workman, 1994), which might be promoted by the spontaneous “wrapping/unwrapping” of nucleosomal DNA (Li et al., 2005). Gal4p is able to disrupt nucleosomes positioned over its TFBS in vivo, accompanied with transcriptional activation (Balasubramanian and Morse, 1999; Morse, 1993; Xu et al., 1998). Pho4p is shown to occupy its nucleosomal binding site in the *PHO5pr* in vivo without nucleosome disassembly (Adkins et al., 2004), and a mutant *PHO5pr* containing solely two nucleosome-embedded high-affinity Pho4p binding sites still allows reasonable *PHO5* induction (Lam et al., 2008). In addition, despite the enrichment of NDR in promoters, many functional promoters lack NDR (Field et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2007; Mavrich et al., 2008a; Shivaswamy et al., 2008; Whitehouse et al., 2007; Yuan et al., 2005).

Thus, the functional significance of NDR on transcription remains to be tested directly and quantitatively (Morse, 2007). Previous studies have mostly presented bulk experiments, which were limited to measure average transcription level. Cell-to-cell variability is now recognized as an important feature of transcriptional regulation, which could directly influence cell phenotype (Acar et al., 2005; Avery, 2006; Blake et al., 2006; Colman-Lerner et al., 2005). The correlation between gene expression variability and nucleosome localization on promoters has not yet been subjected to direct experimental tests.

Here, we studied NDR function on two G1/S cell cycle-regulated promoters, *CLN2pr* and *HOPr*, which are both activated by the transcription factor complex Swi4/Swi6 cell-cycle box (SCB)-binding factor (SBF) with binding site SCB. These promoters are highly dynamic and only expressed within a brief time window early in a cell cycle, and thus present a stringent test system for NDR in quantitative gene expression. Also, the genes




Figure 1. Nucleosome Distribution and Expression Profile of WT *CLN2pr*

(A) Genomic structure and nucleosome distribution on WT *CLN2pr* in asynchronized cells. The plot showed the measured nucleosome occupancy at different positions on the WT *CLN2pr* with the inferred locations of nucleosomes -1, -2, and -3 (shaded ovals) and NDR. The position 0 in the x axis is the *CLN2pr* TSS (chr16, 66788; Cross et al., 1994). The position of SCBs (red rectangles), TATA box (yellow rectangle), and TSS (arrow) are also shown. The error bars are the SE from three independent measurements (same for below).

(B) The maximum occupancy of Nuc -3, NDR, Nuc -2 and Nuc -1 (left to right panels) in synchronized cells at different cell cycle time points after release from the α factor block. The *CLN2pr* activation occurred within the marked time period (10–50 min after the release, including both mother and daughter cells; see also Figure S1B).

(C) The construct and the nucleosome distribution of Omer promoter, where the NruI-SphI segment containing the SCBs was deleted.

(D) Typical GFP intensity versus time traces in a single cell driven by WT (red) or Omer promoter (gray). The fluorescence signal was averaged over the cell area, corrected by subtracting a baseline connecting flanking troughs, and normalized by the average peak intensity per cell cycle of WT *CLN2pr* (same for the other figures unless specified). The colored arrows define the cell division time marked by disappearance of the Myo1 ring.

(E) The histogram of the peak-to-trough difference in the GFP signal per cell cycle for WT and Omer promoters.

driven by these promoters have important physiological functions: the endogenous gene driven by *CLN2pr*, G1 cyclin *CLN2*, is a key regulator mediating G1/S transition (Start). In

the absence of a close analog, *CLN1*, lack of *CLN2* leads to death (unbudded arrest) in ~30% of the cell population (Skotheim et al., 2008). The *HO* gene encodes an endonuclease required for mating-type switching, a critical event in the life cycle of homothallic yeasts. Therefore, the regulatory properties of *CLN2pr* and *HOpr* have direct physiological implications.

We constructed a series of comparable promoters with SCBs either nucleosome embedded or exposed in NDR. Across this series, promoters with nucleosome-embedded SCBs led to highly variable, “on/off” expression in individual cell cycle, while comparable promoters with NDR-localized SCBs reliably activated transcription every cell cycle with low expression noise (as was observed with the WT *CLN2pr*). The “on/off” expression displayed partial inheritance from the previous mother cycle with a half-life of approximately one cell cycle. We further explored the molecular mechanism of this bimodal transcription, and showed that it was related to the lowered accessibility of SBF to nucleosomal SCBs. Finally, we directly demonstrated that high variability in *CLN2* gene expression induced by nucleosome-embedded SCBs led to reduced cell fitness, implying an evolutionary driving force for the conservation of promoter NDR.

RESULTS

CLN2pr SCBs Are Located in NDR

CLN2 expression depends mainly on the transcription factor complex SBF (Swi6p-Swi4p), and secondarily on a closely related complex, MBF (Swi6p-Mbp1p) (Cross et al., 1994; Stuart and Wittenberg, 1994). The upstream activating sequences (UAS) in *CLN2pr* contain three consensus SCBs (Figure 1A), which are required for efficient *CLN2* transcription, and two potential MBF binding sites (MCBs), which partially overlap the SCBs (Cross et al., 1994; Stuart and Wittenberg, 1994). SBF is loaded onto *CLN2pr* starting in late mitosis (Koch et al., 1996) without immediately inducing promoter activation, primarily because of Whi5 inhibition (Costanzo et al., 2004; de Bruin et al., 2004). At cell cycle Start, Whi5 is inactivated, and SBF-dependent transcription of *CLN2pr* is initiated. Later, *CLN2pr* is turned off due to SBF unloading from the promoter (Koch et al., 1996). The effect of chromatin structure on this cyclical regulatory pathway is unknown.

We mapped nucleosomes on the *CLN2pr* by MNase assay and qPCR (Kent and Mellor, 1995; Sekinger et al., 2005). Nucleosome occupancy was normalized to nucleosome -1 in *PHO5pr*, which was shown to be fully occupied (Jessen et al., 2006; Sekinger et al., 2005; Svaren and Horz, 1997). *CLN2pr* contained three positioned nucleosomes (-1, -2 and -3), and a ~300 bp NDR between nucleosome -2 and -3 (Figure 1A). The SCBs were located within the NDR, while the TATA box and TSS were buried inside nucleosome -1. Our data are consistent with two genome-wide nucleosome maps (see Figure S1A available online) (Lee et al., 2007; Mavrich et al., 2008a), which employed different methodologies: immunoprecipitation with H3 and H4 antibody and sequencing (Mavrich et al., 2008a), and hybridization with tiling microarray (Lee et al., 2007). Agreement between these data provides strong support to our nucleosome mapping data.

Next, we synchronized cells in G1 by α -factor block, and assayed nucleosome positioning at different times after release.

Throughout a cell cycle, nucleosome –3 was constantly occupied, and NDR remained nucleosome free. In contrast, occupancy of nucleosomes –1 and –2 dropped upon activation of *CLN2pr* (Figure 1B, Figure S1B; consistent with previous lower-resolution measurements [Hogan et al., 2006]), probably allowing general transcription machinery to assemble onto the TATA box. Eviction of nucleosomes –1 and –2 required SBF binding, since it did not occur upon removal of SCBs (Figure S1C). After transcription was turned off, nucleosomes –1 and –2 were gradually reassembled (Figure 1B).

***CLN2pr* Activation Occurs Reliably Once Every Cell Cycle**

We fused an unstable GFP reporter (Mateus and Avery, 2000) to the *CLN2pr* to evaluate its transcriptional activity in individual cells (Bean et al., 2006; Figure 1C). The promoter fusion only produces GFP; all strains for transcription analysis contain an intact, WT *CLN2* gene. Myo1-mCherry, which forms a bud neck ring between bud emergence and cytokinesis, was used to accurately time cell birth (Di Talia et al., 2007). The time-lapse method allowed us to probe the average transcription level, cell-to-cell variability, and activation kinetics, as well as correlations between different generations through cell pedigrees.

GFP driven by *CLN2pr* exhibited periodic change once per cell cycle (Bean et al., 2006) (Figure 1D). The histogram of its peak expression per cell cycle was unimodal (Figure 1E; see Table S2 for the size of the data set, same as below unless specified), with a coefficient of variation (mean divided by SD) of 0.27. Deletion of an ~100 bp segment from the *CLN2pr* containing all three SCBs and two MCBs (“0mer promoter”; Figure 1C) almost eliminated transcription activation (Figures 1D and 1E). The remaining fluctuation in the fluorescence signal (0.1; normalized by WT *CLN2pr* level, same as below) mostly came from cell autofluorescence background (Figure S1D). The two histograms in Figure 1E were well separated, showing that SCB-dependent *CLN2pr* expression occurred reliably in every cell cycle.

***CLN2pr* Variant with Nucleosomal SCBs Induces Bimodal, “On/Off” Activation in Individual Cell Cycles**

To determine the functional significance of NDR localization of the *CLN2pr* SCBs, we engineered three closely spaced SCBs into the positioned nucleosome –2 in the 0mer promoter with the endogenous SCBs deleted (“3merNuc promoter”; Figure 2A). These synthetic SCBs were generated by mutagenesis with minimal perturbation to the original sequence (Figure S2A). MNase mapping confirmed that these SCBs were indeed covered by nucleosome –2 (Figure 2A; Figure S2B).

The 3merNuc promoter could drive GFP expression at a level of 0.4, but only in ~75% of cell cycles. In the example shown in Figure 2B (top left panel), the promoter fired at cell cycle 1 and 3, but “skipped” cycle 2 (image data in Figure S2C). Accordingly, the expression from this promoter showed a clear bimodal, 2-Gaussian distribution (Figure 2B; Figure S2D). The lower peak centered at ~0.1, identical to the 0mer promoter background, showing that SBF activation was effectively “off” in these cycles. The two Gaussian curves intersected at ~0.18, which we used as an empirical threshold to differentiate between “on” and “off” cycles.

The “On/Off” Pattern Displays Short-Term Memory from the Previous Mother Cycle

To examine how the “on/off” transcription pattern propagated as cells divided, we mapped the “on/off” cycles across pedigrees (Figure 2C; more examples in Figure S2E), and analyzed the correlation between adjacent cell generations. Interestingly, “on” and “off” cycles clustered within pedigrees: when a mother cycle was “off,” both the next mother and daughter cycle had an above-random probability to be “off,” and conversely for “on” cycles (Figure 2D). For example, “off” cycles have an overall frequency of ~25%, but an “off” mother has two “off” descendants from a previous “off” mother cycle $22 \pm 7\%$ of the time, rather than the random expectation of 6% ($p < 2 \times 10^{-3}$).

To quantify the characteristic time of this generation-to-generation memory, we measured the “off” probability of sequential descendants of an individual cell following an initial “off” cycle. We observed an apparent exponential decay with a half-life of 0.8 ± 0.3 cell cycle (Figure 2E). The transcription pattern was similarly propagated from mother to mother and from mother to daughter.

The “On” Cycles of 3merNuc Promoter Had the Same Activation Kinetics as the WT *CLN2pr*

We compared activation and repression kinetics between wild-type cycles and the “on” cycles of the 3merNuc promoter (Experimental Procedures; Figures S2F and S2G). With WT *CLN2pr*, GFP induction occurred at 6.7 ± 0.4 min after cytokinesis in mother cells ($N:163$) and 22.2 ± 1.0 min in daughter cells ($N:126$). In both mother and daughter cells, the WT *CLN2pr* was activated for 24.8 ± 0.4 min before repression. The “on” cycles of the 3merNuc promoter had identical kinetics: the activation occurred at $\sim 6.6 \pm 0.4$ min (mother cells, $N:90$) and 23.0 ± 1.5 min (daughter cells, $N:60$) after cytokinesis, and the activation period was 23.4 ± 0.5 min. Thus, despite frequent “off” cycles with 3merNuc promoter, the “on” cycles exhibit no defects in activation and repression kinetics, and only a minor reduction in magnitude.

***CLN2pr* Variants with NDR-Localized Synthetic SCBs Induce Unimodal Activation**

To test whether “on/off” transcription was specifically due to nucleosome positioning, we devised two control promoters with SCBs in the NDR. In the “3merNDR promoter,” the same synthetic 3mer SCBs were inserted into the NDR of the 0mer promoter. Nucleosome analysis on this promoter confirmed that the inserted SCBs were unoccupied by nucleosomes (Figure 2A; Figure S2B). In the “3merNuc-polyT” promoter, we introduced a polyT stretch into nucleosome –2 of the 3merNuc promoter. PolyT antagonizes nucleosome formation (Anderson and Widom, 2001; Field et al., 2008; Mavrich et al., 2008a; Yuan et al., 2005), and was shown to increase accessibility of the Gcn4 binding sites in chromatin in vivo (Iyer and Struhl, 1995). Indeed, nucleosome –2 in the 3merNuc-polyT promoter relocated upstream, leaving the 3mer SCBs nucleosome free (Figure 2A; Figure S2B).

These promoters expressed at a level comparable to the “on” cycles of the 3merNuc promoter (0.35 and 0.6 versus 0.4). However, in striking contrast to 3merNuc promoter, their expression was unimodal, firing in every cell cycle (Figure 2B).




Figure 2. Construct, Nucleosome Distribution, and Expression Profile of 3merNuc, 3merNDR, and 3merNuc-polyT Promoters
(A) The construct of the three promoters. The sequence of the SCB-containing region in these promoters is shown with the SCB consensus highlighted in red. The polyT sequence is shown in magenta. The inferred nucleosome distributions on these promoters are also shown (see Figure S2B for nucleosome occupancy data).

Therefore, NDR localization of the SCBs correlated with high reliability and unimodality of expression in the *CLN2pr* variants.

A Complementary Case: *HOpr*

To check the generality of the observations above, we tested another SBF-regulated promoter. Genome-wide, SBF binding was detected with high confidence at 50 promoters (Harbison et al., 2004), and 49 of these promoters have at least some of their candidate SCBs situated in NDR (Lee et al., 2007; Experimental Procedures). The one conspicuous exception was the well-characterized *HO* promoter, in which ~10 SCBs are packed within a positioned nucleosomal array (Figure 3A).

Efficient SBF binding to *HOpr* requires prior upstream loading of Swi5, SWI/SNF, and SAGA, while none of these factors contribute to the SBF binding on *CLN2pr* (Cosma et al., 1999). The reason for this difference was not well understood, and we speculated that this could be due to nucleosomal localization of SCBs in the *HOpr*, but not the *CLN2pr*. To test this idea, we examined nucleosome positioning on the ~600 bp SCB-containing region of *HOpr* (URS2) at different cell cycle stages. For cells blocked in early M phase by Cdc20 depletion, when Swi5 had not bound to the *HOpr*, we detected four positioned nucleosomes in this region with high occupancies. The occupancies were significantly lowered for cells blocked in G1 (Figure 3B) (this effect was clear but incomplete; this is likely due to the fact that Swi5 is only active in mother cells due to Ash1 inhibition in daughters [Cosma et al., 1999], so a two-fold difference is the maximum to expect). Nucleosome removal was Swi5 dependent (Figure 3C), suggesting that Swi5 promotes SBF binding to the *HOpr* by evicting the URS2 nucleosomes. Interestingly, the Swi5 binding sites in URS1 of the *HOpr* are located in NDR (Figure 3A), which may allow Swi5, the most upstream factor for *HO* gene activation, to bind *HOpr* reliably without assistance from other factors. A recent publication also reported SWI5-dependent eviction of URS2 nucleosomes (Takahata et al., 2009).

Hybrid *HO/CLN2* Promoters with Different Localization of SCBs Also Affect Expression Variability

We further pursued the role of NDR localization by constructing *CLN2* and *HO* hybrid promoters. We inserted three short SCB-containing segments (each < 120 bp) from *HO* URS2 into the *Omer* promoter ("*HO-S1*," "*S2*," "*S3*"; Figure 4A). Although these segments were nucleosome bound in the context of the *HO* promoter, they were nucleosome free upon transplantation (Figure 4B; Figure S3A). In contrast, insertion of a ~550 bp

(B) The expression profile of GFP driven by 3merNuc, 3merNDR, and 3merNuc-polyT promoters. Left panel shows a typical single-cell GFP intensity-versus-time trace driven by each promoter, with the arrows representing the cell division time. Right panel was the corresponding histogram of the peak-to-trough difference in the GFP signal per cell cycle.

(C) One example of the 3merNuc cell pedigree with mapped "on" (+) and "off" (-) cycles.

(D) The measured fractions of different transcription profiles following an "off" mother cycle, and comparison with random probabilities.

(E) Propagation of the "off" cycle between different cell generations for 3merNuc promoter (i.e., given one "off" cycle, the probability of the "off" cycle in the subsequent cell cycles in both mother and daughter). The horizontal line represents the "baseline" of average "off" cycle probability. The error bars in (D) and (E) are the SE of the measured probability given the limited sample size.




Figure 3. Genomic Structure and Nucleosome Distribution on WT *HOpr*

(A) Genomic structure of the WT *HOpr*. The locations of URS1, URS2, Swi5 binding sites (green rectangle), SCBs (red rectangles), and TSS (arrow) are shown in the diagram. We measured nucleosome distribution over a ~600 bp segment in URS2 (Figure 3B), and the rest was obtained from global nucleosome positioning data (Lee et al., 2007).

(B) Nucleosome distribution on the WT *HOpr* in the WT strain synchronized in G1 (black) and M (gray) phases. The x axis represents the *HOpr* position relative to its TSS (chr4, 48081) (Nagalakshmi et al., 2008). There was a significant decrease in nucleosome occupancy in the G1 phase. The exact locations of the SCB binding sites (relative to the TSS) are also shown in the plot.

(C) Nucleosome distribution on the WT *HOpr* in *swi5⁻* strain synchronized in G1 (black) and M (gray) phases. There was no significant difference in nucleosome occupancy in the two cell cycle points.

segment of *HO* URS2 (including *S1*, *S2*, *S3*) into the same site in the 0mer promoter (“*HO-L*”) yielded largely nucleosome-covered SCBs, although the nucleosomes seemed to be less-well positioned than in the WT *HOpr* (Figures 4A and 4B; Figure S3A). Thus, this set of promoters allowed comparison of *HO* SCBs transplanted to the same site in the *CLN2pr*, either in NDR or nucleosome bound.

The *HO-S1*, *-S2*, and *-S3* promoters all generated a low (~0.25) but unimodal expression every cell cycle (Figure 4C; Figure S3B). In contrast, the *HO-L* promoter induced highly variable expression. The histogram for the *HO-L* promoter expression showed mostly “off” cycles, with a long tail (~8%) of “on” cycles (Figure 4C) and an overall average of ~0.14. Note that *HO-L* promoter contains all the SBF binding sites in *HO-S1*, *-S2*, and *-S3*, but has lower and more variable expression. This initially counterintuitive observation could be well explained by different nucleosome positioning on these promoters.

As was observed with the 3merNuc promoter, the “on/off” cycles on the *HO-L* promoter exhibited memory across genera-

tions (Figure 4D). Interestingly, the memory half-life (0.7 ± 0.2 cycle to mother and 0.5 ± 0.1 cycle to daughter; Figure 4D) was similar to that of the 3merNuc promoter, despite large differences in average expression level and “on” frequency. Also similar to the 3merNuc promoter, the “on” cycle of the *HO-L* promoter had the same activation kinetics as the WT *CLN2pr*: the activation time after cytokinesis was 7.6 ± 1.0 min in mother ($N:15$) and 21.3 ± 3.0 min in daughter ($N:11$), and the activation period was 23.8 ± 1.0 min.

To make sure the “on/off” transcription pattern was not specific to the *CLN2* locus, we constructed a hybrid *HOpr/CLN2pr* at the *HO* locus. This “*HO-CLN2pr*” contained the *CLN2pr* TATA box and TSS (Figure 4B), allowing a direct comparison to *CLN2pr* variants. Endogenous Swi5-dependent *HO* regulation would create an NDR over the SCBs in mothers, and Ash1 inhibition of Swi5 would leave the SCBs nucleosome bound in daughters. Therefore on *HO-CLN2pr*, the NDR localization of SCBs was manipulated by altering *trans* factors rather than by *cis* mutation of the sequence. This promoter was fully activated in every mother cell cycle, while daughter cells exhibited bimodal expression, with ~40% of “on” cycles (Figure 4C, lower right panel). In a *swi5⁻* background, the *HO-CLN2pr* became bimodal in both mother and daughter cells, firing in 41% of all cell cycles (Figure 4C, upper right panel). In summary, across all the promoters that we examined, uniform versus bimodal expression correlated with NDR versus nucleosomal localization of SCBs, strongly supporting the notion that nucleosomal localization causes variable expression.

Bimodal Expression Is Unlikely due to Nucleosome Partial Occupancy

We next probed the mechanism for the “on/off” transcription. The simplest explanation for bimodal expression from promoters with nucleosomal SCBs is that the nucleosome(s) covering SCBs is only present in some cell cycles. For instance, 25% occupancy of the nucleosome -2 in the 3merNuc promoter could account for a 75% “on” cycle probability. However, inconsistent with this idea, in early G1 before SBF activation, we found that nucleosome -2 was fully occupied (Figure 5A). This suggests that SBF could gain access to nucleosomal SCBs, at least in some cell cycles. Subsequent transcriptional activation of the 3merNuc promoter was associated with eviction of nucleosome -2, similar to the WT and 3merNDR promoters (Figure 5A), which could explain why the “on” cycle has comparable activation level as that from promoter with NDR-localized SCBs.

H2A.Z Is Not Responsible for Bimodal Expression

A histone variant, H2A.Z, is thought to reduce nucleosome stability and promote more rapid activation for some genes (Abbott et al., 2001; Santisteban et al., 2000; Suto et al., 2000). H2A.Z is preferentially distributed in promoter regions flanking NDR, including the *CLN2pr* nucleosome -2 (Albert et al., 2007; Jin et al., 2009). In addition, H2A.Z is required for epigenetic memory of transcription for some yeast genes (Brickner et al., 2007). It is thus possible that a H2A/H2A.Z mixed population in nucleosome -2 is responsible for the bimodal expression of 3merNuc promoter.

Deletion of the H2A.Z-encoding gene *HTZ1* did not affect the nucleosome distribution on the WT *CLN2pr*, or on the 3merNuc




Figure 4. Construct and Expression Profile of HOpr Variants

(A) The construct of *HO-S1,2,3* and *HO-L* promoters. These promoters were constructed by inserting *HO URS2* (or part of it) into the SphI site in the 0mer promoter, and integrated into the *CLN2* locus. The range of the *HOpr* inserts is shown on the side (relative to the *HO* TSS). (B) The composition and nucleosome distribution on the *HO-S1,2,3*, *HO-L*, and *HO-CLN2* promoters (see Figure S3A for nucleosome occupancy data). Ds, downstream; Us, upstream. The short vertical bars represent SphI sites, and the arrows are the TSS. (C) The expression profile of GFP driven by *HO-S1*, *HO-L* (left panels) and *HO-CLN2pr* in WT and *swi5*⁻ strain background (right panels). The inset in the *HO-L* panel is the enlarged version of the *HO-L* histogram with high expression level. Note this long “tail” did not exist in the histogram of 0mer promoter expression (Figure 1E). In the *HO-CLN2pr* WT strain panel, the solid bars represent daughters and the hatched bars represent mothers. *HO-CLN2pr*




Figure 5. Mechanism of “On/Off” Activation

(A) Nucleosome -2 occupancy as a function of time in synchronized cell populations on both 3merNuc and 3merNDR promoters. Note that, at time 0 (before SBF activation), nucleosome -2 had ~100% occupancy in both promoters. (B) The expression profile of 3merNuc promoter in the WT (gray) versus the *htz1*⁻ strain (dark yellow). The two profiles are essentially identical. (C and D) The expression profile for the 3merNuc (C) and 3merNuc-PolyT (D) promoters in the CY337 (WT)/CY407 (*snf2*⁻) background. 3merNuc promoter still activates in an “on/off” fashion in the absence of SWI/SNF, but the probability of an “on” cycle decreases. In contrast, the expression of 3merNuc-PolyT promoter is not significantly affected. (E) The expression profile of 3merNuc promoter in the WT (1X *SWI4*) (gray) versus the 4X *SWI4* strain (red). Note the increase of the “on” cycle probability in the 4X *SWI4* strain. (F) The “on” cycle probability for 3merNuc, *HO-CLN2*, and *HO-L* promoters in the WT, 4X *SWI4*, and *sin3*⁻ strains. The error bars in are the SE of the measured probability given the limited sample size.

promoter (Figure S4A). Consistent with previous results (Dhillon et al., 2006), SBF activation and repression was mildly slower in the *htz1*⁻ strain. However, it is not clear whether this is a specific effect, since the strain in general grows more slowly than WT.

Importantly, *HTZ1* deletion had no effect on the expression profile of 3merNuc promoter: it was still bimodal, and the

also shows “on/off” expression in WT daughter cells and both mother/daughter cells in the *swi5*⁻ strain (see main text for details).

(D) One example of the *HO-L* cell pedigree with mapped “on” (+) and “off” (–) cycles (left panel). The right panel shows the propagation of the “on” cycle between different cell generations for *HO-L* promoter from mother to mother (blue) and mother to daughter (red). The analysis is identical to that in Figure 2E. The error bars in are the SE of the measured probability given the limited sample size.




Figure 6. Biological Consequence Induced by 3merNuc-CLN2 Versus 3merNDR-CLN2

(A) The average T_{G1} (time from cell division to budding) and its coefficient of variation (CV) for both mother (red) and daughter cells (blue) in *cln1*[−] strains with either 3merNuc and 3merNDR promoters driving *CLN2* expression. (B) The fraction of 3merNDR-CLN2 strain in a growth competition assay with 3merNuc-CLN2 strain. The 3merNDR-CLN2 strain gradually outcompeted the 3merNuc-CLN2 strain in D+10× Met media (red), but not in D-Met where *Met3pr-CLN2* was expressed. The error bar represents the SE of two repeated growth competition assays.

maximum expression level per cell cycle remained essentially the same (Figure 5B). The memory of the “on/off” profile was not affected in the *htz1*[−] strain either (data not shown).

SWI/SNF Is Not Strictly Required for, but Contributes to, the Activation of 3merNuc Promoter

The activation of WT *CLN2pr* is not SWI/SNF dependent (data not shown). However, nucleosomal SCBs could have elevated dependence on SWI/SNF, as has been demonstrated for Gal4 binding sites (Burns and Peterson, 1997). SWI/SNF was also implicated in memory of gene activation (Kundu et al., 2007). To test whether stochastic recruitment of SWI/SNF leads to the “on/off” activation, we carried out the time-lapse analysis of the 3merNuc and 3merNuc-polyT promoters driving unstable GFP in the *snf2*[−] background (CY407).

Similar to the WT *CLN2pr*, the activation of 3merNuc-PolyT promoter is not significantly affected by the absence of SWI/SNF (Figure 5D). GFP expression from 3merNuc promoter could also be detected in a small subset of cell cycles in the *snf2*[−] strain (Figure 5C). Therefore, SWI/SNF is not strictly required for its activation. However, the probability of “on” cycle decreases significantly in the *snf2*[−] background (~30%, compared with ~65% in the WT CY337 background), indicating that SWI/SNF may contribute to the activation of the 3merNuc promoter, probably by destabilizing/evicting nucleosome −2.

“On” Cycle Probability Is Increased with Elevated SBF Concentration and Histone Acetylation Level

To investigate whether the “on/off” transcription could be rescued by high SBF concentration, we increased SBF level by integrating three extra copies of *SWI4* (likely to be the limiting factor in the SBF complex [Ghaemmaghami et al., 2003]). The increased *Swi4* had little effect on the expression profile of WT promoter, suggesting that *Swi4* may be saturating for WT. It also had no effect on the 0mer promoter, as expected, since this promoter lacks *Swi4* binding sites. Interestingly, extra copies of *SWI4* increased the “on” cycle probability of all the “on/off” promoters (Figures 5E and 5F; Figure S4B). Reversely, when we reduced the SBF/MBF concentration by constructing diploid strain with single copy of *SWI4/MBP1* gene (JB22d), the “on” probability of the 3merNuc promoter was reduced compared to that from a diploid strain with two copies of *SWI4/MBP1* (JB14d) (Figure S4C).

Histone acetylation is thought to weaken the interaction between neighboring nucleosomes and help recruit/stabilize SWI/SNF on target nucleosomes, and therefore may allow more accessibility of buried TFBS (for review, see Hansen, 2002). Previous bulk experiments have shown that deletion of histone deacetylase *Sin3p* increased *HO* expression in the absence of *Swi5* and *Gcn5* (Krebs et al., 1999; Mitra et al., 2006). Interestingly, our single-cell assay revealed that the average expression level in the “on” cycles of *HO-CLN2* (in *swi5*[−] strain) and *HO-L* promoters was similar with or without *Sin3p* (both ~0.5–0.6), but the “on” probability were significantly increased by *sin3*[−] deletion (Figure 5D; Figure S4D). In contrast, this deletion did not affect the expression of 3merNuc promoter (probably not a *Sin3p* target [Figure S4D]). Therefore, the increase of “on” cycle probability in the *sin3*[−] strain was not a global effect, but likely correlated with local changes in acetylation levels. These results indicate that the “on/off” transcription is related to the lowered accessibility of SBF to nucleosomal SCBs.

Biological Consequences of NDR

To determine if increased transcriptional noise due to nucleosomal localization of SCBs has functional consequences, we fused the 3merNuc and 3merNDR promoters to *CLN2* coding sequence instead of to GFP, and placed them in a background where both WT *CLN1* and *CLN2* were deleted (*cln1*[−], *MET3pr-CLN2*, *cln2*[−]::3merNuc/3merNDR-CLN2). These two promoters are directly comparable, because they have similar structure and almost identical average transcription level (0.32 ± 0.01 versus 0.35 ± 0.01), but the 3merNuc promoter is much more variable (Figure 2B). When growing in D+10× Met media, where the *MET3pr-CLN2* is repressed, the $G1$ time (from cell division to budding) was longer and more variable in the 3merNuc-CLN2 strain than the 3merNDR-CLN2 strain for both mother and daughter cells (Figure 6A). Qualitatively similar effects could be detected even in the presence of *CLN1* (data not shown).

The prolonged and more variable $G1$ period in the 3merNuc-CLN2 strain could potentially serve as a driving force favoring low variability in the *Cln2p* expression. To test this idea, we carried out a growth competition assay (Experimental Procedures) where the two strains above were grown together and the composition of the culture were monitored over 30

generations. The 3merNDR-*CLN2* strain successfully out-competed the 3merNuc-*CLN2* strain (Figure 6B). This effect was specifically due to defects in *CLN2* expression, since no competitive advantage was observed when the ectopic *MET3-CLN2* was also expressed (Figure 6B). This is a direct demonstration that low variability of house-keeping gene driven by NDR-localized TFBSs increases cell fitness.

DISCUSSION

NDR Localization of TFBS Reduces Gene Expression Variability

Conflicting results have been obtained with respect to the effect of nucleosome positioning on transcription *in vivo*. The abundance of NDR-localized TFBSs genome wide suggests that an “open” chromatin domain is important for activators to gain access; on the other hand, nucleosome-embedded binding sites still allow efficient transcription factor binding and activation.

Based on genome-wide correlation between transcription noise and nucleosome occupancy, a hypothesis was proposed that promoter chromatin structure could affect variability in gene expression (Choi and Kim, 2009; Field et al., 2008; Tirosh and Barkai, 2008). This intriguing hypothesis still required direct experimental testing, for several reasons. First, correlation does not demonstrate causality; low expression variability and NDR could both be consequences of other structural or regulatory features, so that NDR could correlate with but not directly cause low expression variability. The correlations display a substantial P-value because of the sample size, yet the information conveyed for any particular gene is low. Second, the noise dataset used in those studies was from snapshots of GFP-tagged strain in asynchronous culture (Newman et al., 2006), and therefore does not apply to cell-cycle regulated genes. For instance, WT *CLN2pr* would be scored as highly variable in this dataset, but the actual expression noise is low once cell cycle timing is taken into account (see above). Third, two of these papers (Choi and Kim, 2009; Tirosh and Barkai, 2008) analyzed the nucleosome occupancy relative to transcription and translation start sites, which lowers sensitivity for detecting specific effects of TFBS localization.

Here, through direct experimental manipulation of nucleosomal occupancy over TFBS in individual promoters, we demonstrate a key role of NDR in suppressing transcriptional variability. On both *CLN2* and *HO* promoter variants, we found that SBF activation could still occur even with nucleosome-embedded SCBs. However, this activation is highly variable, firing only in a subset of cell cycles. Such an “on/off” transcription profile was not observed for any WT cell cycle-regulated promoter so far assayed at the single-cell level (Skotheim et al., 2008), suggesting a strong evolutionary pressure for suppressing such variable expression, at least partially through NDR localization of TFBS (see below).

Some origins of DNA replication only fire in some cell cycles, and there is evidence that origin efficiency correlates with its nucleosome density (Field et al., 2008; Gerbi and Bielinsky, 2002). These results are potentially related to our observations. However, the high density of replication origins on chromosomes means that failure of initiation from a given origin has relatively minor consequence of passive replication from adjacent

origins—replication will not fail altogether. In contrast, failure to express a gene is more problematic; in particular, failure to express an unstable protein, such as many cell cycle regulators, is not correctable within a cell cycle. This could be why NDRs have been efficiently selected on promoters, but not replication origins.

The Mechanism of the “On/Off” Cell Cycles and Its Memory

The lowered accessibility of the nucleosomal SCBs could lead to “on/off” expression through two, nonexclusive mechanisms: 1) Nucleosomal SCBs could stochastically delay activation onset, resulting in sporadic “skips” of a transient pulse of SBF activity; 2) there could be structural heterogeneity in the structure of promoters with nucleosomal SCBs, resulting in different accessibility in different cell cycles. Evidence so far excluded the heterogeneity in nucleosome occupancy and H2A.Z, but there are other possibilities, such as variation in SBF concentration, variation in factors bound to the promoter, and heterogeneity in nucleosome positioning and/or modifications. We can divide these variations into the “intrinsic” component, such as the heterogeneity in local chromatin structure, and the “extrinsic” component, such as the variation in SBF concentration (Elowitz et al., 2002; Raser and O’Shea, 2005). These two components can be differentiated by using multiple copies of the same promoter driving different fluorescence reporters in the same cell (Elowitz et al., 2002), which will be an interesting direction to pursue in the future. Some of these variations likely occur at the WT *CLN2pr* as well, but NDR localization of SCBs renders the promoter robust to these environmental noises.

We also observed partial inheritance of “on/off” transcription. Heritable chromatin structure/nuclear localization can provide memory in several systems, such as telomeric transcriptional silencing (Laurenson and Rine, 1992; Xu et al., 2006) and rapid reactivation of *GAL1-10* (Brickner et al., 2007; Kundu et al., 2007). If the “memory” that we observed is also related to local chromatin/nuclear structure, our results would reflect how these structures are inherited across generations in a single cell during continuous growth, a property hard to measure directly. The roughly one cell cycle half-life of memory in our system is consistent with the idea that, at division, the prior transcription pattern is “remembered” in one of the descendants, while the pattern in the other one is randomly acquired. Further experiments are required to test such a model.

NDR Mechanism

Although the mechanism of generating and maintaining NDR is not the focus of our work, some of our observations are relevant to this question. First, SBF is neither necessary nor sufficient for generating NDR. During a cell cycle, the NDR on *CLN2pr* is constitutive, even though SBF binding and transcriptional activation only occur for a short period of time. In a *swi4 mbp1* double deletion strain, where there is no SBF or MBF to bind the sites, and *CLN2pr* activation is completely abolished (Koch et al., 1993), the *CLN2pr* NDR remains intact (unpublished data). These observations are consistent with other controllable promoters, such as *GAL1-10* and *PHO5*, which contain constitutive NDRs irrespective of the transcriptional status of the gene (Lohr, 1997; Svaren and Horz, 1997). Conversely, ~10 copies of SCBs are not

sufficient to evict the nucleosome on *HOpr* URS2, even when this sequence is transplanted to the NDR region of the *CLN2pr*. Second, although H2A.Z is enriched in nucleosome -2 of *CLN2pr* (Albert et al., 2007), its deletion has no effect on the nucleosome distribution on the promoter. This is consistent with a recent finding (Hartley and Madhani, 2009) that H2A.Z disposition is dispensable for NDR formation. Third, NDR is resistant to short-sequence deletion/insertion (Omer, 3merNDR, and *HO-S1,2,3* promoter), but not long-sequence insertion (*HO-L* promoter). This result suggests that the factors responsible for NDR formation have local effects on nucleosome positioning, and are not able to compete with nucleosome-positioning sequences that are longer than the nucleosome repeat length.

Direct Evidence that Those NDR-Localized TFBSs Could Be Selected Through Evolution

NDRs are, in general, energetically unfavorable due to the high affinity between histone and DNA (Thastrom et al., 2004). Indeed, we have found that the NDR sequence of *CLN2* efficiently forms nucleosomes in vitro by salt dialysis, indicating extra energy is required for nucleosome depletion (unpublished data). Nevertheless, many natural promoters contain NDRs, suggesting an important biological function.

We demonstrate that NDR localization of TFBSs limits transcriptional noise, and we tested the biological consequences of NDR- or nucleosomal-localized SCB sites driving *Cln2* expression. *Cln2* is responsible for transcriptional positive feedback that ensures the sharp activation of SBF at Start, which is important for coherent expression of the G1/S regulon (Skotheim et al., 2008), and therefore unreliable *CLN2* expression is likely to be detrimental. Indeed, 3merNuc-*Cln2* strain showed reduced cell fitness. This argument could likely be extended to other SBF-regulated genes (as noted above, 49/50 SBF-bound promoter contain NDR-localized SCBs). Although high expression variability in stress-response genes was indicated to be beneficial for the cell fitness (e.g., Blake et al., 2006), noisy expression of most genes, especially house-keeping genes, such as *CLN2*, is likely to be harmful and therefore minimized by natural selection (Fraser et al., 2004). Especially in higher multicellular organisms, the development and patterning relies on the coordination of the expression of many genes over multiple cells. Many of these genes are under control of a complicated regulation network, where gene expression noise tends to propagate and amplify. The robustness of gene regulation in these organisms indicates highly evolved mechanisms to suppress noise. Since NDR reduces gene expression noise, these results provide an explanation for the abundance and conservation of NDR.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Strains and Plasmids

Standard methods were used to construct the strains and plasmids. All strains are W303-congenic. To introduce *CLN2pr* variation, we started from plasmid pLB02 (containing WT *CLN2pr*-GFP-*CLN2pest* with *CaURA3* marker), mutated the WT *CLN2pr* as desired, digested at the BbsI site in the WT/mutant *CLN2pr*, and integrated into the strain GC46-03 (MATa, *MYO1::MYO1-mCherry-SpHIS5*, *ADE2*) at the *CLN2* locus. The Omer promoter is constructed by deletion of the NruI-SphI segment from WT *CLN2pr* (Figure 1C). 3merNuc, 3merNDR, and 3merNuc-polyT promoters are all mutations from the Omer

promoter, and each only differs by a few bases; detailed methods of their construction are shown in Figure S2A. For the hybrid promoters of *HO* and *CLN2*, we inserted the *HO* URS2 (from -841 to -307 of *HOpr* relative to its TSS) into the SphI site in the Omer promoter (Figure 4A), and integrate the plasmid either into the *CLN2* locus to form *HO-L* promoter, or into the *HO* locus to form *HO-CLN2pr*. The change in integration site is achieved by digesting the plasmid, either in the *CLN2pr* region upstream the SphI site (at the BbsI site), or inside the *HO* URS2 insert (at the AflII site). For the *HO-S1,2,3* promoters, we inserted short segments from *HO* URS2 (see Figure 4A for the range of the segments) into the SphI site in the Omer promoter, and integrated into the *CLN2* locus.

For nucleosome analysis, the *ura⁻* “popout” strain containing the varied *CLN2pr* was selected on FOA plates so that the WT *CLN2pr* was eliminated. This step is to keep the *CLN2pr* sequence as a single copy in the strain to avoid complication for the subsequent PCR analysis. *sin3⁻::KanMx* strain was obtained by one-step gene replacement. Extra copies of *SWI4* were introduced by integrating multiple pRS404-SWI4 (derived from pTOW-SWI4; Moriya et al., 2006) into W303 α , and crossing with strains containing *CLN2pr* variants driving GFP. The *SWI4* copy number was estimated by qPCR. See Table S1 for the complete strain list.

Nucleosome Mapping

For the MNase assay, we used the protocol described by Kent and Mellor (1995). In brief, we first grew cells in a volume of 10 ml to an optical density (OD) of ~ 0.15 , harvested the cell, and washed in 0.5 ml water. Then we resuspended the cells in 0.5 ml of sphaeroplasting solution (1 M sorbitol, 0.5 mM 2-mercaptoethanol, 0.18 mg/ml zymolyase), incubated at room temperature for ~ 5 min with gentle stir. We harvested the cell, washed it in 1 ml of 1 M sorbitol, then resuspended the pellet in 200 μ l of digestion buffer (1 M sorbitol, 50 mM NaCl, 100 mM Tris-Cl [pH 7.4], 5 mM MgCl₂, 1 mM CaCl₂, 1 mM 2-mercaptoethanol, 0.5 mM spermidine, 0.075% NP-40, micrococcal nuclease with a final concentration 1–10 U/ml) for ~ 8 min at 37°C. After terminating the MNase digestion by adding 20 μ l quench buffer (250 mM EDTA, 5% SDS), we extracted the DNA with phenol/chloroform, and proceeded with the qPCR analysis with stacking PCR primer pairs as described by Sekinger et al. (2005). The PCR products were all ~ 100 bp in length, and the distances between adjacent primers were typically 30–50 bp. We used the nucleosome -1 on the *PHO5pr* as the standard to scale the occupancy from 0 to 1 (Sekinger et al., 2005).

Error Bars

The error bars on all figures and supplementary figures represent the SE in the measurements. For nucleosome occupancy, the error bars represent the SE from three independent measurements. For the fluorescence measurements, see Table S2 for the size of the data set.

Time-Lapse Fluorescence Microscopy and Data Analysis

Sample preparation for the time-lapse assay was performed as previously described (Bean et al., 2006; Charvin et al., 2008). The instrumentation of the time-lapse microscopy and the Matlab software for data acquisition and analysis have been described by Charvin et al. (2008). Images were acquired every 4 min for ~ 8 hr. Within this period, the majority of the cells remained in focus (we did not analyze the cells if they were out of focus). Occasionally, we observed cells arrested in mitosis due to photo damage ($<5\%$ of the whole population), and these cells were discarded in the analysis. The GFP intensity versus time curves, as shown in Figure 1D, were smoothed, then corrected by subtracting a baseline connecting flanking troughs, and finally normalized by the average peak GFP intensity of WT *CLN2pr*.

Analysis of Activation Kinetics

We set up a simplified model in which, during one cell cycle from $t = 0$ to T (division to division time), SBF activation occurred within t_{on} to t_{off} . In this window, GFP protein was produced at a constant rate, k_p , and meanwhile degraded at a rate, K_D . Outside the window, the GFP concentration simply decayed exponentially at the rate K_D . To observe GFP fluorescence signal, the GFP must fold first, which is assumed to be a first-order process with folding rate k_f (Charvin et al., 2008):

$$[\text{GFP}] = \begin{cases} 0 & 0 < t < t_{\text{on}} \\ \frac{k_p}{k_d} [1 - \exp(-k_d \cdot (t - t_{\text{on}}))] - \frac{k_p}{k_d + k_f} [1 - \exp(-(k_d + k_f) \cdot (t - t_{\text{on}}))] & t_{\text{on}} < t < t_{\text{off}} \\ C1 \cdot \exp(-k_d \cdot (t - t_{\text{off}})) - C2 \cdot \exp(-(k_d + k_f) \cdot (t - t_{\text{off}})) & t_{\text{off}} < t < T \end{cases}$$

in which

$$C1 = \frac{k_p}{k_d} [1 - \exp(-k_d \cdot (t_{\text{off}} - t_{\text{on}}))], C2 = \frac{k_p}{k_d + k_f} [1 - \exp(-(k_d + k_f) \cdot (t_{\text{off}} - t_{\text{on}}))].$$

We used the function above to fit the experimental data of GFP intensity versus time during each single cell cycle (from cell division to division). We assumed the $k_f = 0.1 \text{ min}^{-1}$, and the fitted parameters were t_{on} , t_{off} , k_p , and k_d . For examples of fitted curves and fitted parameters, see Figures S2F–S2H.

Nucleosome Positioning at SBF Binding Sites in Genome-Wide Scale

Based on the global nucleosome distribution data (Lee et al., 2007), NDRs were recognized with the following steps: 1) we picked out regions where nucleosome density was lower than -0.6 (log scale); 2) to account for the fluctuations in the density measurement, the neighboring low-density regions were lumped together if the distance between them was smaller than 80 bp; and 3) the low-density region was considered as an NDR if its length was longer than 80 bp. Then, for each of the ~ 100 SBF binding sites detected with the highest confidence (distributed on 50 promoters) (Harbison et al., 2004), we examined whether they fall into an NDR.

Growth Competition Assay

First, individual strains were grown to saturation in D-MET medium. We then mixed approximately equal numbers of cells from both strains into 5 ml of D-MET or D+10 \times MET media to a final OD ~ 0.1 . After OD reaches 0.8 (three generations), we harvested most of the culture, stored it in 4°C, and diluted the remaining cells into the same 5 ml medium to an OD of ~ 0.1 and let it grow to an OD of ~ 0.8 again. After 30 generations, we extracted the gDNA from the cultures collected at different time points, and analyzed the culture composition with rtPCR with PCR primer pairs specific to each strain.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information includes four figures and two tables and can be found with this article online at doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2010.02.007.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge Jon Widom and Irene Moore for advice on the MNase assay; Hisao Moriya for the pTOW-SWI4 plasmid; Craig Peterson for CY337 and CY407 strain; Lea Schroeder and Ying Lu for help with strain construction, and all the members of the F. Cross laboratory for insightful comments. This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (E.D.S. and F.R.C.), the Damon Runyon Cancer Research Fellowship (L.B.), Human Frontier Science Program Organization (G.C.), and the National Science Foundation (E.D.S.).

Received: October 13, 2009
Revised: December 17, 2009
Accepted: February 24, 2010
Published: April 19, 2010

REFERENCES

Abbott, D.W., Ivanova, V.S., Wang, X., Bonner, W.M., and Ausio, J. (2001). Characterization of the stability and folding of H2A.Z chromatin particles: implications for transcriptional activation. *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 41945–41949.
Acar, M., Becskei, A., and van Oudenaarden, A. (2005). Enhancement of cellular memory by reducing stochastic transitions. *Nature* 435, 228–232.
Adkins, M.W., Howar, S.R., and Tyler, J.K. (2004). Chromatin disassembly mediated by the histone chaperone Asf1 is essential for transcriptional activation of the yeast PHO5 and PHO8 genes. *Mol. Cell* 14, 657–666.

Albert, I., Mavrich, T.N., Tomsho, L.P., Qi, J., Zanton, S.J., Schuster, S.C., and Pugh, B.F. (2007). Translational and rotational settings of H2A.Z nucleosomes across the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* genome. *Nature* 446, 572–576.

Anderson, J.D., and Widom, J. (2001). Poly(dA-dT) promoter elements increase the equilibrium accessibility of nucleosomal DNA target sites. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 21, 3830–3839.

Avery, S.V. (2006). Microbial cell individuality and the underlying sources of heterogeneity. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 4, 577–587.

Balasubramanian, B., and Morse, R.H. (1999). Binding of Gal4p and bicoid to nucleosomal sites in yeast in the absence of replication. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 19, 2977–2985.

Bean, J.M., Siggia, E.D., and Cross, F.R. (2006). Coherence and timing of cell cycle start examined at single-cell resolution. *Mol. Cell* 21, 3–14.

Blake, W.J., Balazsi, G., Kohanski, M.A., Isaacs, F.J., Murphy, K.F., Kuang, Y., Cantor, C.R., Walt, D.R., and Collins, J.J. (2006). Phenotypic consequences of promoter-mediated transcriptional noise. *Mol. Cell* 24, 853–865.

Brickner, D.G., Cajigas, I., Fondufe-Mittendorf, Y., Ahmed, S., Lee, P.C., Widom, J., and Brickner, J.H. (2007). H2A.Z-mediated localization of genes at the nuclear periphery confers epigenetic memory of previous transcriptional state. *PLoS Biol.* 5, e81. 10.1371/journal.pbio.0050081.

Burns, L.G., and Peterson, C.L. (1997). The yeast SWI-SNF complex facilitates binding of a transcriptional activator to nucleosomal sites in vivo. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 17, 4811–4819.

Charvin, G., Cross, F.R., and Siggia, E.D. (2008). A microfluidic device for temporally controlled gene expression and long-term fluorescent imaging in unperturbed dividing yeast cells. *PLoS ONE* 3, e1468. 10.1371/journal.pone.0001468.

Choi, J.K., and Kim, Y.J. (2009). Intrinsic variability of gene expression encoded in nucleosome positioning sequences. *Nat. Genet.* 41, 498–503.

Colman-Lerner, A., Gordon, A., Serra, E., Chin, T., Resnekov, O., Endy, D., Pesce, C.G., and Brent, R. (2005). Regulated cell-to-cell variation in a cell-fate decision system. *Nature* 437, 699–706.

Cosma, M.P., Tanaka, T., and Nasmyth, K. (1999). Ordered recruitment of transcription and chromatin remodeling factors to a cell cycle- and developmentally regulated promoter. *Cell* 97, 299–311.

Costanzo, M., Nishikawa, J.L., Tang, X., Millman, J.S., Schub, O., Breitkreuz, K., Dewar, D., Rupes, I., Andrews, B., and Tyers, M. (2004). CDK activity antagonizes Whi5, an inhibitor of G1/S transcription in yeast. *Cell* 117, 899–913.

Cross, F.R., Hoek, M., McKinney, J.D., and Tinkelenberg, A.H. (1994). Role of Swi4 in cell cycle regulation of CLN2 expression. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 14, 4779–4787.

de Bruin, R.A., McDonald, W.H., Kalashnikova, T.I., Yates, J., 3rd, and Wittenberg, C. (2004). Cln3 activates G1-specific transcription via phosphorylation of the SBF bound repressor Whi5. *Cell* 117, 887–898.

Dhillon, N., Oki, M., Szyjka, S.J., Aparicio, O.M., and Kamakaka, R.T. (2006). H2A.Z functions to regulate progression through the cell cycle. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 26, 489–501.

Di Talia, S., Skotheim, J.M., Bean, J.M., Siggia, E.D., and Cross, F.R. (2007). The effects of molecular noise and size control on variability in the budding yeast cell cycle. *Nature* 448, 947–951.

Elowitz, M.B., Levine, A.J., Siggia, E.D., and Swain, P.S. (2002). Stochastic gene expression in a single cell. *Science* 297, 1183–1186.

Field, Y., Kaplan, N., Fondufe-Mittendorf, Y., Moore, I.K., Sharon, E., Lubling, Y., Wodmar, J., and Segal, E. (2008). Distinct modes of regulation by chromatin encoded through nucleosome positioning signals. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 4, e1000216. 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000216.

- Fraser, H.B., Hirsh, A.E., Giaever, G., Kumm, J., and Eisen, M.B. (2004). Noise minimization in eukaryotic gene expression. *PLoS Biol.* 2, e137. 10.1371/journal.pbio.0020137.
- Gerbi, S.A., and Bielinsky, A.K. (2002). DNA replication and chromatin. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* 12, 243–248.
- Ghaemmamghami, S., Huh, W.K., Bower, K., Howson, R.W., Belle, A., Dephoure, N., O'Shea, E.K., and Weissman, J.S. (2003). Global analysis of protein expression in yeast. *Nature* 425, 737–741.
- Hansen, J.C. (2002). Conformational dynamics of the chromatin fiber in solution: determinants, mechanisms, and functions. *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct.* 31, 361–392.
- Harbison, C.T., Gordon, D.B., Lee, T.I., Rinaldi, N.J., Macisaac, K.D., Danford, T.W., Hannett, N.M., Tagne, J.B., Reynolds, D.B., Yoo, J., et al. (2004). Transcriptional regulatory code of a eukaryotic genome. *Nature* 431, 99–104.
- Hartley, P.D., and Madhani, H.D. (2009). Mechanisms that specify promoter nucleosome location and identity. *Cell* 137, 445–458.
- Hogan, G.J., Lee, C.K., and Lieb, J.D. (2006). Cell cycle-specified fluctuation of nucleosome occupancy at gene promoters. *PLoS Genet.* 2, e158. 10.1371/journal.pgen.0020158.
- Iyer, V., and Struhl, K. (1995). Poly(dA:dT), a ubiquitous promoter element that stimulates transcription via its intrinsic DNA structure. *EMBO J.* 14, 2570–2579.
- Jessen, W.J., Hoose, S.A., Kilgore, J.A., and Klade, M.P. (2006). Active PHO5 chromatin encompasses variable numbers of nucleosomes at individual promoters. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* 13, 256–263.
- Jin, C., Zang, C., Wei, G., Cui, K., Peng, W., Zhao, K., and Felsenfeld, G. (2009). H3.3/H2A.Z double variant-containing nucleosomes mark 'nucleosome-free regions' of active promoters and other regulatory regions. *Nat. Genet.* 41, 941–945.
- Kent, N.A., and Mellor, J. (1995). Chromatin structure snap-shots: rapid nuclease digestion of chromatin in yeast. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 23, 3786–3787.
- Koch, C., Moll, T., Neuberg, M., Ahorn, H., and Nasmyth, K. (1993). A role for the transcription factors Mbp1 and Swi4 in progression from G1 to S phase. *Science* 261, 1551–1557.
- Koch, C., Schleiffer, A., Ammerer, G., and Nasmyth, K. (1996). Switching transcription on and off during the yeast cell cycle: Cln/Cdc28 kinases activate bound transcription factor SBF (Swi4/Swi6) at start, whereas Clb/Cdc28 kinases displace it from the promoter in G2. *Genes Dev.* 10, 129–141.
- Krebs, J.E., Kuo, M.H., Allis, C.D., and Peterson, C.L. (1999). Cell cycle-regulated histone acetylation required for expression of the yeast HO gene. *Genes Dev.* 13, 1412–1421.
- Kundu, S., Horn, P.J., and Peterson, C.L. (2007). SWI/SNF is required for transcriptional memory at the yeast GAL gene cluster. *Genes Dev.* 21, 997–1004.
- Lam, F.H., Steger, D.J., and O'Shea, E.K. (2008). Chromatin decouples promoter threshold from dynamic range. *Nature* 453, 246–250.
- Laurenson, P., and Rine, J. (1992). Silencers, silencing, and heritable transcriptional states. *Microbiol. Rev.* 56, 543–560.
- Lee, W., Tillo, D., Bray, N., Morse, R.H., Davis, R.W., Hughes, T.R., and Nislow, C. (2007). A high-resolution atlas of nucleosome occupancy in yeast. *Nat. Genet.* 39, 1235–1244.
- Li, G., Levitus, M., Bustamante, C., and Widom, J. (2005). Rapid spontaneous accessibility of nucleosomal DNA. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* 12, 46–53.
- Liu, X., Lee, C.K., Granek, J.A., Clarke, N.D., and Lieb, J.D. (2006). Whole-genome comparison of Leu3 binding in vitro and in vivo reveals the importance of nucleosome occupancy in target site selection. *Genome Res.* 16, 1517–1528.
- Lohr, D. (1997). Nucleosome transactions on the promoters of the yeast GAL and PHO genes. *J. Biol. Chem.* 272, 26795–26798.
- Mateus, C., and Avery, S.V. (2000). Destabilized green fluorescent protein for monitoring dynamic changes in yeast gene expression with flow cytometry. *Yeast* 16, 1313–1323.
- Mavrich, T.N., Ioshikhes, I.P., Venters, B.J., Jiang, C., Tomsho, L.P., Qi, J., Schuster, S.C., Albert, I., and Pugh, B.F. (2008a). A barrier nucleosome model for statistical positioning of nucleosomes throughout the yeast genome. *Genome Res.* 18, 1073–1083.
- Mavrich, T.N., Jiang, C., Ioshikhes, I.P., Li, X., Venters, B.J., Zanton, S.J., Tomsho, L.P., Qi, J., Glaser, R.L., Schuster, S.C., et al. (2008b). Nucleosome organization in the *Drosophila* genome. *Nature* 453, 358–362.
- Mitra, D., Parnell, E.J., Landon, J.W., Yu, Y., and Stillman, D.J. (2006). SWI/SNF binding to the HO promoter requires histone acetylation and stimulates TATA-binding protein recruitment. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 26, 4095–4110.
- Moriya, H., Shimizu-Yoshida, Y., and Kitano, H. (2006). In vivo robustness analysis of cell division cycle genes in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *PLoS Genet.* 2, e111. 10.1371/journal.pgen.0020111.
- Morohashi, N., Nakajima, K., Kurihara, D., Mukai, Y., Mitchell, A.P., and Shimizu, M. (2007). A nucleosome positioned by alpha2/Mcm1 prevents Hap1 activator binding in vivo. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 364, 583–588.
- Morse, R.H. (1993). Nucleosome disruption by transcription factor binding in yeast. *Science* 262, 1563–1566.
- Morse, R.H. (2007). Transcription factor access to promoter elements. *J. Cell. Biochem.* 102, 560–570.
- Nagalakshmi, U., Wang, Z., Waern, K., Shou, C., Raha, D., Gerstein, M., and Snyder, M. (2008). The transcriptional landscape of the yeast genome defined by RNA sequencing. *Science* 320, 1344–1349.
- Newman, J.R., Ghaemmamghami, S., Ihmels, J., Breslow, D.K., Noble, M., DeRisi, J.L., and Weissman, J.S. (2006). Single-cell proteomic analysis of *S. cerevisiae* reveals the architecture of biological noise. *Nature* 441, 840–846.
- Owen-Hughes, T., and Workman, J.L. (1994). Experimental analysis of chromatin function in transcription control. *Crit. Rev. Eukaryot. Gene Expr.* 4, 403–441.
- Ozsolak, F., Song, J.S., Liu, X.S., and Fisher, D.E. (2007). High-throughput mapping of the chromatin structure of human promoters. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 25, 244–248.
- Raser, J.M., and O'Shea, E.K. (2005). Noise in gene expression: origins, consequences, and control. *Science* 309, 2010–2013.
- Santisteban, M.S., Kalashnikova, T., and Smith, M.M. (2000). Histone H2A.Z regulates transcription and is partially redundant with nucleosome remodeling complexes. *Cell* 103, 411–422.
- Schones, D.E., Cui, K., Cuddapah, S., Roh, T.Y., Barski, A., Wang, Z., Wei, G., and Zhao, K. (2008). Dynamic regulation of nucleosome positioning in the human genome. *Cell* 132, 887–898.
- Sekinger, E.A., Moqtaderi, Z., and Struhl, K. (2005). Intrinsic histone-DNA interactions and low nucleosome density are important for preferential accessibility of promoter regions in yeast. *Mol. Cell* 18, 735–748.
- Shivaswamy, S., Bhinge, A., Zhao, Y., Jones, S., Hirst, M., and Iyer, V.R. (2008). Dynamic remodeling of individual nucleosomes across a eukaryotic genome in response to transcriptional perturbation. *PLoS Biol.* 6, e65. 10.1371/journal.pbio.0060065.
- Skotheim, J.M., Di Talia, S., Siggia, E.D., and Cross, F.R. (2008). Positive feedback of G1 cyclins ensures coherent cell cycle entry. *Nature* 454, 291–296.
- Stuart, D., and Wittenberg, C. (1994). Cell cycle-dependent transcription of CLN2 is conferred by multiple distinct *cis*-acting regulatory elements. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 14, 4788–4801.
- Suto, R.K., Clarkson, M.J., Tremethick, D.J., and Luger, K. (2000). Crystal structure of a nucleosome core particle containing the variant histone H2A.Z. *Nat. Struct. Biol.* 7, 1121–1124.
- Svaren, J., and Horz, W. (1997). Transcription factors vs nucleosomes: regulation of the PHO5 promoter in yeast. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* 22, 93–97.
- Takahata, S., Yu, Y., and Stillman, D.J. (2009). FACT and Asf1 regulate nucleosome dynamics and coactivator binding at the HO promoter. *Mol. Cell* 34, 405–415.

Thastrom, A., Lowary, P.T., and Widom, J. (2004). Measurement of histone-DNA interaction free energy in nucleosomes. *Methods* 33, 33–44.

Tirosh, I., and Barkai, N. (2008). Two strategies for gene regulation by promoter nucleosomes. *Genome Res.* 18, 1084–1091.

Whitehouse, I., Rando, O.J., Delrow, J., and Tsukiyama, T. (2007). Chromatin remodelling at promoters suppresses antisense transcription. *Nature* 450, 1031–1035.

Xu, E.Y., Zawadzki, K.A., and Broach, J.R. (2006). Single-cell observations reveal intermediate transcriptional silencing states. *Mol. Cell* 23, 219–229.

Xu, M., Simpson, R.T., and Kladde, M.P. (1998). Gal4p-mediated chromatin remodeling depends on binding site position in nucleosomes but does not require DNA replication. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 18, 1201–1212.

Yuan, G.C., Liu, Y.J., Dion, M.F., Slack, M.D., Wu, L.F., Altschuler, S.J., and Rando, O.J. (2005). Genome-scale identification of nucleosome positions in *S. cerevisiae*. *Science* 309, 626–630.

Zawadzki, K.A., Morozov, A.V., and Broach, J.R. (2009). Chromatin-dependent transcription factor accessibility rather than nucleosome remodeling predominates during global transcriptional restructuring in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Mol. Biol. Cell* 20, 3503–3513.